

THE PROBLEM OF
SIN'S ORIGIN

ELWYN HUMPHREYS

© Elwyn Humphreys 1969

THE PROBLEM OF SIN'S ORIGIN

A consideration of Adam's nature before and after the Fall, and of the entry of Sin into the world; and of the relationship of these subjects to Paul's doctrine of the Atonement

by

ELWYN HUMPHREYS

Published by

D. Bedson and D. Manton, 37 Brentwood Avenue, Coventry
and obtainable from

Mrs. M. Palmer, Siloam, Back Lane, Marazion, Cornwall, England

Printed in Great Britain by

Wordens of Cornwall Limited, Penzance, Cornwall

PREFACE

The writer feels that problems concerning man's origin, and of his original state, and the nature of the serpent, still trouble many in the Brotherhood. He is convinced that the generation now growing up may not be of the persuasion that these subjects are of any great importance. Furthermore, when the problem of the serpent was to some extent aired in our publications, there were in his opinion, aspects of the subject which were not treated. The serpent was dealt with as an isolated subject and its importance with respect to the origin of sin and Paul's exposition of the Atonement scarcely received attention. This essay has been written in an attempt to rectify this omission.

Again, with respect to the problem of man's origin, certain theories have been advanced, which attempt to compromise between Genesis and contemporary scientific views. The real issue which is at stake in this controversy is—was Adam's nature unique in Paradise and did it undergo a change when he sinned? The above mentioned theories are based on the idea that Adam's nature was always sin-stricken and consequently they conflict with Paul's teaching in Romans 5. It is hoped that in those sections of the essay devoted to Paul's teaching, the fallacy of these theories will be manifest. For us, the real answer to evolution should be found, not in scientific works favourable to Scripture, but in the doctrine of sin and atonement, presented by the apostle Paul.

Elwyn Humphreys

MARCH, 1969

INDEX

	Page
Introduction	5
The Nature of Sin	6
Adam at Creation	8
Adams Temptation	9
Eves Temptation	9
Sin the Intruder	10
Exceeding Sinfulness of Sin	11
Pauls Testimony	13
The Atonement	14
The Righteousness of God	16
Condemnation of Sin	16
The Problem of Heredity	17
More about Sin	19
The Serpent	20
The Experience of the Anglicans	22
Summary of Arguments	23

Introduction

In the last twenty years the pressure from the scientific view of origins has been increasingly felt amongst us. Attempts are made to reconcile the Bible view with that of modern science. It is the writer's opinion that in such a compromise it is possible for certain important aspects of truth to be overlooked. Particularly is it important to remember that the origin of sin, in a universe created by a holy God, calls for explanation. The Bible provides that explanation; consequently, any attempt at reconciliation with modern science which ignores this factor, is bound to clash with Scriptural doctrines. As servants of God it is not possible for us to investigate the claims of science experimentally. What we can do, however, is to discover whether tension exists between God's Word and the theories of science. If such is discovered then the servants of God must reject immediately and without question the conclusions of men.

In the current view of the origin of this world we are required to believe that all things have grown by a process which is still visible and proceeding with unbroken continuity. There is no room in this picture for the Biblical presentation of origins, for in the latter is presented a world with unique factors. First, the earth was not watered by rainfall as it is now. Secondly, there were no thorns and thistles. Thirdly, there was no curse upon the land. Fourthly, sin and death were not part of human experience at the time of the first human pair. Fifthly, the child-bearing potentials of woman were much smaller than her present power of reproduction. Both through the writings of the prophets and apostles and the book of Revelation, we understand that it is God's purpose to restore the earth to its former grandeur, and to reclaim human nature from a condition of sin. It scarcely needs emphasizing that restoration implies a former existence, at some time, of the things to be restored.

This view of the world is in immediate conflict with the view presented by historical geology. The exponents of this would have us believe that thorns and thistles, and primitive instincts in man, death, and rainfall, have always been part of the natural order on this planet. We are faced then with the alternative of either holding firmly to Scripture with simple faith and rejecting this view, or else resorting to compromise. This will create more problems and lead inevitably to a perversion of Scriptural doctrines concerning sin and death and atonement. It is our main concern then, to consider whether the idea that Adam sprang from an existing race and that sin and death had always been part of his experience, is reconcilable with apostolic teaching on these matters. If it can be demonstrated from Scripture that inbred sin was not part of human nature when it was formed, and that death needs some explanation in man's case, then we must believe that Adam was unique and a special creation, and with a special relationship to God. For the purpose of this essay we use this term "inbred sin" to describe the inherent principle of evil which at present is part of human nature. Its basic constitution being evil, its normal function is manifested in a variety of wicked tendencies and thoughts (see Mk. 7:20-22).

The apostolic assertion that Adam was first formed leaves no room for the evolution of man. Paul confirms the record of Genesis that man was completely alone for an undefined period of time, and that Eve was miraculously produced from his side. As for the suggestion that there was a contemporary race, this idea is untenable in the light of the statement that there was no "help meet" for Adam. The Hebrew term used here means a counterpart, or literally "answering to face", by which it is understood that there was not even a creature resembling him for companionship.

The Nature of Sin

One feels that the subject of the origin of sin is too frequently treated as unimportant because insufficient weight is given to the abhorrence with which sin is regarded by God. Perhaps something of the world's disregard for the nature of sin percolates into our thinking today. This writer feels impotent to put into words even a part of that abhorrence which only a profoundly meditative reading of Scriptures such as Psalm 51 can convey. One of the most sensitive attempts to describe the nature of sin as God sees it, is found in Prof. Peake's book *Christianity, its Nature and Truth*. Speaking of Christianity he says "And of all religions, Christianity has taken sin with the greatest seriousness. She has not palliated it, or tried to explain it away. She has insisted on its heinousness with a power that has never been equalled. Nothing can shew more clearly the awful gravity with which she has thought of sin than the fact that she regards the extremist measures as necessary to overcome it. It is in no dogmatic statement as to the exceeding sinfulness of sin that its judgement is expressed, but in the fact that the death of God's Own Son was conceived to be necessary to its atonement and extirpation. The cross of Christ reveals to us what God thinks and feels about sin. This stern and austere judgement of sin is a high tribute to the lofty morality of the Gospel".

It helps also to look again at some of the effects of sin in what will one day be regarded as the most violent century in human history, that is, our own twentieth century. Paradoxically, too, in this period when human violence has been manifest in its most extreme form, the world is increasingly denying the existence of sin. The sane mind, however, perceives something radically wrong with human nature, something which becomes manifested early in its growth. The two year old child raises its fist in frustrated rage when a restraining hand gripping his trousers withholds him from the coveted object. The five year old brazenly staring into his mother's eyes will rebel against her command unbuttoning his leggings in silent defiance. I

have been amused by both these authentic examples. But sin presents a different picture when we cower under a staircase whilst an enemy bomber goes throbbing on its bomb run and a young alien dispassionately presses a button with the cold-blooded intent of wiping us off the earth. There was, too, the horror of the revelation in the newspapers of 1945 when the German prison camps were discovered and when the awful truth slowly dawned upon the world that six million Jews had perished in the gas chambers. Sin in rompers might seem very amusing, but in long trousers it is earthly, sensual and devilish.

Some may consider this digression an emotional approach to a study of sin, but it is necessary at a time when theories are being presented which require us to believe that God made human nature with its present lawless twist. The Apostle John's definition of sin is profound. The Revised Version of 1 Jno. 3:4 is closer to the original—"... sin is lawlessness": not as in the Authorised Version which reads "sin is the transgression of the law". It is plain from other Scriptures that both the principle of sin and its active expression exist independently of law. John is telling us that this principle is a rebellious one; it is reflected in an attitude of mind which does not acknowledge law.

Paul's definition of sin is more graphic and personal. "I find then a law that when I would do good evil is present with me" (Rom. 7:21). Paul is speaking of an activity in human flesh, associated with its members or organs which is reflected in its thoughts. Human flesh thinks even in sleep; its thinking is directly influenced by the emotions, the desires and the will, which make up its psychology. The state of mind produced by these influences is Scripturally styled "the *diabolos*" or "accuser" because the natural products of this mind are always in opposition to the Divine Will.

It is the presence of this law in human nature which necessitates its death. "The devil sinneth from the beginning" says John, and on account of this diabolic condition of the mind, Scripture says figuratively that it is the *diabolos* which has the power of death. It was to destroy this in human nature that Jesus died (Heb. 2:14). It is not strictly correct to say that human nature was condemned; rather, it was sin that figuratively reigned in that flesh which was condemned to death on the cross. It is important to realize that chapter 8 of Romans shews human nature *redeemed* from sin and the emancipated sons of God rejoicing in their new found liberty. "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal body" (v. 11). This means that the body under sentence of death on account of sin will be made alive, that is, with a new and vigorous life. Logically then, if sin is the cause of its mortal state, to quicken it implies a removal of sin from that body.

To add force to the terrible nature of this principle in the flesh, Paul personifies it as a despotic tyrant—".. Sin has reigned unto death" (Rom. 5:21). It means that in every human creature descended from Adam there is a dominant law of evil which leads inexorably to sinful thoughts and actions. Hence the absolute necessity for God to consign human flesh to the grave. This, for God, was a terrible thing, because death is the complete antithesis of all that God is, for He is light and life and love. One should hesitate before suggesting that God made a living intelligent creature whose conscious existence produced a dualism in His universe; a dualism inasmuch as his would have been a mind with an evil bias which would have challenged the sovereignty of God.

Adam at Creation

There is in Eccles. 7:29 a much neglected passage: "God made man *upright* but they have

sought out many inventions”. The word “made” is the same as that used in Gen. 1:26 “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness”. The Hebrew word *yashar* here translated “upright” is so used 40 times in the Old Testament; then 53 times it is rendered “right” and 9 times “righteous”. It is important to emphasize that the word “righteous” cannot apply to Adam when he was formed for at this stage he had never made any moral decisions and was therefore still morally undeveloped. The word must therefore in this passage mean “right” or “upright” in constitution; that is to say, the moral constitution of Adam when formed was potentially good. It then becomes synonymous with the statement which describes all created things as “very good”. In Man’s case, this means something more, for he was a being of moral potential and the term “very good” must apply also to his moral constitution.

The subject is immensely difficult and there can be great confusion here. There was no inbuilt moral law in Adam; he had no instinct for choosing good and refusing evil as the theologians have supposed. Any goodness which Adam developed had to come from an external tuition, but on the other hand, it can be said of Adam that he had no inborn instinct for choosing evil either. But we have this inborn instinct for evil, and this is where we differ from Adam in his original state. Adam was therefore unique and in the companionship of righteous beings he was potentially capable of a consistent growth in righteousness—we are not so.

Solomon’s words indicate that man’s moral nature at this stage was “right” as distinct from the crooked things to which he repeatedly refers. It is also very significant that Solomon’s statement concludes a context in which he speaks of a woman who was a snare to a man. The allusion to Adam’s experience with Eve is very plain (Eccles. 7:26-28).

The uniqueness of Adam’s condition is further illustrated by the relationship which he enjoyed with the angels in Eden. He walked and conversed with them in nakedness and without shame. He needed no sacrificial approach to God at this time. This fact in itself is profoundly significant as a guide to his primal condition. He had been made for the express purpose of reflecting the glory of God in the angelic image and likeness. The introduction of the plural at Gen. 1:26 is important—“Let *us* make man in our image”. Psalm 8 confirms that these were the angelic agents who spoke. The Psalmist says— “Thou madest him a little lower than the angels” (Hebrew—*Elohim*). The usual Hebrew name for angel (*malak*) is not used here but the New Testament quotation of the passage confirms that “angels” is the valid translation (Heb. 2:7).

At this stage in his experience, then, Adam was capable of attaining to angelic nature without the need of sacrifice for sin or redemption. This destiny would have been impossible if, at that stage, his flesh had been identical with ours. In us there is an inbred principle of sin which inevitably produces evil thoughts. His was a unique position in which, by continued obedience, he could have attained to life.

We must not think that because one prohibitive commandment is recorded that this was the sum total of law for Adam. That was a penal law, to eat would bring death, but if he was destined to grow in the manners and ways of angels then there must have been positive instruction of which there is no record. The introduction of Eve would further necessitate a revelation of divine etiquette for the conduct of their relationship towards one another. The point we are making is, that if Adam had been formed of sin-prone flesh, there would have been plenty of scope for its expression before he partook of the tree, for sin exists independently of law.

Adam's Temptation

If it is maintained that Adam's flesh was not sin-stricken when created, it is important not to go to the other extreme and argue that consequently he was incapable of sin and also insensible to temptation. If one allows, for the moment, that Adam was not subject to the same sinful promptings from within which we experience, then the fact must be faced that it was still possible for him to sin by choice. Suppose, for example, he had met with an emotional crisis in which there was a conflict of loyalties. This, in fact, appears to have been his experience, judging by Paul's implication.

In 1 Tim. 2:14, the apostle writes concerning the temptation, "Adam was not deceived ..." Adam sinned, knowing full well that it was wrong to partake of the tree; Eve partook thinking that she was morally justified in eating, because she had been *utterly* deceived. There is no indication why Adam made the choice, but seeing that he knew the awful consequence of Eve's transgression, then it is certain that he experienced a severe emotional crisis. The choice lay before him either to accompany his wife or to stand loyal to God. It should be clear then, that a man can be capable of transgression even though he be not subject to a state of inbred sin like ourselves. The difference must lie in the degree of susceptibility to temptation. What we possess today is a nature which has a bias toward evil, which makes transgression inevitable. Our argument in this essay is that Adam, whilst being susceptible to suggestions of evil from without, possessed a nature which he was capable of controlling. In other words, transgression, for Adam, was not an inevitability due to the condition of his flesh.

Eve's Temptation

It is a perfectly natural mistake for Sunday School teachers, faced with the difficult task of explaining the fall of Adam and Eve, to allow their imaginations some scope. This may result in a certain amount of loose thinking. The only safe rule is to keep strictly to Scripture and to its precise implications. There was a teacher who drew a picture of Eve gradually becoming resentful at the embargo placed upon the Tree until the thoughts of lust described in Gen. 3 found full expression in her mind; but this does not accord with the nature of the Temptation in Scripture.

Eve's temptation, when we examine it closely, differs from ours. If the serpent as some assert, was a symbol of Eve's state of mind, then logically, the idea that God had deceived her was her own; and this sprang from her awakened lust for the fruit. This was not so, for the order of the process in her case was quite the reverse. As James has shewn, lust conceived leads to sin. In short, before the act of sin, there takes place either a piece of self-deception or a numbing of the will and consciousness of sin; these are the effects of awakened lust. When Paul says sin "deceives" us (Rom. 7:11) he is describing a terrible reality about sin; one might say sin applies its own anaesthetic in the process. In plainer speech—lust blinds us.

The obvious thing about Eve's temptation which makes it at once different from ours, was that first she was deceived, and then lust awakened. Had she been resentful and covetous by nature, then we can understand how self-deception would certainly have followed her awakened lust, and gradually she would have convinced herself that God had lied. That is how the deceitful heart works in us, but Eve's flesh was not marred by inbred sin, and it was not until she was deceived by the Lie that she began to look covetously at the tree. The psychology of this experience of Eve is vital to the problem concerning her nature in

Paradise. Paul has emphasized the fact of her deception by strengthening the verb in 1 Tim. 2:14—"Adam was not deceived (Gk: *apateo*), but the woman being deceived ('*exapateo*') was in the transgression". Paul by adding a prefix to the verb in Eve's case, says in effect that she was *utterly* deceived.

Sin the Intruder

The late Bro. John Carter writing on *The Atonement* (Testimony, Oct. 1966) observed that man was made with the possibility of endless life to be enjoyed in the presence of God. He then said: "His relationship to God distinguishes him from all other forms of life, and because of this, death in his case ... has been imposed because of his sin. Man's death calls for an explanation which is not required for the animals." Later he emphasizes the point again, "Sin and death then, are intrusive things in man's world". The truth of this becomes immediately apparent as the Genesis narrative continues and we find the children of Adam and Eve offering sacrifice unto the Lord. In Paradise Adam and Eve stood in no need of the sacrificial approach, but outside Eden we see the institution of religion and its accompanying ritual. Sin needed covering and the death of animals offered in faith was God's system of religion or re-binding for the approach of man in worship.

The intrusion of sin as a principle in human nature receives emphasis also in God's warning to Cain. "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted, and if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door ..." (Gen. 4:7 RV). The rendering is also sustained by the RSV. Sin was crouching like a beast of prey waiting to take him if he persisted on a course of evil doing. It was significant and important that Cain should receive such a warning concerning that potent principle which was active in his flesh. Here was a new force, so pervasive in its effect that it would inevitably become the whole of the man's self. It should be noticed that Adam in Paradise stood in no need of such warning.

The weight of the curse of sin and death and of the change in human experience is further illustrated by the introduction of a new word for man. The names *Adam* and *Ish* were already in the human vocabulary before the Fall, but now Seth names his son *Enosh* (Gen. 4:26). The word conveys the idea of man in his new experience of mortality. It is very significant that there follows the statement—"Then began men to call upon the name of Yahweh", that is, they were invoking His Name of Salvation because the weight of sin and mortality was oppressive.

Language describing man's fallen state gradually became part of the very idiom used by men of faith. Eventually the thought of sin became fixed in men's minds as the very synonym for their death-stricken nature. When the daughters of Zelophehad wished to convey the fact that their father, having been no rebel, and died in a natural order, they said "Our father ... died in his own *sin*" (Num. 27:3). Again, David in Psalm 51 uses the term "sin" by the figure metonymy for the nature which Paul describes as "flesh of Sin"— "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psa. 51:5).

Exceeding Sinfulness of Sin

If the nature which Adam bore in Paradise was identical to our sin-stricken one, then the commandment concerning the tree could have served nothing more than to manifest to Adam the fact that he was by nature a sinner. This does not accord with the picture we have of him as he walks with God in the garden.

In our fallen state, however, law is intended to make us conscious of sin, not only when it is manifested in transgression, but also as an essential principle of our nature as the Apostle observes—“ ... that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful” (Rom. 7:13).

There is a tremendous contrast between Adam’s fellowship with God in Paradise and the conditions of fellowship imposed upon Israel when God condescended to dwell in their midst. The great paradox in the lesson of the Tabernacle was that whilst on the one hand God condescended to dwell with Israel, yet on the other hand the very symbolism of the Tabernacle and its ritual taught them how incomplete their fellowship was with Him. God in effect still kept them at arm’s length because of sin and uncleanness. It was on the Day of Atonement that the ritual of the law reached its climax and Israel were forcibly reminded that they were separated from God on account of transgressions and sins and uncleannesses (Lev. 16:16).

The study of the ritual cleansings of the Law for certain defilements and diseases, accompanied by consideration of the allusions to the subject in the writings of the prophets, convinces us of a deeper significance attached to these uncleannesses. It would increase the length of this essay unnecessarily to pursue this subject here. The reader is referred to the excellent treatment of it in Bro. W. F. Barling’s book *Law and Grace*. To illustrate his treatment, suffice it to quote here from page 88 of his work. The writer is shewing that there was a special significance underlying the uncleannesses from the male and female reproductive organs and says—“More transparent symbolism we could not hope to find. The fact was that some source of corruption within the flesh, some deep seated physical disease of the very springs of life, was exuding noisome matter. How could its allegorical meaning possibly be missed? Human nature had clearly been marred at the source. For man and for woman alike, the counterpart of the inward malady was inbred sin. This moral malady, like the physical, secreted a defiling issue—in this case sinful thoughts and words and deeds. The Law was here saying, as plainly as ever it could, that ‘That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men proceed evil thoughts, etc... .’ (Mk. 7:20, 23)”.

The Apostle Paul brings out another important aspect of the purpose of the Law. Not only did it teach Israel in its symbolism, but the very power of its statutes awakened the consciousness of sin within them, so much so that the Jew might well ask “Is the Law identical with sin?” (Rom. 7:7 NEB). The Apostle shews that this is not so. Nevertheless the Law has a potent effect upon our human nature, “When the commandment came, sin sprang to life ...” (v. 9). In the Apostle’s experience the command to abstain from lust awakened all manner of evil desires in him. The experience is recognized by modern psychologists and styled “the law of reversed effort”. This describes that strange intensification of desire which law produces in the individual. The Apostle finds the cause of this phenomenon in the evil principle which is a part of human nature, and which he figuratively styles “Sin”.

Had Paul been in Paradise, then upon receiving the command to abstain from the tree, he would have found an increasing desire to eat it. Not only so, but to use his own expression, Sin would have seduced him; it could have invented all kinds of reasons for his justifiably partaking of it. This, as we have already shewn, would have been the reverse of Eve’s experience, and there appears no evidence whatsoever that law had the same peculiar effect upon Eve, as it did upon Paul. This is very important in a consideration of the nature of the first pair before they sinned. Further on this point that Adam and Eve were not conscious of a

conflict within themselves, there is a strong suggestion in Genesis 3:22 which lends weight to this idea. “The man is become as one of us to know good and evil” said the angels, so they drove out the man to prevent him partaking of the Tree of Life. The significance of this point cannot be over-emphasized. The angels had set out to create a man in their own image and likeness. The work had not been completed, but in Paradise it was possible for Adam to have fulfilled this destiny. The Elohim themselves now testified to the impropriety of man continuing to exist, because like them, he knew both good and evil. But surely he had been destined to be like them and to know both good and evil? The question then is—what change had taken place in man which now hindered his development to their likeness? Was it not that now his nature was responsive to evil and not good? Man’s nature and experience now made him unfit in God’s sight for continued survival. The Elohim also knew good and evil, but there was nothing in their nature to which evil could appeal. Man on the other hand was flesh, and flesh that now *knew* evil: he could not continue indefinitely in this state, he must return to the dust, for the tendency in his flesh would inevitably cause him to choose evil and not good. There is here suggestive evidence as to his condition before the transgression. Evil was no part of his experience then, therefore it is fair to say that there could have been no conflict or dualism aroused in him by the introduction of law.

Sin then, is exceedingly sinful in its manifestations; it is a most potent source of transgression, but there is an idea about this which we must avoid. Many have the idea that the potency of this principle has intensified in human nature as the result of six thousand years’ practice of sin by mankind. Thanks be to God, however, *acquired* characteristics are not transmitted, otherwise the earth would be full of nothing but the most foul fiends imaginable, with none in it redeemable. Cain was a murderer, so there is every reason to suppose that sin was as potent then as it is in us, and there is no reason to suppose that its energy intensified by heredity in each generation. The moral state of society may fluctuate in different ages and varying climes, but that is an entirely different problem.

Paul’s Testimony

In Romans chapter 5 Paul explains God’s method of reconciliation through Christ. To do this he must first explain the cause of the alienation of man from God. It is essential because he is about to discourse on two federal heads: first, Adam through whom the race was involved in death: and secondly, Christ, the second Adam in whom the new race will be involved in life.

“The many sons” of God destined for glory had become sharers of sin and death through no fault of their own because Adam had transgressed. God in His justice and love will more than balance the account by bringing “the many” to eternal life through the obedience of Christ. This is the gist of the Apostle’s explanation. Commencing with the first Adam, therefore (v. 12), Paul shews the entry of sin into the world through *one* man. Death followed on account of sin and permeated the whole race by inheritance—“inasmuch as all sinned” (literal Greek). In this last sentence Paul does not mean that death is pronounced on each individual as and when he sins for the first time. What then does he mean? The tense of the Greek verb here indicates that Paul means there was a single and complete act in which all were involved. He does not say that death came upon all because all *were sinning*. This point is the most vital in the whole argument about Adam’s original nature. Before shewing the unity of the race in Christ as the antitype, Paul establishes our unity in sin and death with Adam, the type. All sinned when Adam sinned, and all were condemned to death when Adam was condemned. The idea that we sinned in the loins of Adam as Levi paid tithes in Abraham, offers no explanation whatever for Paul’s words. In the former case it was a question of priestly rank,

not one of moral responsibility. How then did we sin when Adam sinned? The explanation is clear from what follows in verse 19. Adam did something to himself when he sinned which ensured that all his posterity would be born with a nature prone to sin. Therefore the Apostle could say that, in effect, when Adam sinned, *all sinned*.

Paul finds it necessary to enlarge on this point by way of explanation (v. 13). Paraphrasing what he says, we have this—sin existed in the world before the penal law of Moses (that is, a law with a death sentence); but where there is no penal law, sin cannot be held accountable for death. In spite of this fact all men between Adam and Moses died, even though they had not like Adam broken the penal law, which said, if you do this you shall die. The great point in all this is that men died because they inherited a nature which God had sentenced to death; it was sentenced to death because the sin principle resided in it, making sin inevitable. They did not die because they themselves had committed acts of sin against a penal law, for no such law existed until the Mosaic law.

In verse 19 which is separated from verse 12 by a long parenthesis Paul makes his point about federal heads. “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” We are destined to become sinners through no fault of our own; on the other hand we can be destined to become righteous through no virtue of ours. For this present argument the great point of the verse is that we are made sinners because of something that Adam did. It is axiomatic then that God did not make us sinners. If the condition of Adam’s nature had been *exactly* like ours when he was formed, then *nothing* that he did afterwards would have had any bearing upon the nature which we inherit from him. We should be sinners because we inherit a nature *prone* to sin and we should have inherited it because God had made it like that from the very start. But Paul says that it was an act of Adam’s which caused us to be made sinners; and conversely it is an act of Christ’s which makes us righteous. Both Adam and Christ are each the head of a race; each *did* something which affects his particular race.

The Atonement

God speaks of Himself in Isaiah as “a just God and a Saviour”. God’s justice is an aspect of His holiness. It was that attribute in God’s nature which necessitated the death of Adam. So great is God’s abhorrence of sin that the creature of His handiwork, which had walked before Him in sweet fellowship and lifted up his head with a clear conscience, had to be driven out of Paradise and consigned to the grave. God cannot deny Himself—He cannot act in any way which is inconsistent with His holiness of character. It is also part of His justice that the offender, being a God-conscious creature, should be brought to acknowledge his guilt as it is written “Every knee shall bow ... and every tongue confess” (Phil. 2:10). It is evident then that a situation can never exist in which man can *justifiably* question or challenge the justice of God. This was the sin which Job in the heat of debate was driven to commit. Had Adam been made of sin-stricken flesh then he might well have had whereof to accuse God. The potsherd of the earth could justifiably have asked of God, “Why hast thou made me thus?” (Rom. 9:20) but Adam could not say this, because he had been made upright without an evil bias in his flesh.

Nevertheless there is a sense now in which men groaning under the bondage of sin might ask God why it was necessary for them to be condemned to this nature in Adam. David asks God to take into account that he was born a sinner by nature—“Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me” (Psa. 51:5). But none can accuse God of injustice in

this matter, for our depraved state is not God's work; it is the direct result of the action of our father Adam. Nevertheless it would appear that some Jews did make this accusation, for Paul certainly deals with the problem in Rom. 5:12-19. It is incidental in this treatise that the question, "Why do we die for what Adam did?" finds its answer. The answer is that this was a biological necessity, but God having necessarily consigned all to the grave in Adam has in His amazing wisdom and love more than balanced the account by offering an overwhelming and abundant grace, utterly unmerited, in Christ.

In short then, God's method of atonement is singularly adapted to remedy the damage caused by Adam. This is conveyed to us in the idea that Adam, as Paul says "was the figure (type) of him that was to come". "The many" who were doomed to the grave were literally in Adam when he transgressed. He was an historical reality, the father of a race, and to that race he has imparted his own life and nature. In God's method of atonement, Adam is made a type of the second Adam, in these respects. Christ, therefore, is also the head of a race; in him the many redeemed ones are represented when he obtained life by obedience; and this multitude will partake literally of his life and nature. Clearly, if the race did not spring from an historical figure called Adam and partake of the effects of an historical action on his part, then the antitype is based upon a myth or fiction; there is no typical event to give the shape to the antitypical atonement. But none could ever have charged Paul with supposing that Adam and his sin were symbolic representations.

Those who believe that Adam sprang from an existing race have to maintain that his nature underwent no change. Such a view denies that all men on this planet descended from Adam and Paul's argument is side tracked. Adam and his sin in Romans 5 are both said to be *representational* not literal in their significance. But the doctrine of atonement is based upon an historical act committed by Adam as the progenitor of the race, which brought ruin to his descendants. The argument is emphasized further, if we notice the number of times Paul asserts that sin originated in the single act of one man. In verse 12, it is by one man that sin entered. In verse 15 it is through the offence of one that many die. In verse 16 it was by one that Judgement came upon all to condemnation. In verse 17, it is by one man's offence that death reigned. In verse 18 again, by the offence of one, judgement came upon all; and finally in verse 19 it was by one man's disobedience that many were made sinners. Can it be denied in the light of this testimony that Adam's nature underwent a change when he sinned? Such denial could only spring from a misunderstanding of God's method of atonement. Where this is fully grasped there will be that spontaneous burst of praise, like Paul's: "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgements and His ways past finding out!"

The holiness of God requires the death of the sinner and the destruction of Sin; the marvel is that God has been able to provide a way compatible with His holiness, to save man from this deadly disease. Sin is not a matter to be treated lightly and we should beware lest an erroneous explanation of its origin should reflect upon the holiness of God. On all sides it is demonstrated that Sin was something that God hated, condemned, destroyed and finally eradicated from the body of His Son. It is the very basis of atonement as we understand it, and that not as a theory but as absolute truth, that Christ died to vindicate God for passing sentence of mortality upon human nature, because of the impulse to sin residing in it.

The Righteousness of God

It is in the death of His Son that God's attitude to sin is supremely set forth. In the language

of Paul, the cross of Christ “publicly portrayed” to the world what God’s estimate of sin is (Gal. 3:1 RSV). The enveloping darkness over Calvary and the cry from the cross vividly demonstrate the withdrawal of the Father that the Son might participate fully in the consequence of the law of sin and death. This separation although momentary between the Father and His Beloved brings home to us God’s utter abhorrence of the principle of Sin in human flesh. The Son, manifesting the same hatred of iniquity, submitted to this form of death that he might declare the righteousness of God (Rom. 3:26) and at the same time condemn Sin in the flesh (Rom. 8:3). In so doing he became an offering for sin.

This declaration of God’s righteousness is very important in this argument. The Lord performed his symbolic fulfilment of “all righteousness” when he submitted to burial in water. He thus acknowledged his mortality. On the cross he confirmed this in terrible reality by voluntary death. He advertised to the world that God was justified in passing sentence of death upon human nature, and in the same moment he condemned sin, the root cause, which had necessitated the passing of that sentence.

If it is said that Adam’s nature when created by God was sin-stricken flesh then it is necessary to believe that God created something abhorrent to Himself; so much so that He sentenced it to die, and even the sinless Son had to die because he had inherited that nature. Can, therefore, such an assertion be maintained in the face of this public portrayal of the righteous judgement of God?

Condemnation of Sin

Something more should be said on that aspect of Christ’s sacrifice in which he condemned Sin in the flesh (Rom. 8:3). To understand this phrase we must refer to two sayings of the Lord Jesus in which the sin principle is personified as a king. We can then better understand Paul’s use of the same figure of speech in the above passage. In John 12:31 the Lord said “Now shall the prince of this world be cast out”. Again in chapter 16:11 he said, speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit “... because the prince of this world is judged”. The Lord was personifying the sin principle; this is the power that rules the world and is, therefore, styled the prince of this world. The Lord had come to conquer this power by judging it and finally by casting it out, or eliminating it from human nature.

In Rom. 8:3 Paul follows the Lord’s style of personification. We use capital letters in the quotation following, to bring out the two clauses where the figure is used—“for what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own son in the likeness of flesh of Sin and as an offering for sin, condemned Sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3 RVm). Paul calls it Sin’s flesh because he is thinking of sin in its domination of human nature, claiming it as a proprietor or king. The Lord came with a nature identical to ours to be a sin-offering. In so doing he condemned or sentenced this Despot to death in that very flesh where it had reigned since the fall of Adam.

The very use of this figure of sin as a tyrant, provides an argument for the fact that God could not have made human nature with such a principle in it; for here was a power which, governing the human mind, challenged the sovereignty of God and set up a dualism in His universe. His Son came to conquer and destroy this. Throughout Christ’s perfect life Sin had been on trial and *condemned* as a criminal; the Greek word used by the Apostle shews this. Not once in Christ’s life had this tyrant been permitted to assert himself, either in thought or action. One might say then, that throughout Christ’s life, Sin had been in the death cell until it

had been finally executed on the cross. The world has been shewn what both God and His Son judged Sin to be, and how they have executed it. So Christ was justifiably raised, being sinless, to a new and healthy life with a body free from sin; and at last, man in the image and likeness of God was a reality. To accuse God of having created this principle is to do despite to the work of His Son on the cross. We reduce the teaching of the Cross to nothing, and the grand advertisement that God hates and judges sin, is denied.

The Problem of Heredity

Having said that inbred sin was not part of Adam's nature at creation then an explanation must be given as to how this principle became an hereditary factor in the race. Perhaps we as a community have not hitherto faced up to this question with any seriousness, but now in the present circumstances it must be done.

All will agree that it was *possible* for Adam's first transgression to have led to other transgressions by the law of habit. This, however, need not have been an inevitable consequence unless some change took place in his nature. The tremendous impact of remorse and the sensitivity of an awakened conscience could have produced a deep rooted fear of a repetition. Further, although the first sin caused a psychological upheaval in Adam's mind, it does not follow that this upheaval would affect his physical constitution. It is also certain that no psychological upheaval could have produced an hereditary change in his posterity. Yet we unhesitatingly assert that some change took place in that body which, to use the scriptural figure of speech, defiled it.

It has often been suggested in the past that sin was made a fixation in Adam's nature by a miraculous act of judgement by God. If this were true, then there would be grave injustice on God's part. Why should the whole race have been destined to inherit a sin-prone nature by a divine act because Adam disobeyed? If we say that it took a divine act to alter human nature by making the sin principle a fixation, then we have assumed that in the natural course Cain would have been born very good. Why then should God have deliberately marred His creation because Adam sinned? He could have taken Cain and made a new beginning through him. Is not the whole idea preposterous?

There is a better explanation supplied, by implication, in the Scriptures. But first something should be said about genetics in the light of modern knowledge. One hesitates to mention the subject because some will immediately close their minds to anything which science can offer. We ask the reader to consider patiently the whole of the argument. The subject is not profound and is capable of scientific demonstration.

It is one of our strongest arguments against evolution that God made every plant and creature after his kind, that is, as distinct types and species. Further He ensured that every plant and creature would produce after its own likeness. Creation was therefore stabilized by its Maker. If changes in these species could have occurred frequently and if the species had been capable of commingling, then chaos would have resulted, but God literally locked up the process of heredity in the organs of reproduction and it is known today that it is extremely difficult for any changes to take place in the stream of inheritance. It is also known that new characteristics, acquired during the lifetime of a creature, cannot be transmitted to its offspring. Any new characteristics in a family must be produced in the very germ cells of the creature's reproductive organs if they are to be passed on.

From this can be seen the impossibility of any mental shock in Adam affecting either his physical nature or that of his posterity. If a hereditary change took place in Adam's nature, then it must have operated through those germs of life in his reproductive organs. Now it is a fact which can be demonstrated today that changes in the germ cells can be produced by the action of such things as radio-activity, chlorine gas and ultra-violet rays. Furthermore, some random changes do occur in nature but they are nearly always destructive to the plant or animal and therefore die out without ruining the species. All this is an argument against evolution and a further testimony to the glory of God's handiwork in the beginning.

The question might be asked then, was it possible for Adam himself in some way, to have produced a change in his germ cells. Bearing in mind that such a change can be effected by a biochemical action, then it is possible that it was the eating of the forbidden fruit which produced this disastrous result; for this too would have constituted a biochemical action. The Tree by this view takes on an added significance in the drama. It becomes something that is deadly, intrinsically so, and not merely because it was a forbidden object. This means that death was not inflicted by God merely as a punishment for eating the tree but as an absolute necessity. The Tree having deranged Adam's nature, and at the same time having made this derangement an hereditary factor, then the death of Adam and all his offspring was a judicial necessity; human nature could never again be the same as it had been when it came fresh from the Hands of the Maker.

If it is agreed that it is within the bounds of scientific possibility that the Tree could have produced this change in Adam, the next question is have we scriptural evidence that this occurred? There is no direct evidence, but one thing is certain—the Tree did have an effect upon their reproductive organs for their sexual instincts were awakened after eating. This is revealed by the fact that immediately after eating Adam and Eve knew that they were naked. Before going off at a tangent and treating this statement as a figure of speech for an evil conscience, we should consider its literal implication. That it is a statement of literal fact is unquestionable, for in Gen. 2:25 it is recorded that they were naked and knew it not. Is not the implication plain that at that stage their sexual instinct was dormant but intended for use in God's own good time? It is understandable that moral development was needed first in order to control this most powerful of instincts. In God's wisdom the same thing pertains in every child. By the time puberty is reached, the child has attained the requisite moral capacity, if only parents would instruct him. Adam and Eve, however, had awakened the instinct prematurely and in a manner forbidden by God. Their eyes were opened and they knew they were naked, or in other words they had become sex-conscious. Is not Scripture implying all the time that here the disastrous change took place in human nature which produced that unbalance in its instincts which we call "sin" and which at the same time became an hereditary factor? Paul's assertion can then be understood that it was by one man's act that sin and death passed to all men, for by that act, all men were constituted sinners (Rom. 5:19). The word used by the Apostle in this verse does not describe the act of making an object, it is used as of making a king or judge, that is, appointing or constituting one with authority. It suggests, therefore, that Adam gave his posterity the power which made them sinners.

More about Sin

Sin is described so frequently in figurative ways that it is easy to lose sight of what it really is. These figures suggest to the mind that sin is some form of toxin or uncleanness in the flesh, but such figures are necessary to make sin "exceeding sinful" in our eyes. In a

discussion like this figures must be dispensed with, and bedrock, literal definitions must be stated like Paul's that sin was a law in his members; that is, a mode or principle of operation in his organism, which was reflected in the mind in the form of rebellious thought. It must be remembered of course, that Paul uses the term "sin" by the figure for Metonymy, for the impulses which produce acts of sin. It is in this manner that we have used the term frequently in this essay.

It is necessary then to get rid of the idea that sin is a *thing* or a poison in the flesh. Sin like electricity is not a thing, but a state of affairs. In the case of electricity there is an excitation of atoms in a copper wire, but it is spoken of as a thing or a current for the purpose of every day speech. So it is with sin; it is a state of affairs in our physical being which leads inevitably to transgression of God's law; it springs from the instincts of self-preservation and self-gratification, which are part of our nature. To speak of the entrance of sin into the world, therefore, means that a change was wrought through Adam, in the degree of strength of these instincts. This produced an unbalance in the mind, or a bias towards rebellion against law.

Some suppose that because Adam was an animal being by nature, he was bound to have a nature like ours from the start. But this is unwarranted. The teaching of Paul requires the belief that in fact God did create a man with an animal nature without the sin-bias. Whilst these instincts of self-preservation and self-gratification were a necessary part of Adam before the fall because he was an animal creature, there is no need to suppose that they were present with such exaggerated force as they now possess in us. A further point to remember is that instincts themselves are not identical with sin; they are necessary for the normal functioning of animal life. It is the abuse of these or the use of them in a manner contrary to God's law which is sinful. Their mere existence is not sin.

To illustrate the fact that animal instincts can vary in degree of strength, two varieties of dogs might be considered. In certain types the savage instincts are covered by only a veneer of domestication and easily break out and overrule the habits of training which may be styled "law". In a variety like the Labrador, the savage instincts are far less potent and the creature is highly susceptible to training or law; so much so that the dog can be subjected to the greatest temptations, even when hungry, to break rule and yet not yield and transgress the law of its owner.

It has already been suggested in the previous section that the intensification of these instincts may find its explanation in the eating of the Tree. The Bible often states facts which it does not explain, and a more profound significance may lie behind the statement that the eyes of Adam and Eve were opened and that they knew they were naked, than some would be prepared to admit.

The Serpent

Today some, although certainly not the vast majority of us, have "a serpent problem". There may be difficulty in understanding fully some of the moral aspects which may occur on this subject, but this may arise from a lack of spiritual perception in the ways of God. It must be admitted that a *prima facie* reading of Scripture requires the belief that the serpent was a literal beast of the field, endowed with a higher intelligence than other animals. Further, it was as a beast of the field that the creature was cursed; that is, in terms which indicate its classification—"thou art cursed above all cattle".

Again, we note that God addressed the serpent as the third protagonist in the drama after speaking to Adam and Eve. Another important point is that Eve was the first person in Scripture to refer to the creature in direct speech. "The serpent beguiled me ...". If there was no such creature, why did she then, as some suppose, use the word "serpent" as a symbol of her own evil mind?

The subject of the serpent should never be at issue amongst us. The Bible clearly teaches that sin was not originally part of Adam and Eve's nature, consequently the evil suggestion which *deceived* Eve and led to her transgression, must have come from an external source. It is for this reason the serpent becomes a very important being in the drama. Those who deny the literality of the serpent, especially if they are candidates for baptism, are obliged to provide an explanation for the origin of the lie which deceived Eve. This explanation must be compatible with Paul's doctrine on the origin of sin. Young Christadelphians must be impressed with the fact that the serpent is not a subject which can be isolated; it forms an important and integral part of Paul's doctrine of sin and atonement.

It is a very natural process of thought for those influenced by an evolutionary philosophy to conceive Adam not as unique, but with primitive and evil instincts dominating his moral character, and from that basis to think of the serpent as a symbol of the mental expression of that imaginary Adam. But the whole picture in Gen. 2 is one of a world and a man, both of which were unique in condition; and that condition has been degraded in the moral justice of God.

The question which troubles many minds is—why did God create such a creature? It is often suggested that the serpent was necessary in order to test Adam's fidelity to God. This may be an over-simplification of a most profound design on God's part. It was God's intention to make man in His own image and with His own likeness which was also the image and likeness of the angelic host. It was part of the nature of those angelic sons that they knew both good and evil, they had experienced these things at some time in their existence. "The man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." It is part of the Divine nature which they shared to abominate evil and to love good. This is an essential part of the nature and personality of God.

When, therefore, God produced a man of a nature which was *potentially* upright on the moral plane and destined him to be a manifestation of Himself, a tremendous problem occurred. We speak as men, of course, because there are no problems with God, but if it enhances the work of God, let us say for convenience, that here arose "a problem fit for a god ...". How could a creature which was potentially upright and enjoying no other companionship than the angels of God develop an abhorrence of evil? Whence could come the evil, seeing that God Himself could not create it? We are speaking, of course, of moral and intellectual evil and not of evil as a judicial experience like catastrophe and suffering. It would have been an evil experience if Adam had fallen and injured himself. But whence could come his confrontation with ideas which were hateful to God?

The solution lay in the creation of the serpent. Here was a creature endowed with a higher intelligence than other beasts, yet utterly amoral. There should be no difficulty that God should create such a creature for we can see examples in every four year old child of such an intelligence in animal nature. At that age the reasoning power of the child awakens, but without moral sense, and the results are often startling and disconcerting to adults. To give an authentic example, when a child was reproached for complaining about the God-given rain it

said, "It's all right for Him, He is up above it all". The statement is an implied reproach against the justice of God, but we do not consider the child to be diabolic for saying it; it is reasoning from its limited intellect as the serpent was. Nevertheless even such a childish deduction could become diabolic in its effect, if it perverted a person so innocent and ingenuous as was Eve.

A problem is often created to the effect that God in His justice would not have made such a creature to tempt Eve. Those who create this problem reject the literal serpent on this score. Yet they find no difficulty in believing that God created Adam with a law of sin in his flesh. Is it not a far more blasphemous suggestion to make this latter point than to accept the idea that God made the serpent?

The Experience of the Anglicans

We live in a world in which dogma is frowned upon and in which principles are swept aside even in theological circles. It would be a marvel if nothing of this general attitude of mind found its way into our community. Let us face realities: the errors of God's people in every age have reflected something of the world in which they lived. We must ask ourselves then, are we as a community as firmly resolved today to uphold principles as we were hitherto? It is so very easy for a spirit of indifference to insinuate itself into our thinking. Is the serpent worth making a fuss about? Does it matter what the nature of Adam was when he was created? Can we not serve Christ equally well whatever our opinions may be on these problems? These questions are actually being asked and even published in our midst today, and their influence is very real.

Such questions are asked by intelligent brethren and sisters. It is difficult to understand why such questioners have not learned from the experiences of the Anglican Church within the last century. By the end of the last century, Anglicanism had already compromised with Darwinism, and its casuists sought to reconcile an evolutionary philosophy with the teaching of Paul. Lack of faith in Genesis eventually undermined the authority of Paul. Inspiration as we know it went by the board. Any who take the trouble to read Anglican commentaries published during this last century can trace the process for themselves with salutary effects. The end product of the process of compromise is seen in the book *Honest to God*, by John A. T. Robinson, the one-time Bishop of Woolwich.

One wonders if young Christadelphians today who are blandly disposed to be tolerant to an evolutionary philosophy, have ever seriously considered the lesson which the Anglican experience affords. One aspect may be dealt with in this essay which illustrates how problems which are beginning to trouble us today were wrangled over by Anglicans seventy years ago.

In 1904, Prof. Peake, the editor of "Peake's Commentary" published his book *Christianity, its Nature and its Truth*. He thought that in the theory of man's evolution, he had at last found the answer to the problem of the origin of sin. "We do not recognize the absolute new beginning as our predecessors did. We make room for the evolutionary theory of the origin of mankind ... Now this at once throws a new and welcome light on several sides of the problem. In the first place it provides us with an explanation of the origin of sin, which while it may not account for everything, accounts nevertheless for much. We see man beginning his career with the instincts of ferocity and cruelty, greed and selfishness and cunning stamped deeply into his organism transmitted to him by innumerable animal ancestors. As these

existed in the animal they were not sinful ... But there comes a time when man appears ... But he starts heavily handicapped, the animal qualities remain in all their strength, and all that can be at present pitted against them is the faint consciousness of moral distinction which has just struggled to its birth.” It is important to notice that Peake recognized that the problem of sin’s origin had to be faced. He thought, however, that this evolutionary view provided a solution because it relieved God of the responsibility for the evil state of human nature. It is difficult to understand the logic of this, for however protracted the process was which produced this nature, it would still have been a process deliberately initiated by God; and further, a billion years’ production of man would be no different in His sight than a momentary dynamic act of creation.

In passing, however, it may be observed again, that Prof. Peake was profoundly conscious that the origin of sin called for an explanation in the universe created by a holy God. It would be regrettable if some of us failed to treat the matter with equal reverence.

Peake was trying to stem the flood in Anglican thought, which was threatening to sweep away the authority of Paul. Discussing the incompatibility of the Genesis view of man’s innocence with the evolutionary viewpoint he says, “... at this point many believe that the definite breakdown of the Pauline theology occurs”. Peake himself was making the attempt to maintain the authority of Paul by a reinterpretation of Romans chapter 5 on the basis of the evolutionary theory. To do this he presented the very same arguments which are raised by some amongst us today.

In Peake’s view, whether Adam was a reality or not is unimportant. He was merely the parabolic representative of a race which had evolved and whose nature was evil. Adam’s experience was merely a representational one by which God taught mankind the truth about its own nature. Peake dismissed the idea that Paul taught that Adam committed a trespass which involved all mankind in sin. He says of that trespass—“It is rather an act in which the whole moral character of the race stands revealed. Just because Adam is a sample of humanity, his act is critical. It reveals man’s sinful nature, and shews that under the stimulus of law, transgression inevitably follows”. He thought that this was the correct interpretation of Paul’s argument in Romans 5. Man had come into existence with a sinful nature. He had evolved until he reached the consciousness of moral order. The touch of law awakened him to rebellion, whereas previously he had been innocent. By the transgression of law, innocence gave way to guilt. Then Peake continues—“And as God looked upon it he saw the whole character of humanity clearly displayed, pronounced all men sinners, and imposed the penalty of physical death”. His next words astonish us—“It will now be clear ...”. They astonish us because there is nothing clear about it: the whole argument is a befogged travesty of truth. If Adam’s sin was merely an exemplary one; if it was recorded merely to teach the race about its true nature—merely to make us conscious of our sin-stricken and dying state, then the learned Peake must answer this question: How, we ask, was it possible for God, at some point during the evolution of the race, to pass sentence of death upon it, for sin, when death had always been part of its experience? But the learned Peake appears to be quite satisfied with his brilliant distortion of Paul’s teaching— that through one man sin entered the world and through that one man death passed upon all others.

Summary of Arguments

1. The Bible presents the first man in a unique state of nature and in a unique environment. This conflicts with the view of historical geology which maintains that all things have

continued as we see them.

2. Sin is not a matter to be lightly treated when considered from God's point of view.
3. Solomon's view of Adam in his primal state was that he was, in moral constitution, made upright.
4. The nature of Eve's temptation demonstrates that she was not resentful and covetous by nature. In her case deceit preceded the awakening of lust.
5. Sin was intrusive in man's experience which necessitated a warning for Cain on the potency of the evil principle in his flesh.
6. (a) The Law of Moses through its symbolism taught Israel that human nature had been marred at the source.

(b) The law given to Adam did not cause sin to awaken in his consciousness as law does in our own experience.
7. (a) Paul taking Genesis 3 as literal history, explains God's method of redemption with reference to an historical act by Adam which affected his posterity.

(b) Because all suffered the consequence of this act God more than balances the account by an overwhelming grace through the act of Christ.

(c) In that act Christ condemned Sin and portrayed God's estimate of this vile principle in the flesh, from which we adduce that God could not have created this thing which He abhorred.
8. The hereditary nature of the sin principle calls for explanation—

(a) The idea of a miraculous fixation of the principle in the flesh is untenable.

(b) The idea that the Tree produced this hereditary factor in Adam is tenable both scripturally and scientifically.

(c) Paul's doctrine of the Atonement requires the view that Adam's act produced the hereditary factor.
9. Sin is a state of affairs in our organism springing from the power of our instincts. This instinctive force was not necessarily so potent in Adam as to make transgression a certainty.
10. If Adam and Eve were not of sin-stricken flesh then the tempting lie was of external origin and the serpent was manifestly a literal beast.
11. The creation of the serpent was an absolute necessity to provide a basis whereby Adam and Eve could develop an abhorrence of evil.
12. The experience of Anglicanism is a salutary warning of the consequences following a

compromise with an evolutionary philosophy.