

Chapter 1 : Bible Verses about Sin - 20 Scriptures on Sin

From the earliest times the latter sense of the word was more common, as may be seen by St. Augustine's statement: "the deliberate sin of the First man is the cause of original sin" (De nupt. et concup., II, xxvi, 43).

Does the Bible teach in 1 John we no longer sin when we become believers? Everyone still sins or you are denying the very reason Jesus died for us. Paul writes in Rom 7: For what I will to do, that I do not practice; but what I hate, that I do. If, then, I do what I will not to do, I agree with the law that it is good. But now, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells in me. For I know that in me that is, in my flesh nothing good dwells; for to will is present with me, but how to perform what is good I do not find. For the good that I will to do, I do not do; but the evil I will not to do, that I practice. Now if I do what I will not to do, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells in me. As believers we all still have various degrees of sin because of our weakness of the flesh but God looks at us by the blood of Jesus, the person of Christ who took our place. As the Passover lamb we are passed over in judgment. The blood is applied when it is needed, by our confession of sin and repentance, it continues to cleanse us. A mature Christian does not claim they are sinless but is one that repents quickly when he does sin. Linear present linear menon NT: John is saying that one does not continue to sin. The born again believer has no compulsion to sin over and over as He once had, being driven by a fallen nature. As free moral agents we have a choice to obey or not; a true believer will want to be obedient and choose not to sin. Whosoever sinneth- ho NT: Present linear active articular participle like menon NT: To this end was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. He sinned in the beginning, and has never ceased to sin from the beginning, and still sinneth. Linear progressive present active indicative, "he has been sinning from the beginning" of his career as the devil. The Devil operates with pride and self-seeking and the strength of man without God. Humility defeats the Devil as one puts their trust in Christ they are willing to be conformed to His nature. Linear present active indicative as in 1 John 3: The child of God does not have the habit of sin. This is a wrong translation, for this English naturally means "and he cannot commit sin" as if it were kai NT: The present active infinitive hamartanein NT: For the aorist subjunctive to commit a sin see hamartete NT: A great deal of false theology has grown out of a misunderstanding of the tense of hamartanein NT: This cannot be what it means because it would contradict what he said in chapter one about our sin and confessing it. If this scripture meant absolute perfect holiness, it would prove not that some Christians MAY be perfect, but all of them are. We know this to not be so, sin is still active, we are continually fighting against it so it no longer rules over us, but we are to rule over it. But the deposit of the new nature does not have complete control over us. The sinner who does not possess the regeneration of the Spirit will always gravitate toward sin. He cannot choose not to sin but only what kind of sin he will do. We have to see sin as our enemy not just the devil. It may be more of an enemy as we have it with us all the time. The old sinful nature is not yet completely dead and still causes us to sin. We may occasionally give in to sin, but Sin now becomes the exception and not the rule. If sin is ruling a person's life, that person is probably not redeemed Rom 6. In fact the way to tell that we are saved is how we feel when we sin, do we have a conviction or is our conscience seared. And if done there is Godly remorse for it. What was once easy to do is hard, we continually fight against it. The Holy Spirit works, through the word of God, to sanctify us or to make us holy this is why it is so important to be continually in the word and not the world. Continual sinning with no change in affection or life shows that a new birth has not occurred. Again the meaning is a changed lifestyle, where sin does not dominate but by faith and self control, obeying the word sin has become the lesser influence on the believer. Sinless perfection is beyond our reach for the time being because the old nature is not eradicated, John and Paul writes about practical holiness and obedience that we might not sin. But if any man sins God has given us a provision, the blood of Christ and an advocate "Jesus Christ himself 1 Jn. Matthew Henry writes "All who walk near to God, in holiness and righteousness, are sensible that their best days and duties are mixed with sin. God has given testimony to the sinfulness of the world, by providing a sufficient, effectual Sacrifice for sin, needed in all ages; and the sinfulness of believers themselves is shown, by requiring them continually to confess their sins, and to apply by faith to the blood of

that Sacrifice. That we have no sin. Even the apostle John does not exclude himself from the universal if we say" Ebrard. The same verb as applied to deceivers of various kinds, this would be one of the worst deceptions, to tell people they do not have to be concerned with sin any longer because they cannot sin. A denial of the continual cleansing that is offered to us by the crucifixion of Jesus. Copyright c No portion of this site is to be copied or used unless kept in its original format in the way it appears. Articles can be reproduced in portions for ones personal use, any other use is to have the permission of the author first. To Support Ministries We would like to hear from you. Our time is valuable just as yours is. Please keep in mind, we only have time to answer sincere inquiries. We will use discretion in answering any letters.

Chapter 2 : Seven deadly sins - Wikipedia

At least part of the reason for God's command, however, seems to be that the bad effects of eating unclean meats are not immediately apparent. Sin is seen as an.

How Voluntary Meaning Original sin may be taken to mean: From the earliest times the latter sense of the word was more common, as may be seen by St. It is the hereditary stain that is dealt with here. As to the sin of Adam we have not to examine the circumstances in which it was committed nor make the exegesis of the third chapter of Genesis. Principal adversaries Theodorus of Mopsuestia opened this controversy by denying that the sin of Adam was the origin of death. See the "Excerpta Theodori", by Marius Mercator ; cf. Celestius, a friend of Pelagius , was the first in the West to hold these propositions, borrowed from Theodorus: His sin injured himself only and not the human race " Mercator , "Liber Subnotationem", preface. This, the first position held by the Pelagians , was also the first point condemned at Carthage Denzinger , "Enchiridion", no old no. Against this fundamental error Catholics cited especially Romans 5: Augustine , "Contra duas epist. Paul speaks of the transmission of sin they understood by this the transmission of death. This was their second position, condemned by the Council of Orange [Denz. To take the word sin to mean death was an evident falsification of the text, so the Pelagians soon abandoned the interpretation and admitted that Adam caused sin in us. They did not, however, understand by sin the hereditary stain contracted at our birth, but the sin that adults commit in imitation of Adam. This was their third position, to which is opposed the definition of Trent that sin is transmitted to all by generation propagatione , not by imitation [Denz. Moreover, in the following canon are cited the words of the Council of Carthage , in which there is question of a sin contracted by generation and effaced by generation [Denz. The leaders of the Reformation admitted the dogma of original sin, but at present there are many Protestants imbued with Socinian doctrines whose theory is a revival of Pelagianism. Original sin in Scripture The classical text is Romans 5: In the preceding part the apostle treats of justification by Jesus Christ , and to put in evidence the fact of His being the one Saviour, he contrasts with this Divine Head of mankind the human head who caused its ruin. The question of original sin, therefore, comes in only incidentally. Paul supposes the idea that the faithful have of it from his oral instructions, and he speaks of it to make them understand the work of Redemption. This explains the brevity of the development and the obscurity of some verses. We shall now show what, in the text, is opposed to the three Pelagian positions: Here there is question of physical death. First, the literal meaning of the word ought to be presumed unless there be some reason to the contrary. Second, there is an allusion in this verse to a passage in the Book of Wisdom in which, as may be seen from the context, there is question of physical death. Paul himself, 1 Corinthians Here there can be question only of physical death, since it is opposed to corporal resurrection , which is the subject of the whole chapter. How then could the Pelagians , and at a later period Zwingli , say that St. Paul speaks only of the transmission of physical death? If according to them we must read death where the Apostle wrote sin , we should also read that the disobedience of Adam has made us mortal where the Apostle writes that it has made us sinners. But the word sinner has never meant mortal, nor has sin ever meant death. Also in verse 12 , which corresponds to verse 19 , we see that by one man two things have been brought on all men , sin and death, the one being the consequence of the other and therefore not identical with it. The explanation of the Pelagians differs from that of St. According to them the child who receives mortality at his birth receives sin from Adam only at a later period when he knows the sin of the first man and is inclined to imitate it. The causality of Adam as regards mortality would, therefore, be completely different from his causality as regards sin. And yet all men are, by the influence of Adam , sinners and condemned Romans 5: The influence of Adam cannot, therefore, be the influence of his bad example which we imitate Augustine, "Contra Julian. On this account, several recent Protestants have thus modified the Pelagian explanation: Adam would be no more than the term of a comparison, he would no longer have any influence or causality as regards original sin or death. Moreover, the Apostle did not affirm that all men, in imitation of Adam , are mortal on account of their actual sins ; since children who die before coming to the use of reason have never committed such sins ; but he expressly affirms the contrary in the fourteenth verse: Moreover, we can discern

no natural connexion between any sin and death. In order that a determined sin entail death there is need of a positive law , but before the Law of Moses there was no positive law of God appointing death as a punishment except the law given to Adam Genesis 2: It is, therefore, his disobedience only that could have merited and brought it into the world Romans 5: These Protestant writers lay much stress on the last words of the twelfth verse. We know that several of the Latin Fathers understood the words "in whom all have sinned " , to mean, all have sinned in Adam. This interpretation would be an extra proof of the thesis of original sin, but it is not necessary. Modern exegesis , as well as the Greek Fathers , prefer to translate "and so death passed upon all men because all have sinned " . We accept this second translation which shows us death as an effect of sin. But of what sin? The words "all have sinned " of the twelfth verse , which are obscure on account of their brevity, are thus developed in the nineteenth verse: Similarly in the twelfth verse the words "all have sinned " must mean, "all have participated in the sin of Adam " , "all have contracted its stain". This interpretation too removes the seeming contradiction between the twelfth verse , "all have sinned " , and the fourteenth, "who have not sinned " , for in the former there is question of original sin, in the latter of personal sin. Those who say that in both cases there is question of personal sin are unable to reconcile these two verses. Original sin in tradition On account of a superficial resemblance between the doctrine of original sin and the Manichaeism theory of our nature being evil , the Pelagians accused the Catholics and St. For the accusation and its answer see "Contra duas epist. In our own times this charge has been reiterated by several critics and historians of dogma who have been influenced by the fact that before his conversion St. Augustine was a Manichaeism. They do not identify Manichaeism with the doctrine of original sin, but they say that St. Augustine , with the remains of his former Manichaeism prejudices, created the doctrine of original sin unknown before his time. It is not true that the doctrine of original sin does not appear in the works of the pre-Augustinian Fathers. On the contrary, their testimony is found in special works on the subject. Nor can it be said, as Harnack maintains, that St. Augustine himself acknowledges the absence of this doctrine in the writings of the Fathers. Baseless also is the assertion that before St. Augustine this doctrine was unknown to the Jews and to the Christians ; as we have already shown, it was taught by St. It is found in the fourth Book of Esdras , a work written by a Jew in the first century after Christ and widely read by the Christians. This book represents Adam as the author of the fall of the human race vii, 48 , as having transmitted to all his posterity the permanent infirmity, the malignity, the bad seed of sin iii, 21, 22; iv, Protestants themselves admit the doctrine of original sin in this book and others of the same period see Sanday, "The International Critical Commentary: It is therefore impossible to make St. Augustine , who is of a much later date , the inventor of original sin. That this doctrine existed in Christian tradition before St. The Pelagians held that baptism was given to children, not to remit their sin , but to make them better, to give them supernatural life , to make them adoptive sons of God , and heirs to the Kingdom of Heaven see St. Augustine , Of Sin and Merit I. The Catholics answered by citing the Nicene Creed , "Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum". They reproached the Pelagians with introducing two baptisms , one for adults to remit sins , the other for children with no such purpose. Catholics argued, too, from the ceremonies of baptism , which suppose the child to be under the power of evil , i. Original sin in face of the objections from reason We do not pretend to prove the existence of original sin by arguments from reason only. Thomas makes use of a philosophical proof which proves the existence rather of some kind of decadence than of sin , and he considers his proof as probable only, satis probabiliter probari potest Contra Gent. Many Protestants and Jansenists and some Catholics hold the doctrine of original sin to be necessary in philosophy , and the only means of solving the problem of the existence of evil. This is exaggerated and impossible to prove. It suffices to show that human reason has no serious objection against this doctrine which is founded on Revelation. The objections of Rationalists usually spring from a false concept of our dogma. They attack either the transmission of a sin or the idea of an injury inflicted on his race by the first man , of a decadence of the human race. Here we shall answer only the second category of objections, the others will be considered under a later head VII. Yes, if the progress was necessarily continuous, but history proves the contrary. The line representing progress has its ups and downs, there are periods of decadence and of retrogression, and such was the period, Revelation tells us, that followed the first sin. The human race , however, began to rise again little by little, for neither intelligence nor free will had been

destroyed by original sin and, consequently, there still remained the possibility of material progress, whilst in the spiritual order God did not abandon man, to whom He had promised redemption. This theory of decadence has no connexion with our Revelation. The Bible, on the contrary, shows us even spiritual progress in the people it treats of: This would have weight if we took this decadence in the same sense that Luther took it, i. But according to Catholic theology man has not lost his natural faculties: The Creator, whose gifts were not due to the human race, had the right to bestow them on such conditions as He wished and to make their conservation depend on the fidelity of the head of the family. A prince can confer a hereditary dignity on condition that the recipient remains loyal, and that, in case of his rebelling, this dignity shall be taken from him and, in consequence, from his descendants. It is not, however, intelligible that the prince, on account of a fault committed by a father, should order the hands and feet of all the descendants of the guilty man to be cut off immediately after their birth. This comparison represents the doctrine of Luther which we in no way defend. The doctrine of the Church supposes no sensible or afflictive punishment in the next world for children who die with nothing but original sin on their souls, but only the privation of the sight of God [Denz. Nature of original sin This is a difficult point and many systems have been invented to explain it:

Chapter 3 : Original Sin - Are We Condemned by the Sin of Adam and Eve?

Original sin, also called ancestral sin, is the Christian doctrine of humanity's state of sin resulting from the fall of man, stemming from Adam's rebellion in Eden, namely the sin of disobedience in consuming from the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

The Catechism of the Catholic Church says: By his sin Adam, as the first man, lost the original holiness and justice he had received from God, not only for himself but for all humans. Adam and Eve transmitted to their descendants human nature wounded by their own first sin and hence deprived of original holiness and justice; this deprivation is called "original sin". As a result of original sin, human nature is weakened in its powers, subject to ignorance, suffering and the domination of death, and inclined to sin this inclination is called "concupiscence". Baptism erases original sin but the inclination to sin remains. The absence of sanctifying grace in the new-born child is also an effect of the first sin, for Adam, having received holiness and justice from God, lost it not only for himself but also for us. The sin that through baptism is remitted for them could only be original sin. Baptism confers original sanctifying grace which erases original sin and any actual personal sin. The first comprehensive theological explanation of this practice of baptizing infants, guilty of no actual personal sin, was given by Saint Augustine of Hippo, not all of whose ideas on original sin have been adopted by the Catholic Church. Indeed, the Church has condemned the interpretation of some of his ideas by certain leaders of the Protestant Reformation. The Catechism of the Catholic Church explains that in "yielding to the tempter, Adam and Eve committed a personal sin, but this sin affected the human nature that they would then transmit in a fallen state This "state of deprivation of the original holiness and justice Catechism of the Catholic Church, The doctrine of original sin thus does not impute the sin of the father to his children, but merely states that they inherit from him a "human nature deprived of original holiness and justice", which is "transmitted by propagation to all mankind". The absence of sanctifying grace or holiness in the new-born child is an effect of the first sin, for Adam, having received holiness and justice from God, lost it not only for himself but also for us. The prevailing view, also held in Eastern Orthodoxy, is that human beings bear no guilt for the sin of Adam. The Catholic Church teaches: Is original sin in Scripture? On the other hand, while supporting a continuity in the Bible about the absence of preternatural gifts Latin: Lutheranism[edit] The Lutheran Churches teach that original sin "is a root and fountain-head of all actual sins. As life passes from them to all of their descendants, so does original sin. Every human person born on this earth bears the image of God undistorted within themselves. Rather, they maintain that we inherit our fallen nature. While humanity does bear the consequences of the original, or first, sin, humanity does not bear the personal guilt associated with this sin. Adam and Eve are guilty of their willful action; we bear the consequences, chief of which is death. Some Patristic sources imply that she was cleansed from sin at the Annunciation, while the liturgical references are unanimous that she is all-holy from the time of her conception. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin. The report summarizes: Man is by nature capable of communion with God, and only through such communion can he become what he was created to be. Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam as the Pelagians do vainly talk, but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually. It is wrought by the baptism with or infilling of the Holy Spirit, and comprehends in one experience the cleansing of the heart from sin and the abiding, indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, empowering the believer for life and service. Entire sanctification is provided by the blood of Jesus, is wrought instantaneously by grace through faith, preceded by entire consecration; and to this work and state of grace the Holy Spirit bears witness. The nature of the penalty for original sin, i. By no stretch of the scriptural facts can death be spiritualised as depravity. God did not punish Adam by making him a sinner. They thought of the "sinful nature" in terms of physical mortality rather than moral depravity. Though believing in the concept of inherited sin from Adam, there is no dogmatic Adventist position on original sin. They believe Jesus is the " second Adam ", being the sinless Son of God and the

Messiah , and that he came to undo Adamic sin; and that salvation and everlasting life can only be obtained through faith and obedience to the second Adam. Rather, he is a symbolic representation of the "Most Ancient Church", having a more direct contact with heaven than all other successive churches. However, this rejection of the doctrine of original sin or the necessity of salvation is not something that most conservative or evangelical Quakers affiliated with Friends United Meeting or Evangelical Friends Church International tend to agree with. Although the more conservative and evangelical Quakers also believe in the doctrine of inward light, they interpret it in a manner consistent with the doctrine of original sin, namely, that people may or may not listen to the voice of God within them and be saved, and people who do not listen will not be saved. In Judaism[edit] The doctrine of "inherited sin" is not found in most of mainstream Judaism. Modern Judaism generally teaches that humans are born sin-free and untainted, and choose to sin later and bring suffering to themselves. However, Adam is recognized by some [] as having brought death into the world by his disobedience. Because of his sin, his descendants will live a mortal life, which will end in death of their bodies. Instead, Adam will reproach their mortality because of their sins. But Satan caused them to slip out of it and removed them from that [condition] in which they had been. And We said, "Go down, [all of you], as enemies to one another, and you will have upon the earth a place of settlement and provision for a time. Indeed, it is He who is the Accepting of repentance, the Merciful. If You forgive us not and bestow not upon us Your mercy, we shall certainly be of the losers. Then his Lord chose him, and turned to him with forgiveness, and gave him guidance. And that man can have nothing but what he does of good and bad. And that his deeds will be seen, Then he will be recompensed with a full and the best [fair] recompense.

Chapter 4 : Original Sin | Catholic Answers

that people are born ill because of a sin but this particular man's illness is not a result of a sin but that the works of God might be displayed in him, so this man was born blind so Jesus will cure him and show the works of God.

It is that the believers conscience is now clear as their sins are forgiven. Christians may be forgiven but will inevitably continue to sin and may never be comfortable with sin. One question is whether Christians, though they are seen as pure by God, will be rewarded for overcoming sin. At the final Judgement in Rev The Christians are still judged according to the books, yet are not thrown into the lake of fire. I think that this is an indication that the Christians will still be judged for their lives but will not be condemned. There are also other indications that Christians will be rewarded at the final judgment based on their lives Mat 5: The ultimate reward is to find that your name is in the book of Christ and receive an inheritance with Christ. My inclination is that there is something more as well. God will judge the lives of Christians but they will be seen to be saved in Christ. The Bible speaks about rewards in the Kingdom of Heaven for those who do good now and I take it that these verses may be referring to more than mere salvation. The nature of these rewards is not spelled out, but my opinion is that they are related to seeing others there with you in heaven. One reason to struggle with sin is that the character of your life may lead others to Christ and see them saved on the last day. Struggling with Sin One underlying issue here is that of Christian Assurance. If you are certain that you are saved why worry about struggling with sin? Why not just give in to sin and let God take care of the forgiveness? Romans 6 addresses this issue, to continue in sin is to deny the freedom we have in Christ. Christians are called not to look back to their old lives, or to the world but to set their hope in Christ. That is all well and good but when trying to avoid sin is a struggle, it seems easier to just sin and patch things up later with God. Yet this sort of complacency with sin is dangerous. Most people do not decide to suddenly stop being Christian, normally it is the process of a lots of little compromises until one day you no longer find Jesus relevant or worth believing. If we deliberately keep on sinning after we have received the knowledge of the truth, no sacrifice for sins is left, but only a fearful expectation of judgment and of raging fire that will consume the enemies of God. What this does tell us is that to continue to sin is heading the wrong way, it is not the freedom we have been given in Christ but a return to slavery. While Christians can and do sin, sin must not master the Christian Rom 6. To become complacent about sin in your life as a Christian is profoundly dangerous. In the Bible God speaks two ways to Christians, those who are complacent about sin are called to repent and those who are deeply worried about their sin are reminded that they are secure in Christ. To refuse to struggle against the sin in our lives is to go back and wallow in the filth we have been saved from and to run away from the holy God who has saved us and called us to be holy. At the heart of it, Christians try not to sin because it is better for us not to. God who made us knows the best way for us to live and has given us power through his spirit to begin to live this better way.

Chapter 5 : Christian views on sin - Wikipedia

There could be no expiation for sin apart from the sacrifice of blood, the reason being that God so declared it. "Without shedding of blood is no remission" (Hebrews). "It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul" (Leviticus).

Related Media Introduction Any treatment of Christian doctrine would be incomplete if the biblical statement concerning sin were omitted. Modern Philosophy denies the existence of sin, but any such denial is part of a false philosophy. All refusal to admit the existence of sin can neither be controverted nor challenged. Sin is not a myth, it is not a figment of the mind; sin is a fact. The Explanation of Sin What is sin? When one seeks the answer to this question in the many and varied definitions of men he is left somewhat confused. There is a difference between the way God describes and explains sin, on the one hand, and the way, on the other hand, that men describe and explain sin. God tells us in His Word what sin is. But when any man exalts the human mind to the place of deity and goes so far as to rule God out altogether, that man is on the brink of destruction. The Bible condemns human intellect as the supreme court. Charles Ryrie has given a listing of Hebrew and Greek words which describe sin. He says that in the Hebrew there are at least eight basic words: The usage of these words leads to certain conclusions about the doctrine of sin in the Old Testament. In other words, sin was not simply missing the right mark, but hitting the wrong mark. Kakos, bad Romans From the uses of these words several conclusions may also be drawn. The word that is used most frequently is hamartia, missing the mark. It is the most comprehensive term for explaining sin. Let no man ever think that he comes anywhere near the standard set by God. God has demanded absolute perfection, and no matter how one measures himself, he falls far short. Some men measure themselves on the basis of human intelligence, some by educational attainment, some by financial success, some by cultural environment, and others by religious performance. But God refuses to accept man on any of these grounds. He has established His perfect standard, and by that standard He measures every man. The left-handed marksmen in the Tribe of Benjamin rarely if ever fell short of their target. On the other hand, the Bible contains no record of a man, save Jesus Christ, who never missed the moral standard of Almighty God Every man has failed to do what he ought, therefore the term is fittingly applied to sins of omission. Every man can be charged with the sin of the Pharisees whom our Lord charged with leaving undone the things they ought to have done Matthew Actually God has placed the standard so high so that none can ever reach it. And why do I believe this? I believe it because I know the pride of my own heart, and I am but one member of a fallen and depraved race. Now suppose that we were able to meet the demands of God. Those who made it would never cease to boast about how they did make it, and the unfortunate one who could not make it because of inability or some special inferiority on his own part would be lost forever. But God is not so cruel and compassionless. The thought here is not merely that of doing what is unlawful according to the standard of men, but of a flagrant defiance of the known law of God. Sin, then, is that which is contrary to God Himself. How easily we deceive ourselves and our friends! Both the philosophy and morality of this statement are alike sound and rational. The man who does not decide his actions on the basis of that which he knows is right is deserving of condemnation, because he did not act according to his conviction. The decision of a growing or mature Christian is based upon his love for an obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ. The actions and attitudes which do not proceed from faith in Christ are accounted as sin. If one has doubts about a certain matter, he should abstain from it, but if he goes on to do it anyhow, he acts out of faith, and such an action is sin. We commenced the Christian life by faith, and so we should proceed by faith. Are you wavering between two decisions, to eat or not to eat, to drink or not to drink, to go to a certain amusement or not to go, to say certain things or not say them, to conform to a style of dress or not to conform? If you do something despite strong scruples and convictions against that thing, this is sin which you must judge as sin, for surely God will judge it as sin. What is not done by faith cannot be done to the glory of God. Even though there is no law which says we may not do a certain thing, we may be fully persuaded that the thing is not right, and consequently by doing it we will offend God. In such a case we sin against God and self when we do it. According to Scripture sin first made its appearance in the world in the angelic creation. The obvious deduction is that the sin of these fallen angels was a free act on their part, arising

from their dissatisfaction with the place God assigned to them when He created them. Lucifer, who became the Devil, appears to have been the leader of the rebellion Isaiah They were angels who rose up in rebellion against God. Exactly how such dissatisfaction and rebellion could arise in beings whom God created is not revealed by the sacred writers. We assume that they possessed personality and freedom of will and thereby had the capability of making right or wrong choices. At this point in our study the chief concern is with the entrance of sin in the human race, and this receives a different explanation from that which applied to angels. Sin is a very real and terrible fact of human life. The problem as to its earthly origin is solved in Romans 5. The most tragic chapter in the Bible Genesis 3 contains the inspired account of how sin came into the world. So important is this account to human understanding that God preserved it for all mankind. It is not to be found in the traditions and writings of the various races and antiquities on the earth. The critics of the Bible have referred to the early chapters of Genesis as Babylonian myth, and yet no one has ever found a Babylonian version of the entrance of sin into the human race. Genesis 3 is a divinely inspired account of the facts related to the Fall of man as they actually took place, and this historical record is approved in the New Testament See II Corinthians How did it all happen? And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? The chief agent in the Fall of man was an evil spirit of unusual power and cleverness, no other than Satan himself Revelation Satan did not appear to Eve as one writhing, slithering, hideous creature, but as a creature of grace and beauty with the power to appear as an angel of light II Corinthians He suggested that God did not mean what He said. God had given His Word, and now Satan appears on the scene to sow his tares. Our Lord exposed this method of Satan in His parable in Matthew The fact that Adam and Eve had access to all of the trees except one was minimized by Satan, and the fact that they were restricted from partaking of the one tree was magnified as a harsh and unwelcome restraint imposed by God. The temptation involved a direct attack against the Word of God. Today Satan still uses the familiar suggestion that to obey God is to take out of life all of the possible joy and happiness. All the while he knew that he was leading the human race to death. Thus we see the killer at work in Eden luring the human race to its death by means of his lie. Speaking of the Devil, Dr. Did God know that Satan would deceive Eve and the disastrous results that would follow? Certainly He knew, because He is omniscient. Could God have prevented Satan from entering Eden and deceiving Eve? He could, because He is omnipotent. There is no doubt that the whole experience in Eden was a part of the pre-determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God. As we pursue this series of studies in Biblical Doctrines, it will become clearer that, evil being already present in the universe, the creation and fall of man might have been steps toward the final defeat of Satan and the redemption of man and the earth. But whatever view one takes of the foreknowledge, purposes and permissions of God, we are left with the indisputable fact that Adam and Eve made a wrong moral choice. They disobeyed God and chose to follow evil, knowing full well what the consequences would be. Adam was the first man and the father of all men, so by virtue of the solidarity of the race, when Adam sinned the entire race sinned in him. It is true that we all are sinners by choice, but this is not the point of discussion here. God has made it clear in His Word that this all came about through the disobedience of the first man who stood and acted as the representative of his entire posterity. Now we know that David is not so much as suggesting that the sexual relation between his mother and father, whereby he was conceived, was a sinful act. In substance he is saying the same thing that Paul is saying in Romans 5: The connection is natural and real. The account given in Genesis 3 is the basis for the whole argument, so that David and Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit as was Moses, are in agreement that sin entered the human race through the one man Adam. Sin entered through the disobedience of one man and thereby penetrated to all men. All men commit sins because all are infected with the sin principle. And he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? Only those who repudiate the authority of the Word of God will challenge the fact of transmitted and inherited sin. None can deny that every individual is free to sin or not to sin, but all choose to sin. Why does every member of the race choose to do wrong? Certainly one person could be found who obeyed God in everything if that person existed. Adam and Eve did this after the Fall. This kind of excuse-making is typical of all mankind. The sovereignty of God and the seduction by the Devil do not eliminate the fact that man perpetrates and perpetuates sin, therefore he cannot be relieved of the responsibility for it. Adam and Eve were beguiled by

Satan, yet they were pronounced guilty and punished by God Genesis 3:

Chapter 6 : Original sin - Wikipedia

If our reason told us that the heathen could justly by born sinners, and commit sin necessarily because of an inborn sin nature, and then die in their sins without a knowledge of the Gospel, and go down into hell, they would not object to reason.

Are Men Born Sinners? Overstreet Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it. It makes sin a misfortune and a calamity rather than a crime. It makes the sinner deserve pity and compassion rather than blame for his sins. It excuses the sinner. It makes God responsible for sin. It makes him arbitrary, cruel, and unjust. It causes ministers to wink at and excuse sin. It begets complacency and a low standard of religion among Christians. It is a stumbling-block to the unsaved. It makes Jesus a sinner or it must deny his humanity. It contradicts the Bible. It "adds to" and "takes from" the Bible. God warns against this in Deut. It begets false doctrines and false interpretations of the Scriptures. It is ridiculous, absurd, and unreasonable. Now let us look more fully at each of these points. In fact, if the doctrine of original sin were true, sin would be a calamity rather than a crime. Could a sinful nature be the crime of him upon whom it is entailed without his knowledge or consent? If this doctrine were true, the sinner would be the most unfortunate creature in the universe. To blame him or call him criminal for his sins would be absurd, and to punish him for his sins would be a cruel injustice. He would not deserve punishment for his sins, but would rather deserve pity and compassion for the misfortune he had suffered by being born into this world with a sinful nature. And, of course, under these circumstances the Bible would have to be rewritten. For it never speaks of the sinner as unfortunate. In the Bible, sin is represented as a crime that deserves the everlasting punishment of hell. The sinner knows he cannot be to blame for his sins if he is born a sinner and sins unavoidably because of the nature with which he is born. The sinner is compelled to excuse himself secretly at least if he really believes that he sins because of an inborn sin nature. It is not a matter of whether he chooses to excuse himself or not; he cannot help but excuse himself. If he really believes that he is born a sinner and that he cannot help but sin because of inborn sin, he must and he will excuse himself, even if only secretly. Over against the fact that this doctrine gives the sinner an excuse for his sins, we have the biblical fact that God does not excuse sin. Sin in the Bible is always denounced in the strongest language possible and under the most terrible of penalties. The letter and the spirit of the whole Bible is against any doctrine that would permit men to excuse themselves in their sins. If men are born with a sinful nature, who is to blame? Surely not the sinner, for he had no choice in being born with a sinful nature. The sinner is no more to blame for being born with his nature than he is for being born with blue eyes. But, who is the author of our nature? Who is our Creator? Who gave us life and breath and all things? To talk of men being born with a sinful nature is to ascribe sin to God because God is the Author of our nature. It dishonors God and makes his government tyrannical, cruel, and unjust. Could anything make God more cruel and unreasonable? This doctrine is infinitely dishonorable to God. Men know it would be cruel and unjust to condemn them for the nature with which they are born. They know that they cannot justly be worthy of the wrath of God for being born with a nature which they did not choose and which they could not avoid. They know that God would be a tyrant and his government tyranny if this grotesque doctrine were true. The sinner could not help but stumble over a doctrine that represents God as being cruel and unjust. According to this doctrine, God created us under such physical laws as would cause us all to be born sinners, and then condemns us for being born sinners! The sinner who really believes this doctrine is compelled to regard God as infinitely cruel and unjust. It is not a matter of whether he chooses to regard God as unjust. His irresistible convictions of justice, given to him in his nature by God, will compel him to regard God as unjust. He may not voice his convictions, but he will still hold them secretly nonetheless. Repentance implies that the sinner blame himself for his sins. It implies that he admit that God and his government are righteous and that he has been all wrong. Christ has two great causes in this world today: Every influence of this doctrine is to hinder these two great causes of Christ. And if the Christian believes that his very nature is sinful and that it is impossible for him to live without sinning, then he will not aim for Christian perfection, nor will he feel greatly disturbed about sin and worldliness in his

life. Every tendency of this doctrine begets an indulgent spirit toward sin and a low standard of religion among Christians. It soothes the conscience of sinning Christians, causing them to stumble into hell. Christians sometimes make the excuse that they cannot help but sin because of a sinful nature inherited from Adam. One brother told me that, before his conversion, he actually prayed to God for clemency and excused his sins by telling God that his sins were the result of his Adamic sin nature. It causes ministers to wink at and excuse sin in their churches. Ministers who believe this doctrine will have a tendency to wink at and excuse sin in their churches. The whole tendency of this doctrine is to beget an indulgent spirit toward sin, and the low, unscriptural standard of religion that actually exists in many churches today. Where this doctrine is taught and believed there will be little real horror of sinning against God. Christians and ministers will excuse sin with such statements as: And, thus, the worldly will be allowed to settle down in their worldliness without feeling any really great danger. After all, God knows and understands that they have the "old Adamic sin nature" dwelling in them and will have until they die and go to heaven. God will not judge them for their human weaknesses, frailties, and faults. So multitudes of people in the churches deceive themselves, and go on in the broad way of worldliness, selfishness, and sin which will finally lead them down into hell. It contradicts all the great doctrines of the Bible. This doctrine is so out of character with the Bible that it contradicts all its fundamental teachings. This is something that no true doctrine of the Bible could do, but is exactly what would be expected of a false doctrine. We have already seen that it permits the sinner to excuse himself in his sins. But the letter and the spirit of the whole Bible is against any doctrine that would permit men to excuse themselves in their sins. We have seen that it makes sin a misfortune and a calamity rather than a crime. But the Bible speaks of sin as an act that deserves the everlasting punishment of hell. Also, we have seen that it makes the sinner deserve pity and compassion rather than blame for his sins. But you can search through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will find that God never pities but always blames the sinner for his sins. The fact is that the doctrine of original sin is so contrary to the Bible that to try to make the two harmonize would be like trying to make light and darkness exist together in one and the same place. Only by completely rewriting the Bible could it be made to agree with the doctrine of original sin. For instance, the most fundamental doctrines of the Bible are contradicted by the doctrine of original sin: The doctrines of mercy, grace, guilt, pardon, and repentance. Can a man really be guilty for possessing the nature with which he is born? Can God show him mercy, and pardon his guilt if it is true that he has suffered the misfortune of being born into this world a sinner? What kind of grace would it be that would save a man from the misfortune of being born into this world a sinner? It would not be grace that would save him; it would be justice. And how could a man sincerely repent and condemn himself for his sins if he believed that he was born a sinner and could not avoid sin because of an inborn sin nature? All the fundamental doctrines of the Bible are emptied of their meaning and become contradictory and confusing if the doctrine of original sin is accepted. The Bible says that God will "judge the world in righteousness. But could God judge the world and be righteous if this doctrine were true? What of the heathen who are lost without ever hearing the Gospel? If this doctrine is true, the heathen are born sinners and will of necessity live in sin because of an inherited sin nature, and when they die without ever hearing the Gospel and having a chance to be saved, they are doomed to the everlasting punishment of hell. Now if it is true that they are born sinners and cannot help but sin, can God justly send them to hell? Our God-given convictions of justice war against such an idea. Those who believe in the doctrine of original sin cannot escape the conviction that justice requires that the heathen have a chance to hear the Gospel and be saved. They cannot escape the convictions that it is unjust that the heathen be lost without at least having the opportunity to accept or reject the Gospel. They feel that the heathen are owed the opportunity to hear the Gospel so they might have a chance to be saved. But where did this idea come from that the heathen are owed the chance to be saved? It springs up irresistibly from the belief that men are not the authors of their own sin.

Chapter 7 : What is original sin?

Leaven represents sin, and deleavening our homes symbolizes purging sin from our lives. However, cleansing our lives of sin is a lifetime process that will not be completely fulfilled until we are resurrected and transformed into spirit.

That is why I did not let you touch her. Isaiah announced the consequences: For your hands are stained with blood, your fingers with guilt. Your lips have spoken falsely, and your tongue mutters wicked things" â€” a separation between God and man, and unrequited worshipping. Other church fathers such as Augustine also developed the doctrine, [11] seeing it as based on the New Testament teaching of Paul the Apostle Romans 5: He presented sin and vices as contraries of virtues. Accordingly Augustine includes two things in the definition of sin; one, pertaining to the substance of a human act, and which is the matter, so to speak, of sin, when he says, word, deed, or desire; the other, pertaining to the nature of evil, and which is the form, as it were, of sin, when he says, contrary to the eternal law. Sin is a motion to the goal, it is judged by the object to which it is directed. The field of sin is the same as the field of virtue. There are three major fields: Thomas distinguished between mortal and venial sins. Consequently it is a mortal sin generically, whether it be contrary to the love of God, e. Sin, venial by reason of its object, may become mortal. When venial sin is used as a way to provoke mortal sin it becomes mortal as well, e. That may happen for instance when sudden movements of unbelief arise in the mind. The difference and gravity of sins may be discerned on the grounds of spirit and flesh, even mortal sins may differ in gravity. Carnal sins like lust, adultery or fornication, gluttony and avarice, because the person who commits them is inordinately directed towards material goods that are a serious matter, are mortal sins. They may cause much shame and infamy. But spiritual sins like blaspheming of God or apostasy are, according to Thomas, still greater evil, as they have more of the aversion from God. They are directed against a greater object. The formal, essential element of sin is more at the centre in them. God, and "inordinate turning to mutable good", i. Both *aversio* and *conversio* constitute one single guilty action. At the root of the inordinate turning to the creatures is self-love which expresses itself in disordered desire *cupiditas* and rebellion towards God *superbia*. An effect of such deed is the destruction of "spiritual life which is the effect of charity, whereby God dwells in us. Personal sins are either mortal or venial. Mortal sins are sins of grave serious matter, where the sinner performs the act with full knowledge and deliberate consent. CCC The act of committing a mortal sin destroys charity, i. If left un-reconciled, mortal sins may lead to eternal separation from God, traditionally called damnation. Venial sins are sins which do not meet the conditions for mortal sins. However, venial sins do injure the relationship between the sinner and God, and as such, must be reconciled to God, either through the Sacrament of Reconciliation or receiving the Eucharist after proper contrition fulfilled. Both mortal and venial sins have a dual nature of punishment. They incur both guilt for the sin, yielding eternal punishment, and temporal punishment for the sin. Roman Catholic doctrine also sees sin as being twofold: Sin can and does alienate a person both from God and the community. The Roman Catholic view of sin has recently expanded. Monsignor Gianfranco Girotti , Regent of the Catholic Apostolic Penitentiary , has said that "known sins increasingly manifest themselves as behavior that damages society as a whole," [28] including, for example: The revision was aimed at encouraging confession or the Sacrament of Penance. Mortal sins, which are any severe and intentional actions that directly disobey God, are often confused with the seven deadly sins , which are pride, envy, wrath, sloth, greed, gluttony, and lust. They are not, however, the same. The seven deadly sins are called "deadly" because they might lead another to commit other sins. Some forms of the seven deadly sins i. Another group of four or five sins distinguished by the Church are the sins that cry to heaven: According to traditional Reformed theology and classical Lutheranism , Salvation is *sola fide* by faith alone ; *sola gratia* by grace alone ; and is begun and completed by God alone through Jesus Ephesians 2: This understanding of original sin Romans 5: This is in contrast to the Roman Catholic teaching that while sin has tarnished the original goodness of humanity prior to the Fall, it has not entirely extinguished that goodness, or at least the potential for goodness, allowing humans to reach towards God to share in the Redemption which Jesus Christ won for them. Some Protestants and Orthodox Christians hold similar views. There is dispute about where sin originated. Some who interpret the king of

Tyre in Ezekiel 28 as a symbol for Satan believe sin originated when Satan coveted the position that rightfully belongs to God. The origin of individual sins is discussed in James 1: Original sin â€”Most denominations of Christianity interpret the Garden of Eden account in Genesis in terms of the fall of man.

Chapter 8 : CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA: Original Sin

Original sin by reason of its dire effects is the cause and source of sin in so far as by reason of it our natures are left wounded and inclined to evil. Ignorance, infirmity, malice, and concupiscence are the consequences of original sin.

It is a transgression, an iniquity, an unrighteous act. Sin is a deviation from the will of God. It is not a merely a deficiency. It is an open rebellion and disobedience to what God has declared is right. Sin can only be properly understood in relationship to God since God is the holy one 1 Peter 1: God has revealed His moral character in the law as the standard of good and to violate that standard is sinful. If God says "Do not lie" and you lie, then you have broken His law and sinned. When you sin, you offend God because it is His law that you have broken. Also, the reason God says to not lie, not cheat, etc. Therefore, the Law is a reflection of the character of God. It is wrong to lie because God cannot lie. It is wrong to steal because God cannot steal, etc. The moral law is not arbitrary. The concept of God, therefore, gives to the idea of sin its many-sided meaning. This religious conception of wrongdoing with the terminology it created persists into the NT. The Old Testament contains the Law of God. When we fail to keep the law, we sin. When we sin, we offend God. This offense against God results in a judgment. Laws are laws because they have penalties. There is no law without a penalty. And, "the wages of sin is death. The judgment is known as damnation which is the righteous judgment of God upon the sinner. If God did not judge the sinner, then He is not upholding His holiness; and he would be allowing sinners to go unpunished. Of course, Jesus came to take our place and die for our sins 1 Pet. This means that Jesus bore our sin in His body on the cross and paid for them. He took the judgment upon himself. So, replying to the question "What is sin? All people have sinned. Tyndale House Publishers,

Chapter 9 : What is sin? | racedaydvl.com

Sin is so subtle that a worldly person, examining himself for the cause of his sickness, may never consider sin at all. Not knowing God, he would have no inclination to look for sin as the cause. Our Savior certainly connects sin with sickness: "Jesus said, 'Rise, take up your bed and walk.'"

What does it mean that believers do not continue to sin 1 John 3: In his first epistle, the apostle John deals with the assurance of our salvation: In 1 John are various descriptions of the genuine believer. If a person knows Christ and is growing in grace, he or she will be generally marked by the following traits: The believer enjoys fellowship with Christ and His redeemed people 1 John 1: The believer walks in the light, not in the darkness 1 John 1: The believer admits and confesses his sin 1 John 1: The believer loves God rather than the world 1 John 2: The believer seeks to maintain a pure life 1 John 3: The believer sees a decreasing pattern of sin in his life 1 John 3: The believer demonstrates love for other Christians 1 John 3: The believer maintains a clear conscience 1 John 3: The believer experiences victory in his Christian walk 1 John 5: Number 8 in the list above is that the believer will evince a decreasing pattern of sin in his or her life. Here is what John says: Based on those verses, they reason, sin must be a thing of the past. But that is not what John is teaching. We know that, when John writes that believers do not continue to sin, he is not referring to sinless perfection because of what he writes elsewhere in the same epistle. So, we are all sinners, and we continue to struggle with sin even after we are saved. We will never know a total absence of sin until we are with the Lord in glory: If John is not referring to sinless perfection, what does he mean that believers do not continue to sin? Very simply, he means that believers will not continue practicing sin as a way of life. There will be a difference between the old life without Christ and the new life in Christ. The thief who was characterized by his theft is a thief no more; he has a different way of life. The adulterer who was characterized by his immorality is an adulterer no more; his behavior patterns have changed. The child of God who was a former thief may still struggle with covetousness, but he no longer lives according to the pattern of stealing. The child of God who was a former adulterer may still struggle with lust, but he has broken free from the old life of immorality. A believer will struggle with sin and sometimes give in, but giving in to sin is no longer normative. As we grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord see 2 Peter 3: As we are led by the Spirit, we will walk more and more in obedience to the Word of God. No one who continues to live in willful sin knows God. John gives us the reason why believers do not continue to sin: