

# By Nature

Many who subscribe to prevalent doctrines within the present day Church have been led to believe that men and women are "by nature", that is, by birth children of wrath and subject to God's extreme anger from the very moment they open their eyes in this world. The aim of this article is to bring to your attention some of the issues that arise from embracing such a "dreadful decree", while taking a quick look at who framed this very doctrine. Also, I will compare two passages found in the New Testament with each other so that the unstudied reader in the word of truth can have a better understanding of Paul's terminology and usage of the Greek word *Physis*, which is translated, "by nature" in our modern day English Bibles (Ro. 2:14 & Eph. 2:3). It goes without saying the doctrine of original sin is yet again under evaluation and hopefully this presentation will shed some much needed light on men's darkened hearts who have been indoctrinated within their denominations of choice.

First things first, what exactly does the doctrine of original sin imply? The common understanding of this inborn depravity teaching is that Adam's guilt and wicked nature have been transmitted unconditionally to all his descendants. Consequently, all men are now born with sinful disposition's and are subject to the fierce wrath of God from birth! Due to this original corruption of nature, man is utterly disposed, disabled, made opposite to all good and wholly inclined to all evil and that continually. In other words, all human beings are born with this stuff lodged in behind their wills that will necessitate them to sin at the age of reason. Thus, we have the very cause for human sinfulness, that being, the very nature of man which forces him to act out what was born within, that being, sin!

This then would lead to the second definition found when studying the doctrine of original sin, that being, "actual sin." Why do people sin? The common answer to this question is usually claimed to be found in Eph. 2:3. Here, the claim is made that man is a "child of wrath" by his very nature, which translates into, man sins because his physical nature compels him to do so. Consequently, man is no longer responsible for the "actual sin" he commits, rather, the fruit of his doings are only a symptom of Adam's "original sin" that was imparted to him when he was brought forth from his mother's womb. Because of this infectious-disease man's nature is totally crippled and unable to choose any virtue apart from Divine intervention (e.g. Prevenient or Irresistible grace). As follows, man is only able to choose to live according to his corrupted desires and must simply accept he was born in sin. Once this is understood he will be urged to accept Jesus as Savior and allow the Holy Spirit to move in which will begin to be gradually offset this inherited wickedness that was submerged in his very nature that he inherited from the first parents through birth.

Before we go any further, consider for a moment the effects this doctrine has placed on the so-called Christian world today that lines up with the 'imputed' righteous side of the doctrinal fence. Ask yourself this question...why does the majority of professed Christians in our day hold to the perverted view of imputation? Is it not because it fits so easily into the sin nature teaching? Think about it... You can be declared righteous (while you're still sinful) by merely 'trusting' that Jesus obeyed for you. It's the perfect COVER to your continued sinful disposition! Once you 'trust' in the provision of Christ God no longer holds you accountable for your sinful nature (which you have no control over anyway) because He has made allowance for it on the cross. Therefore, sin is paid for in advance, which means, when you trust in Jesus you're forgiven for past, present and even future sins. At this point nothing you do or fail to do can affect the outcome of your salvation since this arrangement was made 2000 years ago between God and Jesus for all time. According to imputation teachers at the moment you trust in Christ's provision on the cross you are automatically accepted by God and eternally secure forevermore.

Therefore, it is no longer, "the soul that sins shall die!", but rather, "you shall surely NOT die!" (Gen. 3:4; Ezk. 18:4; Ro. 8:5-8, 13; Gal. 6:7-9). The reality is the exact same LIE Satan used in the garden on Eve (that distracted her from the simplicity of God's Truth) is still today at work in our modern day Churches (2 Cor. 11:3-4)! The "different" Gospel Paul referred to in 2 Cor. 11:3-4 is certainly one that turns the grace of God into license for immorality (Jude 3-4)! What better method to corrupt the entire message than to remove the very base message preached by Christ and His disciples of Biblical repentance (Mk. 1:15; 6:12; Lk. 24:47; 2 Co. 7:10-11)! This is exactly what the doctrine of "original sin" has accomplished!

If man is incapable of repenting and forsaking his sin (as the doctrine of original sin states) then we must conclude that sin is no longer a crime against God and man is now saved as he is, which means, he must be saved IN his sins due to his very sinful nature he was born with! Again, because the sinfulness of man is an inbred disease, sympathy is extended to the sinner, conviction is aborted and never brought upon the rebellious soul. How can the Preacher (who himself feels sorry for the sinner) possibly mention anything about disqualifying sins that will exclude his people from the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:9-10; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 5:5-7; Rev. 21:8, 22:15)? How about you, wouldn't you feel sorrow for someone who was afflicted with a deadly disease? Of course! Because of this disease then wouldn't you be obligated to handle the situation with 'kid gloves' (so to speak) and gently encourages the poor wretch to 'confess' his sinful state and 'receive' Jesus into his heart? Can you begin to see the restrictions this doctrine has placed on the preaching of repentance and faith and why the message of heart purity is no where to be found in our day (Matt. 3:8; Acts 20:21; 26:20; 2 Co. 7:10-11)?

You see, because of this doctrine no one ever actually repents of their sin! How can you possibly forsake the very nature you were born with? Impossible! Since sin is understood as a physical substance, how exactly does one rid himself of it's corrupting influence (2 Pe. 1:3-4)? Again, it's not possible. Therefore everyone (including the preachers), "get saved" and continue in bondage to sin under the impression that the Holy Spirit is going to help them CHANGE their desires eventually and enable them to do what is right. However the entire premise is in error because of the assumption that man is born a sinner (which renders him entirely powerless) to repent and obey God from his heart (Acts 5:32; Ro. 6:17; Heb. 5:9; Jas. 1:21-22).

Thus, the Gospel now must be presented in reverse! In stead of man amending his ways and forsaking the evil of his doings, he must simply trust in Jesus (i.e get saved), then allow the Holy Spirit to move in and start a process of cleaning him up! In other words, because man is born with a wicked nature he can only choose the evil! If man could choose the good, then according to the multitudes of so called Gospel preachers, he wouldn't need Jesus and could save himself! Why do they say this? The simple answer is -- they don't understand nor preach Biblical repentance and they believe men are born sinners!

What becomes of these notions is truly devastating indeed to the very nature and character of the Father. The doctrine of original sin truly paints a tyrannical picture of a God -- not only do unbaptized babies receive eternal death (due to the first parents sin), but God now demands that man repent of something he inherited from Adam (Ezk. 18:20; Acts 17:30-31; Ro. 6:23)! Even worse than that, He decrees that this same sin will send the soul to eternal perdition if not repented of which is exactly affirmed in the Westminster Confession of faith! (*Read carefully*)

#### [Westminster Confession of Faith, Article VI:](#)

[Our first parents, being seduced by the subtlety and temptation of Satan, sinned, in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin, God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory.](#)

[II. By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the parts and faculties of soul and body.](#)

III. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed; and the same death in sin, and corrupted nature, conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation.

IV. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.

V. This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be, through Christ, pardoned, and mortified; yet both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin.

VI. Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth, in its own nature, bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries spiritual, temporal, and eternal.

This above confession has ultimately lead to the demise of repentance, since the sin can never really STOP (as we have shown in other articles). Notice part five of the confession, "*the original corruption of nature...doth remain in those that are regenerated*". Thus, even after regeneration, man retains the original stain of Adam's sin. As follows, converts in the Church are told that their nature remains corrupted and their hearts divided! This means then, the double mind survives and the soul serves two masters (Matt. 6:22-24; Acts 28:18; 2 Co. 6:14; Jas. 1:7-8; 3:11-12; 1 Pe. 2:9; 1 Jn. 1:5-7). Because this stain remains, SIN is the ultimate outcome of everything they do! Does this sound familiar to you? If so I will pass on the advise I once received, look into what you have been taught! Many may attempt to show you it was the early reformers who are responsible for framing the tenets of original sin and different Divine graces, however, as I have learned this is completely inaccurate. If you do your homework on this you will ultimately end up in third century Rome with a Bishop named Augustine of Hippo. (*Read carefully!*)

### **Who is Augustine of Hippo**

Born in 354, in Thagaste in North Africa, under the Roman Empire. The Empire had embraced Christianity as the official State Religion since Emperor Constantine consolidated his power base in the West in 311. This made each succeeding Emperor himself the head honcho of the Church. Nothing could be done without him or against him. He held the power of life and death over all the inhabitants in his Empire.

Underneath his reigning authority were the Bishops, who often opposed one another over systems of belief and Doctrine. Into this world of controversy and schisms Augustine was born and grew to manhood. It is very likely he was quite aware of the brutal persecutions against the Donatus by Emperor Constantine to silence their opposition of his Catholic Authority and knew very well that these factions still existed in the church. But Augustine was not a professing Christian in his youth, although his Mother was a member of the Catholic church, his father was pagan and had high expectations for his son in Roman Society.

Augustine's parents used their connections to secure a University education for their son in Carthage. As a student he engaged in much loose behavior and soon had a young son from one of his affairs. This lead to a life long obsession with lust that would impact his doctrinal beliefs greatly. While in the city he joined the Manicheans, a syncretistic, Gnostic religion founded by a medium called Mani in third century Persia. As a youth, Mani had received revelations by a spirit being he called his "Twin". Since its foundation, Manichaeism had spread like wildfire through the ancient world, finding many followers, some of them being influential people in Roman society. The Manicheans spoke of Jesus too, as a prophet, alongside Buddha and Zoroaster, but reserved the title of "Last Prophet" or "Seal of the Prophets" for Mani himself.

## **Where Did the Concept for Original Sin Come from? (IMPORTANT!!!)**

The world view of Manichaeism was dualistic: one side was a world of light, inherently good and on the other the material world, inherently evil. Each world was presided over by a god. As everything material, the incarnate part of the human was evil by nature from the day of his conception and was drawn towards sin. Only the immaterial soul, belonging to the world of light, was pure and could not be defiled, not even by the grossest sins of the body. The worst sins in Manichean thinking were the sexual sins, because they resulted in more souls of light becoming imprisoned in evil bodies. According to Manichaeism, mankind was divided into three separate groups of people: the Sinners, the Hearers and the Elect. The Elect were obliged to refrain from all things that bound them to the material world: certain foods, sexual intercourse and manual labor. They were certain to obtain salvation once they died. The Hearers had to observe the same restrictions only on Sundays. They would have to go through more cycles of incarnations before they, too, would reach salvation. Augustine himself was a Hearer.

Manichaeism offered a world view that eliminated the fear of judgment by offering hope for salvation while still living in sin. It also gave an explanation for sin according to which nobody could be singled out as a sinner since all men were born sinners. It's easy to see how attractive that must have been for Augustine, guilt-ridden as he was over the ongoing fornication in his life. The Manicheans called themselves Christians, which made it easier for someone raised Catholic to see himself as an adherent of something that was really Christianity. The Roman Manicheans were very well connected, so opportunities opened up for Augustine he otherwise wouldn't have had. In 384, aged 30, he became professor of rhetoric at the imperial court in Milan. This was a very prestigious job that brought him close to the Emperor himself.

Given Augustine's fame in the annals of Christianity, where he is considered the Greatest theologian of Christian Doctrine in all history, it is EASY to see where he derived the bases of his teachings. His background in the Pagan Philosophies of the day set the stage for what would become his understanding of Grace, Faith and Salvation. NO ONE Before Augustine taught that man was Born a Sinner or that his Free Will was in bondage to his flesh. Such Teaching came from the Gnostics!

## **Sinful "by nature"?**

Far too many have alluded to Paul's writings in hopes to support their plea of inherited sinfulness, however, if we consider the immediate context of his writings, we will soon learn this is not the aim of the Apostle at all. Without question, Eph. 2:1 is often used as a proof text to teach that man is "born" dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1). Of course, if this were so (which it's not!) it would follow man is "born" separated from God (i.e spiritually dead) and automatically under His wrath. Again, how exactly did man end up in this predicament? According to the preachers, it's because he is guilty of a sin he didn't commit -- hence, the notion of original sin (Ezk. 18:20). As follows, a righteous God must punish sin, therefore, babies that are born with sin in them must consequently be punished with eternal fire period (Ro. 6:23). Thus, we reach the dreadful decree that Augustine and the reformers all cling to (which most don't care to talk about today), that is, all unbaptized babies are thrown into the lake of fire for a sin they had no part in (unless of course they receive infant baptism).

## **Preachers say:**

As far as the biblical data we have indicates, **all infants go to hell if they die in infancy** - because if they were elect infants, they would live long enough to be saved through the biblical method of repentance and faith, which is the only revealed method of salvation.

In Christ, Max Doner

Assuming there are non-elect infants, the answer would be "Yes." The Bible does not specifically answer the question of infants dying in infancy (despite dubious claims about David's son born to Bathsheba). The Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689 allows for "elect infants" dying in infancy to be saved. Since **we are all fallen in Adam no one is born "innocent" and without "guilt" before God.**

Pastor Jack A. Werth

I'm not sure whose question I'm answering, but **all the elect go to heaven and all the non-elect go to hell.**

Was this truly what Paul the Apostle was communicating to us through his various epistles? Let's see. Paul told those in Rome, "*I was alive once without the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died*" (Ro. 7:9). When was Paul alive? Is it not before the law came, that is, before he had knowledge of the commandment, "*thou shall not covet*" (Ro. 7:7). According to Paul, "*sin is not imputed where there is no law*" and it is only by the "*knowledge of law*" the commandment can spiritually kill (Ro. 3:20; 5:13; 7:11). Thus spiritual death and knowledge go hand in hand (Jas. 4:17). According to Paul children not yet being born have done neither good nor evil (Ro. 9:11)! How could Paul make these claims if he truly believed men and women are born sinners due to Adam? It should become obvious, Paul never taught this "dreadful decree" and clearly understood children are born innocent without the guilt of Adam's sin (Rom. 9:11, Ecc. 7:29, Duet. 1:39).

*"The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin" (Deut. 24:16).*

*"But he slew not their children, but did as it is written in the law in the book of Moses, where the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not die for the children, neither shall the children die for the fathers, but every man shall die for his own sin" (2 Chron. 25:4).*

*"Behold, all souls are Mine; The soul of the father as well the soul of the son is Mine; The soul who sins shall die" (Ezk. 18:4).*

*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" (Ezk. 18:20).*

Many allude to the Old Testament for support of this heinous doctrine of inherited sinfulness, however, it should be noted that to this very day Judaism (where which Christianity originated) rejects any and all notions of original sin? How is that? Because there Bible (Old Testament) don't teach it! The next question is...how come Christianity teaches it then? The answer is Augustine of Hippo! There are many more Scriptures that deal with this very issue, however, it should be crystal clear that spiritual death can only come by our own personal sin and our own wicked works (Isa. 59:2; Col.1:21; Eph. 2:1). It is only when one reaches the age of reason and willfully submits their will to the lust of the flesh that they become dead in their trespasses and sins (Gen. 2:17; 3:4| Ro. 3:23; 5:12; Jas. 1:13-15; 1 Jn. 2:15-16). The term Spiritual death is highly misunderstood because of the very doctrine of original sin. Why? Because the doctrine of original sin places sin in the constitution of man and not the choice (Jas. 4:17; 1 Jn. 3:4). Either man becomes a sinner by liberty or he sins out of necessity -- not both!

*"Therefore, to him who knows to do good and does not do it, to him it is sin" (Jas. 4:17).*

*" Whoever commits sin also commits lawlessness and sin is lawlessness" (1 Jn. 3:4).*

Being dead in your trespasses and sins simply is referring to a moral break and relational separation from communion with God and NEVER has anything to do with infant-children (Matt. 19:14; Heb. 7:26). Infants do not come into this world separated from God (as taught by those who embrace Augustinian-Gnosticism). The Scripture is complete with text that prove infants are born innocent with NO knowledge of good or evil (2 Kings 14:6; 21:16; 24:4; Joel 3:19; Ro. 9:11, Ecc. 7:29, Duet. 1:39). Therefore, infants do NOT go to hell if they die being they have no moral sin to be punished for (Matt. 19:14; Mark 10:14; Luke 18:16; Jn. 9:41; Ro. 3:20; 5:13; 7:9)!

*"And you He made alive, who were dead in trespasses and sins, 2 in which you once walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit who now works in the sons of disobedience, 3 among whom also we all once conducted ourselves in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were **by nature** children of wrath, just as the others" (Eph. 2:1-3).*

Here we have a commonly abused verse that is used in attempt to prove man's born dead with Adam's sin and by nature a child of wrath. However, the word used here "by nature" is not referring to one's birth status, rather, it is simply relating to, "a mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature." The word Paul used is *Physis* #5449 in Strong's. Thayer's Greek Lexicon of the New Testament places the very definition I have provided (a mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature) with Eph. 2:1-3 due to the **context**.

Study it for yourself and you will discover that the word "born" is nowhere to be found in Eph. 2:1-3 which means it is pure conjecture! Paul is addressing adults (not babies) who formerly "walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air" who "conducted themselves in the lusts of their flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were **by nature** children of wrath, just as the others". Therefore, without a doubt, Paul's terminology of a "child of wrath" is referencing a former walk, not birth (Col. 1:21). Hence, a mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature.

*"knowing this that you were not redeemed with corruptible things like silver or gold, from the aimless conduct received by tradition from your fathers" (1 Pe. 1:18).*

Observe that aimless conduct or a mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature is received by "tradition" passed down from your fathers (not inherited in birth!). This same point was made by Paul in Ro. 5:12 where he speaks of all sinning and becoming dead in sin through being influenced and imitating Adam's original example of disobedience (Ro. 5:12; Eph. 2:1-3; 1 Pe. 1:18). Sin is not substance, however, sin is moral (1 Jn. 3:4). In other words, sin is something you do, not something you are! Furthermore, where does the Bible teach that men are made righteous apart from choice (Ro. 5:18; 1 Jn. 3:7)? No where! Why then is the exact opposite automatically assumed that men can be made sinners apart from personally transgressing the law of God (Jn. 1:9; Ro. 2:14; 5:18; 6:23)? Fallacy, unless of course you believe in the heresy of universal salvation (Matt. 7:13-14; 21-24; Lk. 13:24; Rev. 21:8)! Sin cannot be transferred any more than virtue can be exchanged from one to the other. This is why the Bible teaches Christ was your example and that you should follow in His foot steps (Prov. 8:20; Jn. 13:15; 1 Cor. 11:1; Php. 3:17; 2 Thess. 3:9; Eph. 5:1; 1 Pet. 2:21; Tit. 2:11-12; Rom. 6:16, 19; 1 Jn. 2:29; 3:7).

*"for when Gentiles, who do not have the law, **by nature** do the things in the law...." (Ro. 2:14).*

Interestingly enough, the same word "*Physis*" or simply "by nature" that is used by Paul in Eph. 2:3, is also used in Ro. 2:14. Now, if this 'nature' was corrupted, as supposed by the multitudes, HOW could the Gentiles use the same nature to keep the things contained in the law? Wouldn't it stand to reason they would violate it instead because of this very wicked nature? Think about it! You must begin to understand there are many fallacies that are being passed off right under the

multitudes noses that could be discovered if people would sincerely begin to read the New Testament for themselves. The Scripture (from OT to NT) does not teach the fallacy of inbred sinfulness, rather, it presents sin as a choice and man as a slave to whom he obeys (Isa. 59:2; Jn. 8:34,36; Ro. 6:16). Man can produce neither vice nor virtue apart from his own volition and to say otherwise is to violate the freedom of the will which God bestowed upon all his creation. Augustine's doctrine of original sin and the modern day teaching on man being born a sinner "by nature" is a myth and violates the very humanity and existence of the Lord Jesus Christ!

Does the doctrine of original sin violate God's human nature? How exactly did Jesus not become infected with the universal disease? Clearly the scripture tells us that Christ partook of the same flesh and blood that we have being that He was made in all points as we are (Heb.2:14). Therefore it follows, if Jesus truly came in the flesh then he was surely tempted in all points just as we are --yet He committed no sin (Isa. 59:2; Heb. 4:15; 1 Pe. 2:22; 13:8; 1 Jn. 3:4) This is absolute proof that our natural desires are not sinful apart from our submission to their lust, for if they were, Christ would have had sinned by taking on flesh (Gen. 3:4; Matt. 4:1-11; Heb. 4:15; Jas. 1:13-15)! According to the Apostle John, denying Christ humanity is equal to denying his Deity and automatically makes you an anti-christ (1 Jn. 4:1-6; 2 Jn. 7-11)!

*"Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call His name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14).*

Many who teach that men are sinners "by nature" will quickly conjecture that Christ was born of a virgin to avoid this inherited sinful nature they are so fond of defending. Is this so? Did the prophet Isaiah mention anything about Christ being born of a virgin so He could avoid this wicked nature that was passed down from the first parents? Of course not! Christ was simply born of a virgin as a "SIGN" to the Jews that He was indeed sent from the Father (Isa. 7:14). Why is it those who embrace the fallacy of inherited sinfulness want you to believe that Christ was born of a virgin to avoid this stuff called sin? Is it not because it cancels out His humanity and sinless life (Heb. 2:17; 4:15)? Think about it... If this supposed sin nature is truly passed to us through our genetics from Adam, then Christ Himself, being born of Mary (a totally depraved sinner) would then be infected! Thus we arrive at yet another one of Augustine's doctrinal errors of 'Immaculate Conception' (which is heavily embraced within Roman Catholicism), that is, the idea that Christ was born of the virgin Mary in order to avoid this very plague inherited human sinfulness.

Do you see how the foundational error of original sin necessitates another error, upon another error, etc...? If you tell one lie then by necessity another lie must be brought forth to cover the previous lie that was already spoken. The reality is, men are born into this world neutral capable of vice or virtue. Sin is something you do, not something you are. Moreover, the whole concept of this sin nature dilemma is shattered by the fact that John the Baptist parents brought him into the world (in the usual manner) already filled with the Holy Spirit in the Womb (Lk. 1:6, 15, 28, 41)! How could they possibly be depraved sinners "by nature" and be chosen for such a task by God? Likewise, Mary and Joseph were also found to be upright in heart, pure before God and chosen to bring about the birth of the Messiah. How could this possibly be if they were completely depraved "by nature" and wicked in disposition? Do you think it's time to reevaluate what you have been taught yet? The conclusion to the matter is this, unless you have some sort of explanation why Jesus was free of a 'sinful nature' from birth, you need to abandon this horrible doctrine of original sin and start refuting it.

Chris Hill

[TheSinMustStop.org](http://TheSinMustStop.org)