

ON ORIGINAL SIN

Question #1:

Dr. Luginbill recently linked me to your efforts regarding Angels and the Nephilim in Genesis 6 (<http://ichthys.com/Odii%20Foundational%20Principles/About%20Angels.pdf>) when we were discussing resistance to teaching in the Bible study I am leading. I must say -- you handled the issue quite well, and I was thrilled to see someone else standing up for the truth in this manner. My friends were pushing back a bit on the idea of the sin nature being inherited through the male line (and related matters), but they were nowhere near as resistant as your correspondents!

Response #1:

Thank you for your very kind words about that conversation. I post on a Nigerian forum where all kinds of people congregate to do all kinds of things including attack the Truth and try to trip Christians up. I used to be active there for a few years before I left and a couple years later found Ichthys. I went back because I needed an outlet, a place to share what I have been learning. It's been amazing practice so far. I'm deeply grateful for it. I'm also very grateful that the Lord has seen fit to use it to produce material that other believers like you have found valuable. I desired that very greatly...

...An idea about your friends' concern about the inheritance of sin through the male line: I'm sure I don't know what the conversation was, but I know that that was a little bumpy for me too at some point. I found that Romans smooths out travel there very well. Paul said under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit that sin and death entered through one man, not through two people, or through one woman (see Romans 5:19, for example). I consider that pretty conclusive. Perhaps some of them might. It might also help the related matters, if they are really only troubled by the inheritance of the sin nature.

Question #2:

Thanks for your suggestion. I don't think I used this particular angle, but I'm not so sure it would work. I see exactly the point you make... but I'm afraid my friends wouldn't buy it. After all, we understand that Eve possessed a sin nature too, and she wasn't born through human procreation. To my understanding, after the fall, both Adam and Eve came to possess sin natures (however exactly this happened), and

humans since then (with the exception of Jesus) have been born with one since it is passed down through the male line.

They would probably say something along the lines of "Romans 5:19 says that sin came into the world through Adam's choice, not that the sin nature is passed down through Adam's male line." Ultimately, what they say isn't wrong (i.e., I think the verse is talking about Adam's choice as well). It's just that -- as you and I believe -- Adam was not only responsible for causing the fallen state of man in an abstract moral sense, but also in a very physical sense (pace wrong notions from Augustine of "imputation of sin" and so on).

Response #2:

About the sin nature, forgive me if I am pursuing it more than you wish. Say the word, and I'll stop. It seems easy to me to deal with the concern you state here. Eve acquired the sin nature the same way Adam did: by eating the fruit. I think the close association of sin and death in the Bible makes it clear that that was what the Lord was warning them about when He commanded them not to eat the fruit. The fruit did give them an expanded conscience but it also corrupted their flesh with sin. But from Romans, it seems abundantly clear to me that only Adam was burdened with passing it on to the next generation. I also think it would be quite wrong to say that Romans 5:19 means that sin came in through Adam's choice as if to mean that sin was perhaps like bad air. Eve sinned by eating the fruit. So, there was sin already before Adam ate the fruit. The only sense I see in which "sin came in" can be interpreted is in the sense that it became a permanent part of the human experience in this life. That would instantly lead to the understanding that we all inherit the sin nature through the male line (consider Romans 5:12 as well).

The sin nature is not really a nebulous thing, in my thinking. It is just the twisting of our bodily operations, so that our physical bodies are not in sync with our spirits anymore. Its appetites are out of control. So, we are constantly bombarded with desires that come at the wrong time or target the wrong thing. Our bodies were built in the beginning with the desires that they have. They are not in themselves wrong, but the fruit that our first parents ate twisted them. Curiosity, for example, is critical to enjoying the cosmos that God created. We exist, in part, to wonder and be amazed at the things that God has done, is doing, and will do. But our curiosity in this flesh has been twisted so that we are wondering and being amazed at depraved things, for an easy example, consider sexuality: the very telling term, "bi-curious", etc. As James says, we are tempted to sin when our evil desires seduce us. Then, Paul devoted chapter 7 of Romans to describing the connection between their body and sin. Our bodies seem to have a mind of their own, so to speak, independent, it seems, of our own mind. It's like a

robot that you wear to work with but which suddenly begins to malfunction, resisting your control and producing feedback to reprogram the controls so that it can do things you don't necessarily want it to do. That is the sin nature: a malfunctioning body (cf. 1 Corinthians 9:27).

Question #3:

I'm going to think about your comments regarding the sin nature more. I do not think you are out of line at all for continuing the discussion -- after all, that is more or less the goal for the group we are forming. I will say that my confusion in part is stemming from the understanding that Adam was more culpable for his sin as he ate in full knowledge, while Eve was deceived. I have commonly heard the interpretation that this is what Romans 5:19 (and similar) are getting at -- that it was due to Adam's "fuller knowledge" that sin is said to come through him (= through his choice), even though Eve had already eaten of the tree.

I don't know if that is right, but that is what I have been taught growing up, and so that is where I was "coming from" initially. We didn't get into this in my Bible study explicitly because I wasn't 100% sure on the origin of the sin nature as it relates to Genesis/the fall, and I try not to teach anything that I am not 100% on. So I mostly talked about the sin nature as a concept, and how the virgin birth was important since it meant that Christ didn't have one.

I'd be happy to hear any more thoughts you have on the matter, though.

Response #3:

I learned from Ichthys that Adam was more culpable because he ate in full knowledge of his disobedience. I have no reason to doubt that. In Genesis 3, as the Lord apportioned punishments to each of the players in the debacle, Adam is the one for whose sake the earth itself is cursed. This seems significant to me because of the breadth of curse. I note also that Eve (representative of all women there) was made subject to her husband. All this is in addition to Paul's later comment that Eve, and not Adam, was the one deceived (1 Timothy 2:14). But I don't quite understand the term "fuller knowledge". Perhaps it refers to the difference between what Eve reported that God said and what God actually said. That would make sense. But, it isn't because of this "fuller knowledge" that Adam was more culpable. It is because Adam ate the fruit fully cognizant of his error in doing so. Eve, on the other hand, was tricked into doing it.

That culpability which 1 Timothy 2:14 clearly declares is what explains the declaration of Romans 5:19 that it is through the male half that sin "came in". The female half also had sin, obviously. So, the making of many disobedient must mean the inheritance of the sin nature. That happens through the male line, according to 1 Timothy 2:14.

I believe that yours is the right approach: teach only what you are sure that the Bible says. I'm positive that that is the only way to proceed if one will please the Lord and keep His sheep safe. Of course, the teaching gift means that we can gain insight into the Bible in ways that may be a little like seeing through a fog. But that is not something to handle recklessly. Leaps of faith may bring us into greater understanding, but each leap will be from one Bible foothold to another. The more we do it, the better we are at it. Soon enough, we begin to recognize that point of light that pierces the fog, and learn to distinguish it from flights of fancy that go straight down into error and heresy. In my experience so far, it seems to me that the more we get out of our own "selves", and commit more to following the Lord, wherever He leads no matter where that may be, no matter how we may feel about it, the deeper He brings us into "all the Truth", as He promised in John.

PS: Correction - it is Romans 5:19 which teaches that sin nature is inherited through the male line, not 1 Timothy 2:14. I said it in other parts of the email. It was an error in the 4th paragraph.

Question #4:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HmnCYrcQqH4>

Response #4:

It looks like a panel discussion, and it's a 58-minute video. I'm disinclined to watch it, not least because Bible teaching is not a democratic exercise.

Regardless what the video says, it is true that no human descendant inherits the sins of its forebears. Each person is responsible for their own sins.

It is important, however, to note that because of Adam's own witting disobedience to God, all of his descendants inherit a sin nature, that is, a flesh that is sinful, so long as they are born of male seed. That is what Romans 5:19 teaches. Our physical bodies, derived from male and female seeds, are bodies of sin (Romans 6:6; Romans 7). This is why there is no righteous person (except the Lord Jesus Christ Whose physical body was conceived not of male and female seeds, but of female only). The corruption of our bodies guarantees that we all sin from birth until we die.

In conclusion, we do not inherit sin from our parents, but we do inherit a sinful physical body from them that guarantees that we will sin and therefore need Salvation from God.

Question #5:

[The video] clearly confirmed that there is nothing like *inherited sin/original sin* from Parents to children.

New born babies do not need salvation because they are *pure/unsoiled* like *God* who is there *originator*

Sin *must* be *a commission or omission*

It is when a human being can omit or commit sin then he/she needs *salvation* because *salvation is deliverance from sin*

They used biblical passages to explain all its details and misconceptions about *inherited sin/original sin* being unbiblical and against the teachings of Our Lord Jesus Christ*

I will encourage any Christian to take time to download and listen to that video because it is worth sharing and transferring to believers from generation to generation by way of sound teaching and instructions on Christianity.

Response #5:

I agree with everything you said except

"New born babies do not need salvation because they are *pure/unsoiled* like *God* who is there *originator*"

Right from birth, we all sin. Sin is natural to us because our bodies are bodies of sin (Romans 6:6). So, it is not that babies are pure. They are not.

The reason that babies and other children who die before the age of accountability are saved is that all human beings have had their sins paid for by the Lord Jesus, so only those who reject His Sacrifice or who fail to accept it are condemned. Children below the age of accountability have neither rejected the Sacrifice nor failed to accept it, since they are not able to do either. So, when they die at that age, they are automatically saved.

Another way to explain that is that every human being has their name in the Book of Life until they die rejecting or failing to accept the Sacrifice that the Lord Jesus made in their behalf. That is when their names are struck off.

Question #6:

The *phrase sin is natural to human being is wrong*,

we were not created by sin rather by *God* who is *pure, holy and unsoiled*

These are some of the clarity done in that video.

Jesus Christ was asked who is the greatest in the kingdom of God, He brought a little child and placed before everybody while telling them that *it is only those who are like a little child* that is greatest in the kingdom of Heaven hence *child-likeness* defines purity/Sanctity/Godliness/Holiness e.t.c.

Adam was not created and he started sinning, he started manifesting sin in Genesis 3 hence chapter 1 and 2, he was without sin; the same way is a child until he/she begins to omit or commit sin.

Adam did not transfer body of sin unto us rather we have the ability to make positive or negative choices based upon the examples placed before a child as he/she grows thus a child with *Christian up bringing might not even manifest these sinful abilities unless he/she moves outside their parental supervision/guide*

Much more understanding of this topic is taking time to watch this video.

Great Grace!!!

Response #6

As I told you on your thread, I don't consider the video of much value.

As for whether what I said is true or not, Romans 5-7 is enough to help anyone understand. In Romans 5:19, we are told explicitly that we all became sinners because of one man's sin. In Romans 6:6, we are told explicitly that our bodies are bodies of sin. In Romans 7, Paul teaches us through the Holy Spirit that while our spirits are pure and incorruptible, our bodies are outlaws that seek to disobey God at every turn.

That is where I stand: on the Scriptures, not on any human ideas.

Question #7:

One thing about this video is not from any human knowledge, it is clearly based on God's word, it might also interest us to know that there is growth in revelations and knowledge of Scriptures, when you are not ready to learn, unlearn and relearn then growth in revelations will be a serious issue for such a person. The term all have sinned did not include *new-born babies* who did not transgress the law because sin is the transgression of the law rather it is referring to the *initiation and consciousness of sin and death in the world amongst every conscious human person not a *transfer of inherited sin*, having the body of sin means every human being became a sinner from *conception* and *God* in whose image we are created is *sinful* because we are what He is thus "In his own image and likeness, He created them, man and woman He made them" {Genesis 1:26-28} from your own *literal translation and I suppose that this is not what you want to say?*. In Genesis 1 and 2, there was no sin or body of sin in Adam until Genesis 3 where he disobeyed God hence the *only time any man or woman has body of sin is when he/she begins to disobey God by omission or commission*. Ezekiel 18:20 "The Children shall not be punished for the sin of their father, the father shall not be punished for the sin of the children rather the soul that sinned shall die". The Death of Christ Jesus was to make us *not become controlled/distracted/manipulated* by the *presence of sin and its effect* in our lives and on those who believe which Adam activated upon the whole of creation, it did not take away sin from the world just like the passage you are quoting. "By one man's sin, all have sinned yet by one man's obedience all will be made righteous", yet after Jesus Christ purchased redemption by His Blood on Calvary human beings still *sin* even those who believe in Jesus Christ some times still *sin*. You can see that sin involves being conscious of sin and getting involved with it which cannot be an attribute of a child however when he/she starts growing conscious of his/her thoughts and actions, he/she needs to be encouraged to

reject and denounce sin in all its appearances, accept Jesus Christ as Lord, become baptized so that the Holy Spirit consciousness will *always prevail over the worlds/sinful presence and consciousness* in his or her life through fellowship.

Response #7:

There is much in your post that I find troubling for any believer, much less a teacher, to say, but I don't think it is my place to correct you. Since you are a teacher, I expect that you will figure it out with the Lord.

What I will answer here I will answer only because I will defend what I have myself offered here as the Truth, and because I think it is the root of the errors in what you teach. Feel free to accept or reject it, but I hadn't responded to you because I was looking for a debate. I was interested in what you had to say about sin as a concept because of the video you shared. My comments have been to clarify my position on the issue. I don't expect you to adopt it, but I believe completely that it is true.

This is what I am going to respond to in your post:

"One thing about this video is not from any human knowledge, it is clearly based on God's word, it might also interest us to know that there is growth in revelations and knowledge of Scriptures, when you are not ready to learn, unlearn and relearn then growth in revelations will be a serious issue for such a person."

There are two things here, so I will split them up.

I. *"One thing about this video is not from any human knowledge, it is clearly based on God's word..."*

I read your post through, and I did not see why you believe that the video is "clearly based on God's word". I did see your allusion to something you called "[my] own literal translation". That seemed to me to suggest that you did see the things I said that the Bible said in the Bible itself. If I am correct about

what that phrase meant, then you know that I wasn't making any of it up. The only trouble is that you do not accept the literal reading in the Bible. The question then would be "why?"

I did not add or remove anything from what the Bible actually says in those passages. It seems to me that you recognize that. But you also reject this literal reading - more accurately put - of the Bible. There are, of course, many situations in the Bible where what is written is not meant to be taken literally, but rather symbolically or metaphorically. In those situations, the Bible itself provides indicators that the reading is to be received symbolically and not literally. An easy example would be Revelation 12 where the Bible tells us that "signs" appeared in heaven. Following this indicator, Satan is described graphically as a huge seven-headed dragon (or snake), and Israel as a woman clothed with the sun, crowned with stars, and given eagles' wings to fly with. Clearly, these are not supposed to be read literally. They were all a "sign", that is, a representation, a graphic, a metaphor, or a pointer to a substantive meaning. Such an indicator is lacking in the passages given. In fact, in Romans 7, Paul used a metaphor - marriage - to explain the relationship we have to our sinful bodies. In other words, if the sinful bodies were the metaphor, then why would he be using another metaphor to explain that metaphor?

This is the first problem: you accept the video to be based on the Bible, but apparently not because it agrees with the Bible. So, why do you while rejecting what I said when it is clearly in the Bible?

II. "...it might also interest us to know that there is growth in revelations and knowledge of Scriptures, when you are not ready to learn, unlearn and relearn then growth in revelations will be a serious issue for such a person."

I completely agree that there is growth in understanding the Bible that does involve learning new biblical truths, giving up lies that you previously thought were truths, and refreshing and confirming yourself in the truths that you already knew. In fact, this is what spiritual growth means in essence. It is also what the Lord Jesus calls all of us to: to learn the Truth, believe it, apply it to our lives, and help others who are willing to do the same.

My concern here is that judging from the rest of your post, you seem to not quite appreciate that Truth is stable and unchanging. It seems to me as if you think that we can read just anything out of the Bible at any time. This is not true. The Truth is stable and immutable. It will never be altered even a little. For that reason, once you learn the Truth, it is not wrong if you never turn around and believe something

different. The Truth gets clearer for those who labor in learning it, this is true, but it does not change. So, one does not go from "all have sinned" and "God has bound everyone over to sin so that He may have mercy on them all" to "newborns have never sinned". Either the first is true, and thus the Bible is true, or the second is true, and thus the Bible is false. Unless the Bible indicates somewhere that newborns are excluded from those for whom the Lord Jesus Christ died, it is merely a fantasy to imagine that they do not sin.

As a matter of fact, we all sin from the first breath. It is not for nothing that David said under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit that he (that is, his body) was formed in iniquity, and he was conceived in sin. That is true of us all because our bodies are tainted. Only the Lord Jesus came into this world with a sinless Body, so He never had the urge to sin against God, although His possession of a true free will meant that just like Adam and Eve, He could sin if He wanted to. This is what the Bible actually teaches.

One cannot learn that and then "unlearn" it, without doing damage to one's faith in the Lord. If we have learned what the Bible says, then every further unlearning will really be a refining of what we have already learned, so that it becomes purer and more comprehensive. A simple test to know whether we are keeping safe in the process is to see if the Bible says what we believe. If it doesn't, then we have some "unlearning" to do. Otherwise, we are fine and should only confirm ourselves in what we have learned to be true from the Bible.

In conclusion, I would encourage every Christian - including you certainly - to make sure that what they believe comes from the Bible and to be humble enough to stick to what they have learned from it, rather than allow themselves to be seduced from a pure faith in the Lord to follow after "revelations" and "knowledge" that are really anything but.

Grace be with you.

Question #8:

Thanks for your contributions so far however, I have observed that you did not watch the video because you are making references to the same Scriptural passages they explained hence there is no need trying to impose my "revelation or knowledge" to you since the video adds no value to you.

Great Grace!!!

Response #8:

I implore you not to be upset about that. My curiosity was not about the video, but about why you shared it. I already knew what the Bible teaches about original sin, namely, we don't inherit our parents' or ancestors' sins, rather we inherit sinful bodies from our fathers so that we all sin from the first breath. So I didn't see a need to watch the video, especially considering the expense in time.

Furthermore, I don't find it useful to watch people try to interpret the Bible in groups. It is often a democratic exercise, and it never yields much spiritual value. It can be entertaining, but that's it.

If you feel that the video explains your position better than you have done, then excuse my presumption. As I said, I am not trying to debate with you about this. What you believe is your responsibility. It only becomes mine when you accept me as your teacher. As I said, you have presented yourself here as a teacher, so I don't presume that I am responsible for your doctrinal safety.

Cheers.

Question #9:

Honestly, my curiosity is rising all the more...

You already knew about *original sin* then you were still *curious to ask what the video was saying?*

Then my main curiosity is

How do you create the biblical balance that;

human beings do not inherit their parents sins, ancestors sins yet they inherit *body of sin from our fathers*; this *fathers are they not part of our ancestors*?

Another question is for *Christians* who have *received the new creation in Christ for all things including his/her body and "the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus* now *married on the altar of Christ Jesus* then give birth to a child that has the body of sin?

Christianity *must* be submerged *under Jesus Christ teachings thus "You search and keep on searching and examining the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and *yet it is those [very Scriptures] that testify about Me*" {John 5:39 amp} not just Paul's letter or Peters or any other authors of the new testament unless *error abounds* even Peter cautioned us about *carefulness in Paul's teachings because it is deep and some people may misinterpret it* thus "...just as our beloved brother Paul also wrote to you according to the wisdom given to him [by God], 16 speaking about these things as he does in all of his letters. In which there are *some things that are difficult to understand*, which the untaught and unstable [who have fallen into error] twist and misinterpret, just as they do the rest of the Scriptures, to their own destruction." {2 Peter 3:15-16 amp}. The reason why all the *few* new testament epistles were accepted as canonical was because its alignment/agreement with *Jesus Christ teachings in the 4-gospels* not to even mention the removal of those gospel that were presenting Jesus Christ as a magician.

Look at Jesus Christ teachings and sayings about little children

"At that time the disciples came to Jesus and asked, "Who, then, is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?"

2 He called a little child to him, and placed the child among them. 3 And he said: "Truly I tell you, *unless* you change and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven" {Matthew 18:1-3 NIV}.

"People were bringing little children to Jesus for him to place his hands on them, but the disciples rebuked them. 14 When Jesus saw this, he was indignant. He said to them, "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for the kingdom of God belongs to such as these. 15 Truly I tell you, *anyone* who will *not receive the kingdom of God like a little child* will never enter it." 16 And he took the children in his arms, placed his hands on them and blessed them. {Mark 10:13-16 NIV}

"But when the chief priests and the teachers of the law saw the wonderful things he did and the children shouting in the temple courts, "Hosanna to the Son of David," they were indignant. 16 "Do you hear

what these children are saying?" they asked him. "Yes," replied Jesus, "have you never read, " 'From the lips of children and infants you, Lord, have called forth your praise'?" {Matthew 21:15-16 NIV}

Does any of the scriptural passage define *little children* as *having body of sin* ?

Response #9:

I would rather not debate with you about this. As I said, I am sure that what I said is correct, and I do not agree with you. If you prefer to believe what you do in spite of the witness of the Bible, I have nothing to say in the matter. But I will answer the questions you asked me.

1. I asked what the video said because I was curious about what you saw in it that you thought was important for us all to know. I didn't know what the panelists said, but I knew the correct doctrine on the issue, so I was not intending to watch it. But I wanted to know what had impressed you in it.
2. A body of sin is a different thing from the specific sins we commit. The body of sin is our body which is corrupted so that we remain in a constant struggle against sin as long as we live in it. Sins are the actual things that we think, say, and do which displease God. Inheriting a body of sin is not then the same as inheriting somebody else's actual sins.
3. Becoming believers makes us heirs to God's Promise of Resurrection when we will finally be actually married to the Lord Jesus in new bodies that have no sin in them, and which are eternal and perfect and powerful in every way, bodies just like the glorious one that our Lord Jesus has right now. So, becoming a believer does not change our flesh right now from being weak and sinful or from producing children with the same taint of sin. It only guarantees that if we remain loyal to the Lord Jesus until the end of our lives, we will inherit new sinless bodies that are like the one our Lord now has.
4. There is no reason to expect the Lord to say anything about children having bodies of sin in those passages when He had already said it elsewhere. What we would expect naturally is for Him to use that opportunity to teach that children are excepted from the principle that not only are we all sinners because we inherit Adam's corrupted flesh, but that they too do not sin. But the Lord Jesus said neither in those passages. He said there that the Kingdom of God belongs to children, but He also said elsewhere that adults must become like children if they will ever be saved. Since salvation is by grace

through faith, the Lord Jesus only meant that the Kingdom of God belongs to those who are willing to, just like a child, cast themselves upon God's Mercy and trust Him to save them with the simplicity of a child's faith. It does not mean at all that children never sin, only that they find it ridiculously easy to trust someone else.

Question #10:

This is a learning platform which is interactive, it is not about *imposing my beliefs on you or anybody*, if you know and you do not share and interact, the spring of life (Christ Jesus) inside you is not being allowed to gush up to eternal life{John 4:13-14};

this question you did not clarify me on it,

"How do you create the biblical balance that;

human beings do not inherit their parents sins, ancestors sins yet they inherit *body of sin from our fathers*; this *fathers are they not part of our ancestors*?"

2. A body of sin is a different thing from the specific sins we commit. The body of sin is our body which is corrupted so that we remain in a constant struggle against sin as long as we live in it. Sins are the actual things that we think, say, and do which displease God. Inheriting a body of sin is not then the same as inheriting somebody else's actual sins.

My contribution here; the body of sin meant by Paul in Romans 6:6 is not *human body which is created as a corrupted entity* else "God is being defined as corrupted because man was created in the image and likeness of God" {Genesis 1:26-28}

another thing that will help here is "body of sin" was used by Paul in Rom. 6:6 then in Rom.6:12 "mortal body" was used.

Rom.6:6 "body of sin" in my own understanding is "the attempted dominion/control/blackmail/manipulation of the devil over a human being the moment he/she starts committing sin" which happens when "sin which is transgression/disobedience of instruction/rule/law/regulation of God takes place {1 John 3:4, James 4:17} hence a baby/child does not have *body of sin* just like Adam and Eve did not have a body of sin in Genesis 1 & 2 until they disobeyed/sinned against God in Genesis 3 then *this body of sin* was activated in them hence *body of sin* gets *activated in any man or woman when he/she starts sinning either by omission or

commission* not *something inherited from God His Creator; the Father of all Spirits and life{Hebrews 12:9} during creation or inherited from parents whether believers or unbelievers {Ezekiel 18:20}* , if Adam and Eve did not sin in Genesis 3 there will be no *body of sin activated in mankind* hence there will be no need for salvation/redemption by Jesus Christ.

Another insight to understand *body of sin* and when it gets activated in each human being not as an inherited habit is this passage "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:

17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" {Genesis 2:16-17 KJV} hence death is made active *only in those who disobey instructions* which does not fit in with little babies/children. Disobedience to God activates *body of sin* which *brings* death, body of sin is not just our continued struggle against sin inherited from God through creation or from human parents or Adam/ancestors. This is Romans 6:6 KJV "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin"; the *body of sin* analysed here is *commission and omissions* of a knowledgeable human being that must be surrendered to Christ for *complete destruction* which *makes him/her to *serve sin* and not * a human inherited corrupt nature that struggle against sin*

Sin can only be committed by a man or woman who has *knowledge* of instructions/rules/law not a child/baby.

"mortal body" in my own understanding is *the body, soul and spirit of man as was created in the resemblance of God without any corruption yet has a free-will/free-choice to agree or disagree with God{His Creator}" because God saw that *all* he created *was good* which does not imply *corruption*.

Having *a corrupt body that remains in constant struggle against sin* is for those who *have knowledge* and not for babies/children who do not know what is *sin*.

What you are trying to stand upon is "trying to say that man is inherently evil from conception" which is tagged *gnosticism*{one of the heresies of 2nd and 3rd centuries} just like so many people misinterpret Psalm 51 where David said "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" {Psalm 51:5 KJV} as if it is saying we were created by *sinful God* or *we inherited sin from our parents* instead of the *interpretation* that *sin's effect of death, sickness, wars, chaos, diabolical-manipulations, witch-crafty, devil's impacts, abortion e.t.c is being felt by every human being starting from the womb.

This is my little contribution to your point number-2, I will get to others where I have issues later.

Response #10:

About your first paragraph, I know what Nairaland was built for. I also know that it is impossible to learn the Bible through arguments. Only submission to a gifted and prepared Bible teacher makes that happen (Ephesians 4:11-14). That is why I am not prepared to argue with you or any other teacher. If I am questioned about the things I say, I will answer, but I never assume that those who challenge me are either willing or able to learn from me. I answer always to make a witness that the Truth was given to them, and also for the sake of those who may be willing to hear me.

Regarding your question, the difference between the body we inherit from our fathers and the sins we don't inherit from either our fathers or our mothers was my answer. That is, yes, our fathers are among our ancestors, but that does not mean that we inherit their sins. What we inherit from them is the body we have about which Paul says that there is "another law at work in the members of my body, waging war against the law of my mind and making me a prisoner of the law of sin at work within my members" (Romans 7:23).

I have already told you that I have no intention to debate with you, so I am not going to comment on the rest of your post.

Question #11:

You are my friend whom I love with all my heart and all my soul and all my being and emojis and all but you sure are no child!

The Bible did not witness here, Ihe! You did. With your understanding and interpretation of your own reading of the Bible. And not everyone agrees with you. I have to say.

The rest though. I agree.

This response is for the sake of courtesy.

Response #11:

This post (i.e., Response #6 above) was a description rather than any kind of interpretation.

Question #12:

You read in Romans that "your body is a body of sin" and without checking whether your body was a body of sin did you just take Romans word for it, or did you check your body and find that it was a body of sin like Romans said? I ask because it's your body, I see, but here is where I'm confused.

You have not checked other peoples bodies but you seem to have decided that "their bodies are bodies of sin" too because Romans said so.

I don't get how you did that

Response #12:

Perhaps this is a bit of a confusion for you - I'd prefer to believe that it is - or else it is dishonesty (I hope it isn't).

Your complaint was that I was promoting my own interpretation. I have just shown you that, just like in an earlier conversation with you, I was merely repeating what the Bible says, so even if I have made an interpretation, it is no more than saying what the Bible says using easier words and concepts to provide a bridge of understanding. So, this is actually what the Bible says, not some idea of my own that I am demanding that others submit to.

Now, you have left what you complained about to complain about my faith in the Bible. What that means is that you either would prefer not to admit that you were wrong about your first complaint (or you just forgot to express your appreciation of your error), or else you really don't care if you are wrong so long as you continue to throw obstacles up against accepting what I say as true. The latter is something I expect from antichristians. It is, in fact, why I call some unbelievers antichristians. Knowing what it means for anyone to be antichrist, I prefer to give everyone the benefit of the doubt before

treating them like that, so this is me doing that for you. I want to hold a different opinion of you, so I am allowing for the possibility that you just sped past your appreciation of your error.

To equate the truth with the lie is a terrible thing to do to other people. No one is forced to accept the truth as true, but it is wickedness to deceive people about what is true. If I have offered an explanation or description of what the Bible says that is true to the Bible itself, it is evil to say that it is the same as any other interpretation that anybody else is pleased to come up with, because that only means that the Bible is not truth. If the Bible can be made to say whatever anybody wants it to say, it cannot be true. If the Bible is not true, then human beings are hopeless - certainly, those who believe the Bible are doomed.

Therefore, I would celebrate your honesty when you admit that you have difficulty dealing with biblical theology, and condemn your dishonesty when you attack the veracity of the Bible for no real cause.

Regarding your concern about my faith in Romans, first, I believe the Bible because I believe in the Person Who wrote it. To explain, those who conduct their lives according to the Constitution of the United States do so because they believe that the document is good for accomplishing what its authors wrote it for, that is, they believe that if the Constitution is followed, then the States will attain to and maintain the greatness that the authors and revisers envision and promise. In the same way, I believe the Bible because I have total confidence in its Author. So, I assume that everything that I read in it is true because He said it. I don't need to test or check or confirm it. He is worthy of my trust, so I take for granted that He does not lie about anything.

Second, I have a human body, and I live around human beings. I have found that it is a struggle to "stay good" for any length of time at all. So I have already seen proof in my own self that God did not lie about that. Additionally, I have never met a single person in my life who does no wrong. Every single human being I have come across slips up in some way, if they are not really blowing it in some other way. So, I have even more proof that this thing that God inspired Paul to say is true indeed.

Again, if I had NO PROOF at all, I would still believe it, because God does not lie. The proof only strengthens my confidence in Him, so that I have that much more reason to believe other things that He says even before I have proof of them.

That is what it means to be a Christian: to trust God. I trust Him, _____. That is the difference (and it is a great big world of difference) between me and you.

Question #13:

This [part of your post] was the answer to my question, ihe, and all I asked for. Thanks for it.

I choose to have faith in people myself. I check the evidence on their body and do not take Paul's word for it that their body is full of sin because Paul never met the people I meet so isn't exactly in a position to be telling me what fills their body. I do not ever think people are being dishonest, lying, deceiving or have bodies full of sin, unless I see sin in their body myself, because once I make the assumption that their body is full of sin it affects how I behave towards them. I'd likely find it difficult to love them if I assumed their body were full of sin already, so I always check their body first and not just assume their body is full of sin.

If I do not check their body first to see if it is full of sin, it's like I'm covering my eyes so I don't see the evidence because the preconceived belief Paul put in my head is the absolute truth and its not possible for me or Paul to be wrong! But covering my eyes and not checking the evidence is like blinding myself, and is, at the very least, an act that would be like filling my own body with sin and while focusing on the speck of sin on the bodies of others. Paul is no excuse to make me fill my body with sin like that!

In my checking first, and not just taking Paul's word for it, I have found lots of un sinful bodied people too. Perhaps because my thoughts of them is they are un sinful they live up to my un sinning expectations. This might be because I live amongst people who don't sin so much because they been learning to not sin for close on 2000 years, but even in Nigeria, I don't tend to find most people I meet have bodies full of sin. I know my body is not full of sin so why would I go about thinking everyone else's body is full of sin?

You are correct about _____, ihe, _____ has not got faith in the Bible. Jesus met a lot of people who had 'faith' in the Bible of his day and some of the names he called such people were not exactly those that promote a behaviour I should emulate so my faith is in the Lord God Almighty whom I see not and in my fellow human beings whom I do see, because how

I treat the least of my fellow humans whom I see, "ye have done it unto me". I do not focus on the body because my focus is on your mind.

Response #13:

As I always say, you are welcome to your beliefs. I don't care about them. If you love the Truth, great for you, and I'm happy to make friends since we love the same Person. If you hate the Truth, bad for you, and I'm under no compulsion to be friends especially if I have to endure a constant assault on the Truth from you. In the end, whether you love or hate the Truth, you alone gain and you alone lose. My only gain comes from having an easier relationship with you if we share the same attitude to the Truth. Otherwise, it really is none of my business.

Still, your post seems to have answered my question: you don't care at all whether I interpret the Bible correctly or not. Your sole interest is to corrupt what I say with your challenges. You will attack me for interpreting, alleging that all interpretations are equally valid, and that I wish to subordinate other people to myself. Clearly, you don't care if either of these allegations you make is true. Your business is to make them, so that I have an obstacle to deal with. If I get past that, you just find another and throw my way. Now, if it were just me whom you were troubling, I would not care so much, if at all, because they are easy enough challenges to dismiss. But I have many weak brothers and sisters for whose sake I bother to post on this platform. Whether it is your intent or not, your constant antagonism opposes their well-being. That is something for which you will pay extremely dearly on the Day of Jesus Christ, if you do not repent and yield to the Gospel first.

Regarding your claims about Jesus Christ, as with nearly everything you say about the Bible, you are also wrong here. The Lord Jesus condemned the Pharisees and the Scribes for not believing the Bible that they read. He told them that if they did, they would have believed Him too. But, you obviously don't care if the Bible said that at all. You are simply playing to the common narrative that the Pharisees were Bible-thumping hypocrites who ultimately murdered the Lord Jesus, as if believing the Bible were somehow the issue. But, you're just as Bible-thumping and Bible-ignorant as they were with your pretence to competence in biblical theology and your arrogant claim to being the Law. So, it is entirely possible for someone to make a big deal of reading the Bible even while learning and believing nothing in it.

Question #14:

I do care ihe, especially as you are interpreting it on a public forum where thousands will read it and be edified if your interpretation is edifying and die if it is killing!

I understand him to be condemning the scribes and the Pharisees for believing and for not doing what was written in the bible that they should actually do. Or is that not the lesson taught in the parable of the Samaritan with its very believing but not doing priest and Levite, and that of the tax collector with the 'righteous' Pharisee?

In fact ihe, was it not for the sin of excessive believing and not exactly doing that Christ heaped Seven Woes on the scribes and the Pharisees?

Response #14:

Actually, no, it wasn't the lesson at all. The lessons were that

1. Christians ought to look out for one another in every way and at all times, even at cost to ourselves, because that is what it means to love your neighbor; and
2. the tax collector, rather than the Pharisee, was the one who understood the Law, believed it, and did as it demanded, because the Law teaches that we are all sinners in desperate need of God's Mercy, and that God is a God of both Justice and Mercy, and is not only willing, but also able and desirous to forgive the sinner, if they ask for mercy, and also that God calls all sinners, no matter what their sin - whether it is a little or plenty, ignorant or arrogant, great or small - to repent and ask for His Mercy.

John 5:46-47 is clear that the religious elite of His Day did not believe the Bible at all.

Question #15:

I am looking out for you because you are my neighbour and not because you are a Christian, ihe.

Jesus told me to, "Go and do likewise" when he warned me with the Parable of the Priest of God who for fear of becoming defiled wouldn't look out for the pagan Samaritan not knowing he defiled himself by not doing.

John 5:46-47 refers to their belief and acceptance of Christ, and not about their understanding and belief in their Bible of the day, which they preached and told others to believe but themselves "did not practice". They constantly threw their belief at Christ too with their 'why you working on the Sabbath', 'why you no wash your hands', 'why you eating with those sinners', 'who are you to forgive sin', 'who are you to raise the dead', 'there is a demon in you' etc!

I put it to you that they did 'believe' ihe, just like satan also believes, and that understanding and doing what is said in the Bible is what they lacked.

Response #15:

1. I don't really care about what you do, as I said before.

2. You have the story backward. It was a Jew travelling from Jerusalem to Jericho who fell in among false friends who robbed him and nearly murdered him. This is why you get the lesson wrong. A Jew should have been helped by a Priest and a Levite sooner than by anybody else. But they failed in their duty, and a Samaritan, who was almost a Gentile, was the one who helped.

3. About John 5:46-47, you mean to teach me the Bible, _____? Do you really believe that I have anything to learn from you about the Bible? Regardless, the words on the page are glaring enough. I would be a fool to bother to add anything to what the text itself says here.

Question #16:

I know. You only care about what you believe.

I wouldn't deign to attempt to teach you the Bible, I hed inobi3. You already know it all so why would learning me attempt to teach it to know it all you? Thankfully, we are not the only ones on here learning not just from our words but from the Spirit of our Words too which also glare.

Please know that I teach you not. I just cast my seed and let it fall where it may by the GoG, Amen.

Jesus tends to stretch his lessons a bit, I he, this is him, said, "_____, let your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees or ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven". I like heaven, see. The peaceful blessing lovely heaven within.

Indeed the "Jew should have been helped by a Priest and a Levite" since they were of the same family who all believed the same things, but the question being answered was "Who is my neighbor?", and not "Who is my family?" I he, it is glaringly there:

"Which of these three do you think was a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of robbers?"

Imagine! Not the priest or the Levite but the not family non-believing defiling pagan worshipping but doing good Samaritan.

The instruction I get is, "_____, go and do likewise".

You must forgive me allowing myself to be ministered to, I he.

Response #16:

I have nothing more to say to you about this matter, _____, so I must leave the conversation at this point.