

STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

Volume I

Anthropology

Compiled by

Stanton W. Richardson, M A.

St. Paul Bible College, St. Paul, Minnesota

Fourth edition, Revised in 1969, printed in United States of America

Format revised by Rev. Richard W. Rutherford, M.C.M., M.Div. Revisions were to: (a) Scale the 8.5 x 11 format to 7 x 8.5. (b) To divide Volume One into four sections: Bibliology, Theology Proper, Angelology, and Anthropology. (c) To create consistency in margins, indentations and outline numbering. All content concerning theological study is unchanged.

PREFACE

The following study was compiled as a result of the need for a class-room handbook in Biblical Theology. It was compiled by Stanton W. Richardson, M A. while teaching at the St. Paul Bible College.

Dr. Richardson recognized the fact that many good works had been written on Christian Doctrine. Yet, some were not suited for Bible College use because of their complexity and depth. Still others did not seem to come up to the level demanded by Bible College students.

Dr. Richardson also recognized the impossibility of covering such material thoroughly and completely within the given time restraints. However, this text should serve as a guide in the various studies in Biblical Theology and that the guidance will always be directed to the Holy Scriptures.

Dr. Richardson noted that these studies did not necessarily constitute the official statement or theology of the then St. Paul Bible College. They were merely compiled by him for class-room use.

The American Standard Version of the Bible was the original reference throughout these Studies. It was Dr. Richardson's desire that The New American Standard Version replace the ASV in these studies.

It was Dr. Richardson's prayer that "every student who uses these Studies will always endeavor to permit the Word of God to be the final authority, and that the convictions of this writer will not be adopted unless such adoption comes as the result of a study of the Word of God for himself."

Rev. Richard W. Rutherford, M.C.M., M.Div.
Omaha, Nebraska, 1998
Printed in United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SURVEY OF WORK	4
I. THE ORIGIN OF MAN	5
II. THE UNITY OF MAN	9
III. THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN	12
A. MAN'S PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITION	
B. MAN'S MORAL CONSTITUTION	
IV. THE ORIGIN OF THE SOUL	18
A. THE THEORY OF PRE-EXISTENCE	
B. THE CREATION THEORY	
C. THE TRADUCIAN THEORY	
V. THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN	22
VI. THE FALL OF MAN	25

SURVEY OF WORK

This text is compiled so as to cover one unit's work. The study given is not intended to be exhaustive. At best a text like this will serve as a guide to further study of the Bible and other writings on theology.

MEANING:

Anthropology is the doctrine of man, but today the term has both a theological and a scientific use. Theological anthropology deals with man in relation to God; while scientific anthropology deals with his psychophysical organism and natural history.

There are, however, wide variations in the latter usage when it comes to the range of topics included in the subject by different writers. Naturalists, for example, embrace under this head the natural history of the race; while philosophers broaden the term to include psychology, sociology, and ethics, together with anatomy and physiology. It should be noted that this distinction applies to topics only, not to methods of treatment; for scientific anthropology is no more scientific than theological anthropology, but merely deals with different aspects of the doctrine of man (Miley, Sys. Theo. I. p. 353).

DIVISION OF WORK

Under the study of Anthropology we will study:

- I. The Origin of Man
- II. The Unity of Man
- III. The Constitution of Man
- IV. The Origin of the Soul
- V. The Original State of Man
- VI. The Fall of Man

I. THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

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

A. DOCTRINE OF CREATIONISM.

1. The Bible thus teaches that man is a creation of God.
 - a. Adam and Eve are spoken of in the Bible as two human beings, each being endowed by God with souls (Gen. 2:7).
 - b. The Genesis record gives good evidence that this first pair were moral beings, that is, they were equipped with the powers of right and wrong choice as seen in the probation under which they were placed by God (Gen 2:16,17). They possessed an immaterial nature that was capable of communication with God (Gen. 1:28-30).
 - c. To accept these statements as literal and factual is to accept a “creationist” view of the origin of man.

2. The Bible as a whole supports the view that man was created by God, both as to material and immaterial natures (Gen. 5:1,2; 6:7; Deut. 4:32; Psa, 104:30; Isa. 45:12; 1 Cor. 11:9). That he was “made” and “formed” out of the dust of the ground is seen in Gen. 1:26; 2:22; 6:6,7; Psa. 100:3; 103:14; 1 Tim 2:13).

3. While it is not our purpose in Biblical Theology to delve into matters that would be studied in detail in Physical and Cultural Anthropology, we will concern ourselves in a limited way with the creationist’s interpretation of the origin of man.

B. CREATIONISM VS SCIENCE.

1. James Buswell III, Evolution and Christian Thought Today.

a. James Buswell III, writing in Evolution and Christian Thought Today, edited by Mixer, 1959, states that there are four major areas of God's creative activity, namely, matter, life, major "kinds" of plants and animals, and man. (p.179). We are concerned about man.

b. The creationist "may accept the evidence for the age of the prehistoric man and his culture," says Buswell. "He need have no quarrel with an antiquity of hundreds or of thousands of years; there is nothing in the Bible to indicate how long ago man was created." (op.cit., p.181).

2. The age of man has been perhaps the foremost problem for the creationist. It is not simply a question of whether we accept the biblical account and reject the findings of science nor is it a matter of accepting the findings of science and SCIENCE rejecting the Scripture. The Scripture states that God created man and we accept it as true. Science has studied the development of man and the creationist has no need to reject the scientists' findings.

C. CREATIONISM VS EVOLUTIONISM.

1. The Genesis account deals with the origin of man - a creation of God - although there is no clear statement as to the time of such creation apart from the statement that it was accomplished in the "sixth" day (Gen. 1:26-31).

2. Buswell goes on to say that there is much that the scientist has found that is not in conflict with the Scripture. The primary point of difference between creationism and evolutionism, says Buswell, is not just a matter of accepting or rejecting facts. "There is no data as such that conflict with the Genesis account of creation as interpreted in the context of the author's language and culture." (op.cit., p.18h). The primary point of difference, he says, "is on the level of mechanistic vs. supernatural presuppositions." (ibid).

3. The evolutionist has not “proved” the origin of man to be from some “pre-human” form.

a. If man has his origin from something “pre-human” then it seems that this “pre-human” form must also have a culture.

b. The evidence of human paleontology shows that where-ever the fossil man was found that there were also indications of his material culture. In fact, the material culture remains are more abundant than the remains of the bones.

c. On the other hand, a “pre-human”, or “pre-Adamic” theory would imply that there were beings that were morphologically human but without a material culture.

4. The crux of the whole matter lies in origins and we accept the statements of Genesis as true.

a. Adam was the first man whether he was a Pithecanthropoid or a Caucasoid. The Genesis account does not give us a description of Adam nor does it say when this creation took place.

b. There need be no quarrel, according to leading Christian anthropologists in general, when it comes to accepting the age of pre-historic man and his culture. Creationists have differed in their opinions as have anthropologists but in no case do we need to reject the Bible a statements that God created Adam.

D. CREATIONISM AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

1. The creation of Adam by God and the literality of the record furnishes a basis for much of biblical theology.

a. If Adam was not one real person as Genesis tells us he was, then how are we to understand the analogy between Christ and Adam which centers around the idea “as by one man” (Rom. 5:12, 19)?

b. Christ was one personal being. Only as we understand Adam to be a man - one man - the federal head of the race, can we understand Jesus Christ, another man, the federal head of a new “race”.

2. Only as we understand the Genesis record as dealing with man, a creation of God who fell from his first estate and sinned, do we understand the work of Jesus Christ in redemption. To reject the literality of the creation of Adam is to reject our entire biblical understanding of the race of people and God's work of redemption.

E. NOTE:

The subject of the origin of man is one that cannot be confined to one or two lessons and the same number of class periods. Therefore, we recommend that more diligent and extensive reading be done outside of this text. There have been several good books written in recent years by Christian leaders in the fields of science and anthropology whose works should be pursued. Following is a list of a few of them.

Carnell, E. J., An Introduction to Christian Apologetics, Eerdmans, 1956
Clark, R. E. D., Darwin: Before and After, Grand Rapids Int'l Pub., 1958.
Handrich, Theodore, The Creation, Moody Press, 1953.
Klotz, John W., Genes, Genesis, and Evolution, Concordia, 1955.
Lever, Jan, Creation and Evolution, Grand Rapids International Pub. 1958.
Mixer, R. L. et. al., Evolution and Christian Thought Today, Eerdmans, 1959.
Ramm, Bernard, The Christian View of Science and the Scripture, Eerdmans, 1955

II. THE UNITY OF MAN.

A. THE SCRIPTURES CLEARLY TEACH THAT THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE IS DESCENDED FROM A SINGLE PAIR (GEN. 1:27,28; 2:7,22; 3:20; 9:19).

1. All are children of a common parent and have a common nature.

a. Paul takes this truth for granted in his doctrine of the organic unity of mankind in the first transgression and of the provision of salvation for those in Christ (Rom. 5:12,19; 1 Cor. 15:21,22; Heb. 2:16).

b. This truth also constitutes the ground of man's responsibility toward his fellow-man (Gen. 4:9; Acts 17:26).

2. Attention should be called to the fact of the unity of man in another sense.

a. In Gen. 1:26 God says, "Let us make man," and in v.27 we read "Male and female made he them." Shedd says: "This implies that the idea of man is incomplete, neither the male nor the female should be considered by itself in isolation from the other. The two together constitute the human species.

b. A solitary male or female individual would not be the species man, nor include it, nor propagate it" (op.cit., II p.4). In harmony with this we have the statement in Gen. 2:21-23 that God did not make Eve out of the dust of the ground, but out of a bone taken out of Adam. Neither do we read that God breathed into Eve's nostrils; apparently she was taken out of Adam as to her immaterial nature as truly as with regard to her physical (1 Cor. 11:8).

3. The teaching of Scripture is corroborated by history and science. We note four proofs as follows:

a. The Argument from History. Says Strong: "So far as the history of nations and tribes in hemispheres can be traced, the evidence points to a common origin and ancestry in central Asia" (op.cit., p.477). We know that the European nations have come in successive waves from Asia. The American Indians, ethnologists generally agree, have come from Mongoloid sources in Eastern Asia. Eskimos frequently go back and forth to Asia by way of Bering Strait. This may throw some light on the origin of the pre-historic races of America (Ibid.).

b. The Argument from Physiology.

(1) Fisher says: “Zoologists, from the point of view of their own science, now more generally favor the monogenist doctrine, which traces mankind to a single pair, than the polygenist, which assumed different centers of origin.

(2) The present tendencies of natural science, especially since Darwin, are favorable to the monogenist view” (Universal History, p. 9).

(a) All races are fruitful one with an other.

(b) The normal temperature of the body is the same.

(c) The mean frequency of the pulse is the same.

(d) There is liability to the same diseases.

(3) These facts are not true of other animals; and again, human blood can be distinguished by the microscope from that of any other animal. This teaching is corroborated in the Scripture as we read: Acts 17:26, “And he made of one (blood) every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth . . .”

c. The Argument from Philology (Language).

(1) Strong says, ‘Comparative philology points to a common origin: of all the more important languages, and furnishes no evidence that the less important are not also so derived” (op.cit., p. 479). Hodge says: “The diversity of origin of the different varieties of our race, are proved to be false by the certain testimony of the common origin of the languages which they speak” (op.cit., II.90).

(2) Fisher quotes Max Muller thus: “Nothing necessitates the admission of different independent beginnings for the material elements, “ i.e., the vocabulary, “of the Turanian, Semitic, and Aryan branches of speech.” He affirms the same thing of the grammatical structure of these groups of languages (in Universal History, p. 11).

(3) Robertson says that the late Alfredo Trombetti of Rome, in his book The Unity of Origin of Language, claimed to be able to prove the common origin of all languages (New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament, p.3)

d. The Argument from Psychology.

(1) Again we quote Strong: “The existence, among all families of mankind, of common mental and moral characteristics, as evidenced in co~mon maxims, tendencies and capacities, in the prevalence of similar traditions, and in the universal applicability of one philosophy and religion, is most easily explained upon the theory of a common origin”, (op.cit., p.479).

(2) We have the so-called “Chaldean Genesis” with its account of creation, the traditions of the Fall in Eastern countries, of longevity, of the Flood, and of the Tower of Babel. These are but a few of the things known by many races in different parts of the world, and they have a definite value in proving the unity of the source from which the traditions emanated.

B. CONCLUSION.

Thus we conclude that from the teaching of the Bible, together with the proof offered by science and history, that the human race is an organic unity, descended from a single pair.

III. THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN. We must next consider man's nature. From the standpoint of theology we are interested in his psychological and moral constitution. We look at these separately.

A. MAN'S PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSTITUTION.

1. All are agreed that man has both a material and an immaterial nature. His material nature is his body; his immaterial nature is his soul and spirit.

a. The question arises, Is man a two-fold or a three-fold being? Are soul and spirit one and the same thing, or are we to distinguish between them?

b. Those who believe that soul and spirit are one and the same are called dichotomists; those who hold that they are not the same are called trichotomists. Let us examine these two views in the light of the Scriptures.

(1) The Dichotomous Theory.

(a) Statement of theory. Strong states the theory thus: "The immaterial part of man, viewed as an individual and conscious life, capable of possessing and animating a physical organism, is called psuche; viewed as a rational and moral agent, susceptible of divine influence and indwelling, this same immaterial part is called pneuma. The pneuma, then, is man's nature looking Godward, and capable of receiving and manifesting the Holy Spirit, the psuche is man's nature looking earthward, and touching the world of sense. The pneuma is man's higher part, as related to spiritual realities or as capable of such relation: psuche is man's higher part, as related to the body, or as capable of such relation. man's being is therefore not trichotomous but dichotomous, and his immaterial part, while possessing duality of powers, has unity or substance": (op.cit., p.486).

(b) Proof of theory. This theory is supported by:

1] The fact that God breathed into man but one principle, the living soul (Gen. 2 :7). In Job 27:3 "life" and "spirit" seem to be used interchangeably; cf. 33:18.

2] By the fact that the term "soul" and "spirit" seem to be used interchangeably in some references (Gen. 41:8 and Ps. 42:6; John 12:27 and 13:21; Matt 20:28 and 27:50; Heb. 12:23 and Rev. 6:9).

3] By the fact that "spirit" as well as "soul" is ascribed to brute creation (Eccl. 3:21; Rev.16:3). But as Pardington observes: "The living principle in beasts (soul or spirit) is believed to be irrational and mortal; in man, rational and immortal" (op.cit., p.146).

4] By the fact that “soul” is ascribed to Jehovah (Amos 6:8, lit. “by his soul”; Jer. 9:9; Isa. 42:1; 53:10-12; Heb. 10:38).

5] By the fact that the highest place in religion is ascribed to the soul (Mark 12:30; Luke 1:46; Heb. 6:18,19; Jas. 1:21).

6] By the fact that body and soul (or spirit) are spoken of as constituting the whole of man (Matt. 10:28; 1 Cor 5:3; 3 John :2) and that to lose the “soul” is to lose all (Matt. 16:26; Mark 8:36,37).

(c) To this we may add that consciousness testifies that there are two elements in man’s being: we can distinguish a material part and an immaterial part. But the consciousness of no one can discriminate between soul and spirit.

(2) The Trichotomous Theory.

(a) Statement of theory. This theory holds that man consists of three distinct elements, body, soul, and spirit.

1] The body is the material part of our constitution;

2] The soul is the principle of animal life;

3] And the spirit is the principle of our rational life.

a] Some add to this last statement “and immortal” life.

b] This can, however, not be made an essential part of the theory. Those who take this extreme view hold that at death the body returns to the earth; the soul ceases to exist; and the spirit alone remains to be reunited with the body at the resurrection (Hodge, op.cit., p.47 II).

(b) Proof of theory. This theory rests on the following considerations:

1] In the first place, Gen 2 :7 does not absolutely declare that God made man a two-fold being.

a] The Hebrew text is in the plural: “And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives; and man became a living soul.”

b] We note, however, that it is not said that man became spirit and soul; but rather, that God “inbreathed spirit, and man became a living soul; i.e., God’s life took possession of clay, and as a result, man had a soul” (Strong, op.cit., p.483).

2] Paul seems to think of body, soul, and spirit as three distinct parts of man’s nature (1 Thess. 5:23).

3] The same thing seems to be indicated in Heb. 4:12, where the Word is said to pierce “even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow.”

4] Such a three-fold organization of man’s nature seem also to be implied in the classification of men as “natural,” “carnal,” and “spiritual,” in 1 Cor. 2:14-3:4.

a] These Scriptures seem to point to trichotomy.

b] But is it not possible that they are merely intended to include the whole man? Jesus said to the young man, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength” (Mark 12:30) but no one would build a four-fold division of human nature on this statement. Heb. 4.12 does not speak of the separation of the soul from the spirit, but of the separation itself extending to that point.

(3) CONCLUSION.

(a) It is probable, however that we are to think of man’s immaterial nature as composed of a lower and a higher portion (Alford on Heb. 4:12). To the soul would belong man’s imagination, memory, understanding; to the spirit, his powers of reason, conscience, and free will.

(b) This variation from the traditional trichotonous view makes it possible to conserve the arguments for the dichotomous view, and yet explain how some Christians are “carnal” and others “spiritual”. It also agrees with the teaching that the present body is a “soul-body” and that the resurrection body will be a “spiritual body” (1 Cor. 15:44).

(c) In other words, man’s immaterial nature is looked upon as one nature, but as composed of two parts. Sometimes the parts are sharply distinguished; at other times, by metonymy, they are used for the whole being.

B. MAN'S MORAL CONSTITUTION.

1. Meaning of term. By this we mean those powers which fit him for right or wrong action. These powers are intellect, sensibility or emotion and will, together with that peculiar power of discrimination and impulsion, which we call conscience.

a. Intellect. Intellect enables man to discern between what is right and what is wrong, it is that faculty that can be impressed with a course of action or the choice of several courses of action.

b. Emotions or Sensibility. The emotions appeal to him to do the one or the other; they set value on the course of action.

c. Will

(1) Meaning of the term. The term "will" is used in a two-fold sense:

(a) Inclination. The will is referred to in the sense of inclination or disposition of mind. We speak now of the particular bent or tendency that a person may follow. They, of course, involve individual acts but this has to do mainly with the general trend or practice of which one is inclined.

(b) Volition. Volition is the exercise of that power to act in given situations. It is the actual choosing, the termination of a course of action in the mind of the person.

(2) Function of Will.

(a) Man does not commit a moral act without the function of the will.

(b) The intellect may be impressed with a certain course of action, the emotions will set value on pursuing one course or another but the transaction is not complete until the will has acted.

(c) This distinguishes man from the brute. Man can think objectively, weigh circumstances, obey his conscience and act in the light of revealed circumstances. This makes man a moral creature.

2. Accomplishment of Moral Act

a. Man by his intellect reasons what should be done in a given situation. His will, however, must be put into action to accomplish such an act.

b. Many times man's powers of reason are not sufficient alone to move the will, thus man's emotions or feelings come into play.

(1) He will not only reason what should be done but will begin to love one course of action and dislike the other.

(2) Hence, the emotions, which are so closely tied to the will, serve as a force to cause the will to act.

c. It is possible in some cases for the emotions to play such a large part in the transaction that actually the reasoning powers have been left out and the will has been "overpowered" by the emotions. In such cases the man has done what he has desired, not necessarily what he reasoned to be the best course of action.

d. When the will acts in conjunction with the intellect and the emotions then a moral act is accomplished.

3. Conscience

a. Meaning of term.

(1) The term "conscience" never occurs in the Old Testament, but it appears thirty times in the New Testament (A.S.V.). it comes from the Greek meaning "an accompanying knowledge."

(2) It is a knowing of our moral acts and states in connection with some moral standard or law which is conceived of as our true self, and there fore as having authority over us (Strong, op.cit. p.498).

b. Function of Conscience. The function of conscience is two-fold:

(1) Discrimination

(a) The primary work of conscience is involved in declaring whether or not a man's acts and states conform to the standard.

(b) The standard is that law or rule of conduct which man has adopted for himself.

1] The conscience merely judges whether or not man conforms to it. it will always decide correctly as to man's conformity; in that sense the conscience is uniform and infallible.

2] The conscience has the power of discrimination and will always render its decision in the light of the standard given it.

(2) Impulsion

(a) We say, in the second place, that the conscience is impulsive, that is, it declares those acts and states which conform to be obligatory.

(b) That is, the conscience impresses upon the consciousness of the individual that he has either acted correctly or should have acted correctly after it has rendered a certain decision.

c. CONCLUSION concerning Conscience.

(1) As stated, the conscience judges according to the standard given to it. if the moral standard accepted by the intellect is imperfect, the decisions & conscience, though relatively just, may be wholly unjust.

(2) The only true standard for the conscience is the Word of God as interpreted by the Holy Spirit. When it judges according to other standards its decisions are not certainly infallible; but when it judges according to the divinely inspired Scriptures, its verdict is absolutely infallible.

IV. THE ORIGIN OF THE SOUL.

For the sake of simplicity we shall use the term “soul” in this discussion to denote man’s entire immaterial nature, both soul and spirit. Though the whole question is more or less speculative, we must devote some attention to it. Three distinct theories have been held with regard to the origin of the soul: Pre-existence, creationism, and traducianism. Let us consider them separately.

A. THE THEORY OF PRE-EXISTENCE.

1. Statement of theory.

a. Souls have existed in a previous state, and enter the human body at some point in the early development of the body.

b. Some have felt that the disciples of Christ were influenced by this view when they said of the man born blind: “Who sinned, this man, or his parents, that he should be born blind?” (John 9:2).

c. This is not certain, but we know that Plato, Philo, and Origen held this view.

2 Consideration of theory.

a. But the theory has no warrant in Scripture. Indeed it contradicts Paul’s teaching that all sin and death are the result of Adam’s sin.

b. The theory we are opposing holds that it is the result of sin in a previous existence; but we have no recollection of such a pre-existence.

c. Surely, if we were personal entities in such an existence, we ought to be able to recall something about it; if we were not, it is inconceivable how we could commit sin and bring woe upon us in the present existence.

B. THE CREATION THEORY.

1. Statement of theory.

- a. According to this view,
- (1) The soul is an immediate creation of God.
 - (2) It enters the body at an early stage of the development of the body.
 - (3) The body only is propagated from past generations.

b. It is thought that this view preserves the spiritual nature of the soul, and that the traducian theory implies that the soul is material. Certain passages of Scripture that speak of God as the Creator of the soul and the spirit (Num. 16:22; Eccl 12:7; Isa. 57:16; Zech. 12:1; Heb. 12:9) are urged in support of this view.

2. Consideration of theory.

a. To this theory we reply that the Scriptures do not support it.

(1) The references that speak of God as the Creator of the soul, imply mediate creation.

(2) God is with equal clearness represented as being the former of the body (e.g., Ps. 139:13,14; Jer. 1:5); yet we do not interpret this as meaning immediate creation, but mediate. God is present in all natural generation, but mediately rather than immediately.

b. Secondly, we reply that men often resemble their ancestors in spirit as well as in body.

(1) Mullins says: “if heredity explains similar bodily traits, it more satisfactorily accounts also for the spiritual resemblances” (Christian Religion p.263).

(2) If the father begets only the body of his child, then “the beast has nobler powers of propagation than man; for the beast multiplies himself after his own image” (Strong, op.cit., p.492).

(3) Creationism cannot account for the fact that children resemble their parents in intellectual and spiritual as well as in physical respects. Myerson says that the life germ carries mentality and personality, just as it carries size, color, sex, etc. He emphasizes the fact thus: “There is plenty of evidence to show that normal character qualities are inherited as well as abnormal” (Foundation of Personality, p. 22 f.).

c. And thirdly, we remark that this theory does not account for the tendency of all men to sin.

(1) God must either have created each soul in a condition of sinfulness, or the very contact of the soul with the body must have corrupted it.

(2) In the first instance God is the direct author of sin; in the second, the indirect.

(3) All of this proves that the creation theory is untenable.

C. THE TRADUCIAN THEORY.

1. Statement of theory. This theory holds that the human race was immediately created in Adam, with respect to the soul as well as the body, and that both are propagated from him by natural generation.

2. Consideration of theory.

a. The traducian theory best accords with Scripture, which, as Shedd says, “teaches that man is a species, and the idea of a species implies the propagation of the entire individual out of it.” He adds: “individuals, generally, are not propagated in parts, but as wholes.

(1) In Gen. 1:26,27, the man and the woman together are denominated ‘man’” (op.cit., II p.19).

(2) In Gen. 5:2 God called the two “Adam”, that is, He treated them as a species.

(3) In Rom. 7:1 the term “man” seems also to be used on both husband and wife.

(4) In harmony with this Jesus was called the “Son of Man,” although only the woman had a part in His human origin.

(5) In Matt. 12:5 and 1 Cor. 15:21 the term “man” likewise means both sexes (Shedd, op.cit., p. 20 II).

b. Furthermore, the “‘likeness’ to himself in which Adam begat a son can scarcely be restricted to the body, and if it was also in the soul, then that was included in the begetting” (Smith, Christian Theology, p. 168).

(1) “In sin did my mother conceive me” (Ps. 51:5), can only mean that David inherited a depraved soul from his mother.

(2) In Gen. 46:26 we read of the “souls” that came out of Jacob’s loins. Acts 17:26 teaches that “God hath made of one blood all nations.” This most naturally means that they are descended from one pair and have one common human nature as to their whole constitution

(3) Gen 2:1-3 teaches that the work of creation was completed on the sixth day This could not be the case if God daily, hourly, and momentarily created souls.

c. The theory also best accords with theology.

(1) Our participation in Adam's sin is best explained on the traducian theory.

(a) Sin came into the world by a self-determined act, and is chargeable upon every individual man.

(b) This requires that the posterity of Adam and Eve: should, in some way or other, partake in it.

(2) The transmission of a sinful nature is also best explained by the traducian theory.

(a) The Larger Catechism says: "Originally sin is conveyed from our first parents unto their posterity by natural generation, so that all who proceed from them in that way are conceived and born in sin" (Question 26).

(b) Numerous Scriptures intimate that we have derived our sinful nature by natural generation. See for example Job 14:4; 15:14; Ps. 51:5; 58:3; John 3:6; Eph. 2:3.

V. THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN.

A. BIBLICAL STATEMENT.

1. The Scriptures represent man's original condition by the phrase, "in the image and likeness of God" (Gen. 1:26,27; 5:1; 9:6; 1 Cor. 11:7; Jas. 3:9).

2. There does not seem to be any difference between the Hebrew words for "image" and "likeness."

a. Brown, Driver, and Briggs define the former as "image, likeness," and the latter as "likeness, similitude" (Hebrew and English Lexicon, 5. v.).

b. Evans says, "Image, means the shadow or outline of a figure, while likeness denoted the resemblance of that shadow to the figure" (Great Doctrines, p. 127); but that also makes the two mean practically the same thing.

3. We need not try to find any difference; but we need to inquire in what that "image and likeness" consisted.

B. EXPLANATION OF "LIKENESS OF GOD."

1. It was a spiritual likeness.

a. Hodge says: "God is a Spirit, the human soul is a spirit. The essential attributes of a spirit are reason, conscience, and will. A spirit is a rational, moral, and therefore also, a free agent. In making man after his own image, therefore, God endowed him with those attributes which belong to his own nature as a spirit. Man is thereby distinguished from all other inhabitants of this world, and raised immeasurably above them. He belongs to the same order of being as God Himself, and is therefore capable of communion with his maker. This conformity of nature between man and God . . . is also the necessary condition of our capacity to know God, and therefore the foundation of our religious nature. If we were not like God, we could not know Him. We should be as the beasts which perish" (op.cit., II p.97).

b. This statement is confirmed by Scripture.

(1) In Sanctification man is "being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col. 3:10). Of course, this renewal begins in regeneration; but it is continued in sanctification.

(2) This likeness to God is inalienable, and since it constitutes man's capacity for redemption, it gives value to the life even of the unregenerated (Gen. 9:6.; 1 Cor.11:7; James 3:9).

(3) How different is the evolutionist, who thinks of the first man as only a shade above the brute, not only ignorant, but with practically no mental ability whatever!

2. It was a Moral likeness.

a. This "likeness of God" was a moral conformity to God.

(1) That is, man was fitted with powers for right and wrong action.

(2) He was given all those faculties discussed before under "Man's Moral Constitution."

b. That man had such a likeness to God is clear from the Scriptures.

(1) If in regeneration the new man "after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth" (Eph.4:24), it is undoubtedly correct to infer that originally man had both righteousness and holiness.

(2) The context in Genesis 1 and 2 bears this out.

(a) Only on this ground was it possible for man to have communion with God, Who cannot look upon perverseness (Hab. 1:13).

(b) Eccl. 7:29 confirms this view. There we read that "God made man upright."

(c) This we may also infer from the statement in Gen. 1:31, that "God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." This includes man, and would not be true if man had been morally imperfect.

c. And we may say with Shedd that "holiness is more than innocence. It is not sufficient to say that man was created in a state of innocence. It would be true, if he had been destitute of a moral disposition either right or wrong. Man was made not only negatively innocent, but positively holy. Man's regenerate condition is a restoration of his primitive state; and his righteousness as regenerate is described in Eph. 4:21, and as 'true holiness,' Eph. 4:24. This is positive character, and note mere innocency."

d. This original holiness may be defined as:

(1) A tendency of man's affections and will,

(2) Though accompanied by the power of evil choice,

(3) In the direction of the spiritual knowledge of God and of divine things generally.

(4) It is distinguished from the perfected holiness of the saints, as instinctive affection and childlike innocence differ from the holiness which has developed and been confirmed by temptation.

3. It was a Social likeness.

a. As God has a social nature, so He has endowed man with a social nature. Consequently man seeks companionship.

(1) In the first place, He found this fellowship in God Himself.

(a) Man “heard the voice of Jehovah God walking in the garden in the cool of the day” (Gen. 3:8), and held converse with His Maker.

(b) God had made man for Himself, and man found supreme satisfaction in communion with his Lord.

(2) Secondly, God provided also human fellowship.

(a) He created the woman, for, He said, “It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him” (Gen. 2:18).

(b) To make this a very intimate fellowship, He made the woman out of a bone taken from the man.

(c) Adam recognized that Eve was bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, and so he called her “woman.”

(d) And because of this intimate relation between the two, “therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh” (Gen. 2:23,24).

b. It is evident, therefore that God has made man with a social nature, even as He has a social nature.

(1) It is clear that God provided for man’s social nature.

(2) Human love and social interests spring directly from this element in man’s nature, which he had not lost in the fall.

VI. THE FALL OF MAN. Before we can understand the fall of man we must consider two other subjects. These are: the law of God and the nature of sin. We need to know about the law of God in order to understand the transgression of it, which was sin, and we need to know about the nature of sin in order to understand its origin in Adam and Eve.

A. THE LAW OF GOD.

1. Law defined.

a. Speaking generally, law is an expression of will enforced by power; it implies a lawgiver, a subject, an expression of will, and power enforcing that will (Strong, op.cit., p. 533).

b. The law of God, in particular, is the expression of His will enforced by His power. It implies:

- (1) A Lawgiver, God;
- (2) Subjects upon whom it terminates;
- (3) A positive command, written in the moral constitution of man;
- (4) Power to enforce the command; duty, or obligation to obey;
- (5) And sanctions for disobedience.

c. This law is an expression of God's moral nature and intimates that complete conformity to that nature is the normal condition of man (closely following Strong, p.536 f.)

2. Nature of the law. From this it is clear that the law of God is not something arbitrary, since it springs from His nature; that it is not temporary, devised to meet an exigency; that it is not merely negative but also positive, demanding positive conformity to God; that it is not partial, addressed to but one part of man's being, but to body and soul alike.

3. Purpose of the law.

(1) We need to be clear as to the purpose of the law.

(a) It was not given as a means whereby man might be saved. "If there had been a law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of the law" (Gal. 3:21).

(b) It could not make alive because “it was weak through the flesh” (Rom. 8:3).

1] The Scriptures that promise life for keeping the law (as Lev. 18:5); Nehm. 9:29; Ezek. 18:5-9; Matt. 19:17; Rom. 7:10; 10:5; Gal. 3:12) speak ideally, as if man had no carnal nature and so were able to do God’s whole will.

2] Since, however, man is hopelessly enslaved to self, he cannot keep God’s law, and consequently neither life nor righteousness are possible by the law.

(c) It was given however, 1] to intensify man’s knowledge of sin, 2] to reveal the holiness of God, 3] and to lead the sinner to Christ.

1] To intensify man’s knowledge of sin.

a] Man knows that he is a sinner by the testimony of conscience; but by the published law of God he has an intensified “knowledge of sin” (Rom. 3:19,20; 7:7).

b] Sin now takes on the form of transgression (Rom. 5:13; 7:13). Paul says, “I had not known sin, except Through the law” (Rom. 7:7). He does not mean that he had not known sin in any sense, but that he had not known the real nature of sin in that it was an inward spiritual thing, not simply an outward legal transgression.

c] This is why we must preach the law to sinners. We must show them that they are personally guilty when measured by God’s law. See Gal. 3:19.

2] To reveal the holiness of God.

a] But the law was also given to reveal the holiness of God (Rom. 7:12).

b] The nature of the commandments show this; but more particularly the ceremonies and rituals, the tabernacle with its court, holy place, and holy of holies, and the mediation of the priesthood were intended to show the holiness of God.

c] Approach to Him was possible only on certain conditions, to certain men, and on certain occasions. The ceremonial law set forth visibly the holiness of God.

3] To lead the sinner to Christ.

a] And, finally, the law was given to lead men to Christ.

b] Christ was the end of the law for righteousness (Rom.

10:4); but He is also its aim.

c] Paul calls the law a paidagoges to bring us to Christ (Gal. 3:24).

1} In the Roman household, from which this figure was borrowed, the paidagoges was usually a trusted slave to whom the moral supervision of the child was committed.

2} As he trained and guided his ward with a view to the future, so the law prepared those under it for the reception of Christ (Meyer, Commentary on Galatians, in loc.).

3} This it did by revealing God's holiness and man's sinfulness, and by pointing to the Cross of Christ by its offerings, priesthood, and tabernacle, as the only way of salvation and access to God.

4. CONCLUSION concerning the Law.

a. The statement in Romans 6:15 that the Christian is not "under law, but under grace" needs clarification.

(1) This might lend the idea that the believer has nothing whatsoever to do with the law, he is not under it, therefore there should be no attempt to know it or to keep it.

(2) Paul is explaining to the Romans that being dead in Christ and alive in His resurrection puts the believer in a position for Christ to live in the believer and therefore He (Christ) lives his life in the believer and fulfills the "righteous requirements of the law" (Rom. 8:4) for him (the believer).

(3) In this sense, therefore, the believer is not under the law but Christ as his life is fulfilling its requirements within him (the believer).

b. So Christ becomes the end of the law to them that believe (Rom. 10:4).

(1) He has kept it to the letter, he has taken its penalty, the penalty that had fallen upon every man.

(2) As Christ lives out His life in the believer he is doing in the believer what was required by the law - this is grace.

(3) The law required man to do something good for God and he (man) failed; Christ now, in the believer, does it for him - the believer is "under grace."

c. According to Paul's letter to the Galatians there were believers who were trying to make the keeping of the law a means of salvation.

(1) If Christ had become the end of the law to them that believe then these Galatians should let Christ live in them (See Gal. 2:20) after Paul's example.

(2) The believer, having passed from death unto life (John 5:24) is in no position as a dead person to keep the law.

(3) Christ must keep it for him and He does so by the Spirit (Rom. 8:4) as the believer yields himself to Him (Rom. 6:13, 21), and continues to walk after the Spirit (Rom. 8:4; Gal. 5:16).

B. THE NATURE OF SIN.

1. A want of Conformity to, or transgression of, the law of God.

a. Since we are moral and rational creatures, we are of necessity subject to the law of right.

(1) We have already set forth the nature of the law of God, but we may here summarize it in the words of Jesus. He said: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets" (Matt. 22:37-40).

(2) Several specific elucidations concerning the relation between the law and sin must be added. In the first place, failure to do what the law enjoins is as much sin as doing what it forbids. There are sins of omission as well as of commission (Jas. 4:17).

b. In the second place, to fail in one point is to be guilty of the whole (Gal. 3:10; Jas. 2:10). One needs to break but one of God's commandments, not all of them, to be guilty in His sight.

c. In the third place, ignorance of a law does not excuse a man. "That servant, who knew his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. And to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required; and to whom they commit much, of him will they ask the more" (Luke 12:47,48). Ignorance of the law lessens the penalty as to degree, but not as to duration.

d. In the fourth place, ability to keep the law is not essential to make the non-fulfillment sin. Man's inability to fulfill the law is due to his own part in the sin of Adam, and is not an original condition. Since the law of God expresses the holiness of God as the only standard for the creature, ability to obey cannot be the measure of obligations or the test of sin.

e. In the fifth place, the feeling of guilt is not necessary to the fact of sin. Man's moral standard may be so low and his conscience may have been so often sinned against, that he has practically no sense of sin left. The feeling of guilt is not necessary to the fact of sin in a man's life.

2. A Principle or Nature.

a. Biblical teaching.

(1) Want of conformity to the law of God embraces want in nature as well as in conduct.

(2) Acts of sin spring from a principle or nature that is sin. A corrupt tree can only bring forth evil fruit (Matt. 7:17,18). "For out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings," (Matt. 15:19). Back of adultery lies the sinful lust; back of murder the fierce hatred (Matt. 5:21,22,27,28).

(3) Paul distinguishes between sin and sins, the one the nature and the other the expression of that nature.

(a) Sin is present in every one as a nature before it expresses itself in deeds.

(b) "Sin . . . wrought in me through the commandment all manner of coveting; for apart from the law sin is dead. And I was alive apart from the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died" (Rom. 7:8-9). Paul also says, "Sin dwelleth in me" (ib. v.17), and he represents it as reigning in the unsaved (Rom. 6:12-14).

(c) John says, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John 1:8). The Old Testament regulation concerning sins of ignorance, of omission, and concerning general sinfulness indicates that sin is not to be limited to acts, but must be made to include also the condition from which it arrives (Lev. 4:14,20,31; 5:5,6).

b. Opinion of mankind. The opinion of mankind in general agrees with this view.

(1) Men universally attribute both vice and virtue to dispositions and states as well as to conscious and deliberate acts. Thus they speak of a “bad temper,” and “evil disposition.”

(2) Indeed, outward acts are condemned only when they are regarded as originating in evil dispositions.

(3) Criminal law is more concerned about the motive than about the act in the crime. How this evil bent originated does not matter; the presence of it is condemned, whether inherited from our ancestors or developed in experience.

c. Christian Consciousness. Christian consciousness also testifies to the fact that sin is a principle as well as an act. The spiritually enlightened Christian regards his deviation from the law of God as due to a depravity within him and repents for it more deeply than for his acts of sin.

3. Essentially Selfishness.

a. Meaning of term.

(1) It is difficult to determine what is the essential principle of sin.

(a) Inasmuch as Scripture teaches that the essence of godliness is love to God, we seem to require as the essence of sin the love of self.

(b) Shedd says: “Adam first inclined to self instead of God, as the ultimate end” (op.cit., II p. 169). “Ye have turned every one to his own way” (Isa. 53:6).

(c) There is, we grant, a proper love of self. It constitutes the basis of self-respect, self-preservation, self-improvement, and of a proper regard for others. None of these are inherently sinful. What we do mean is such an exaggerated love of self, as puts self-interests ahead of God’s interests.

(2) That selfishness is the essence of sin is evident also from the fact that all the forms of sin can be traced to selfishness as their source.

(a) Thus man’s natural appetites, his sensuality, selfish ambitions, and selfish affections are rooted in his selfishness.

(b) Even an idolatrous affection for others may be due to the feeling that they are in some sense a part of ourselves, and so regard for them may be only an indirect love of self.

b. Biblical teaching.

(1) Jesus exemplified true unselfishness. He said: "I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (John 5:30).

(2) Paul regarded love as "the fulfillment of the law" (Rom. 13:10). He said that Christ "died for all, that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again" (2 Cor. 5:15), and he represents the men in the last days as being "lovers of self" (2 Tim. 3:2). Isaiah said, "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way." (Isa. 53:6).

(3) These and other Scriptures represent selfishness as the essence of sin, the principle from which all else springs. When selfishness is considered as an undue preference of our interests to God's interests, we have in selfishness the essence of all sin.

C. THE ORIGIN OF SIN: IN THE FREE ACTS OF ADAM.

1. Sin is a fact.

a. We have already noted its character and background.

b. We are not now concerned with the origin of sin in the universe; for this point is treated under the fall of the angels.

c. We purpose here to inquire as to its origin among men.

2. Biblical Teaching.

a. Sin originated in the free act of Adam.

(1) The fact that it is universally present requires us to go to the fountain head of the race for an explanation.

(2) The Scriptures teach that through one sin of one man sin came into the world, and with it all the universal consequences of sin.

(a) Rom. 5:12, 17, 18, 19

1] "Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned:"

2] "For if, by the trespass of the one, death reigned through the one, much more shall they that receive the abundance of grace of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ."

3] “So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life.”

4] “For as through the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.”

(b) 1 Cor. 15:21,22 - “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. (As in Adam all die - physical death).

b. This one man was Adam and this one sin was the partaking of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 3:1-8; 1 Tim 2:13,14).

3. The Probation of Adam. Gen. 2:16,17

a. The test consisted in the prohibition to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. It seems as if there was a life-preserving quality in the tree of life, for when God drove our first parents out of the Garden, He did this “lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever” (Gen. 3:22).

b. There is nothing in this prohibition that suggests that God sought man’s downfall. It is a fair and simple requirement of the Creator. There is, instead, much to show that God made obedience easy. THE ORIGINAL STATUS OF MAN:

- (1) He created man without a sinful nature.
- (2) He placed them into an ideal environment.
- (3) He provided for all his temporal needs.
- (4) He endowed him with strong mental powers.
- (5) He gave him work to engage his hands and his mind.
- (6) He provided a life-partner for him.
- (7) He warned him of the consequences of disobedience.
- (8) He entered personal fellowship with him.

c. Surely, we cannot blame God for man’s apostasy in the light of these facts!

d. Mason says: “Satan’s temptation to man may be summed up in this: - To have what God had forbidden, to know what God had not revealed, and to be what God had not intended him to be” (Lessons of the Ages., p. 18).

4. The Essence of the Sin of Adam and Eve.

- a. If we would now set forth the essence of the sin of our first parents we would have something like the following:
- (1) Eve distrusted the goodness of God.
 - (2) She believed the lie of Satan.
 - (3) She yielded to her physical appetite.
 - (4) She admitted to an inordinate desire for the beautiful.
 - (5) She coveted a wisdom that was not intended for her.
- b. Adam, it seems sinned because of his love for Eve and in the full light of the warning of God. In other words, the first sin was the desire in the heart, the choosing of self-interests sin that had already been committed in the heart.

D. THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE SIN OF ADAM.

1. Immediate, far-reaching, and fearful were the consequences of the sin of our first parents.

a. It is difficult to suppress the desire to know what would have happened if they had not sinned; but the Scriptures are silent on the subject, and we do well to refrain from speculating where God has not seen fit to give us a definite revelation.

b. We may assume, however, that the consequences of obedience would have been as great in the right direction as the consequences of disobedience have been in the wrong direction.

c. Farther than this we cannot go. We must turn our attention to the things that have happened, and look at the consequences of sin in three respects. In its effect upon Adam and Eve, their environment, and upon their posterity through them.

2. The Effects of sin upon Adam and Eve.

a. The third chapter of Genesis is our main source of information on this point, but there are also other Scriptures that touch on this subject. We may note here that the first sin had an effect on our first parents' relation to God, on their nature, on their bodies, and on their environment.

b. Their sin had an effect on their relation to God.

(1) Before the fall, God and Adam were in fellowship with each other; after the fall, that fellowship was broken.

(2) Our first parents now had the sense of God's displeasure upon them; they had disobeyed His explicit command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and they were guilty.

(3) They knew that they had lost their standing before God and that His condemnation rested upon them.

(a) So instead of seeking His fellowship, they now tried to flee from Him.

(b) Their guilty conscience did not permit them any rest; so they tried to shift the responsibility.

1] Adam said Eve, the woman whom God had given him, had led him into sin; Eve accused the serpent.

2] They were guilty, but tried to shift the responsibility for their sin to others.

c. Their sin had an effect on their nature.

(1) When they first came from the hand of the Creator, they were not only innocent, but also holy. They had no sinful nature.

(2) Now they had a sense of shame, degradation, and pollution. There was something to hide.

(a) They were naked and could not appear before God in their fallen condition.

(b) It was this sense of unfitness that led them to make for themselves aprons of fig leaves.

(c) They were not only ashamed to appear before God in their new condition, but also to appear before one another. They were morally ruined.

(3) God had said to Adam regarding the forbidden tree: "The day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"(Gen.2:17).

(a) This death is first of all spiritual, or a separation of the soul from God.

1] It implies not only the inability to do anything well-pleasing to God, but also the possession of a corrupt nature. "Through one man sin entered into the world" (Rom. 5:12).

2] Stifler observes: “He says ‘sin,’ not ‘sins’, He is looking not at the concrete acts of sin, not at the habit. Adam did not bring sin into the world by setting a bad example; his one act wrought a constitutional change of unholiness within his heart. That act resulted in an innate corrupting principle” (Epistle to the Romans 9:6).

3] This corrupt nature prompts to all manner of sin in practice.

d. Their sin also had an effect on their bodies.

(1) When God said that for disobedience man would “surely die,” He meant also as to the body.

(a) Immediately after the trespass God said to Adam, “Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return” (Gen 3:19).

(b) “As in Adam all die” (1 Cor. 15:22), has reference primarily to physical death as a result of Adam’s sin.

(c) And since the Scriptures are final authority in all matters, it is necessary to regard physical death as the penalty of sin.

(2) In view of this fact we would remark that all physical illness is due indirectly to sin. The Hebrew of Gen. 2:17 may be translated, “dying thou shalt die.”

(a) From the moment that man ate of the forbidden tree he was a dying creature. The destructive germs were introduced on that very occasion.

(b) The pains which both man and woman should suffer grew out of that one apostasy.

(c) The fact that man did not die instantaneously was due to God’s gracious purpose of redemption.

(3) Because of the intimate relation between the mind and the body, we may assume that the mental as well as the physical powers were weakened and began to decay.

(4) This element of the penalty of sin alone undermines the theory of evolution. Man has not developed of body and mind, but has degenerated from a primitive perfect condition to the present enfeebled and imperfect condition.

3. Effects of Sin on Adam and Eve’s Environment.

a. The Serpent. We read that the serpent was cursed “above all cattle, and above every beast of the field” (Gen. 3:14).

b. Animal Creation.

(1) It is evident that animal creation has suffered as a result of Adam's sin.

(2) In the future age this curse will be removed, and the ravenous wild beasts will lie down together with the docile domestic animals (Isa. 11:6-9; cf 65:25; Hosea 2:18).

c. The Ground.

(1) Again, "cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the ground" (Gen. 3:17-19).

(2) Here even inanimate nature is represented as suffering the curse of man's sin.

d. All Creation.

(1) The Scriptures tell us elsewhere that the time is coming when "the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (Rom. 8:21,22). All creation has been "subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope" (v.20).

(2) Isa. 35 speaks of the restoration of nature to its pristine condition and beauty.

e. Expulsion from Garden.

(1) And again, Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden and forced to make their way in this fallen world.

(2) At the first they were in the most beautiful and perfect environment; now they were obliged to get along in an imperfect and almost hostile one. Their environment was decidedly changed because of sin.

4. The Effect of Sin upon the Race.

a. The Universality of Sin.

(1) The Statement.

(a) We have seen what sin is, namely, that it is both an act principle, both guilt and pollution. As we look about us we see that sin is universal.

(b) History testifies to this fact in its accounts of priesthoods

and sacrifices among pagan nations.

(c) And every man knows not only that he has come short of moral perfection, but also that every other man has done so likewise.

(d) Popular maxims express the conviction of all mankind that sin is universal (such as “No man is perfect”; “every man has his price,” etc.).

(e) Christian experience uniformly testifies to the presence of sin in the heart of man, and the lack of such a consciousness in an unsaved person must be interpreted as a hardened condition.

(2) Scriptural teaching. Certainly the Scriptures teach the universality of sin.

(a) 1 Kgs. 8:46 - “There is no man that sinneth not”

(b) Eccl. 7:20 - “surely there is not a righteous man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not”

(c) Rom. 3:10,12 “there is none righteous, no, not one . . . There is none that doeth good, no, not so much as one”

(d) Rom. 3:23 - “for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God”

(e) Gal. 3:22 - “the Scriptures shut up all things under sin”

(f) I John 1:8 - “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”

(3) CONCLUSION Concerning Universality of Sin.

(a) If then all men are sinners, how shall we account for this situation? So universal an effect must have a universal cause.

(b) The Scriptures teach that the sin of Adam and Eve constituted all their posterity sinners (Rom 5:19, “through the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners”), i.e., the sin of Adam was imputed, reckoned, or charged to every member of the race.

(c) It is because of Adam’s sin that we come into the world with a depraved nature and under God’s condemnation (Rom. 5:12; Eph. 2:3).

b. Theories Concerning Imputation of Sin.

(1) How can we be responsible for a depraved nature which we did not personally and consciously originate, and how can God justly charge to our account the sin of Adam? This leads us to a discussion of the various theories of the imputation of Adam’s sin to his posterity.

(2) This discussion rightly belongs to Historical or Systematic theology so we will give only a brief summation.

(a) Pelagian theory.

- 1] This theory holds that Adam's sin affected only himself;
- 2] that every human soul is immediately created by God, and created as innocent, free from depraved tendencies, and able to obey God as Adam was;
- 3] that God imputes to men only those acts which they personally and consciously perform;
- 4] and that the only effect of Adam's sin on his posterity is that of a bad example.
- 5] Men can be saved by the law as well as by the Gospel.
- 6] Physical death is merely the outworking of an original law. "Death passed upon all men, for that all sinned" (Rom. 5:12), means that all incurred eternal death by sinning after the example of Adam.
- 7] According to this view, man is well.

(b) Arminian theory.

- 1] According to this theory man is sick.
- 2] As the outcome of Adam's transgression men are by nature destitute of original righteousness and, without divine aid, utterly unable to attain it.
- 3] Since this inability is physical and intellectual, not voluntary, God as a matter of justice bestows upon each individual at the dawn of consciousness,
 - a] a special influence of the Holy Spirit,
 - b] sufficient to counteract the effect of their inherited depravity and to make obedience possible,
 - c] if they will cooperate with the Spirit, which they are able to do.
- 4] The evil tendency in man may be called sin; but it does not involve guilt or punishment.
 - a] Certainly, mankind is not accounted guilty of Adam's sin.
 - b] Only when men consciously and voluntarily appropriate these evil tendencies does God impute them to them as sin.

c] Rom 5:12, “death passed unto all men, for that all sinned,” means that all suffer the consequences of Adam's sin and that all personally consent to their inborn sinfulness by acts of transgression.

(c) The New School theory.

1] The so-called New School Theory, a departure from the Old Puritan view, is much like the Arminian theory.

2] It, too, holds that men are responsible only for their personal acts; that though all men inherit a constitution which predisposes them to sin, and all men do actually sin as soon as they come to moral consciousness, this inability is not itself sin.

3] The only difference between this theory and the Arminian is that the will at birth has no moral character and so does not need the bestowal of special influences of the Spirit in order to choose aright; and that each soul is immediately created by God.

4] This view was held by Hopkins, Emmons, Dwight and Finney. Strong says: “It is held at present by New Schools Presbyterians, and by the larger part of the Congregational body” (op.cit., p. 606).

(d) The Federal theory.

1] The Federal theory seems to have had its origin with Cocceius (1603-1669), professor in Holland, but it was more fully elaborated by Francis Turretin (1623-1687), also a professor in Holland.

a] It became the teaching of the Reformed church as distinguished from the Lutheran, though Hodge maintains that this was the “doctrine of the Church universal in all ages” (op.cit., III. p. 204).

b] In America Charles Hodge and the Princeton theologians are the chief representatives of this view.

2] On this theory:

a] God made Adam the representative of the race and entered into a covenant with him. Our kinship to Adam was the reason why he and not another was chosen.

b] By the terms of this covenant:

1} God promised to bestow eternal life upon Adam and his posterity if he, as federal head, obeyed God and denounced the punishment of a corrupt nature and of death, if he disobeyed.

2} Since Adam sinned, God reckons all his descendants as sinners, and condemns them because of Adam's transgression.

c] Therefore He immediately creates each soul of Adam's posterity with a corrupt nature, which invariably leads to acts of sin and which is itself sin.

d] It should be noted that on this view the corruption of our nature is not the cause of the imputation of Adam's sin, but the effect of it. Roman 4:12 means that we all sinned in the person of our representative.

(e) The Mediate Imputation theory.

1] This theory teaches that all men are born physically and morally depraved, and, that this native depravity is the source of all actual sin, and is itself sin.

2] The physical depravity has descended by natural propagation from Adam; and the soul is immediately created by God, but it becomes actively corrupt as soon as it is united to the body.

3] This native depravity is the only thing which God imputes to man, but merely as the consequence, and not the penalty, of Adam's transgression.

4] In other words, Adam's sin is imputed mediately, and not immediately. On the Federal theory imputation is the cause of depravity; on this theory depravity is the cause of imputation. Rom. 4:12 means that all sinned by having a sinful nature.

(f) The Augustinian theory.

1] Although this theory was first elaborated by Augustine (354-430), and was therefore named after him, the main features of it are found as early as the writings of Tertullian. Luther, Calvin, and the Reformers generally, except Zwingli, held this view.

2] According to this theory God, in virtue of the organic unity of the race in Adam, imputes the sin of Adam immediately to all his posterity.

a] "In Adam's free act, the will of the race revolted from God and the nature of the race corrupted itself. The nature which we now possess is the same nature that corrupted itself in Adam" (Strong, op.cit., p.619).

b] Adam's sin is, therefore, imputed to us not as something foreign to us, but as properly ours.

c] In other words, according to Rom. 5:12, death passed upon all men, because that all sinned in Adam, their natural head.

3] This theory is supported by the following considerations:

a] That the principle of natural headship is recognized in Heb.7:9, 10, where Levi is said to have paid tithes in Abraham.

b] That it puts the most natural interpretation on Rom. 5:12-21 where “all sinned” in “the one trespass” of “the one” man, and the legal phraseology, show that the infliction is not due to sovereign decree, but by way of judicial penalty (vv. 13, 14, 15, 16, 18).

c] That it alone is in keeping with the justice of God in making Adam the representative of the race.

d] That “it accepts the Scriptural representations of the nature of sin, the penal character of death, the origin of the soul, and the oneness of the race in the transgression” (strong,

e] That it best explains the reasons for our accountability for our sinful nature.

f] That it best accords with the scientific and philosophical conclusions of today, namely, that evil tendencies are inherited, that the race is one, that sin is a question of right or wrong states as well as of right or wrong acts.

g] That it accords with the Scriptural representation that the sin of Adam is the immediate cause and ground of inborn depravity, guilt, and condemnation that have come upon the whole race.

TABULAR VIEW OF THE VARIOUS THEORIES OF IMPUTATION

A.A.Strong - p. 628 (Point #9 added)

I. NO CONDEMNATION INHERITED

	<u>Polagian</u>	<u>Arminian</u>	<u>New School</u>
1. Origin of soul.	Immediate Creation	Immediate Creation	Immediate Creation
2. Man's state at birth.	Innocent and able to obey God.	Depraved, but still able to cooperate with the Spirit.	Depraved and vicious, but this not sin.
3. Effect of Adam's sin.	Only upon himself.	To corrupt his posterity physically and intellectually; no guilt of Adam's sin imputed.	To communicate vitiation to the whole race.
4. How did all sin?	By following Adam's example.	By consciously ratifying Adam's own deed, in spite of the Spirit's aid.	By voluntary transgression of known law.
5. What is Corruption?	Only of evil habit Uncondemnable but in each case.	Evil tendencies kept in spite of the Spirit	evil tendencies.
6. What is imputed?	Every man's own sins.	Only man's own sins and ratifying of this nature.	Man's individual acts of transgression
7. What is the death incurred?	Spiritual and eternal.	Physical and spiritual death by decree.	Spiritual and eternal death only.
8. How are men saved?	By following Christ's example.	By cooperating with the Spirit given to all.	By accepting Christ under influences of truth presented by the Spirit.
9. Theory held by	Socinians Unitarians	Methodists Greek Church	New School Presbyterians and the Larger part of Congregational body.

TABULAR VIEW OF THE VARIOUS THEORIES OF IMPUTATION
II. CONDEMNATION INHERITED

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>Placean</u>	<u>Augustinian</u>
1. Origin of soul.	Immediate creation.	Immediate creation.	Mediate creation.
2. Man's state at birth.	Depraved, unable, and condemnable.	Depraved, unable, and condemnable.	Depraved, unable, and condemnable.
3. Effect of Adam's sin	To insure condemnation of his fellows in covenant and their creation as depraved.	Natural connection of depravity in all his descendants.	Guilt of Adam's sin, corruption, and death.
4. How did all sin?	By being accounted sinners in Adam's sin.	By possessing a depraved nature.	By having a part in the sin of Adam, as seminal head of the race.
5. What is corruption?	Condemnable, evil disposition and state.	Condemnable, evil disposition and state.	Condemnable, evil disposition and state.
6. What is imputed?	Adam's sin, man's own corruption, and man's own sins.	Only depraved nature and man's own sins.	Adam's sin, our depravity, and our own sins.
7. What is the death incurred?	Physical, spiritual and eternal	Physical, spiritual and eternal	Physical, spiritual and eternal
8. How are men saved?	By being accounted righteous through the act of Christ.	By becoming possessors of a new nature in Christ.	By Christ's work, with whom we are one.
9. Theory held by:	Reformed, Princeton School of theologians Dr. Chas. Hodge	Payne, Caird, E.G. Robinson, and N.B. Smith to a certain extent.	Shedd and Strong

4. The Nature of the Consequences of Adam's sin upon the Race. Having now shown by the theories of imputation the method by which the consequences of Adam's sin have passed over to the race, we deal next with the precise nature of those consequences. All of them have been repeatedly referred to; but we need to set them forth more fully and to consider their exact nature. They are three: depravity, guilt and penalty.

a. Depravity.

(1) Meaning of term.

(a) By depravity of man we mean the corruption of the moral nature and his bias toward evil.

1] He is void of original righteousness and of holy affections toward God.

2] Furthermore, we say man is depraved because he cannot by his own volition change his character and life so as to please God. In this latter sense, we say man is totally depraved.

(b) The above definition does not mean that man is so bad that he has no freedom at all to avoid doing certain things. He can, for instance, avoid sinning against the Holy Spirit, choose the lesser sin rather than the greater, refuse altogether to yield to certain temptations, do outwardly good acts, though with imperfect motives, and seek God from selfish motives.

(2) Scriptural proof. All of the Scriptures that teach that man is sinful also teach that man is depraved. The following Scriptural statements will serve to prove this point.

(a) All have sinned: Psa. 14:2,3; Isa. 53:6; Rom.3:9, 10, 22, 23:
1 Jn 1:8-10.

(b) Every mouth stopped: Psa. 107:42; 143:2; Rom. 3:19 R.V.

(c) All under a curse: Gal. 3:10.

(d) All children of the devil: John 8:44; 1 Jn 3:8-10.

(e) Natural man a stranger to the things of God: 1 Cor. 2:14.

(f) Natural heart deceitful: Jer. 17:9.

(g) Alienated from the life of God--understanding darkened:
Eph. 4:18.

(h) Mental and moral nature corrupt: Gen.6:5,12; 8:21;
Psa.94:11; Rom. 1:19-31.

- Col.3:5,7.
- (i) Outward behavior vile and detestable: Eph.2:3; Tit 3:3;
 - (j) Slaves of sin: Rom. 6:17; 7:5,7,8,14,15,19,23,24.
 - (k) Controlled by prince of the power of the air: Eph. 2:2.
 - (l) Carnal mind enmity against God: Rom. 8:7,8.
 - (m) Body weakened and death-doomed: 2 Cor. 4:7; Rom. 8:11.
 - (n) Dead in trespasses and sins: Eph. 2:1.
 - (o) Children of wrath: Eph. 2:3.

(3) Thus we see that, as the result of sin, man's spirit is alienated from and antagonistic to God, his mind deteriorated and darkened, and his body diseased and death-doomed. By nature, man is helpless and a hopeless sinner. HE IS LOST. (Pardington, Outline Studies in Christian Doctrine, pp. 201,202.)

b. Guilt

(1) Meaning of the term. Guilt means the desert of punishment, and obligation to render satisfaction.

(2) How guilt is acquired.

(a) Guilt is incurred only through the self-chosen transgression either on the part of mankind in Adam, or on the part of the individual person. As unlikeness to God's purity, sin involves pollution; as antagonism to His holy will, it involves guilt.

(b) Guilt, however, is an objective result of sin, and must not be confounded with the subjective consciousness of it.

1] In other words, a person does not necessarily have to "feel" guilt in order to be guilty.

2] Guilt is primarily a relation to God, and secondarily, a relation to conscience.

(3) Scriptural proof.

(a) First, there is the sin of nature and personal transgression. Though the possession of a sinful nature involves guilt, there is greater guilt when this sin of nature reasserts itself in personal transgression (cf. Matt. 19:24; 23:32).

(b) Secondly, there are sins of ignorance and sins of knowledge. The greater the degree of knowledge, the greater the guilt (Matt 10:15; Luke 12:47,48; 23:34; Rom. 1:32; 2:12; 1 Tim 1:13,15,16).

(c) Thirdly, there are sins of infirmity and sins of presumption. The greater the strength of will in the sin, the greater the guilt. The Psalmist prayed to be kept from presumptuous sins (Ps. 19:13), and Isaiah speaks of those who “draw iniquity with cords of falsehood, and sin as with a cartrope” (5:18), i.e., who knowingly and determinedly indulge in sin. On the other hand, Peter in his denial of Christ illustrates the sin of infirmity. He was overcome in spite of his determination to stand.

(d) Fourthly, there are sins of incomplete and sins of final obduracy. Greater is the sin that is committed in the face of multiplied offers of the grace of God than that which is committed in the face of the first offers of grace. Final obduracy is the sin against the Holy Spirit and is unpardonable, because the soul through it has ceased to be receptive of divine influence (Matt. 12:31, 32; Mark 3:29; 1 Jn 5:16,17; Heb.10:26).

c. Penalty.

(1) Meaning of the term.

(a) Penalty is that pain or loss which is directly inflicted by the lawgiver in vindication of his justice, which has been outraged by the violation of the law.

(b) In this statement it is implied that the natural consequences of sin, although they are a part of the penalty, do not exhaust that penalty. In all penalty there is a personal element, viz., the holy wrath of the lawgiver, and this the natural consequences only partially express.

(2) We should note here that penalty is not primarily intended to reform the offender or to ensure the safety of society. Chastisement proceeds from love (Jer. 10:24; Heb. 12:6); but punishment proceeds from justice (Ezek. 28:22; 36:21, 22; Rev. 15:1, 4; 16:5; 19:2), and so is not intended to reform the offender. Neither is it primarily deterrent and preventive, for it is never right to punish an individual simply for the good of society, nor will punishment do good unless the person punished deserves punishment.

(a) Physical Death.

1] Physical death is the separation of soul and body. It is represented as a part of the penalty of sin.

2] This is the most a natural meaning of Gen. 2:17; 3:19; Num. 16:29; 27:3.

3] The prayer of Moses (Psa. 90:7-11) and the prayer of Hezekiah (Isa. 38:17,18) recognize the penal character of death.

4] The same thing is true in the New Testament (John 8:44; Rom. 5:12, 14, 16, 17; 1 Pet. 4:6; Rom 4:24, 25; 6:9, 10; 8:3, 10, 11; Gal. 3:13). But since Christ has endured death as the penalty of sin, death to the Christian becomes sleep as to the body and a gateway as to the soul through which he enters into full communion with his Lord (2 Cor. 5:8; Phil 1:21,23; 1 Thess. 4:13,14; Mark 5:39).

(b) Spiritual Death.

1] Spiritual death is the separation of the soul from God.

2] The penalty denounced in Eden which has fallen upon the race is primarily this death of the soul (Gen. 2:17; Rom. 5:21; Eph. 2:1,5).

3] By it man has lost the presence and favor of God, and the knowledge of and desire for God.

4] Because of this he needs to be made alive from the dead (Luke 15:32; John 5:24; 8:51).

(c) Eternal Death.

1] And eternal death is the culmination and completion of spiritual death.

2] It is the eternal separation of the soul from God, together with the accompanying remorse and outward punishment (Matt. 25:41; 10:28; 2 Thess. 1:9; Heb. 10:31; Rev. 14:11).

3] That this is an eternal condition is evident from many Scriptures, some of which are given above and others will be mentioned in connection with the doctrine of the last things.