

Original Sin and Ancestral Sin - Comparative Doctrines By James J. DeFrancisco, Ph.D.

The LORD descended in the cloud and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the LORD. The LORD passed before him and proclaimed, “The LORD, the LORD, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children and the children’s children, to the third and the fourth generation.” And Moses quickly bowed his head toward the earth and worshiped. And he said, “If now I have found favor in your sight, O Lord, please let the Lord go in the midst of us, for it is a stiff-necked people, and pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for your inheritance.”*

- Exodus 34:5-9 ESV

When Dr. Tom Roberts asked me to write this paper I must admit that I had mixed feelings. I conceived of a treatise on dry Theology comparing Eastern Orthodox with Western Christian Theological concepts and ancient arguments. I envisioned reviewing much material containing much sound and fury but signifying nothing. However, as I began to review material on this subject I began to appreciate the deep importance of this subject matter and also how far away from Holy Scripture the church has strayed. As a Christian counselor I see a sound grasp of this subject matter as being vital to emotional, mental, and spiritual well being.

Recently the Roman Catholic Church has altered its position relative to the status of the souls of infants who have died as well as those who lost life due to stillborn deaths and abortions. The entire doctrine of original sin will be re-visited due to this radical change. With this position change, long overdue, and the elimination of the Roman Catholic doctrine on Limbo, the subject of this paper will take on more significance.

This paper explores the differences between the doctrine of Ancestral Sin—as understood in the church of the first two centuries and the present-day Orthodox Church—and the doctrine of Original Sin—developed by Augustine in the 5th century C.E. and afterward by his heirs in the Western Christian traditions. Other viewpoints from Protestant, Jewish, and Islamic sources will be considered as well.

There are wide-ranging disagreements among Christian groups relative to an understanding of the state of sinfulness and its relationship to holiness. Sin has a

lasting affect on all human beings, even children, which has been explained through various doctrines of original sin and with some Christian groups denying this doctrine altogether.

In the New Testament, Paul wrote that just as sin entered the world through Adam, death also entered.

Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:

- Romans 5:12 KJV

This is usually referred to as The Fall of Man with salvation from sin coming through Jesus, the second Adam. Most Christians believe that Jesus' death and resurrection provide salvation not only from personal sin, but from the condition of sin itself. This is the concept of ancestral sin (Eastern Christianity) or original sin (Western Christianity, following Augustine of Hippo).

Augustine generally affirms that humanity inherited both the tendency to sin and the guilt of Adam and Eve's sin. The doctrine in Eastern Christianity is that humanity inherited the tendency to sin, but not the guilt for Adam and Eve's sin. This doctrine, also adopted by some in the Western Church as a form of *Arminianism* and is sometimes called *Semipelagianism*. A minority of Christians affirm *Pelagianism*, the belief that neither the condition nor the guilt of original sin is inherited; rather, we all freely face the same choice between sin and salvation that Adam and Eve did. *Pelagianism* was opposed by the Council of Carthage in 418 AD/CE.

Most Christians believe sin separated humanity from God, making all humans liable to condemnation to eternal punishment in Hell but that Jesus' death and resurrection reconciled humanity with God, granting eternal life in Heaven to the saved or faithful

Most Christians accept the New Testament account of Christ's resurrection as a historical factual account of an actual event central to Christian faith although that has been challenged by many modern theologians. Belief in the resurrection is one of the most distinctive elements of traditional Christian faith; and defending the historicity of Christ's resurrection is vital to traditional Christianity. Therefore, the historicity of the resurrection is usually a central issue of Christian apologetics.

Conservative Christian scholars believe that Jesus was raised bodily from the dead and that he was raised in a physical as well as a spiritual body. Many liberal scholars do not believe Christ's resurrection was historical fact but rather that it was a spiritual event relative to faith. They do not believe that Jesus was raised bodily from the dead, or that he still lives bodily.

The relationship between the physical body and the spirit is important in Theology and a sound understanding of original sin as well as the resurrection. In the Greek view (dualism), the body is evil but the spirit is good. In the Hebraic view, the

whole person (spirit and body) is good. The importance of this subject is highlighted by John S. Romanides:ⁱ

The importance of a correct definition of original sin and its consequences can never be exaggerated. Any attempt to minimize its importance or alter its significance automatically entails either a weakening or even a complete misunderstanding of the nature of the Church, sacraments and human destiny. A proper approach to the New Testament teaching of Paul concerning original sin cannot be one-sided. It is incorrect, for example, to emphasize, in Romans 5:12, the phrase, *eph'ho pantes hemarton*, by trying to make it fit any certain system of thought concerning moral law and guilt without first establishing the importance of Paul's beliefs concerning the powers of Satan and the true situation not only of man, but of all creation. It is also wrong to deal with the problem of the transmission of original sin within the framework of dualistic anthropology while at the same time completely ignoring the Hebraic foundations of Paul's anthropology. Likewise, and attempt to interpret the Biblical doctrine of the fall in terms of a hedonistic philosophy of happiness is already doomed to failure because of its refusal to recognize not only the abnormality but, more important, the consequences of death and corruption. A correct approach to the Pauline doctrine of original sin must take into consideration Paul's understanding of (1) the fallen state of creation, including the powers of Satan, death and corruption, (2) the justice of God and law, and (3) anthropology and the destiny of man and creation. . . .

Original sin –Definitions of Key Words

Let's begin with definitions of key words used within this paper. First, the standard definition for Original Sin:

Original Sin – “The predisposition towards sin which is part of all humanity, believed to stem from humanity's fall. This belief does not take away from individual responsibility, but it does highlight the inbuilt factors within environment and heredity which push us towards disobedience, and it corresponds to observable facts about human nature.”ⁱⁱ

This is simply expressed in the statement, “Since humanity's fall, everyone inherits an inclination to sin and a desire to go his or her own way rather than obey God. Human beings are sinful by nature.”ⁱⁱⁱ

We cannot investigate this subject without taking into consideration the fact that Holy Scripture states that humans were created in the image of God. Simply put, “God creates humankind to reflect his character.”^{iv} In some way, sin has affected that image.

Image of God - “ That in the nature of human beings which reflects the nature of God . . . All the goodness in humanity comes from this aspect of our creation, but the image of God has been spoilt in us by the fall.v

Since the whole subject is related to an event (or state) referred to as “the fall” we need another basic definition:

The Fall – Humanity’s choice to be independent of God and his will, a choice in which we are all involved and which has resulted in the deflection of humanity from the path God intended, the distortion of the image of God in mankind and the spoiling of the creation itself.”vi

However, there is a significant difference between the Roman Catholic or Western perspective and the Orthodox or Eastern perspective on Original Sin (often referred to more accurately as Ancestral Sin by the Orthodox Church.

Ancestral Sin - To the Orthodox Church, Original Sin is “The fact that every person born comes into the world stained with the consequences of the sins of Adam and Eve and of their other ancestors. Those consequences are chiefly: (1) mortality, (2) a tendency to sin, and (3) alienation from God and other people. Original sin does not carry guilt, however, for a person is guilty only of his or her own sins, not those of Adam. Therefore, the Orthodox Church does not believe that a baby who dies unbaptized is condemned to hell. Se Gen. 3:1-24; Rom. 5:12-16”.vii

This paper will investigate and challenge the above positions while comparing various views on Original and Ancestral Sin as well as the character of human nature. Does a “predisposition towards sin . . . stem from humanity’s fall”? Is it true that this belief “corresponds to observable facts about human nature” and that “Since humanity’s fall, everyone inherits an inclination to sin and a desire to go his or her own way rather than obey God. Human beings are sinful by nature.”? If so, how can it be that humans were created in the image of God since, “God creates humankind to reflect his character”? Is there guilt associated with Adam’s sin which extend to all humanity or, is a person “guilty only of his or her own sins”? In our investigation we will look at the Roman Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, Assyrian, Jewish, Islamic, and most importantly, the view of Holy Scripture.

Original sin

According to Christian tradition, ***original sin*** is the general condition of sinfulness in which human beings are born. Used with the definite article ("the original sin"), it refers to the first sin, committed when Adam and Eve succumbed to the serpent's temptation. This Biblical story of original sin is the sign and seed of future evil choices and effects for the whole human race. Christians usually refer to this first sin as “the Fall”. Original sin is distinguished from actual sin as cause and effect: "a bad tree bears bad fruit". Original sin is not "personal" (in the modern sense

of this word)—in that it is not the consequence of personal choice or personal failure to act—but nevertheless it is "personal" in the sense that every individual person is personally subject to the effects of original sin.viii

Jews do not believe in "original sin," but it is a key teaching for most Christians. For Christians, atonement for original sin (and actual sin) requires the redemption of Jesus Christ's death and resurrection. Subsequently, many mainline Christians require baptism to wash away this sin (or still many others suggest baptism as only a public and symbolic representation of one's redemption).

Disputes Concerning Original Sin

The doctrine of Original Sin has received considerable scrutiny from contemporary Christians. The chief dispute focuses on the emotive argument of whether an apparently innocent baby can be deemed subject to sin and death. The dispute revolves around distinctions between personal sin (i.e. freely willed, conscious and understood) and original sin (not the result of free will). The Augustinian tradition makes a clear distinction between sin which is the result of freely and consciously chosen actions, and the impersonal nature of original sin; namely the ***unchosen*** context and situations into which the child is born and which surrounds the baby, and into which the child might be educated and formed. Effectively, the Augustinian teaching says that even though the baby has not made any conscious choice, it is nevertheless personally affected by—and subject to—sin, and that God's grace is essential to give hope and salvation. The Augustinian view is seen by some scholars as a negative view of human nature, since Augustine believed that the human race, without God's help, is depraved.

Original sin, from the Augustinian perspective, is not a free and individual choice by a baby; but rather the effect of the sum total of "world sin", taught analogously through the story of the sin of Adam and Eve. The Augustinian doctrine of original sin teaches that every individual is born into a broken world where sin is already active; that they are inevitably influenced personally by the actions of others and the consequences of choices made by others. The Augustinian effectively believes that human nature—and hence every individual person—is flawed. ***The Augustinian remedy for original sin is baptism; the ritual washing away of the unchosen but inevitable condition of birth sin***; and a vigorous declaration by Christians that sin shall not prevail, but that God's grace can overpower it with our free cooperation.

Some individuals challenge the entire doctrine of original sin as unbiblical, understanding the concept is to contradict Mosaic teaching that the children should not be punished for the sins of the fathers. Ezekiel 18:20 again states unequivocally that descendants are not to be punished for their parents' sins.

Those who understand original sin as personal guilt and sin, rather than as sin in an analogous sense, are confronted with a yet graver difficulty, particularly if they conceive of sin as a matter of a person's soul as such, rather than of the ensouled body,

or en fleshed soul, that is the person. Sin, they say, is an issue of the soul, but, if we inherit our bodies from our parents and our souls from God, then original sin, which is inherited with human nature from our parents, must be a matter of the body; or, if it is a matter of the soul, original sin must come from God.

Judaism rejects the concept of the original sin altogether and stresses free will and men's responsibility of their actions rather than religious obedience or faith. Why, they ask, would God, who is universal unconditional Love, create sentient and sapient beings, then intentionally let them become corrupt—and then punish them from generation to generation with eternal torture for simply just being born in the world and for nothing else—and judge people not on their actions but by their faith or its lack—and then by whim save the beings from nothing else but from his very own wrath.

Original Sin in Mainstream Protestantism

The doctrine of original sin as interpreted by Augustine was affirmed by the Protestant Reformers Martin Luther and John Calvin. Both Luther and Calvin agreed that humans inherit guilt from the sin of Adam and are in a state of sin from the moment of conception. This inherently sinful nature (the basis for the Calvinist doctrine of "total depravity") results in a complete alienation from God and the total inability of humans to achieve reconciliation with God based on their own abilities. Not only do individuals inherit a sinful nature due to Adam's fall, but since he was the head and representative of the human race, all whom he represents inherit the guilt of his sin by imputation.

Because of this spiritual problem, Protestants believe that God the Father sent Jesus into the world. The personhood, life, ministry, suffering, and death of Jesus, as God incarnate in human flesh, is meant to be the atonement for original sin as well as actual sins committed by humans; this atonement is according to some Protestants rendered fully effective by the resurrection of Jesus.

Original Sin in Restoration Movement

The majority of Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement Churches, such as the Churches of Christ, Christian Churches, and other Congregational Churches of the same origin, reject the notion of original sin, believing only in the sins for which men and women are personally responsible. Adam and Eve did bring sin into the world by introducing disobedience. This spread to further generations in much the same way other ideas spread, thus ensuring an environment that will produce sin in any individual above "The Age of Accountability."

In the Book of Ezekiel, God's people are rebuked for suggesting that the children would die/suffer for their father's sins:
The word of the Lord came to me: "What do you people mean by quoting this proverb about the land of Israel: '*The parents eat sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge*'? As surely as I live, declares the Sovereign Lord, you will no longer quote

this proverb in Israel. For everyone belongs to me, the parent as well as the child—both alike belong to me. The one who sins is the one who will die. ix

The Lord then gives examples of a good father with a bad son, of a good son with a bad father, etc. and states:

"Yet you ask, '*Why does the son not share the guilt of his father?*' Since the son has done what is just and right and has been careful to keep all my decrees, he will surely live. The one who sins is the one who will die. The child will not share the guilt of the parent, nor will the parent share the guilt of the child. The righteousness of the righteous will be credited to them, and the wickedness of the wicked will be charged against them. x

God concludes: "house of Israel, I will judge each of you according to your own ways ... Repent! Turn away from all your offenses; then sin will not be your downfall. Rid yourselves of all the offenses you have committed, and get a new heart and a new spirit". xi

It must be noted, however, that many Restoration movement churches and individuals do believe that Adam's sin made us depraved (that is, with a tendency towards sin) without making us guilty of Adam's sin. Man is predisposed towards sin, but though every person sins, they are not intrinsically *forced* to sin.

Original Sin for Seventh-day Adventists

According to the General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church's official website on theological doctrine, there is still no clear position within Adventism relative to the origins of sin. xii The Biblical Research Institute website indicates that there have been a variety of positions within the SDA church.xiii There has been a move by some scholars towards a more traditionally Augustinian understanding of original sin. On the other hand, there does still appear strong theological support for the 'traditional' Adventist position, which is more in line with Eastern Orthodox understandings.

It is remarkable that this topic is very interesting and important in that it affects Christianity's understanding of the nature of Christ, what sin is (an act or a state?), what exactly we inherit from fallen Adam (his guilt or nature?), and finally it addresses the questions regarding exactly how and why Christ saves mankind. For the most thorough treatment of this subject in Adventism see the work of Edwin Zackrisson. xiv

Original sin in the Unity Church

The Unity Church looks at the doctrine of Original Sin as both false and blasphemous. Their logic is that if a manufacturer (the Creator) consistently puts out a product with the same flaw, it is the fault of the company, not its products, and so it

would be if God were creating beings with the same flaw. This is similar to the Jewish position.

They cite the Bible as self-contradictory with Scriptures depicting humans as both sinful and good maintaining that Psalm 8, Psalm 82, John 10:34, and John 14:12 are not consistent with the concept of Original Sin.

Original sin in Islam

According to Qur'an, it was Adam, not Eve, who let the devil convince them to eat the forbidden fruit but both repented and both were forgiven. This is depicted in several places, including Sura 7:20-23:

But the Shaitan made an evil suggestion to them that he might make manifest to them what had been hidden from them of their evil inclinations, and he said: Your Lord has not forbidden you this tree except that you may not both become two angels or that you may (not) become of the immortals. And he swore to them both: Most surely I am a sincere adviser to you. Then he caused them to fall by deceit; so when they tasted of the tree, their evil inclinations became manifest to them, and they both began to cover themselves with the leaves of the garden; and their Lord called out to them: Did I not forbid you both from that tree and say to you that the Shaitan is your open enemy? They said: Our Lord! We have been unjust to ourselves, and if Thou forgive us not, and have (not) mercy on us, we shall certainly be of the losers.

In the Qur'an Adam and Eve are forgiven by God after they repent: Then Adam received (some) words from his Lord, so He turned to him mercifully; surely He is Oft-returning (to mercy), the Merciful. xv

Therefore, the idea that the sin is passed on to offspring is categorically refused by Muslims who cite verses such as the following:

Say: What! shall I seek a Lord other than Allah? And He is the Lord of all things; and no soul earns (evil) but against itself, and no bearer of burden shall bear the burden of another; then to your Lord is your return, so He will inform you of that in which you differed. xvi

and

Allah does not impose upon any soul a duty but to the extent of its ability; for it is (the benefit of) what it has earned and upon it (the evil of) what it has wrought: Our Lord! do not punish us if we forget or make a mistake; Our Lord! do not lay on us a burden as Thou didst lay on those before us, Our Lord do not impose upon us that which we have not the strength to bear; and pardon us and grant us protection and have mercy on us, Thou art our Patron, so help us against the unbelieving people. xvii

Therefore, according to the Quran, all children are born without sin in the state of purity.

Classical Biblical view

Adam and Eve's sin, as recounted in the Book of Genesis is sometimes called in Hebrew החטא הקדמון (the original sin), on the basis of the traditional Christian term. But the term used in classical Jewish literature is חטא אדם הראשון (the sin of the first man, or of Adam).

The account in Genesis 2-3 implies that Adam and Eve initially lived in a state of intimate communion with God. The narrative reads that God "caused to grow every tree that is pleasing to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (Gen. 2:9, NASB). God then forbade Adam to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil warning him that he would surely die if he did. Man was not forbidden to eat from the tree of life initially, but was after breaking the commandment to not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. God said that "man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever" (Gen. 3:22, NASB). The serpent persuaded Eve to eat from the tree and "she gave also to her husband with her, and he ate" (Gen. 3:6, NASB). After eating the fruit Adam became aware of his nakedness (Gen. 3:1-7). God bestowed a curse upon each of the active participants. First the earth is cursed with thorns. Next the serpent's physical form is altered and God sets up an eternal enmity between Eve and the serpent and all their offspring (Gen. 3:9-15). God then pronounces two curses upon Eve. First, she is to suffer the difficulties of pregnancy. Second, her husband will henceforth rule over her and she will strive for that power. God then tells Adam that he will now struggle for his sustenance, and places the fault of fallen mankind on his shoulders (Gen. 3:16-21).

Adam and Eve were not necessarily expelled from the Garden of Eden for their disobedience *per se*. The narrative reads that God no longer wanted them to eat from the Tree of Life, which would impart eternal life to them, something they lost upon disobeying God's orders. To avoid this, God expelled them from paradise (Gen. 3:22-24).

Reform and Conservative Judaism's Views

Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden and had to live ordinary, human lives. This would provide opportunity for their growth and maturity to enable them to live as responsible human beings. If they had never eaten from the forbidden tree, they would never have discovered their capacity to do evil. God gave Adam and Eve free will when he created them, but it was not until they ate the fruit that they became aware of the possibility of choosing to do evil or to do good, as they originally had no

knowledge of both. Without this experience they would never develop mature character.

Judaism's Rabbinic Views

Rebbi Nachman bar Shmuel said: "And behold, it was very good!" (Bereishis 1:31); "And behold," this refers to the *yetzer tov*; "very good," this refers to the *yetzer hara* for the *yetzer hara* is very good. Were it not for the *yetzer hara* a man would not build a house, marry a woman, do business . . . (Bereishis Rabbah 9:7). A necessary evil, perhaps, but evil nevertheless. Indeed, the Talmud is even more direct:

Difficult is the *yetzer hara* that even its Creator called it evil, as it says, "Because the inclination of the heart of man is evil from his youth" (Bereishis 8:21). Rav Shimon, the son of Levi said: every day the *yetzer* of a man strengthens itself seeking to kill him . . . (Kiddushin 30b)

Evil is a qualitative term that can really only be ascribed to a human being as an evaluation of his choice. The *yetzer hara* was made to be what it is-which it is very good at being-and what it was created to be is best illustrated by the following:

The Holy One, Blessed is He, said to the Jewish people: I created the *yetzer hara* and I created Torah as its spice. If you involve yourselves in Torah, then you will not fall prey to it, as it says, "If you improve, [you will be forgiven]," and if you don't involve yourselves with Torah then you will fall prey to it, as it says, "[If you don't improve] then transgression crouches at your door." Not only this, but it will expend every energy to induce you to transgress, as it says, "To you is its desire"; but if you choose to, you can rule over it, as it says, "And you can control it" (Bereishis 4:7; Kiddushin 30b)

Therefore, the *yetzer hara* is the active ingredient that transforms an act of devout servitude into a challenge to be spiritual and Godly. Indeed, it is often referred to as the "*seor sh'b'issa*," the leaven within the dough that causes it to rise. For Pesach, Jews burn the *chometz* as a symbol of breaking with the *yetzer hara* and its bloated reality and eat *matzah* to remind us of how simple and pure we are without the *yetzer hara*.

It is the *yetzer hara* who makes effort possible. Without him, there would be no struggle, no challenge, and therefore no reward in the eternal world of *Olam HaBah*-the World-to-Come-as there will not be for any mitzvos done after his demise. Once Moshiach arrives and the *yetzer hara* is "slaughtered," the period of earning eternal reward comes to an end-forever.

The *yetzer hara* will be there on the day of judgment to testify against us, about how we fell for all of his clever ruses to convince us to do what was forbidden to us, and to convince us to not do what we were obligated to perform (Yoma 52b). He is a master of disguises and his best is acting and sounding like us, to the point that

we believe him. We hear his voice from within us, tempting us on to do that which we'd rather avoid, or to avoid that which we would rather do if we only knew the consequences of our actions, a small detail he works hard to keep from our conscious minds. But that's his job, his *raison d'être*. And, it is OURS to see who he is, to see the face of our enemy, or our study partner, depending upon one's approach to God, life, and the struggle of being human. And, they say that there is no better defense than an offence, which means knowing about the *yetzer hara*, believing in it, and appreciating that Torah is the only way to harness its power for good and reward in the World-to-Come.

For, only then can one activate his free-will ability and use it at will, and make life naturally exhilarating. Only then can one become a partner with God in Creation, and not simply a pawn in His master plan, as so many unwittingly seem to do. And never do much about it, either, ever. And, in this statement lies another very important discussion as we come to a deeper understanding about the role of free-will in life and perfection of Creation.xviii

The Soul is Pure at Birth

Judaism teaches that humans are born morally pure and this seems to be founded on a basic understanding of the creation story within Holy Scripture. Humans were created in the image of God with freedom of choice to obey or disobey God. Therefore, Judaism has no concept analogous to original sin but rather affirms that people are born with a *yetzer ha-tov* (יצר הטוב), a tendency to do good, and with a *yetzer hara* (יצר הרע), a tendency to do evil. Thus, human beings have free will to choose the path in life that they will take. The rabbis even recognize a positive value to the *yetzer ha-ra*: without the *yetzer ha-ra* there would be no civilization or other fruits of human labor. The implication is that *yetzer ha-tov* and *yetzer ha-ra* are best understood not only as moral categories of good and evil but as the inherent conflict within man between selfless and selfish orientations.

Rabban Yochanan stated that Judaism had a source of atonement beyond the sacrificial system, "We have another, equally important source of atonement, the practice of *gemiluth ḥasadim* (loving kindness), as it is stated: "I desire loving kindness and not sacrifice" (Hosea 6:6). Also, the Babylonian Talmud teaches that "Rabbi Yochanan and Rabbi Eleazar both explain that as long as the Temple stood, the altar atoned for Israel, but now, one's table atones [when the poor are invited as guests]" (Talmud, tractate Berachoth 55a). Similarly, the liturgy of the High Holy Days; i.e. Rosh HaShanah and Yom Kippur states that prayer, repentance, and charity atone for sin. xix

The rabbinic duality of *yetzer hara*, the so-called "evil inclination," and *yetzer hatov*, the "good inclination," is more subtle than the names connote. *Yetzer hara* is not a demonic force that pushes a person to do evil, but rather a drive toward pleasure or property or security, which if left unlimited, can lead to evil (cf. Genesis Rabbah

9:7). When properly controlled by the *yetzer hatov*, the *yetzer hara* leads to many socially desirable results, including marriage, business, and community.

For the rabbis, adults are distinguished from children by the *yetzer hatov*, which controls and channels the drives that exist unchecked in the child. Thus children may seek pleasure and acquisition, but they are not able to create a sanctified relationship or exercise the responsibility to engage in business. Maturity therefore is a primary factor in the Jewish viewpoint regarding the balance of good and evil in human character.

Developing a Moral Sense

In Judaism, the young adult is not described as someone who has developed a sophisticated moral sense; in fact, the early adolescent may base moral decisions entirely on fear of punishment. Yet by age 13, the child's moral sense has developed sufficiently to hold the child responsible for his or her actions. This is the birth of the good inclination

In rabbinic texts, the distinction between childhood and young adulthood is the birth of the *yetzer hatov*, the good inclination. xx

Battling for Control of the Body in Judaism

As Rashi points out, a significant battlefield for the two inclinations is control over the physical body of the adolescent. Rashi's reference to control of the limbs may indicate the typical awkwardness that accompanies adolescent growth, but is more likely a euphemism for control over awakening sexual desire. In view of the belief that since the *yetzer hara* is older and stronger, few adolescents, in Rashi's view, apparently maintain control over those desires. Rashi's final comment concerning how the *yetzer hara* "does not accept reproof" describes the real difficulty of unlearning habits and attitudes acquired in childhood.

Rashi pointed out how hard it is for the *yetzer hatov* to overcome the *yetzer hara's* control over one's sexual urges. R. Epstein extends this to the entirety of one's spiritual being. The birth of the *yetzer hatov* does not make life easier; it makes life more difficult, at least for those who "desire to connect to God." R. Epstein's realistic description of the process of growth and self-examination as being lengthy provides a valuable lesson for the young adult. *Bar mitzvah* and *bat mitzvah* are significant milestones, but they are not transformative. They mark the beginning of a process that takes place "very, very slowly." xxi

The Ancestral Sin Approach of the Orthodox Fathers

As widespread as the term *original sin* is today, it was unknown in both the Eastern and Western Church until Augustine (c. 354-430). The concept of original sin

may have arisen in the writings of Tertullian, but the expression seems to have first appeared in Augustine's writings. Prior to Augustine, theologians used different terminology indicating a contrasting way of thinking about the fall, its effects, and God's response to it. The phrase the Greek Fathers used to describe the fall that took place in the Garden was *ancestral sin*.

It is suggested by those in the Orthodox Church that the doctrine of ancestral sin naturally leads to a focus on human death and Divine compassion as the inheritance from Adam, while the doctrine of original sin shifts the center of attention to human guilt and Divine wrath.^{xxii} It is further posited by Hughes that the approach of the ancient church points to a more therapeutic than juridical approach to pastoral care and counseling.^{xxiii}

According to Hughes, love is the heart and soul of the theology of the early Church Fathers and of the Orthodox Church. He states that, "The Fathers of the Church—East and West—in the early centuries shared the same perspective: humanity longs for liberation from the tyranny of death, sin, corruption and the devil which is only possible through the Life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ."^{xxiv}

Ancestral sin (Greek: *amartema*) refers to an individual act of sin. The Eastern Church Fathers assigned full responsibility for the sin in the Garden to Adam and Eve alone. The word *amartia* is the more familiar term for sin which literally means "missing the mark" and is used to refer to the condition common to all humanity.^{xxv} The Eastern Church never speaks of guilt being passed from Adam and Eve to their progeny, as did Augustine and the Western Church. Instead, the position of the Eastern Church is that each person bears the guilt of his or her own sin.

Relative to the Eastern view, the question becomes, "What then is the inheritance of humanity from Adam and Eve if it is not guilt?" The Orthodox Fathers uniformly answer with the word: *death*.^{xxvi} As Romanides writes, "Man is born with the parasitic power of death within him."^{xxvii} Cyril of Alexandria teaches that our human nature became "diseased...through the sin of one."^{xxviii} Therefore, for the Orthodox fathers, it is not guilt that is passed on but, rather it is a condition, a disease that results in death.

The freedom to obey or disobey belonged to our first parents, "For God made man free and sovereign."^{xxix} Adam and Eve failed to obey the commandment not to eat from the forbidden tree – the tree of knowledge of good and evil - thus rejecting God's commands and their potential to manifest the fullness of human existence.^{xxx} Because of this, in the Eastern view, death and corruption began to take over the creation. "Sin reigned through death."^{xxxi} In this view death and corruption do not originate with God and He didn't create or intend for death and corruption to enter into the world. In this view, God cannot be the Author of evil. Death is the natural result of turning aside from God.

Adam and Eve were overcome with the same temptation that afflicts all humanity: the desire to be independent and exercise self will, to realize the fullness of human existence without God. According to the Orthodox fathers sin is not a violation of an impersonal law or code of behavior; it is outright rejection of the life offered by God.^{xxxii} This higher level of life is the mark, the missing of which is what the word *amartia* refers. Fallen human life is above all else the failure to realize the God-given potential of human existence, which is, as Peter writes, to “become partakers of the divine nature”.^{xxxiii}

In Orthodox thought God did not threaten Adam and Eve with punishment. He was not angered or offended by their sin. Rather, He was moved to compassion. ^{xxxiv}. The expulsion from the Garden and from the Tree of Life was an act of love and not vengeance so that humanity would not “become immortal in sin”. ^{xxxv}

The Fall could not destroy the image of God in humanity. This great gift given by God to humanity remained intact, but damaged.^{xxxvi} Origen described this as the image buried as if in a well choked with debris. ^{xxxvii} While the work of salvation was accomplished by God through Jesus Christ the removal of this debris hiding the image in humanity calls for free and voluntary cooperation. Paul uses the word synergy, or “co-workers”, ^{xxxviii} to describe the cooperation between Divine Grace and human freedom. For the Orthodox Fathers this means asceticism (prayer, fasting, charity and keeping vigil) developed from Paul’s image of the spiritual athlete. ^{xxxix} This is also the working out of salvation “with fear and trembling” spoken of by Paul. ^{xl} Paul and Jesus describe salvation as a process involving faith, freedom and personal effort to fulfill the commandment of Christ to “love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, mind and strength and your neighbor as yourself”. ^{xli}

The Orthodox use the term "ancestral sin" in relation to the disobedience of Adam and Eve. The Orthodox understanding on this matter is quite different from the "west" in its doctrine of "original sin."

There are two major issues presented by these three texts related to ancestral sin and salvation: Genesis 3:1-24, Roman 6:22-23 and 1 Corinthians 15:20-28, 51-58 when seen in conjunction:

(1) The relationship between sin and death. Here we can identify:
Romans 6:23: *"For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."*
1Corinthians 15:56: *The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law.*

(2) The Orthodox doctrine of salvation as it pertains to the cross and the resurrection of Christ.

It begins with the Garden of Eden. Since in the Greek this is *παράδεισος* (Paradise) we may rightly understand the Garden and indeed Heaven as a real place in space-time but removed from the fallen domain of this world. In this dimension, our

first parents communed with the world, each other and God. The Fathers (Theophilus of Antioch, Ephraim the Syrian, Hilary of Poitiers, Maximus the Confessor), insist that our first parents were created neither mortal nor immortal. Until the point of his disobedience Adam was sinless but not perfect and able to sin. He was not immortal but capable of achieving immortality through obedience. This is most important for what comes afterward and especially as we compare the doctrine of our original state from the perspective of Holy Scripture with what later emerged in the post-Orthodox West.

From this starting point Adam was like a child, fully capable of growing up in obedience to his Heavenly Father and achieving immortality. He ate the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in disobedience to God's Word and suffered death as a result.

Irenaeus and the Fathers generally do not see death as a divine punishment for the disobedience of our first parents. This distortion arose later in the West under the influence of Augustine. The Fathers interpret the consequences of the Fall as something we brought on ourselves when we distanced ourselves from God. In this view, God still walks in the Garden. It is we who hide and shamefully cover our nakedness. Likewise, the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise and the angel standing guard with the flaming sword is not an act of divine retribution but a compassionate and merciful provision lest we eat of the second tree, the Tree of Life, and die eternally. The fruit of this tree, if we had eaten it, would have condemned us forever.

John Chrysostom says:

"Partaking of the tree, the man and woman became liable to death and subject to the future needs of the body. Adam was no longer permitted to remain in the Garden, and was bidden to leave, a move by which God showed His love for him ... he had become mortal, and lest he presume to eat further from the tree which promised an endless life of continuous sinning, he was expelled from the Garden as a mark of divine solicitude, not of necessity."xlii

Paul taught in the context of the resurrection as the remedy for sin and death, ("O death where is thy sting ...?"), "the sting of death is sin." [1 Corinthians 15:55-56]

Cyril of Alexandria wrote:

"Adam had heard: 'Earth thou art and to the earth shalt thou return,' and from being incorruptible he became corruptible and was made subject to the bonds of death. But since he produced children after falling into this state, we his descendents are corruptible coming from a corruptible source. Thus it is that we are heirs of Adam's curse."xliii

Augustine and His Influence as a Theologian and a Thinker

Augustine is a central theological figure, both within Christianity and in the history of Western thought and he was greatly influenced by Stoicism, Platonism, and Neoplatonism, particularly by the works of Plotinus, author of the *Enneads*, and widely considered the father of Neoplatonism. His generally favorable view of Neoplatonic thought contributed to the "baptism" of Greek thought and its entrance into the Christian and subsequently the Western intellectual tradition. His early and influential writing on the human will, a central topic in ethics, would become a focal point for later philosophers including Schopenhauer and Nietzsche.

Augustine's theological views in the early middle era were revolutionary. Perhaps none were quite as revolutionary and influential as his clear formulation of the doctrine of Original Sin which has substantially influenced Roman Catholic theology. Augustine's concept of original sin was expounded in his works against the Pelagians. In contrast to this view, Eastern Orthodox theologians believe all humans were damaged by the original sin of Adam and Eve but have key disputes with Augustine about the doctrine of original sin, and this is viewed as a key source of division between East and West.

Thomas Aquinas borrowed much from Augustine's theology while creating his own unique synthesis of Greek and Christian thought after the widespread rediscovery of the work of Aristotle.

Battling for Control of the Body in the Augustinian West: Sex = Lust = Sin

There is huge difference between the belief that we share in Adam's curse through the corruption of death and the view common in the West since Augustine that we are punished by death for an original sin in Eden. The West came to believe that this original sin was transmitted to subsequent generations through sexual reproduction and that we inherit not only the sin of Adam but the guilt as well through sexual lust and the reproductive process. This view is first found in Augustine: "*... now when this (the Fall) happened, the whole human race was 'in his loins' (Adam). Hence in accordance with the mysterious and powerful natural laws of heredity it followed that those who were in his loins and were to come into this world through the concupiscence (lustful desires) of the flesh were condemned with him.*"^{xliv}

Aquinas and later the Reformers for whom Augustine was all felt constrained to repeat: "*. . . the commingling of the sexes which, after the sin of our first parent, cannot take place without lust, transmits original sin to the offspring.*"^{xlv}

This is not Orthodox. The Orthodox position is that individuals are responsible for the sins that they commit, not the sins of their forefathers and not the

sins of our first parents. In addition, the Fall is not a taint in our character transmitted by sex, nor is sex itself necessarily tainted by lust. The Orthodox refer instead to "ancestral sin," by which they mean that our participation in the disobedience of the first Adam as inherited through death, not sex. It is a curse that the Law exposed in the inability of humans to fulfil the Mosaic Covenant. It is a curse which has been redeemed by Christ. xlvi

Some Western commentators criticize the Orthodox understanding at this point by reminding us that, according to Psalm 50(51):5 "*behold I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me.*" (NKJV: Masoretic text). As stated in the Masoretic text, this is capable of being interpreted either in the "Western" manner or in the Orthodox manner. Lamsa's translation of the Peshitta is similar: "*For behold, I was formed in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.*" xlvii However, the Septuagint (LXX) version of the Psalm translated into English reads: "*Behold I was brought forth in iniquities, and in sins (plural) did my mother conceive me.*" This clarifies the Orthodox position that sin is endemic to the human condition from birth to death. It says nothing about transmission, let alone transmission by sex. The Jewish scholars in Alexandria knew what they were doing when they translated the Hebrew text into Greek. The Orthodox Church accepts their scholarship and there is nothing in Judaism then or now that supports the Christian West's understanding of original sin. This is important relative understanding of Paul's teaching on Adam and Christ the New Adam in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15. We must remember that Paul like our Lord, was a Jew by birth and by training, and adept in the Law.

The understanding of the Fall within the Orthodox Church is that sin is generated through the corruption of humanity because of death. In the "post-Orthodox, post Christian West" however, many people see death as both the natural created state of man and an unacceptable reality. This mental bind is also not Orthodox. Death, being the curse of Eden, is an unnatural enemy, neither designed into Creation by God nor desired by Him. Death, as the ultimate threat, causes people to flee from their fellow humanity and their God in a selfish pursuit of material things as if these things will enhance and extend life. *Hedonism* is the real death, the death of the spirit from whence death itself has cast a longer and longer shadow over the God-less secularism of western materialism.

The Fall and its consequences were self induced and not inflicted upon humanity by a malignant and wrathful deity. Even the murderer Cain was given his mark for protection. God did not cease to love and care for us in our fallen state. He desired that the self-inflicted curse hanging over humanity should be lifted and that humans should resume their role as God's priests in creation by growing back into spiritual maturity. God achieved this through the Messiah, the New and Final Adam, the Christ. Characteristically the Orthodox Fathers speak of God saving us by re-gathering the whole creation in Himself and redeeming it,xlviii The beginning of this process was in the Incarnation and then it continues in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. Its fruition is in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the Church, the Body of Christ glorified. As Irenaeus proclaimed : "*God the Son became Man in*

order to regather in Himself the ancient creation, so that He might slay sin and destroy the power of death, and give life to all men."^{xlix} With this in mind, Macarius the Great and others look with faith upon the words of Paul in 2 Corinthians 3:18 : *"the inner being of believers who through perfect faith are born of the Spirit shall reflect as in a mirror the Glory of the Lord, and are transfigured into the same image from Glory to Glory."* This text supports the concept of *ancestral sin* but not *original sin*.

Death and Immortality

Although it is common in the West to think of death as "natural", the Orthodox understanding is far different from this. Immortality in Orthodox Christianity is something to be acquired by grace and humans are created neither mortal nor immortal. The Paradise account of Genesis reveals latency toward immortality in humankind which has been spoiled by disobedience to God. Although Genesis is silent on death as a more widespread phenomenon among all life forms, Romans is not and with the coming of Christ we have new revelation from the writings of Paul. Corruption and death have indeed spread from humans to all life forms yet such bondage to decay is being reversed by the new birth of the resurrection. Death is an integral part of a "good" creation that the Orthodox understand as a necessary but temporary adjustment in God's plan. Although God's real goal for humanity is immortality when it comes through grace it seems completely irreconcilable with insights from the natural sciences. According to these insights death has ALWAYS existed from the dawn of life.

But Paul writes:

"For the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly, but because of Him who subjected it in hope; ²¹because the creation itself also will be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. ²²For we know that the whole creation groans and labours with birth pangs together until now."^l

In the natural way of understanding things in this world, life is inconceivable without death. In the perspective of God's saving providence, however, there will be in the Last Day life without end and a renewed creation.

According to Orthodox theology, God did not create death either for us or for any other living creature. There is no hint of this idea in Holy Scripture or Orthodox tradition. The only way of reconciling the universality of death with the Fall in particular is to suppose that the death spread to all creation backwards and forwards in time by some major break in the timeline. The Universe branched into a creation subject to futility, corruption and decay which formerly it had not known. This must be the context to that great reversal of the cosmic effects of the Fall to which Paul alludes in his reference to the resurrection in Romans 8:20-22. To the Orthodox the solution of regarding "death" as "spiritual death" and therefore "resurrection" as a

"spiritual resurrection" cannot accommodate the centrality to Orthodox Christianity of both the Incarnation of the Word made flesh and the Resurrection of the body.^{li}

Augustine's Legacy

Although the piety and devotion of Augustine are largely unquestioned by Orthodox theologians, his conclusions on the Atonement are challenged. ^{lii} Augustine seems to have relied mostly on Latin translations of Greek texts. ^{liii} (Augustine, 1956a, p. 9) and this was a liability for him. His misinterpretation of a key scriptural reference, Romans 5:12, is a case in point. ^{liv} In Latin, the Greek idiom *eph ho* which means *because of* was translated as *in whom*. Saying that all have sinned *in Adam* is quite different than saying that all sinned *because of him*. Augustine believed and taught that all humanity has sinned in Adam ^{lv} and that the result is that guilt replaces death as the ancestral inheritance. ^{lvi} From this comes the term *original sin* conveying the belief that Adam and Eve's sin is the first and universal transgression in which all humanity participates. This misinterpretation is even more evident when one views New Testament texts from a Semitic viewpoint, e.g. from a view of the Peshitta and other Syriac texts.

Augustine debated Pelagius (c. 354-418) over the place the human will could play in salvation. Augustine took the position against him that only grace is able to save, *sola gratis*. ^{lvii} From this a doctrine of predestination developed (God gives grace to whom He will) which hardened in the 16th and 17th centuries into the doctrine of two-fold predestination which states that God in His sovereignty saves some and condemns others. With this the position of the Church of the first two centuries concerning the image and human freedom was abandoned.

Pelagius is regarded as a heretic in the East as well as the West. He elevated the human will and the expense of divine grace. In fairness, however, the Orthodox position may be expressed best by John Cassian—who is often regarded as “semi-Pelagian” in the West. From the Orthodox perspective both Pelagius and Augustine took extreme positions, one emphasizing freedom of the will without a balanced emphasis on God's sovereignty versus an emphasis on the complete sovereignty of God without a balanced emphasis on human will. Recognizing the true balanced position, the Church Fathers emphasized “synergy,” the mystery of God's grace being given with the cooperation of the human heart.

The Roman idea of justice found prominence in Augustinian and later Western theology. The idea that Adam and Eve offended God's infinite justice and honor made death God's method of retribution. ^{lviii} But this idea of justice deviates from Biblical thought. A. Kalomiris explains the meaning of justice in the Greek of the New Testament which is rooted in the earlier Hebrew concept:

The Greek word *diakosuni* ‘justice’, is a translation of the Hebrew word *tsedaka*. The word means ‘the divine energy which accomplishes man's salvation.’ It is

parallel and almost synonymous with the word *hesed* which means ‘mercy’, ‘compassion’, ‘love’, and to the word *emeth* which means ‘fidelity’, ‘truth’. This is entirely different from the juridical understanding of ‘justice’. lix

Logically justice provides proof of inherited guilt for Augustine, because since all humanity suffers death (which is viewed as a punishment for sin) and since God who is just cannot punish the innocent, then all must be guilty in Adam. In contrast with this position, the Orthodox father, Basil the Great, attributes the change in attitude to humanity rather than to God.lx Because of the theological foundation laid by Augustine and taken up by his heirs, the conclusion seems to be that a significant change occurs in the West making the wrath of God and not death the problem facing humanity. lxi

The ancient Church had no answer to the question of how God’s anger could be satisfied because its proponents did not see wrath as the problem and it did not need to seek an answer. The Satisfaction Theory proposed by Anselm of Canterbury (c. 1033-1109) in his work *Why the God-Man?* provides the most predominant answer in the West. The theory is that God sacrifices His Son to restore His honor and pronounces the sacrifice sufficient to appease God’s wrath. The idea of imputed righteousness rises from this. The Orthodox understanding that “the resurrection...through Christ, opens for humanity the way of love that is stronger than death” is replaced by a juridical theory of courtrooms and verdicts. lxii

The image of an angry, vengeful God haunts the Western Church where a basic insecurity and guilt seem to exist. Many appear to hold that sickness, suffering and death are God’s will. This theological approach may promote a deep and persistent belief that God is still angry and must be appeased. When sickness, suffering and death come and when God’s grace is able to transform them into life-bearing trials, they may be perceived as a product of God’s will. It may appear that God punishes us when the mood strikes, when our behavior displeases Him, or for no apparent reason at all. This causes us to question if the ills that afflict creation are on account of God and if the loving Father could really be said to enjoy the sufferings of His Son or of the damned in hell. lxiii Freud rebelled against these ideas calling the God inherent in them the *sadistic Father* and it is no surprise that Yannaras, Clement and Kalomiris propose that modern atheism is a healthy rebellion against a terrorist deity. lxiv

Orthodoxy agrees that grace is a gift from God, but a gift that is given to all and not merely to a chosen few. Grace is an uncreated energy of God sustaining all creation apart from which nothing can exist. lxv In addition, although grace sustains humanity, salvation cannot be forced upon us (or withheld) by divine decree. Clement points out that the “Greek fathers (and some of the Latin Fathers), according to whom the creation of humanity entailed a real risk on God’s part, laid the emphasis on salvation through love: ‘God can do anything except force a man to love him’. The gift of grace saves, but only in an encounter of love”. lxvi Orthodox theology maintains that divine grace must be joined with human will.

Orthodox theology recognizes that all human language, concepts and analogies fail to describe God in His essence. True knowledge of God demands that we proceed with the stripping away of human concepts, for God is infinitely beyond them all.

Original sin in the New Testament

The doctrine of original sin is thought by some to be implied in the Apostle Paul's description of human sinfulness as no less universal than Christ's free gift of righteousness, especially in the verses here italicized:

Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned—for sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law. Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come. lxvii

Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all men. For *as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man's obedience the many will be made righteous*. Now the law came in to increase the trespass, but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, so that, as sin reigned in death, grace also might reign through righteousness leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. lxviii

Those who identify original sin with concupiscence lxix apply to it also Paul's description of a general experience:

I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate. Now if I do what I do not want, I agree with the law, that it is good. So now it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me. For I know that nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh. For I have the desire to do what is right, but not the ability to carry it out. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I keep on doing. Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me. So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand. For I delight in the law of God, in my inner being, but I see in my members another law waging war against the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin that dwells in my members. Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? lxx

The Roman Catholic View on Original Sin lxxi

The Roman Catholic position is based on prolific writings of Church Fathers and has been developed by philosophical and theological teachings into a complex dogma. Here is a basis overview of elemental information taken directly from the Catholic Encyclopedia:

MEANING

Original sin may be taken to mean: (1) the sin that Adam committed; (2) a consequence of this first sin, the hereditary stain with which we are born on account of our origin or descent from Adam.

From the earliest times the latter sense of the word was more common, as may be seen by Augustine's statement: "the deliberate sin of the first man is the cause of original sin" (*De nupt. et concup.*, II, xxvi, 43). It is the hereditary stain that is dealt with here. . .

PRINCIPAL ADVERSARIES

Theodorus of Mopsuestia opened this controversy by denying that the sin of Adam was the origin of death. (See the "Excerpta Theodori", by Marius Mercator; cf. Smith, "A Dictionary of Christian Biography", IV, 942.). Celestius, a friend of Pelagius, was the first in the West to hold these propositions, borrowed from Theodorus: "Adam was to die in every hypothesis, whether he sinned or did not sin. His sin injured himself only and not the human race" (Mercator, "Liber Subnotationem", preface). This, the first position held by the Pelagians, was also the first point condemned at Carthage (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", no 101-old no. 65). Against this fundamental error Catholics cited especially Rom., v, 12, where Adam is shown as transmitting death with sin. After some time the Pelagians admitted the transmission of death -- this being more easily understood as we see that parents transmit to their children hereditary diseases- but they still violently attacked the transmission of sin (Augustine, "Contra duas epist. Pelag.", IV, iv, 6). And when Paul speaks of the transmission of sin they understood by this the transmission of death. This was their second position, condemned by the Council of Orange [Denz., n. 175 (145)], and again later on with the first by the Council of Trent [Sess. V, can. ii; Denz., n. 789 (671)]. To take the word sin to mean death was an evident falsification of the text, so the Pelagians soon abandoned the interpretation and admitted that Adam caused sin in us. They did not, however, understand by sin the hereditary stain contracted at our birth, but the sin that adults commit in imitation of Adam. This was their third position, to which is opposed the definition of Trent that sin is transmitted to all by generation (*propagatione*), not by imitation [Denz., n. 790 (672)]. Moreover, in the following canon are cited the words of the Council of Carthage, in which there is question of a sin contracted by generation and effaced by generation [Denz., n. 102 (66)]. The

leaders of the Reformation admitted the dogma of original sin, but at present there are many Protestants imbued with Socinian doctrines whose theory is a revival of Pelagianism.

***Original Sin in Scripture
Viewed from the Roman Catholic Position
And Contrasted with the Pelagian Position***

The classical text for Roman Catholics is Romans 5:12 which is interpreted as providing incidental evidence for the doctrine of original sin. Paul refers to justification by Jesus Christ and based on the fact of His being the one Savior, he contrasts with Christ as the Divine Head of mankind Adam as the human head who caused its ruin. The issue of original sin, therefore, comes in only incidentally. Paul allegedly supposes the idea that the faithful have of it from his oral instructions, and he speaks of it to make them understand the work of Redemption. This explains the brevity of the development and the obscurity of some verses according to Roman Catholics. According to them this text is opposed to the three Pelagian positions in the following ways:

1. The sin of Adam has injured the human race at least in the sense that it has introduced death -- "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men". Here there is question of physical death which should be dealt with in the following ways:

The literal meaning of the word ought to be presumed unless there is some reason to interpret the meaning of death differently.

- a. There is an allusion in this verse in Romans to a passage in apocryphal the Book of Wisdom in which, when viewed contextually, there is question of physical death. Wisdom 2:24: "But by the envy of the devil death came into the world". Cf. Genesis 2:17; 3: 3, 19; and I Corinthians 15:21: "For by a man came death and by a man the resurrection of the dead". In this last verse there can be reference only to physical death, since it is opposed to corporal resurrection, which is the subject of the whole chapter.
- b. Adam through his own fault transmitted to us death and sin, "for as by the disobedience of one man many [i.e., all men] were made sinners". lxxii This is problematic for the Pelagians, and at a later period Zwingli, when they state that Paul speaks only of the transmission of physical death. If according to them we must read *death* where Paul wrote *sin*, we should also then read that the disobedience of Adam has made us *mortal* where Paul writes that it has made us *sinners*. But the word *sinner* has never meant *mortal*, nor has sin ever meant *death*. Also in verse 12, which corresponds to verse 19, we see that by one man two things have been brought

on all men, sin and death, the one being the consequence of the other and therefore not identical with it.

2. Since Adam transmits death to his children by way of generation when he begets them as mortal beings it is by generation that he transmits sin to them for Paul presents these two effects as being produced at the same time and by the same causality. The explanation of the Pelagians differs from that of Paul since according to them the child receives mortality at his birth and then receives sin from Adam at a later period when he knows the sin of the first man and has an inclination to imitate it. Therefore, the causality of Adam in regard to mortality would be completely different from his causality as regards sin. The Roman Catholic position is that since all men are, by the influence of Adam, sinners and condemned, lxxiii the influence of Adam cannot be the influence of his bad example which we imitate (Augustine, "Contra Julian.", VI, xxiv, 75).

On this account, several Protestants have modified the Pelagian explanation using this position: "Even without being aware of it all men imitate Adam inasmuch as they merit death as the punishment of their own sins just as Adam merited it as the punishment for his sin." This is going farther and farther from the text of Paul making Adam no more than a comparison and giving him no influence or causality as regards original sin or death. Paul did not affirm that all men, in imitation of Adam, are mortal on account of their actual sins since children who die before coming to the use of reason have never committed sins. He expressly affirms the contrary in the fourteenth verse: "But death reigned", not only over those who imitated Adam, but "even over them also who have not sinned after the similitude of the transgression of Adam." According to this view, Adam's sin is the sole cause of death for the entire human race. But there is no natural connection discernable between any sin and death. These Protestant writers lay much stress on the last words of the twelfth verse. Several of the Latin Fathers understood the words "in whom all have sinned", to mean that all have sinned in Adam. This interpretation would be an extra proof of the thesis of original sin, but it is not necessary. Modern exegesis, as well as that of the Greek Fathers, prefer to translate this as, "and so death passed upon all men *because* all have sinned". Catholics accept this second translation which shows us death as an effect of sin. The adversarial view questions personal sin stating that, "The personal sins of each one is the natural sense of the words `all have sinned.'" Catholics respond that it would be the natural sense if the context was not absolutely opposed to it. The words "all have sinned" of the twelfth verse, which are obscure on account of their brevity, are thus developed in the nineteenth verse: "for as by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners." To Catholics there is no question here of personal sins, differing in species and number, committed by each one during one's life, but of one first sin which was enough to transmit equally to all humanity a state of sin and the title of "sinners". Similarly in the twelfth verse the words "all have sinned" must mean, "all have participated in the sin of Adam", "all have contracted its stain". This interpretation too removes the seeming contradiction between the twelfth verse, "all have sinned", and the fourteenth, "who have not sinned", for in the former there is

question of original sin, in the latter of personal sin. Those who say that in both cases there is question of personal sin are unable to reconcile these two verses according to the Roman Catholic view.

Original Sin in Christian Tradition

Because of an obvious resemblance between the doctrine of original sin and the Manichaeic theory of human nature being evil, the Pelagians accused the Catholics and Augustine of Manichaeism. For the accusation and its answer see "Contra duas epist. Pelag.", I, II, 4; V, 10; III, IX, 25; IV, III. This charge has been reiterated by several critics and historians of dogma who have been influenced by the fact that before his conversion Augustine was a Manichaeic. It is not necessary to identify Manichaeism with the doctrine of original sin, but it is apparent that Augustine, with the remains of his former Manichaeic preconceptions, created the doctrine of original sin which was unknown previously. Harnack maintains, that Augustine himself acknowledges the absence of this doctrine in the writings of the Fathers. However, it may be true that Augustine invokes the testimony of eleven Fathers, Greek as well as Latin (Contra Jul., II, x, 33). Catholics argue that the assertion that before Augustine this doctrine was not unknown to the Jews and to the Christians but was taught by Paul in Romans 5 and that it is found in the fourth Book of Esdras, a work written by a Jew in the first century after Christ and widely read by the Christians. This book represents Adam as the author of the Fall of the human race (vii, 48), as having transmitted to all his posterity the permanent infirmity, the malignity, the bad seed of sin (iii, 21, 22; iv, 30). Protestants themselves admit the doctrine of original sin in this book and others of the same period. lxxiv According to the Catholic view it is therefore impossible to make Augustine, who is of a much later date, the inventor of original sin.

Also, Catholics state proof that this doctrine existed in Christian tradition before Augustine's time by the practice of the Church in the baptism of children. The Pelagians held that baptism was given to children, not to remit their sin, but to make them better, to give them supernatural life, to make them adoptive sons of God, and heirs to the Kingdom of Heaven. lxxv The Catholics answered by citing the Nicene Creed, "Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum". They reproached the Pelagians with introducing two baptisms, one for adults to remit sins, the other for children with no such purpose. Catholics argued, too, from the ceremonies of baptism, which suppose the child to be under the power of evil, i.e., exorcisms, abjuration of Satan made by the sponsor in the name of the child, etc. lxxvi

Original Sin from the Roman Catholic Viewpoint in the Face of the Objections from Reason

It is futile to attempt to prove the existence of original sin by arguments from reason only. Thomas Aquinas makes use of a philosophical proof which proves the existence of some kind of decadence rather than of sin, and he considers his proof as probable only, *satis probabiliter probari potest*. lxxvii Some Protestants, Jansenists,

and Catholics hold the doctrine of original sin to be necessary in philosophy, and the only means of solving the problem of the existence of evil but this position is exaggerated and impossible to prove. To Roman Catholics it suffices to show that human reason has no serious objection against this doctrine which is founded on their understanding of revelation.

Roman Catholic View Regarding The Nature of Original Sin

Original sin is the privation of sanctifying grace in consequence of the sin of Adam. This position, which is that of Thomas Aquinas, goes back to Anselm and even to the traditions of the early Church, as we see by the declaration of the Second Council of Orange (A.D. 529): one man has transmitted to the whole human race not only the death of the body, which is the punishment of sin, but even sin itself, *which is the death of the soul*. lxxviii As death is the privation of the principle of life, the death of the soul is the privation of sanctifying grace which according to all theologians is the principle of supernatural life. Therefore, if original sin is "the death of the soul", it is the privation of sanctifying grace to Roman Catholics.

The Council of Trent, although it did not make this solution obligatory by a definition, regarded it with favour and authorized its use. lxxix Original sin is described not only as the death of the soul lxxx , but as a "privation of justice that each child contracts at its conception". lxxxi But the Council calls "justice" what we call sanctifying grace lxxxii , and as each child should have had personally his own justice so now after the Fall he suffers his own privation of justice. We may add an argument based on the principle of Augustine already cited, "the deliberate sin of the first man is the cause of original sin". This principle is developed by Anselm: "the sin of Adam was one thing but the sin of children at their birth is quite another, the former was the cause, the latter is the effect". lxxxiii In a child original sin is distinct from the fault of Adam, it is one of its effects. But which of these effects is it? Here we shall examine the Roman Catholic view relative to several effects of Adams's fault and those rejected as not being original sin:

1. Death and Suffering.- These are purely physical evils and cannot be called sin. Paul, and the councils afterward, regarded death and original sin as two distinct things transmitted by Adam.
2. Concupiscence.- This rebellion of the lower appetite transmitted to us by Adam is an occasion of sin and in that sense comes nearer to moral evil. However, the occasion of a fault is not necessarily a fault, and whilst original sin is effaced by baptism concupiscence still remains in the person baptized; therefore original sin and concupiscence cannot be one and the same thing, as was held by the early Protestants. lxxxiv

3. The absence of sanctifying grace in the new-born child is also an effect of the first sin, for Adam, having received holiness and justice from God, lost it not only for himself but also for us. lxxxv If he has lost it for us we were to have received it from him at our birth with the other prerogatives of our race. Therefore the absence of sanctifying grace in a child is a real privation, it is the want of something that should have been in him according to the Divine plan. If this favour is not merely something physical but is something in the moral order, if it is holiness, its privation may be called a sin. But sanctifying grace is holiness and is so called by the Council of Trent, because holiness consists in union with God, and grace unites us intimately with God. Moral goodness consists in this that our action is according to the moral law, but grace is a deification, as the Fathers say, a perfect conformity with God who is the first rule of all morality. Sanctifying grace therefore enters into the moral order, not as an act that passes but as a permanent tendency which exists even when the subject who possesses it does not act; it is a turning towards God, *conversio ad Deum*. Consequently the privation of this grace, even without any other act, would be a stain, a moral deformity, a turning away from God, *aversio a Deo*, and this character is not found in any other effect of the fault of Adam. This privation, therefore, is the hereditary stain.

Roman Catholic Viewpoint on How Voluntary is Original Sin

According to Augustine, "There can be no sin that is not voluntary, the learned and the ignorant admit this evident truth". lxxxvi The Roman Catholic Church has condemned the opposite solution given by Baius. lxxxvii Original sin is not an act but, as already explained, a state, a permanent privation, and this can be voluntary indirectly- similar to the situation of a drunken man who is deprived of his reason and incapable of using his liberty, yet it is by his free fault that he is in this state and hence his drunkenness, his privation of reason is voluntary and can be imputed to him. But how can original sin be even indirectly voluntary for a child that has never used its personal free will? The whole Christian religion, says Augustine, may be summed up in the intervention of two men, the one to ruin us, the other to save us. lxxxviii

According to Catholics, and with only minor exceptions (notably in the 17th and 18th centuries CE), the doctrine of original sin does not make humanity strictly responsible for the sin of Adam. This doctrine does not attribute to the children of Adam any properly so-called responsibility for the act of their father, nor do they say that original sin is voluntary in the strict sense of the word. It is considered as "a moral deformity", "a separation from God", as "the death of the soul", and therefore, original sin is a real sin which deprives the soul of sanctifying grace. To Catholics it has the same claim to be a sin as has habitual sin, which is the state in which an adult is placed by a grave and personal fault, the "stain" which Thomas Aquinas defines as "the privation of grace" lxxxix, and it is from this point of view that baptism, putting an end to the privation of grace, "takes away all that is really and properly sin", for concupiscence which remains "is not really and properly sin", although its

transmission was equally voluntary. xc Considered precisely as voluntary, original sin is only the shadow of sin properly so-called. According to Thomas Aquinas xci , it is not called sin in the same sense, but only in an analogous sense.

The Catechism of the Catholic Church on Original Sin

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* says:

By his sin Adam, as the first man, lost the original holiness and justice he had received from God, not only for himself but for all human beings. Adam and Eve transmitted to their descendants human nature wounded by their own first sin and hence deprived of original holiness and justice; this deprivation is called "original sin".

As a result of original sin, human nature is weakened in its powers, subject to ignorance, suffering and the domination of death, and inclined to sin (this inclination is called "concupiscence"). xcii

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* explains that in "yielding to the tempter, Adam and Eve committed a *personal sin*, but this sin affected *the human nature* that they would then transmit in a *fallen state* ... original sin is called "sin" only in an analogical sense: it is a sin "contracted" and not "committed"—a state and not an act". xciii This "state of deprivation of the original holiness and justice ... transmitted to the descendants of Adam along with human nature" xciv involves no personal responsibility or personal guilt on their part. xcv Personal responsibility and guilt were Adam's, who because of his sin, was unable to pass on to his descendants a human nature with the holiness with which it would otherwise have been endowed, in this way implicating them in his sin.

Though Adam's sinful act is not the responsibility of his descendants, the state of human nature that has resulted from that sinful act has consequences that plague them: "Human nature, without being entirely corrupted, has been harmed in its natural powers, is subject to ignorance, suffering and the power of death, and has a tendency to sin. This tendency is called concupiscence" xcvi , but is distinct from original sin itself.

Concupiscence - The Difference Between Catholic and Protestant Views

The primary difference between Catholic and Protestant theology on the issue of concupiscence is that *Protestants consider concupiscence to be sinful, whereas Catholics believe it to be highly likely to cause sin, though not sinful in itself*. This difference is intimately tied with the different traditions on original sin. Protestantism holds that the original Prelapsarian nature of humanity was an innate tendency to good; the special relationship that Adam and Eve enjoyed with God was due not to some supernatural gift, but to their own natures. Hence the Fall was not the destruction of a supernatural gift, leaving humanity's nature to work unimpeded, but rather the

corruption of that nature itself. Since the present nature of humans is corrupted from their original nature, it follows that it is not good, but rather evil (although some good may still remain). Thus, in the Protestant view, concupiscence is evil in itself.

Catholicism, by contrast, teaches that humanity's original nature contained an innate tendency to sin. Due to a special supernatural gift granted by God to Adam and Eve, original righteousness, they were able to overcome their tendency toward evil and fully orient themselves towards God. After the Fall this gift was lost, and the natural self ruled; because the natural self was not fully oriented toward God, the result was sin. But human nature cannot be called evil, because it is natural; despite the fact that sin usually results, Catholic theology teaches that human nature itself is not the *cause* of sin, although once it comes into contact with sin it may produce more sin, just as a flammable substance may be easily ignited by a fire.

The difference in views also extends to the relationship between concupiscence and original sin. In the Protestant view, original sin is concupiscence inherited from Adam and Eve. It is never fully eliminated in this life, although sanctifying grace helps to eliminate it gradually. Since concupiscence is not evil in the Catholic view, it cannot be original sin. This Roman Catholic view is that original sin is the real and actual sin of Adam, passed on to his descendants; rather than remaining until death (or in the case of the damned, for all eternity), and therefore it can be removed by the sacrament of baptism.

Protestants believe that concupiscence is sinful, indeed, they believe it to be the primary type of sin; thus they most often refer to it simply as sin, or, to distinguish it from particular sinful acts, as "man's sinful nature". Thus, *concupiscence* as a distinct term is more likely to be used by Catholics.

The Roman Catholic Church has always held baptism to be "for the remission of sins", and, as mentioned in *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, xcvi, infants too have traditionally been baptized, though not guilty of any actual personal sin. The sin that through baptism was remitted for them could only be original sin, with which they were connected by the very fact of being human beings. Based largely on this practice, Augustine articulated the teaching in reaction to Pelagianism, which insisted that human beings have of themselves, without the necessary help of God's grace, the ability to lead a morally good life, and thus denied both the importance of baptism and the teaching that God is the giver of all that is good.

The Roman Catholic Church did not accept all of Augustine's ideas, which he developed to counter the claim by Pelagius that the influence of Adam on other human beings was merely that of bad example. For instance, the Roman Catholic Church did not adopt the opinion that involvement in Adam's guilt and punishment takes effect through the dependence of human procreation on the sexual passion, in which the spirit's inability to control flesh is evident. Rather, the Roman Catholic Church teaches that original sin comes to the soul simply from the new person taking his nature from one whose nature itself had original sin. In this way, the Roman Catholic Church

argues that original sin is not imputing the sin of the father to the son; rather, it is simply the inheritance of a wounded nature from the father, which is an unavoidable part of reproduction.

There is a close link between the notion of original sin and the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, namely the Church's teaching that, in view of the saving power of the future death and resurrection of her son, Jesus, she was preserved from this "stain" (lack of holiness), which affects others, that is to say, that she was conceived without original sin. Those who deny the existence of original sin thus profess belief in the *Immaculate Conception* not only of Mary but of every human being.

Eastern Orthodoxy acknowledges that the introduction of ancestral sin into the human race affected the subsequent environment for mankind, but denies (or rather never accepted) Augustine's notions of original sin and hereditary guilt. xciii. The sinful act of Adam is not the responsibility of all humanity, but the consequences of that act changed the reality of this present age of the cosmos.

Instead of the term "original sin", some prefer to use the term "ancestral sin". However, this distinction does not exist in, for instance, the Greek translation of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Cactus Editions, Athens, 1996) renders *peccatum originale* (original sin), the traditional term in Latin, as *προπατορική αμαρτία* (ancestral sin), the traditional term in Greek. Thus no significance can be attached to the use of the traditional English term, *original sin*, in Orthodox catechisms such as the following one written originally in English, the other translated from Russian: "[O]riginal sin is hereditary. It did not remain only Adam and Eve's. As life passes from them to all of their descendants, so does original sin. We all of us participate in original sin because we are all descended from the same forefather, Adam. This creates a problem for many people. They ask, why should we be responsible for the actions of Adam and Eve? Why should we have to pay for the sins of our parents? They say. Unfortunately, this is so, because the consequence of original sin is the distortion of the nature of man. Of course, this is unexplainable and belongs to the realm of mystery, but we can give one example to make it somewhat better understood. Let us say that you have a wild orange tree, from which you make a graft. You will get domesticated oranges, but the root will still be that of the wild orange tree. To have wild oranges again, you must regraft the tree. This is what Christ came for and achieved for fallen man" (*Orthodox Catechism – Basic Teachings of the Orthodox Faith* by Metropolitan Archbishop Sotirios). xcix "As from an infected source there naturally flows an infected stream, so from a father infected with sin, and consequently mortal, there naturally proceeds a posterity infected like him with sin, and like him mortal". c

Apocryphal writings are sometimes used to support the doctrine of original sin. In Esdras ci, a book that some Eastern and Oriental Orthodox Churches regard as canonical, Ezra states:

I answered and said, "This is my first and last word, that it would have been better if the earth had not produced Adam, or else, when it had produced him, had restrained him from sinning. For what good is it to all that they live in sorrow now and expect punishment after death? O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants."

Fallen Creation

The apostle Paul strongly affirms the belief that all things created by God are good. cii However, he also emphasizes the fact that man and all of creation has fallen. ciii and Satan has temporarily become the "god of this age." civ A basic presupposition of Paul's thought is that although the world was created by God and as such is good but it is temporarily ruled by the power of Satan. It is also taught that Satan is by no means absolute and God has never abandoned His creation. cv

Evil can and does exist, at least temporarily, as a parasitic element alongside and inside of that which God created originally good. An example of this is one who would do the good according to the "inner man," but finds it impossible because of the indwelling power of sin in the flesh. cvi Although it was created good and is still maintained and governed by God, creation as it exists is still far from being normal or natural, if by "normal" we understand nature according to the original and final intention of God for His creation.

All of creation has been subjected to the vanity and evil power of Satan, who is ruling by the powers of death and corruption. cvii Because of this all men have become sinners. cviii There is no such thing as a man who is sinless simply because he is living according to the rules of reason or the Mosaic law. cix Theoretically there is the possibility of living according to universal reason and also the possibility of being without sin. But for Paul this is not attainable because Satan has all humanity which is born under the power of death and corruption under his influence. cx Romanides observes:

In spite of the fact that creation is of God and essentially good, the devil at the same time has parasitically transformed this same creation of God into a temporary kingdom for himself. The devil, death, and sin are reigning in *this* world and not in another. Both the kingdom of darkness and kingdom of light are battling hand to hand in the same place. For this reason, the only true victory possible over the devil is the resurrection of the dead. There is no escape from the battlefield. The only choice possible for every man is either to fight the devil by actively sharing in the victory of Christ, or to accept the deceptions of the devil by wanting to believe that all goes well and everything is normal. cxi

Original Sin - The Difference Between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Views

The difference between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic doctrines of original sin developed from the Latin translation of Romans 5:12, The Augustinian teaching is based on the Latin “in quo omnia peccaverunt” or “in whom all have sinned” as opposed to the Greek original, “in that” or “because all have sinned.” The former implies a personal guilt of the entire human race. While Roman Catholics and Protestants may differ on how the guilt is transmitted, the end result is the same according to those who believe in the doctrine of original sin. According to this doctrine all people are personally guilty unto damnation. This single presupposition has set a particular context for most of Western theology. Belief determines action. For many this determines what Christian life is all about: it is why people go to church and why congregants receive the Holy Sacraments because, in the end for many, these acts are done to make up to God and be cleansed from the stain of original sin. From this mind set arose the doctrines of indulgences, acts of supererogation and merits, the Tridentine version of the teaching in which this guilt is passed on through sex, the Immaculate Conception, and the idea (confusion from the Orthodox view) among Roman Catholics about the Assumption of the *Theotokos*. Devotional prayers like *Salve Regina* and acts of reparation before the Blessed Sacrament reflect a spirituality based on the presupposition of personal guilt for Adam’s transgression and consequential damnation – and the hope that if one is good enough – with proper behavior before God, proper contriteness and appreciation of His mercy, one might escape the eternal torment of Hell that everyone deserves just for having been born a descendant of Adam.

The Orthodox Church affirms that we have inherited not Adam’s guilt, but the full consequences of his sin. A suitable analogy is a baby born to a drug- addicted mother. The baby is not guilty of drug abuse but he or she bears in the body, as well as in the environment, the consequences of the mother’s addiction. The baby will be physically impaired and will live in an environment that inclines toward following the path of addiction; so likewise, we bear in our bodies the consequence of illness and death and in our environments the myriad of temptations we face. We absolutely require the grace of God to overcome sin and its effects. We may affirm the Orthodox doctrine of synergy, but the doctrine of synergy does not deny the absolute need for God’s part in that synergy.

Virtue is personal and not natural, which is why for the Orthodox, there is no inherited guilt. Sin is personal and not natural. Consequently, there can’t be anyone created virtuous. Hence Paul states, “for all have sinned and fallen short of the GLORY of God.” cxii

The Orthodox do not agree on the Prelapsarian condition with Scholasticism, because they reject all the implications that accompany the *donum superadditum* and affirm that Mary, the mother of Jesus, inherited death just like all people have, and

therefore she inherited Ancestral Sin. Orthodoxy affirms in her liturgy that Mary died. Mary inherited Ancestral Sin, because she died, since that is what Ancestral Sin is. Orthodoxy affirms in her liturgy that Mary died. Mary inherited Ancestral Sin, because she died, since that is what Ancestral Sin IS. Ancestral Sin is death rather than imputed guilt (as in the Reformed view) or inherited guilt (as in Augustinism) for what Adam did. The Holy Scriptures state that death came from one man, and that it reigns now in us. cxiii

God is generally considered the author of whatever good will humanity has, since we have received all we have and are ultimately from God alone. Nothing at all would exist unless it existed in whom it is found. However, it is problematic if in that way one could also say that we should also attribute to God our bad will, because it could not exist in a human being, unless the human being existed in whom it is found. God is the author of the existence of the human being. Thus, one would have to credit God with being the author of this bad will too, since it could not exist if it did not have a human being in which to exist. But this presents a serious problem relative to the image of God in most theological viewpoints.

Augustine's teachings have fundamental importance in Western theology but the East never accepted his grace theology or anthropology which led to doctrines such as the Immaculate Conception, Limbo, merit, free will, and original sin resulting in even fundamental doctrines such as Soteriology being very differently understood. John Cassian and John Chrysostom both took exception to it and yet medieval Catholic theologians classified both Cassian and Benedict as drifting to "semi-Pelagianism".

The centralization of authority in the hands of the papacy was not taught by the Roman Catholic Church or the papacy itself until the early Middle Ages. In the Eastern Roman Empire that shaped the Orthodox East, the factor that held the Church together was common faith, not any one patriarchate. The separation of Rome and the Orthodox East was a terrible thing, but it did not change the basic structure of the Church which has always been conciliar. To the Orthodox, it is quite possible to have an authentic ecclesiastical life without scholasticism, thomism, anselmian "atonement" theology, "reform theology, and the like.

The possibility of sin itself comes from the lack of virtue since virtue is attained through habituation. It is the individual's personal use of will in deliberating between real and apparent good that makes sin possible. This mode of willing which leads to sin is not essential to human nature and Jesus Christ doesn't have it as a part of his character. Corruption is natural but sin is personal. Natures don't sin but individual persons do.

Augustine articulated this as the absence of justice in the soul, and his position was that concupiscence is just the material element that is the evidence of its existence in every single person. Without justice one cannot have communion with God and

stand righteous before him. The absence of justice in the soul indicates a personal turning away from God.

From an Orthodox perspective justice is a virtue and virtues are gained through habituation. Adam is created holy and good but the road to *theosis* cxiv is open before him. (All of nature is good even without justice for example.) Adam simply doesn't have the virtues that result from habituated obedience yet for obvious reasons.

Augustine's position is that concupiscence is an immoral lust or desire. But the East Church tends to see desire as not immoral or an unstable element in the "matter" of human nature. For the Eastern mindset, desire is part of nature and is thus good. It is the personal employment and vicious enslavement of the person to their desires out of a fear of death that makes those desires sinful in their employment. Of itself, desire is naturally and metaphysically good. In viewing concupiscence as in and of itself immoral, Augustine is mistaken according to the Eastern view. What he takes to be "lust," the Eastern Church takes more generally to be natural desires and what is natural is not opposed to God. Augustine is aware of different uses of the term but he takes the Scriptural use to be negative.

With regard to inherited guilt, within the Augustinian position it is difficult conceptually to explain how inherited guilt in children can be personal. Natures are inherited and it is easy to explain how one can have an inherited corrupt or disordered nature, which in and of itself is still metaphysically good but this doesn't explain how personal guilt is transmitted or inherited.

For Orthodoxy, what a person is as well as individual ability or inability to sin depends on the personal employment of the individual will and the presence or absence of virtue.

The Justice of God and Law

To clearly understand the basic presuppositions of Holy Scripture on this subject it is necessary to abandon any juridical scheme of human justice which demands punishment and rewards according to objective rules of morality. "To approach the problem of original sin in such a naive manner as to say that *tout lecteur sense concilura qu'une penalite commune implique une offense commune*, and that therefore all humanity shares in the guilt of Adam, is to ignore the true nature of the justice of God and deny and real power to the devil. . . . salvation for man and creation cannot come by a simple act of forgiveness or any juridical imputation of sin, nor can it come by any payment of satisfaction to the devil (Origen) or to God (Rome). Salvation can come only by the destruction of the devil and his power." cxv

To understand Paul's anthropology in the Greek New Testament, it is necessary to avoid the dualistic anthropology of the Greeks, with its clear distinction between soul and body, and view his writings through the lens of the Hebraic frame of

references, in which *sarx* (flesh) and *psyche* (soul) both denote the whole living person and not merely any part of of the individual. Romanides continues:

Thus we find that, for Paul, to be *sarkikos* and *psychikos* means exactly the same thing. "Flesh and blood (*sarx kai haima*) cannot inherit the kingdom of God" because corruption cannot inherit incorruption. For this reason, a *soma psychikon* is "sown in corruption" and raised in incorruption; "it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power." ["A *soma psychikon* is sown, and a *soma pneumatikon* is raised. There is a *soma psychikon* and there is a *soma pneumatikon*!"] Both the *sarkikon* and the *psychikon* and dominated by death and corruption and so cannot inherit the kingdom of life. This only the *pneumatikon* can do. "However, the *pneumatikon* is not first, but the *psychikon*, and afterward the *pneumatikon*. The first man is from the earth; earthy; the second man, the Lord, from heaven." That the first man became *eis psychen zosan* (a living soul), for Paul, means exactly that he became *psychikon*, and therefore subject to corruption, because "from the earth, earthy..." Such expressions do not admit of any dualistic anthropology. A *soma psychikon* "from the earth, earthy," or a *psyche zosa* "from the earth, earthy," would lead to impossible confusion if interpreted from the viewpoint of a dualism which distinguishes between the body and soul, the lower and the higher, the material and the purely spiritual. What, then, would a *psyche zosa* be, which came from the earth and is earthy? In speaking of death, a dualist could never say that a *soma psychikon* is sown in corruption. He would rather have to say that the soul leaves the body, which alone is sown in corruption.

. . . In order to express the idea of intellect or understanding all four evangelists use the word, *kardia* (heart). The word, *nous* (mind), is used only once by Luke. In contrast, Paul makes use of both *kardia* and *nous* to denote the faculty of intelligence. *Nous*, however, cannot be taken for any such thing as the intellectual faculties of an immaterial soul. *Nous* is rather synonymous with *kardia*, which in turn is synonymous with the *eso anthropon*.

The Holy Spirit is sent by God into the *kardia*, or into the *eso anthropon*, that Christ may dwell in the *kardia*. The *kardia* and the *eso anthropon* are the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit. Man delights in the law of God according to the *eso anthropon*, but there is another law in his members which wars against the law of the *nous*. Here the *nous* is clearly synonymous with the *eso anthropon*, which in turn is the *kardia*, the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit and Christ. To walk in the vanity of the *nous*, with the *dianoia* darkened, being alienated from the life of God through ignorance, is a result of the "hardening of the heart—*dia ten perosin test kardias*." It is the heart which is the seat of man's free will, and it is here where man by his own choice either becomes blinded and hardened, or else enlightened in his understanding of the hope, glory, and power in Christ. It is in the heart where the secrets of men are kept, and it is Christ "Who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the heart." cxvi

Paul's usage of the word, *soma*, is not always consistent. However, it is never used in any dualistic context, e.g. to distinguish between body and soul. On the contrary, Paul frequently uses *soma* as synonymous with *sarx* (I Cor. 6:16; 7:34; 13:3; 15:35-58; II Cor. 4:10-11; Eph. 1:20-22; 2:15; 5:28 ff; Col. 1:22-24). If his anthropology were dualistic, it would not have been logical to use the term, *soma*, to designate the church and *kephale tou somatos* (head of the body) to designate Christ. It would have been much more normal to call the Church the body and Christ the soul in the body.

It is grossly inaccurate to interpret Paul's use of the expressions, *eso anthropon* and *nous*, according to a dualistic anthropology since this would require ignoring his use of the word, *kardia*, which is in perfect accord with both the New Testament and Old Testament writers. By using such words as *nous* and *eso anthropon*, Paul is certainly introducing new Greek terminology, foreign to traditional Hebraic usage, but he is not introducing any new anthropology based on Hellenistic dualism. Paul never refers to either *psyche* or *pneuma* as faculties of human intelligence. His anthropology is Hebraic and not Hellenistic.

In both the LXX and Greek New Testament, one finds the expression, *to pneuma tes zoes* (the spirit of life), but never *to pneuma zon* (the living spirit). One also finds *psyche zosa* (the living soul) but never *psyche tes zoes* (the soul of life). This is due to the fact that the *psyche*, or *sarx*, lives only by participation between spirit (*pneuma*) and flesh, while the *pneuma* is itself the principle of life given to man as a gift from God ("Who alone hath immortality"). God gives man of His Own uncreated life through the Holy Spirit as the spirit of life without destroying the freedom of human personality. Man is not an intellectual form fashioned according to a predetermined essence. Man is not merely a universal idea whereby the destiny of man is to become conformed to a state of mechanical contentment in the presence of God and whereby his will becomes sterile and immobile in a state of complete self-satisfaction and happiness. This is the Neo-platonic teaching of Augustine and the Roman scholastics in general concerning human destiny but not the truth of Holy Scripture. Also, man does not consist of an immaterial intellectual soul and personality which has life of itself and uses the body simply as a dwelling place. The *sarx*, or *psyche*, is the total man, and the *kardia* is the center of intelligence where the will has complete independence of choice to become either hardened to truth or receptive to divine enlightenment from outside of itself. The *pneuma* of man is the spark of divine life given to man as his principle of life and not the center of human personality or the faculty which rules the actions of men. Man can live either according to the *pneuma tes zoes* or according to the law of the flesh but the latter leads to death and corruption. According to Romanides, "The very personality of man, therefore, although created by God Himself, remains outside of the essence of God, and therefore completely free either to reject the act of creation, for which he was not consulted, or to accept the creative love of God by living according to the *pneuma*, given to him for this purpose by God".cxvii

"The mind of the flesh is death, but the mind of the spirit is life and peace." cxviii Those who live their lives according to the flesh shall die. cxix But those who overcome and put down the actions of the flesh by the spirit shall live. The spirit of man, however, deprived of union with the life giving spirit of God, is hopelessly weak against the flesh dominated by death and corruption ("Who shall deliver me from the body of this death. "). cxx Through the grace of God, "the law of the *pneumatōs tes zōēs* (spirit of life) in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." cxxi Therefore, only those whose spirit has been renewed by union with the Spirit of God can successfully fight the desires of the flesh. cxxii Only those who are given the Spirit of God and hear Its voice in the life of the body of Christ are able to effectively fight against sin. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." cxxiii

Although the spirit of humans is the principle of life given to us by God, it can still partake of the filthiness of fleshly works. For this reason, it is necessary for Christians to guard against the corruption not only of the flesh, but of the spirit, also. cxxiv The union of man's spirit with the Spirit of God in baptism is not a guarantee against the possibility of their separation. The Spirit of God is given to man so that Christ may dwell in the heart. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His." cxxv "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. Such people are enslaved to the power of death and corruption in the flesh. They must be saved from the "Body of this death." cxxvi On the other hand, those who have been buried with Christ through baptism have died to the body of sin and are living unto Christ. They are no longer living according to the desires of flesh, but of the spirit. "The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance—against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." cxxvii

Paul deals throughout his epistles with the categories of life and death. God is life and Satan holds the reins of death and corruption. Unity with God in the Spirit, through the body of Christ in the life of love, is life. God brings salvation and perfection. Separation of man's spirit from the divine life in the body of Christ is slavery to the powers of death and corruption used by the devil to destroy the works of God. The life of the spirit is unity and love. The life according to the flesh is disunity and dissolution in death and corruption.

We must grasp the essential spirit of Paul's usage of the words, *sarx*, *psyche*, and *pneuma*, in order to avoid the widespread confusion that dominates Pauline theology. Paul is never speaking in terms of immaterial rational souls in contrast to material bodies. *Sarx* and *psyche* are synonymous and comprise, together with the *pneuma*, the total man. To live according to the *pneuma* is not to live a life according to the lower half of man. On the contrary, to live according to the *sarx*, or *psyche*, is to live according to the law of death. To live according to the spirit is to live according to the law of life and love.

Those who are *sarkikoi* cannot live according to their original purpose of selfless love for God and neighbor, because they are dominated by the power of death and corruption. "the sting of death is sin." Sin reigned in death. Death is the last enemy to be destroyed. So long as man lives according to the law of death, in the flesh, he cannot please God because he does not live according to the law of life and love. "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God for it is not subject to the law of God, neither can it be." In order to live according to his purpose, man must be liberated from "the body of this death." This liberation from the power of death and corruption has come from God, Who sent His own Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh" to deliver man "from the law of sin and death." But, although the power of death and sin has thus been destroyed by the death and resurrection of Christ, participation in this victory can come only through dying to this world with Christ and this is demonstrated in the waters of baptism. cxxviii

However, this new life of love within the body of Christ must be accompanied by a continuous death to the ways of this world, which is dominated by the law of death and corruption in the hands of the devil. Participation in the victory over death does not come simply by having faith and a general sentiment of vague love for humanity (Luther). Full membership in the body of Christ can come only by dying to self and demonstrating a change of life in the waters of baptism with Christ, and then living according to the law of the "spirit of life." Catechumens and penitents certainly had faith, but they either had not yet passed through death, in baptism, to the new life, or else, once having died to the flesh in baptism, they failed to remain steadfast and allowed the power of death and corruption to regain its dominance over the "spirit of life."

Synthetic Observations on Paul

Paul does not say anywhere within his writings that the whole human race has been accounted guilty of the sin of Adam and is therefore punished by God with death. Death is an evil force which made its way into the world through sin, lodged itself in the world, and, in the person of Satan, has reigned both in human beings and creation. For this reason, although as human beings we can know the good through the law written within our hearts and may wish to do what is good, we do not because of the sin which is dwelling in our flesh. Therefore, it is not the one who does the evil, but sin that dwells within that is the root of the problem. Because of this sin, we cannot find the means to do good and must be saved from "the body of this death."cxxix Only then can we truly do good. The power of death in the universe has brought with it the will for self-preservation, fear, and anxiety, cxxx which in turn are the root causes of self-assertion, egoism, hatred, envy and the like. Because we are afraid of becoming meaningless, we constantly endeavor to prove, to ourselves and others, that we have value. We seek after compliments and fear insults. We seek security and happiness in wealth, glory and bodily pleasures, or imagine that our purpose and destiny is to be happy in the presence of God by living an introverted and individualistic life. Thereby, we are inclined to mistake our desires for self-satisfaction and happiness as our true purpose. We can become zealous over vague ideological principles of love for humanity and yet hate our closest neighbors. These

are the works of the flesh that Paul speaks of. cxxxii Underlying every movement of what the world has come to regard as normal human being, is the quest for security and happiness. *But such desires are not normal in the will of God.* They are the consequences of perversion by death and corruption, through which the devil pervades all of creation, dividing and destroying. This power is so great that even if we wish to live according to our original purpose it is impossible because of the sin which is dwelling in the flesh - "Who will deliver me from the body of this death?" cxxxiii

The breaking of this communion with God can be consummated only in death, because nothing created can continue indefinitely to exist of itself. cxxxiiii Thus, by the transgression of the first man, the principle of "sin (the devil) entered into the world and through sin death, and so death passed upon all men..." cxxxv Not only humanity, but all of creation has become subjected to death and corruption by the devil. cxxxvi Because man is inseparably a part of, and in constant communion with, creation and is linked through procreation to the whole historical process of humanity, the fall of creation through one man automatically involves the fall and corruption of all men. It is through death and corruption that all of humanity and creation is held captive to Satan and involved in sin, because it is by death that humanity falls short of his original destiny, which was to love God and neighbor without concern for the self. Man does not die because he is guilty for the sin of Adam. cxxxvii He becomes a sinner because he is yoked to the power of the devil through death and its consequences. cxxxviii

Paul clearly says that "the sting of death is sin," cxxxix that "sin reigned in death," cxxxix and that death is "the last enemy that shall be destroyed." cxli In his epistles, Paul seems especially inspired when he is speaking about the victory of Christ over death and corruption. It would be highly illogical to try to interpret Pauline thought with the presuppositions (1) that death is normal or (2) that it is the outcome of a juridical decision of God to punish the whole human race for one sin, (3) that happiness is the ultimate destiny of man, and (4) that the soul is immaterial, naturally immortal and directly created by God at conception and is therefore normal and pure of defects (Roman scholasticism). The Pauline doctrine of man's inability to do the good which he is capable of acknowledging according to the "inner man" can be understood only if one takes seriously the power of death and corruption in the flesh, which makes it impossible for man to live according to his original destiny.

The moralistic problem raised by Augustine concerning the transmission of death to the descendants of Adam as punishment for the one original transgression is foreign to Paul's thoughts. The death of each man cannot be considered the outcome of personal guilt. Paul is not thinking as a philosophical moralist looking for the cause of the fall of humanity and creation in the breaking of objective rules of good behavior, which demands punishment from a God whose justice is in the image of the justice of this world. When Paul says that the serpent "deceived Eve" cxli and that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." cxlii he indicates that humanity was not punished by God, but taken captive by the devil.

Paul insists that "until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." cxliii It is clear that Paul here is denying anything like a general personal guilt for the sin of Adam but that sin was in the world with death reigning over the human race - even over them who had not sinned as Adam sinned. Sin here is personified by Satan, who ruled the world through death even before the coming of the law. This is clearly supported elsewhere by Paul's teachings concerning the extraordinary powers of the devil, especially in Romans 8:19-21. Paul's says that the last enemy to be destroyed is death and that "the sting of death is sin." cxliv

The doctrine or theory of the transmission of original sin and guilt is definitely not found in Paul's writings. Paul cannot be interpreted in terms of juridicism or in terms of any dualism which distinguishes between the material and the allegedly pure, spiritual, and intellectual parts of man. There is no clear-cut support for "the Pauline doctrine of original sin in terms of moral guilt and punishment." cxlv

The Theological Context for the Sacramentalology of the Church of the East and its Relationship to the Fall and Sin

Regarding the Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East's understanding of the Fall, the sacraments are a focal point. And, "Against the background of a unique understanding of man's fall into sin, the sacramental theology of the Church of the East rests ultimately upon the High Priesthood of Christ, who has become our eternal High Priest according to the order of Melchizedec." cxlvi.

Through His Incarnation, Life, Ministry, Passion, Death, Resurrection and Ascension, Jesus Christ achieved victory over Satan, and therefore enabled those who believe in Him to become God's Adopted Sons which is demonstrated through Baptism. Theodore sees Jesus Christ as the fulfillment of the potential of the humanity which characterized Adam's original state. Through the victory of Christ, in his Person, humanity is provided a bridge between the Two Ages, this world and the world to come. He himself becomes the 'earnest', or 'pledge' of man's salvation, and through him, man participates in the foretaste and promise of the coming age, which is mediated in the sacraments. Reine states, "The Eucharist, then, 'symbolically' or 'sacramentally' feeds the Christian in order to nourish that foretaste of his future immortal existence. This nourishment consists in the hope of the future benefits of salvation, which hope is generated by the sacramental image of Christ's work of redemption." cxlvii

Theodore's understanding of human nature before the Fall is not altogether clear. In his commentary on the Book of Galatians, Theodore states that "The Lord God established us in this present life, in fact, as mortals." cxlviii He further assumes that the first man was created mortal, and that mortality was a constituent of the nature that belonged to Adam and to his posterity. Norris asserts, "[A] training in virtue

requires that man be created mortal, since the possibility which is [the] essence of mortality is also a presupposition of moral growth and moral effort. . . . [T]o have created him immortal, and hence (bodily) impassible, would have been to deny him the possibility of earning immortal life for himself. . . .” cxlix Theodore believed that, with foreknowledge, God knew what was going to happen to the first man in terms of his disobedience and sin. He contends accordingly that the Creator, in the beginning and in view of this sin, created Adam susceptible of dying. The sin of Adam did not frustrate God to the extent that in a matter of some moments of time he would transform man’s nature from immortality to the state of mortality.

Theodore’s other, i.e., minor, view is found in his commentary on the Galatians. He states, “When the first man was made, if he had remained immortal, there would have been no existence of the sort which is now come upon us, inasmuch as it would have had no end. But since (man) became mortal through his sin, the present life is rightly called ‘the existence which is now come upon us’, as inferior to the life which is to come.” cl Theodore seems to have divided the history of salvation into three parts. (i) The pre-fall period; (ii) the period between the fall and the Second Coming, or that of the First Age; (iii) the period after the Second Coming, or that of the Second Age. Before the Fall, Theodore affirms, when God first created Adam, he was made immortal. But by sinning against his Creator, Adam was removed from his immortal state, and his posterity, as well was transferred from that level of existence to an inferior one. The second phase is the present human condition. According to the above citation, this existence was brought about not as part of the original plan of God, but as a result of Adam’s sin and its consequences: that is, the Fall. In this phase, which elsewhere Theodore will call the First Age, man became mortal and could not reach his potential objective because of his mortality, which is the merited reward of sin. The third phase is initiated with the Second Coming of the Son of God and His Final Judgement of the world through which man shall be restored to immortality in order to be brought back to a higher level of existence.

Theodore contends accordingly that the Creator, in the beginning and in view of this sin, created Adam susceptible of dying. The sin of Adam did not frustrate God to the extent that in a matter of some moments of time he would transform man’s nature from immortality to the state of mortality. His position is succinctly stated,

It is obvious both that (God) knew (Adam) would sin, and that for this reason he would, beyond doubt, die. How then is it not the part of the most serious insanity to believe that (God) first made him immortal in six hours . . . , but after he sinned, made him mortal? For it is certain that if he (God) had wanted him to be immortal, not even the intervention of the act of sin would have changed the divine decree. For (God) did not reduce the devil from immortality to mortality. cli

Therefore, in his wisdom and foreknowledge, God created Adam mortal from the beginning so that after man’s disobedience (sin), death would both serve as his punishment and, unlike sin, also as a constitutive part of his nature.

Theodore's most clearly stated position on Adam's mortality is presented in his "Fragments of the Dogmatic Works on the Original Sin and Mortality":

The Lord became the author of all good things for people in order that—just as Adam appeared as the founder at the first and mortal state—He Himself, by appearing as the beginner of the second and the immortal state, might safeguard that which pertained to the nature of the first, earlier Adam . . . Thus He ultimately incurred death in order that He, by dying in accordance to the law of human nature and rising by divine power, might become the beginning for all people who die according to nature so that they might rise from the dead. clii

Theodore's conception of the Fall is that God, in his foreknowledge, created Adam rational and mortal even though innocent. According to the Genesis account, God commanded Adam not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and imposed a penalty if he should do so. cliii Subsequently, Theodore declares that Satan took advantage of Adam's naiveté and primitiveness, deceiving him by assuming the role of a friend and an ally and then tempting him by removing his fear and by perverting God's word and promise. cliv By his own will and desire, Adam became arrogant and deliberately contradicted God's instruction. When Adam yielded to Satan, he exchanged God's promise for Satan's assurance that he (Adam) would be a god or like god; in other words, he distorted his own reality. Through the sin of disobedience Adam ceased to be innocent; he became guilty and thus brought about his Fall. Hence, as Theodore presents it, God punished Adam for his disobedience, imposing death upon him and his posterity and this is illustrated in Holy Scripture and in Theodore's writings:

From the beginning and from the time of our forefathers, we did not belong to Satan but to God, who created us while we were not and made us in his own image clv. . . . It was through the iniquity and wickedness of the Tyrant and through our own negligence that we were driven towards evil, from which we lost also honor and greatness of our image, and because of our sinfulness we further received the punishment of death. clvi

Because of the Fall, Adam caused his posterity to inherit a nature which was subject to temptation and inclined toward sin, though this nature had not originally been sinful, nor had sinfulness as such ever come to be an inherent element of it. Theodore continues to insist that it is by man's choices that he becomes sinful, rather than through his nature. clvii Theodore's position is that, since the inherited connection between Adam and his posterity is obviously the human nature rather than the will, then sin, not being a constituent property of this nature, cannot itself be passed on or inherited. For Theodore, sin is disobedience to the divine law and can only be exercised by a free and unconstrained will. clviii

How, then, have men obtained from Adam an inherited natural-state of sin? Theodore maintains that it is by virtue of the fact that the knowledge of mortality and its fear are ever present to their consciousness. This knowledge provides a strong incentive to obey the demands of the flesh, with the result that concupiscence (lustful desire) has its way. Nevertheless, this evil inclination or tendency toward sin is not

due to an original and inherited sinful human nature, but is mainly due to human weakness in the face of limitation and death. clix Consequently, after Adam's Fall or Adam's Sin, as it is identified in the terminology of the Church of the East -- all men possess an inclination, a tendency toward sin, and therefore all do sin, though some less than others.

Included among the propositions clearly and fervently advanced in Theodore's writings, therefore, are these: 1) that there is a distinction between nature and will; 2) that sin cannot be inherited; and 3) that it is a property of the will and not of nature. These anthropological considerations provide the context within which the sacramental theology of the Church of the East takes shape.

Although Theodore uses traditional theological language, the theological argumentation in his doctrine of the Fall comes to us with a content which differs from the categories which are more familiar in the West. While Theodore would hold that the weak and mortal state of man may be inherited, he would not accept that through this inheritance man can receive a predisposed moral state per se, unconnected to actual choices made before God. He locates the root of sin in human free will. Therefore sinfulness is not in the properties of human nature but in man's own use of his faculties when confronted with the limitations of his nature. When Adam disobeys God's laws, it is his free and responsible will, and that of his posterity, which is the source of the sin.

The weakness inherent in mortal flesh is the occasion for sin and guilt, rather than an inherited component of it. If man were born already as a sinner, he would cease to be responsible and free before his Creator.clx Humanity has not inherited the actual guilt of our predecessors, nor could we be blamed for a sin which we did not commit. A free choice freely made, by a human free either to obey or to disobey, is absolutely central to the understanding of our posture before God which prevails in the theological tradition of the Church of the East.

Following Paul's teachings on the relationship between sin and death, Theodore affirms that man turned away from God through disobedience, and in consequence was made subject first to death, and then to Satan. In other words, the outcome of Adam's sin was death, i.e., to be detached from God, to return to the earth, from which he had been taken and to have an alliance with (the Rebel) Satan. Here is how Theodore puts it:

Our Lord God made man from dust in his image. . . If (man) had been wise he would have remained with the one who was to him the source of all good things, which he truly possessed, but he accepted and completed the image of the Devil, who like a rebel . . . had striven to detach man from God by all kinds of deception and . . . assumed the role of a helper. And because man yielded to (the Devil's) words and rejected the laws that God had given him and followed the Rebel as man's true helper, God inflicted upon him the punishment of returning to the earth from which he had been taken. By sin therefore death entered in. clxi

Theodore speaks of three consequences after the Fall. The first one pertains to the relationship between Adam and his posterity. His anthropological argument concerning Adam and his posterity is clarified below within a Christological context:

(In the fullness of time, God) . . . indeed wished to put on (humanity) and raise the fallen man, who is composed of a (mortal) body and of an immortal and rational soul, so that «as by one man sin entered the world, and death by sin, so also the free gift and the grace of God by the righteousness of one man might abound unto many. As death was by one man, so also the resurrection from the dead (will be) by one man because «as we all die in Adam, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, as the blessed Paul testifies. Therefore, it was necessary that he should assume not only the (mortal) body but also the immortal and rational soul. It was not only the death of the body that had to cease but also that of the soul, which is sin. clxii

The second result is that all men share in Adam's mortality. Death, considered not only as a natural event but as a condemnation which is due to sin and which generates sin, is now a constitutive element of their nature. Hence, Theodore states, "By sin therefore death entered in, and this death weakened (human) nature and generated in it a great inclination towards sin." clxiii

The third effect of Adam's sin takes also place within the universe in which God had bestowed upon Adam a primal place and power. The death which Adam inflicted upon himself and his posterity brought dissolution to the cosmic unity and destroyed the perfect spiritual and material harmony that had existed between man and the universe. clxiv

In summary, although Theodore rejects the concept of hereditary sin, he nevertheless appeals to some elements of such a notion. He declares that since all men inherit mortality from Adam, through his nature, they accordingly have an additional inclination to sin. God created man mortal . . . by nature Theodore states in his commentary on the Book of Romans, "and therefore, he possesses an ability to sin easily. After the fall, Adam's posterity possessed a tendency to sin which was related to the anxiety engendered by the perception of their own mortality and limitations." clxv

In Orthodox Christianity human beings do not inherit sin or guilt through their human nature. clxvi Human beings inherit mortality and not sin or guilt. For Theodore, sin is an act of willful and voluntary disobedience to God's law. And, accordingly, it is not inherent in human nature but is a consequence of individual human choices. These choices involve the exercise of will since sin is a property of will and not of nature. Theodore would also assert that it is the natural inherited mortality of humanity which underlies this moral failure. Correspondingly, the lust (concupiscence to the Latin theologians) of the flesh explains human disobedience toward God. In this regard Theodore says in his commentary on Chapter Five of the Book of Romans:

Death reigned over all who had sinned in any way whatsoever. For the rest of mankind are not free from death because their sin was not of the same sort as Adam's. Rather, all

were placed under the decree of death because they sinned in any way whatsoever. For death is not set as the punishment of this or that kind of sin, but as the punishment of all sin. clxvii

Theodore adds to this commentary by stating the following, “When Adam had sinned, and had become mortal on account of his sin, sin gained access to his descendants and death ruled over all men, as was just. For since all had sinned . . . it was necessary that death should rule over all in the same way.” clxviii Here again, Theodore definitely regards mortality, at once, as the cause and the effect of sin.

It is obvious that the relationship in Theodore’s thought between creation, sin and mortality is a complex one. However, it is also obvious that for Theodore God’s loving design for humanity is so consistent as to prevent any possibility that God would create humans first immortal and then punish humanity later with mortality after we had fallen into sin. Human mortality is a means for the punishment of a sin that is foreseen by God even in His act of creating humans and the same sin would also be “occasioned by the weak human condition (i.e., mortality!) of Adam and his posterity”. clxix The paradox is that even though the mortal state precedes sin in chronological terms, death is, at the same time, the reasonable consequence of sin. Through this human mortality God punishes sin, prepares his creation for redemption, and instructs mortal human beings to live in accordance with higher moral principles.

Pastoral Practices
Viewed Through the Theological Lens of the East and West
- Shepherding and Punitive Approaches

The Eastern Church tends towards a therapeutic model which sees sin as missing the mark and illness, while the Western Church tends towards a legal model seeing sin as moral failure. The Eastern Church is the hospital of souls, the place of salvation where, through the grace of God, the faithful ascend from “glory to glory” (2 Corinthians 3:18) into union with God in a joining together of grace and human will. The choice offered to Adam and Eve remains our choice: to ascend to life or descend into corruption. Through Western Theology, the model of sin as moral failing rests on divine election and adherence to moral, ethical codes as both the cure for sin and guarantor of fidelity. Whether ecclesiastical authority or individual conscience imposes the moral code the result is the same leading to guilt, shame, and moral failure and the perception of a wrathful God.

Although the idea of salvation as process is not absent in the West (the Western mystics and the Wesleyan movement are examples), the underlying theological foundations of Eastern Church and Western Church in regard to *ancestral* or *original* sin are dramatically opposed. The difference is apparent when looking at the understanding of ethics itself. For the Western Church ethics often seems to imply

exclusively adherence to an external moral code; for the Eastern Church ethics implies “the restoration of life to the fullness of freedom and love”. clxx

Modern psychology has encouraged most Christian caregivers to view sin as illness. This implies a need for healing so that, in practice, the emphasis on guilt, shame, and moral failure is often mitigated. The recognition of a need to refer to mental health providers when necessary implies an expansion of the definition of sin from moral infraction to a human condition. Recognizing sin as disease helps us to understand that the problem of the human condition operates on many levels which include mental, emotional, biochemical and genetic components. Hughes writes: It is interesting that Christians from a broad spectrum have rediscovered the psychology of spiritual writers of the ancient Church. The pastors and teachers of the ancient Church were inspired by the Orthodox perspective enunciated in this paper: death as the problem, sin as disease, salvation as process and Christ as Victor. clxxi

Sin as *missing the mark* or, put another way, as the failure to realize the full potential of the gift of human life, calls for a gradual approach to pastoral care. The goal is getting the person on target which is nothing less than an existential transformation from within through growth in communion with God. Daily sins are more than moral infractions; they are revelations of the brokenness of human life and evidence of personal struggle. “Repentance means rejecting death and uniting ourselves to life”. clxxii

Orthodoxy tends to dwell on the process and the goal more than the sin. Hughes writes that “a wise Serbian Orthodox priest once commented that God is more concerned about the direction of our lives than He is about the specifics. Indeed, the Scriptures point to the wondrous truth that, ‘If thou, O God, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who could stand, but with Thee there is forgiveness’ (Psalm 130:3-4). The way is open for all who desire to take it. A young monk was once asked, ‘What do you do all day in the monastery?’ He replied, ‘We fall and rise, fall and rise.’” clxxiii

The approach that has predominated in the West may make pastoral practice seem cold and automatic. Neither a focus on good works or faith alone are sufficient to transform the human heart. Positive, external criteria do not necessarily signify inner transformation in all cases. Some branches of Christian counseling too often rely on the application of seemingly relevant verses of Scripture to effect changes in behavior as if convincing one of the truth of Holy Scripture is enough. This is an emphasis on behavior modification and not restoration or transformational inner change. Belief in Scripture may be a beginning, but real transformation is not just a matter of thinking. According to Hughes, “first and foremost it is a matter of an existential transformation. It is a matter of a shift in the very mode of life itself: from autonomy to communion.” Hughes explains:

Death has caused a change in the way we relate to God, to one another and to the world. Our lives are dominated by the struggle to survive. Yannaras writes that we see ourselves not as *persons* sharing a common nature and purpose, but

as autonomous *individuals* who live to survive in competition with one another. Thus, set adrift by death, we are alienated from God, from others and also from our true selves (Yannaras, 1984). The Lord Jesus speaks to this saying, “For whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it” (Matthew 16:26). Salvation is a transformation from the tragic state of alienation and autonomy that ends in death into a state of communion with God and one another that ends in eternal life. So, in the Orthodox view, a transformation in this mode of existence must occur. If the chosen are saved by decree and not by choice such an emphasis is irrelevant. The courtroom seems insufficient as an arena for healing or transformation. clxxiv

Much flexibility is needed in pastoral care if it is to promote authentic transformation. We need to take people *as they are* and not as we believe they ought to be. Moral and ethical codes are frames of reference for conduct rather than ends in themselves. Experienced pastors and counselors know that moving people in one step from sin to righteousness is usually impossible but that is the typical theological position of the Western Church. If, by the grace of God, a step by step process is begun often real progress can be made. Every step is a real step. If we can be faithful in small things the Lord will grant us more significant accomplishments later. clxxv This process should not be rushed since this intimate process of real transformation that has no end. Hughes mentions that as a priest and confessor he tells those who come to him, “I do not know exactly what is ahead on this spiritual adventure. That is between you and God, but if you will allow me, we will take the road together.” clxxvi

The salvation road is a continuous process of trying to do better as we move forward on the path. Yannaras states that the message of the Church for humanity wounded and degraded by the ‘terrorist God of juridical ethics’ is precisely that, “what God really asks of man is neither individual feats nor works of merit, but a cry of trust and love from the depths”. clxxvii

This knowledge that salvation is a process makes our failures understandable. The illness of sin that afflicts us demands access to the grace of God often and repeatedly. When we offer to Him the only things that we have, our weakened condition and will and combine them with God’s love and grace it proves the fuel that breathed upon by the Spirit of God, breaks the soul into flame that cleanses us from sin through the power of Christ.

For the early Church Fathers and the Orthodox Church the Atonement is much more than a divine exercise in jurisprudence. It is the event of the life, death and resurrection of the Son of God that sets us free from the Ancestral Sin and its effects. Our slavery to death, sin, corruption and the devil are destroyed through the sacrificial death and Resurrection. Our hopeless independent efforts are revealed to be merely a futile dead end. Salvation is much more than a verdict from God as a judge. It is an endless process of transformation from independence and autonomy to fellowship and communion, a gradual ascent from glory to glory as we take up once again our original purpose which is now fulfilled in Christ. The way to the Tree of Life at long

last revealed to be Christ is reopened and its fruit, the Body and Blood of God, offered to all. The goal is far greater than a change in behavior. We are meant to become conformed to the very image of God in which we were created.

Summary and Conclusion ***Original Sin, Ancestral Sin, or Something Else?***

Questions about original sin and ancestral sin may be interesting in the classroom but they also are very significant from a practical point of view and are often emotionally charged when doing counseling to help someone in trouble or someone who has just lost a loved one. As shown above, the Eastern Church tends towards a therapeutic model which sees sin as missing the mark and illness, while the Western Church tends towards a legal model seeing sin as moral failure. Looking at the Eastern Church as *the hospital of souls* reminds me of a concept that was presented to me years ago by an SDA evangelist years ago when he said that, “the church is a hospital for sinners and not a rest home for saints.”

My review of this subject favors the Eastern Church’s position on ancestral sin in that it seems to be more consistent with the direct teachings of Holy Scripture as well as the empirical evidence and reason. According to the Holy Scripture, human beings were created in the image of God. God allowed for both the tempter and the temptation knowing that human beings were inclined toward both good and evil (as in the traditional Jewish view). Obviously, the tendency or inclination to sin can be passed on to progeny by example and cultural influences. Ancestral sin passes on mortality and the tendency to sin but not guilt for sins of ancestors. With these thoughts in mind, I believe it would be best to close this study with two quotes from the sacred texts:

Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and **sin**, and that will by no means clear [the guilty]; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth [generation].

- Exodus 34:7

Behold, all souls are mine; as the **soul** of the father, so also the **soul** of the son is mine: the **soul that sinneth**, it shall die. . . The **soul that sinneth**, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.

- Ezekiel 18:4, 20

ENDNOTES

- i. Romanides, John, Original Sin According to St. Paul; St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, Vol. IV, Nos. 1 and 2, 1955-6. at <http://www.romanity.org>.
- ii. Eerdman's Handbook to Christian Belief, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982, p.471
- iii. Ibid, p. 247
- iv. Ibid, p. 224
- v. Ibid, p. 468
- vi. Ibid, p. 467
- vii. The Orthodox Study Bible New Testament and Psalms, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1993, p. 804
- viii. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Original_sin
- ix. Ezekiel 18:1-4, TNIV
- x. Ezekiel 18:19-20, TNIV
- xi. Ezek. 18:30-31, TNIV
- xii. <http://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/aboutus.htm>
- xiii. Pfandl, Gerhard, Some Thoughts on Original Sin, <http://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/documents/sinoriginal-web.pdf>
- xiv. Edwin Zackrison, *In the Loins of Adam*, New York: Iuniverse, 2004.
- xv. Sura 2:37
- xvi. Sura 6:164
- xvii. Sura 2:286
- xviii. <http://www.thirtysix.org/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=237&mode=thread&order=0&thold=0&POSTNUKESID=7712d56a7606cba9c9b83c0f0a615830>
- xix. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jewish_principles_of_faith
- xx. Spitzer, J., "The Birth of the Good Inclination" at http://www.myjewishlearning.com/lifecycle/Bar_Bat_Mitzvah/AboutBarBatMitzvah/HowOld/barmitzvahpsychology.htm
- xxi. Hughes, A. M.Div , Ancestral Versus Original Sin: An Overview with Implications for Psychotherapy, Abstract, St. Mary Antiochian Orthodox Church, Cambridge, Massachusetts < <http://www.stmaryorthodoxchurch.org/orthodoxy/articles/2004-hughes-sin.php> , 2004. p. 1
- xxii. Ibid
- xxiii. Ibid
- xxiv. Romanides, J.S., *The Ancestral Sin*, Ridgewood, New Jersey, Zephyr, 2002
- xxv. I Corinthians 15:21
- xxvi. Romanides, 2002. p. 161
- xxvii. Migne, J.P. (Ed.). 1857-1866a . *The patrologiae curus completes, seris graeca.* (Vols. 1-161), 74, 788-789. Paris: Parisorium.
- xxviii. Romanides, 2002, p. 32

- xxix. Yannaras, C., *The Freedom of Morality*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.
- xxx. Romans 5:21
- xxxi. Yannaras, 1984
- xxxii. II Peter 1:4
- xxxiii. Hughes, 2004
- xxxiv. Romanides, 2002, p. 32
- xxxv. Ibid
- xxxvi. Clement, O. *The Roots of Christian Mysticism*. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1993.
- xxxvii. I Corinthians 3:9
- xxxviii. I Corinthians 9:24-27
- xxxix. Philippians 2:12
 - xl. Matthew 22:37-39
 - xli. Hom. in Gen XVIII, 3 PG 53 151.
 - xl.ii. Doctrinal Questions and Answers, IX, 6 in Cyril of Alexandria, *Selected Letters*
 - xl.iii. *Treatise against Julian the Pelagian*.
 - xl.iv. Aquinas: *Comp. Theol.*, 224
 - xl.v. Galatians 3:13
 - xl.vi. Lamsa, George. *Holy Bible: From the Ancient Eastern Text*, San Francisco: Harper, 1985
 - xl.vii. Ephesians 1:10
- xl.iii. Against the Heresies, III, xix 6 ANF
- xl.iii. Romans 8:20-22
 - l. http://www.orthodox.clara.net/ancestral_sin.htm
 - li. Romanides, 2002
 - lii. Augustine. *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers: Four Anti-Pelagian Writings*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids , Michigan: Eerdmans. (1956a)
 - liii. Meyendorff, J., *Byzantine Theology*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979
 - liv. Ibid, 144.
 - lv. Augustine, (1956a)
 - lvi. Hughes, Ancestral, 2004 and Augustine, *On the Predestination of the Saints*, 7
 - lvii. Romanides, 2002
- lv.iii. Kalomiris, A. (1980). *The river of fire*. 1980, p. 30; Retrieved April, 20, 2004, www.orthodoxpress.org/parish/river_of_fire.htm.
- lix. Migne, J.P., (Ed.). (1857-1866b). *The patrologiae curus completes, seris graeca*. (Vols. 1-161), 31, 345. Paris: Parisorium.
- lx. Romanides, 1992, p. 155-156.
- lxi. Clement, 1993, p. 87
- lxii. Yannaras, 1984
- lxiii. Ibid, p. 153; Clement, 2000.
- lxiv. Psalm 104:29
- lxv. Clement, 1993, p. 81.
- lxvi. Romans 5:12-14, ESV
- lxvii. Romans 5:18-21, ESV

- lxviii. In theology, concupiscence refers to the orientation or inclination or innate tendency of human beings to do evil. It is derived from the Latin word *concupiscentia*.
- lxix. Romans 7:15-24, ESV
- lxx. Catholic Encyclopedia, Original Sin at <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/index.html>
- lxxi. Romans 5:19
- lxxii. Romans 5:18, 19
- lxxiii. Sanday, "The International Critical Commentary: Romans", 134, 137; Hastings, "A Dictionary of the Bible", I, 841.
- lxxiv. Augustine, "De peccat. meritis", I, xviii.
- lxxv. Aug., loc. cit., xxxiv, 63; Denz., n. 140 (96)].
- lxxvi. Contra Gent., IV, lii
- lxxvii. Denz., n. 175 (145)
- lxxviii. cf. Pallavicini, "Istoria del Concilio di Trento", vii-ix.
- lxxix. Sess. V, can. ii)
- lxxx. Sess. VI, cap. Iii
- lxxxi. Sess. VI
- lxxxii. De conceptu virginali, xxvi.
- lxxxiii. Council of Trent, Sess. V, can. v.
- lxxxiv. loc. cit., can. ii.
- lxxxv. De vera relig., xiv, 27.
- lxxxvi. prop. xlvi, xlvii, in Denz., n. 1046 (926)
- lxxxvii. De pecc. orig., xxiv.
- lxxxviii. <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/2109.htm> ; I-II:109:7 ; III:87:2,ad 3
- lxxxix. Council of Trent, Sess. V, can. v.
- xc. In II Sent., dist. xxv, Q. i, a. 2, ad 2um
- xc. Catechism of the Catholic Church, 416-418
- xcii. Catechism, 404
- xciii. Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church, 76
- xciv. Catechism, 405
- xcv. Compendium, 77
- xcvi. *Catechism*, 403
- xcvii. Hughes, Ancestral
- xcviii. <http://www.gocanada.org/Catechism/catorsin.htm>
- xcix. The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church also known as the Catechism of Philaret, question 168
- c. 2 Esdras 7:46
- ci. I Timothy 4:4
- cii. Romans 5:12; 8:20
- ciii. I Cor. 15:26; II Cor. 4:3
- civ. Romans 1:20
- cv. Romans 7:15-25
- cvi. I Cor. 15:56
- cvii. Romans 3:9-12; 5:19
- cviii. Romans 5:13

- cix. Romans 8:24
- cx. Romanides, Original Sin According to St. Paul,
http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/inquirers/frjr_sin.aspx#43#43 ; II Cor. 4:3; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 6:12 ; I Cor. 15:1 ff. ; Rom. 12:2; I Cor. 2:12; 11:32; II Cor. 4:3; Col. 2:20; II Thes. 2:9; II Tim. 4:10; Col. 2:8; I Cor. 5:10
- cxii. Romans 3:23
- cxiii. Romans 5
- cxiii. *Theosis*, meaning *deification* or *divinization*, is the process of man becoming holy and being united with God, beginning in this life and later consummated in the resurrection. *Theosis* is the understanding that humans from the beginning are made to share in the life of the godhead (the Trinity according to both Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox as well as most Protestant churches). Therefore, we are saved from sin for participation in the life of the Trinity, which is life-giving and therefore eternal.
- cxiv. Romanides, Original Sin According to St. Paul,
http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/inquirers/frjr_sin.aspx#43#43
- cxv. Romanides
- cxvi. Ibid
- cxvii. Romans 8:6
- cxviii. Romans 8:13
- cxix. Romans 8:9 and 7:24
- cxx. Romans 8:2
- cxxi. Romans 7:6 and 8:9
- cxxii. Romans 8:16
- cxxiii. II Cor. 7:1
- cxxiv. II Cor. 1:22; Gal. 4:6; Eph. 3:16-17; Rom. 8:9
- cxxv. Rom. 8:7-8; Rom. 7:13-25
- cxxvi. Rom. 6:1-14; Gal. 5:22-24
- cxxvii. I Cor. 15:56; Rom. 5:21; I Cor. 15:26; Rom. 8:8; Rom. 8:7; Rom. 7:24; Rom. 8:1-11; Rom. 6:1-14
- cxxviii. Romans. 7:13-25
- cxxix. Hebrews 2:14-15
- cxiii. Galatians 5:19-21
- cxiii. Romans 7:24
- cxiii. Athanasius, De Incarnatione Verbi Dei, 4-5
- cxiii. Romans 5:12
- cxiii. Romans 8:20-22
- cxiii. St. John Chrysostom, Migne, P.G.t. 60, col. 391-692; Theophylactos, Migne, P.G.t. 124, c. 404-405
- cxiii. St. Cyrill of Alexandria, Migne, P.G.t. 74, c. 781-785, and especially c. 788-789; Theodoretos of Cyrus, Migne, P.G.t. 66, c. 800
- cxiii. I Cor. 15:56
- cxiii. Romans 5:21
- cxiii. I Cor. 15:26
- cxli. II Cor. 11:3
- cxli. I Tim. 2:14

- cxlii. Romans 5:13-14
- cxliii. I Cor. 15:26, 56
- cxliv. Lagrange, *Epître aux Romains*, p. 117-118; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 136-137
- cxlv. Mar Bawai Soro, Fourth Pro Oriente Syriac Commission Consultation: "Sacraments in the Syriac Tradition" Vienna, 2000 at http://www.cired.org/east/0401_sacraments_in_church_of_east.pdf; Book of Hebrews 6:20. Relative to the priesthood of Jesus Christ after the order of Melchizedec, Theodore states that Jesus became a priest after the order of high priests because he was the first to enter heaven, and through him the favor of entering was bestowed upon us. The work of a high priest is indeed that he should draw near unto God first and then after him and through him the rest should draw near; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*, in the *Woodbrooke Studies*, vol. 6, Alphonse Mingana, ed., Cambridge, 1933, 18.
- cxlvi. Theodore, VI, Mingana 20; Francis J. Reine, *The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1966, 38f.
- cxlvii. Theodore's *Commentary on Galatians*, 1:3 ff., Swete vol. 1, p. 25.
- cxlviii. Richard Alfred Norris, *The Anthropological foundations of the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, a thesis submitted to the General Theological Seminary, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sacred Theology, New York, 1957, 55.
- cxlix. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii*, 2 vol., H. B. Swete, ed., (Cambridge, 1880, 1882). See Theodore's *Commentary on Galatians*, 1:3 ff., Swete vol. 1, p. 7.
- cl. Theodore, *Fragments of the Dogmatic Works of Theodore*, Section VI. On the Original Sin and Mortality, Book III, Swete, vol. II, Appendix A, 332.
- cli. Theodore, *Fragments of the Dogmatic Works of Theodore*, Swete, 335.
- clii. Genesis 2: 15-17.
- cliii. Theodore, VI, Mingana, 21.
- cliv. Genesis 1:27.
- clv. Theodore, VI, Mingana, 28.
- clvi. Theodore cannot be categorized as an Augustinian because his portrayal of man's freedom and moral responsibility cannot be considered to cause Adam's posterity to inherit original, or the first man's, sin and guilt. Theodorian Anthropology resolutely negates any possibility that Adam's posterity would inherit his sin and his guilt. This is contrary to Augustinian theology.
- clvii. R. A. Norris, *Manhood in Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1963), p. 179, note 5.
- clviii. Norris, *Manhood in Christ*, 58. Norris declares that «But it is this weakness of the flesh which accounts ultimately for the fact that the Law cannot assure men of salvation. Because of their mortality, they fall away perpetually into sin . . .
- clix. Theodore, (Swete, 335).
- clx. Theodore, VI, Mingana, 21.
- clxi. Theodore, VI, Mingana, 56.

- clxii. Ibid., 21.
- clxiii. Theodore's Commentary on Colossians, 1:16 ff., Swete vol. 1, p. 267 ff.
- clxiv. Mar Bawai Soro,
http://www.cired.org/east/0401_sacraments_in_church_of_east.pdf ; Theodore of Mopsuestia, Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche, in Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 15, Karl Staab, ed., (Aschendorff Münster, 1933). See Theodore's Commentary on Romans, 7:14, Staab, p. 131-212.
- clxv. From the perspective of Theodore's theology, the death which was caused by the Fall means (a) to be detached from God, (b) to return to the earth, from which he had been taken, and (c) to be in alliance with (the Rebel) Satan.
- clxvi. Theodore's Commentary on Romans, 5:13-14, Staab, p. 119.
- clxvii. Ibid
- clxviii. http://www.cired.org/east/0401_sacraments_in_church_of_east.pdf
- clxix. Yannaras, 1984, p. 143
- clxx. V. Rev. Antony Hughes, Ancestral Versus Original Sin: An Overview with Implications for Psychotherapy
- clxxi. Yannaras, 1984, 147-148
- clxxii. Hughes
- clxxiii. Ibid
- clxxiv. Matthew 25:21
- clxxv. Hughes
- clxxvi. Yannaras, 1984, p. 47

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Athanasius (1981). *On the incarnation: The treatise de incarnatione verbi dei*. (P. Lawson, Trans.). Crestwood: NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Augustine (1956a). *Nicene and post nicene fathers: Four anti-pelagian writings*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

_____, (1956b). *Nicene and post nicene fathers: Four anti-pelagian writings*, vol. 5, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Cahill, T. (1995). *How the Irish saved civilization*. New York: Doubleday.

Catholic Encyclopedia, Original Sin at <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/index.html>

Clement, O. (1993). *The roots of Christian mysticism*. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.

_____, (2000). *On human being*. New York: New City Press.

Eerdmans' (1982) *Eerdmans' Handbook to Christian Belief*, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans.

Hughes, Antony (2004). *Ancestral Versus Original Sin: An Overview with Implications for Psychotherapy*, Abstract, St. Mary Antiochian Orthodox Church, Cambridge, Massachusetts <http://www.stmaryorthodoxchurch.org/orthodoxy/articles/2004-hughes-sin.php>.

Kalomiris, A. (1980). *The river of fire*. Retrieved April, 20, 2004, www.orthodoxpress.org/parish/river_of_fire.htm.

Mar Bawai Soro, Fourth Pro Oriente Syriac Commission Consultation: "Sacraments in the Syriac Tradition" Vienna, 2000 at http://www.cired.org/east/0401_sacraments_in_church_of_east.pdf

Meyendorff, J. (1979). *Byzantine theology*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Migne, J. P. (Ed.). *The patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. (Vols. 1-161), Paris: Parisiorium

Mingana, A., ed., *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Commentary on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*, in the Woodbrooke Studies, vol. 6, Cambridge, 1933.

Nomura, Yushi, trans. (2001). *Desert wisdom: Sayings from the desert fathers*, Marynoll, New York: Orbis Books.

Norris, R. A., *The Anthropological foundations of the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, a thesis submitted to the General Theological Seminary, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sacred Theology, New York, 1957.

Oden, T. C. (2003). *The rebirth of orthodoxy: Signs of new life in Christianity*. New York: Harper Collins.

Packer, J. I. & Oden, T. C. (2004). *One faith: The evangelical consensus*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press.

Pfandl, Gerhard, *Some Thoughts on Original Sin*,
<http://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/documents/sinoriginal-web.pdf>

Reine, F.J., *The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1966.

Romanides, J. (1992). *The ancestral sin*. Ridgewood, NJ: Zephyr Publishing.

_____, *Original Sin According to St. Paul*; *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, Vol. IV, Nos. 1 and 2, at <http://www.romanity.org>.

Spitzer, J. "The Birth of the Good Inclination" at
http://www.myjewishlearning.com/lifecycle/Bar_Bat_Mitzvah/AboutBarBatMitzvah/HowOld/barmitzvahpsychology.htm

Swete, H.B., ed., *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii* (Cambridge, 1880, 1882).

_____, *Theodore, Fragments of the Dogmatic Works of Theodore, Section VI. On the Original Sin and Mortality, Book III*,

The liturgikon: The book of divine services for the priest and deacon (1989). New York: Athens Printing Co.

The Orthodox Study Bible New Testament and Psalms, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers (1993).

Williams, T. "Saint Anselm", Retrieved April 21, 2004. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2002 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL=
<http://plato.Stanford.edu/archives/spr.2002/entries/anselm/>.

Yannaras, C. (1984). *The freedom of morality*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Zackrisson, Edwin Edwin *In the Loins of Adam*, New York: Iuniverse, 2004.

i Romanides, John, *Original Sin According to St. Paul*; St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, Vol. IV, Nos. 1 and 2, 1955-6. at <http://www.romanity.org>.

ii Eerdman's Handbook to Christian Belief, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982, p.471

iii Ibid, p. 247

iv Ibid, p. 224

v Ibid, p. 468

vi Ibid, p. 467

vii The Orthodox Study Bible New Testament and Psalms, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1993, p. 804

viii http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Original_sin

ix Ezekiel 18:1-4, TNIV

x Ezekiel 18:19-20, TNIV

xi Ezek. 18:30-31, TNIV

xii <http://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/aboutus.htm>

xiii Pfandl, Gerhard, *Some Thoughts on Original Sin*,
<http://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/documents/sinoriginal-web.pdf>

xiv Edwin Zackrisson, *In the Loins of Adam*, New York: Iuniverse, 2004.

xv Sura 2:37

xvi Sura 6:164

xvii Sura 2:286

xviii

<http://www.thirtysix.org/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=237&mode=thread&order=0&thold=0&POSTNUKESID=7712d56a7606cba9c9b83c0f0a615830>

xix http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jewish_principles_of_faith

xx Jeffrey Spitzer "The Birth of the Good Inclination" at
http://www.myjewishlearning.com/lifecycle/Bar_Bat_Mitzvah/AboutBarBatMitzvah/HowOld/barmitzvahpsychology.htm

xxi Spitzer

xxii Antony Hughes, M.Div , Ancestral Versus Original Sin: An Overview with Implications for Psychotherapy, Abstract, St. Mary Antiochian Orthodox Church, Cambridge, Massachusetts < <http://www.stmaryorthodoxchurch.org/orthodoxy/articles/2004-hughes-sin.php> > , 2004. p. 1

xxiii Hughes, Ancestral, 2004

xxiv Hughes, Ancestral, 2004

xxv John S. Romanides, The Ancestral Sin, Ridgewood, New Jersey, Zephyr, 2002

xxvi I Corinthians 15:21

xxvii Romanides, 2002. p. 161

xxviii J. P. Migne (Ed.). 1857-1866a . The patrologiae curus completes, seris graeca. (Vols. 1-161), 74, 788-789. Paris: Parisorium.

xxix Romanides, 2002, p. 32

xxx C. Yannaras, The Freedom of Morality. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.

xxxi Romans 5:21

xxxii Yannaras, 1984

xxxiii II Peter 1:4

xxxiv Hughes, 2004

xxxv Romanides, 2002, p. 32

xxxvi Romanides, 2002

xxxvii Clement, O. The Roots of Christian Mysticism. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1993.

xxxviii I Corinthians 3:9

xxxix I Corinthians 9:24-27

xl Philippians 2:12

xli Matthew 22:37-39

xlii [*Hom. in Gen XVIII, 3 PG 53 151*]

xliii *Doctrinal Questions and Answers, IX, 6 in Cyril of Alexandria, Selected Letters*

xliv [*Treatise against Julian the Pelagian*]

xlv *Aquinas: Comp. Theol., 224*

xlvi Galatians 3:13

xlvii Lamsa, George. *Holy Bible: From the Ancient Eastern Text*, SanFrancisco: Harper, 1985

xlviii Ephesians 1:10

xlix *Against the Heresies, III, xix 6 ANF*

l Romans 8:20-22

li http://www.orthodox.clara.net/ancestral_sin.htm

lii Romanides, 2002

liii Augustine. Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers: Four Anti-Pelagian Writings, vol. 1, Grand Rapids , Michigan: Eerdmans. (1956a)

liv J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979

lv Meyendorff, 1979, 144.

lvi Augustine, (1956a)

lvii Hughes, *Ancestral*, 2004 and Augustine, *On the Predestination of the Saints*, 7

lviii Romanides, 2002

lix Kalomiris, A. (1980). *The river of fire*. 1980, p. 30; Retrieved April, 20, 2004, www.orthodoxpress.org/parish/river_of_fire.htm.

lx J. P. Migne (Ed.). (1857-1866b). *The patrologiae cursus completes, seris graeca*. (Vols. 1-161), 31, 345. Paris: Parisorium.

lxi Romanides, 1992, p. 155-156.

lxii Clement, 1993, p. 87

lxiii Yannaras, 1984

lxiv Yannaras, 1984, p. 153; Clement, 2000.

lxv Psalm 104:29

lxvi Clement, 1993, p. 81.

lxvii Romans 5:12-14, ESV

lxviii Romans 5:18-21, ESV

lxix In theology, **concupiscence** refers to the orientation or inclination or innate tendency of human beings to do evil. It is derived from the Latin word *concupiscentia*.

lxx Romans 7:15-24, ESV

-
- lxxi Catholic Encyclopedia, Original Sin at <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/index.html>
- lxxii Romans 5:19
- lxxiii Romans 5:18, 19
- lxxiv Sanday, "The International Critical Commentary: Romans", 134, 137; Hastings, "A Dictionary of the Bible", I, 841.
- lxxv Augustine, "De peccat. meritis", I, xviii.
- lxxvi Aug., loc. cit., xxxiv, 63; Denz., n. 140 (96)].
- lxxvii Contra Gent., IV, lii
- lxxviii Denz., n. 175 (145)
- lxxix cf. Pallavicini, "Istoria del Concilio di Trento", vii-ix.
- lxxx Sess. V, can. ii)
- lxxxi Sess. VI, cap. iii
- lxxxii Sess. VI
- lxxxiii De conceptu virginali, xxvi.
- lxxxiv Council of Trent, Sess. V, can. v.
- lxxxv loc. cit., can. ii.
- lxxxvi De vera relig., xiv, 27.
- lxxxvii prop. xlvi, xlvii, in Denz., n. 1046 (926)
- lxxxviii De pecc. orig., xxiv.
- lxxxix <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/2109.htm> ; I-II:109:7 ; III:87:2, ad 3
- xc Council of Trent, Sess. V, can. v.
- xcI In II Sent., dist. xxv, Q. i, a. 2, ad 2um
- xcii *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 416-418
- xciii *Catechism*, 404
- xciv *Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 76
- xcv *Catechism*, 405
- xcvi *Compendium*, 77
- xcvii *Catechism*, 403
- xcviii Hughes, Ancestral
- xcix <http://www.gocanada.org/Catechism/catorsin.htm>
- c *The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church* also known as the *Catechism of Philaret*, question 168
- ci 2 Esdras 7:46
- cii I Tim. 4:4
- ciii Rom. 5:12; 8:20
- civ I Cor. 15:26; II Cor. 4:3
- cv Rom. 1:20

cvi Rom. 7:15-25

cvii I Cor. 15:56

cviii Rom. 3:9-12; 5:19

cix Rom. 5:13

cx Rom. 8:24

cxii Romanides, Original Sin According to St. Paul,
http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/inquirers/frjr_sin.aspx#43#43 ; II Cor. 4:3; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 6:12 ; I Cor.
15:1 ff. ; Rom. 12:2; I Cor. 2:12; 11:32; II Cor. 4:3; Col. 2:20; II Thes. 2:9; II Tim. 4:10; Col. 2:8; I Cor.
5:10

cxiii Romans 3:23

cxiii Romans 5

cxiv *Theosis*, meaning *deification* or *divinization*, is the process of man becoming holy and being united with God, beginning in this life and later consummated in the resurrection. *Theosis* is the understanding that humans from the beginning are made to share in the life of the godhead (the Trinity). Therefore, we are saved **from** sin **for** participation in the life of the Trinity, which is life-giving and therefore eternal.

cxv Romanides, Original Sin According to St. Paul,
http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/inquirers/frjr_sin.aspx#43#43

cxvi Romanides

cxvii Ibid

cxviii Romans 8:6

cxix Romans 8:13

cxx Romans 8:9 and 7:24

cxxi Romans 8:2

cxxii Romans 7:6 and 8:9

cxxiii Romans 8:16

cxxiv II Cor. 7:1

cxxv II Cor. 1:22; Gal. 4:6; Eph. 3:16-17; Rom. 8:9

cxxvi Rom. 8:7-8; Rom. 7:13-25

cxxvii] Rom. 6:1-14; Gal. 5:22-24

cxxviii I Cor. 15:56; Rom. 5:21; I Cor. 15:26; Rom. 8:8; Rom. 8:7; Rom. 7:24; Rom. 8:1-11; Rom. 6:1-14

cxxix Romans. 7:13-25

cxxx Heb. 2:14-15

cxxxi Gal. 5:19-21

cxxxii Rom. 7:24

cxxxiii Athanasius, De Incarnatione Verbi Dei, 4-5

cxxxiv Rom. 5:12

cxxxv Rom. 8:20-22

cxxxvi St. John Chrysostom, Migne, P.G.t. 60, col. 391-692; Theophylactos, Migne, P.G.t. 124, c. 404-405

cxxxvii St. Cyrill of Alexandria, Migne, P.G.t. 74, c. 781-785, and especially c. 788-789; Theodoretos of Cyrus, Migne, P.G.t. 66, c. 800

cxxxviii I Cor. 15:56

cxxxix Rom. 5:21

cxl I Cor. 15:26

cxli II Cor. 11:3

cxlii I Tim. 2:14

cxliiii Romans 5:13-14

cxliv I Cor. 15:26, 56

cxlv Lagrange, Epitre aux Romains, p. 117-118; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 136-137

cxlvi Mar Bawai Soro, Fourth Pro Oriente Syriac Commission Consultation: "Sacraments in the Syriac Tradition" Vienna, 2000 at http://www.cired.org/east/0401_sacraments_in_church_of_east.pdf; Book of Hebrews 6:20. Relative to the priesthood of Jesus Christ after the order of Melchizedec, Theodore states that Jesus became a priest after the order of high priests because he was the first to enter heaven, and through him the favor of entering was bestowed upon us. The work of a high priest is indeed that he should draw near unto God first and then after him and through him the rest should draw near; Theodore of Mopsuestia, Commentary on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, in the Woodbrooke Studies, vol. 6, Alphonse Mingana, ed., Cambridge, 1933, 18.

cxlvii Theodore, VI, Mingana 20; Francis J. Reine, The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1966, 38f.

cxlviii Theodore's Commentary on Galatians, 1:3 ff., Swete vol. 1, p. 25.

cxlix Richard Alfred Norris, *The Anthropological foundations of the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, a thesis submitted to the General Theological Seminary, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sacred Theology, New York, 1957, 55.

cl Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii*, 2 vol., H. B. Swete, ed., (Cambridge, 1880, 1882). See Theodore's Commentary on Galatians, 1:3 ff., Swete vol. 1, p. 7.

cli Theodore, *Fragments of the Dogmatic Works of Theodore*, Section VI. On the Original Sin and Mortality, Book III, Swete, vol. II, Appendix A, 332.

clii Theodore, *Fragments of the Dogmatic Works of Theodore*, Swete, 335.

cliii Gen. 2: 15-17.

cliv Theodore, VI, Mingana, 21.

clv Gen. 1:27.

clvi Theodore, VI, Mingana, 28.

clvii Theodore cannot be categorized as an Augustinian because his portrayal of man's freedom and moral responsibility cannot be considered to cause Adam's posterity to inherit original, or the first man's, sin and guilt. Theodorian Anthropology resolutely negates any possibility that Adam's posterity would inherit his sin and his guilt. This is contrary to Augustinian theology.

clviii R. A. Norris, *Manhood in Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1963), p. 179, note 5.

clix Norris, *Manhood in Christ*, 58. Norris declares that «But it is this weakness of the flesh which accounts ultimately for the fact that the Law cannot assure men of salvation. Because of their mortality, they fall away perpetually into sin . . .».

clx²⁰ Theodore, (Swete, 335).

clxi Theodore, VI, Mingana, 21.

clxii Theodore, VI, Mingana, 56.

clxiii Ibid., 21.

clxiv Theodore's Commentary on Colossians, 1:16 ff., Swete vol. 1, p. 267 ff.

clxv Mar Bawai Soro, http://www.cired.org/east/0401_sacraments_in_church_of_east.pdf ; **Theodore of Mopsuestia, Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche, in Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 15, Karl Staab, ed., (Aschendorff Münster, 1933). See Theodore's Commentary on Romans, 7:14, Staab, p. 131-212.**

clxvi From the perspective of Theodore's theology, the death which was caused by the Fall means (a) to be detached from God, (b) to return to the earth, from which he had been taken, and (c) to be in alliance with (the Rebel) Satan.

clxvii Theodore's Commentary on Romans, 5:13-14, Staab, p. 119.

clxviii Ibid

clxix http://www.cired.org/east/0401_sacraments_in_church_of_east.pdf

clxx Yannaras, 1984, p. 143

clxxi V. Rev. Antony Hughes, Ancestral Versus Original Sin: An Overview with Implications for Psychotherapy

clxxii Yannaras, 1984, 147-148

clxxiii Hughes

clxxiv Hughes

clxxv Matthew 25:21

clxxvi Hughes

clxxvii Yannaras, 1984, p. 47