

1: The Articles of Religion of the Methodist Church – The United Methodist Church

Original sin is an invention to cover up irresponsibility. And make a place for priests and ministers. Ann Rynd and Robert Ingersoll here criticize both 'Original Sin' and the 'Trinity'.

The Doctrine of Original Sin Therefore, just as through one person sin entered the world, and through sin, death, and thus death came to all, inasmuch as all sinned --Romans 5: Adam In order to understand the doctrine of original sin, it is necessary to begin with the first created man, Adam. Scripture and Tradition tell us that "God created man in his image; in the divine image he created him; male and female he created them" Genesis 1: The first human, Adam, was created by God as the progenitor of the human race. Together Adam and Eve, were given the loving gifts of free will, original justice and original holiness. Composed of both flesh and spirit, man was created in, "the divine image" Genesis 1: God placed mankind with, "dominion over the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, and all the living things that move on the earth" Genesis 1: Along with the gift of a soul came the gift of freewill. Before their temptation at the hands of the devil, Adam and Eve chose to accept and return the love of their Creator, as well as submit to obedience out of love for God. This harmony before the fall of mankind is sometimes called original justice and original holiness. The author of sin and Prince of evil A dark and seductive voice entered into the domain of man. Out of hatred for God it sought the ruin of the human race. The Church teaches us that the source of sin and evil is manifested in the fallen angel, Lucifer, or as he is more commonly known, Satan the devil. Church Tradition and teachings implore that evil could not originate from God, the source of justice and quintessence of holiness. Evil itself, the rejection of the loving grace of God, began with the angel Lucifer. God created Lucifer as a good angel, a being of pure spirit. Lucifer as a spiritual creature was one of beauty, power and intelligence. Like all creatures Lucifer was created to love God and serve him, but Lucifer began to focus on his own individual power, intelligence and qualities. Rather than attribute his strengths and qualities to the service and love of his creator, Lucifer turned from God and sought himself as the source of his own pleasures and service. By a free choice, Lucifer rejected God and fell from his place in heaven. He also took with him many other angels, who likewise rejected God. By separating themselves from the creator, the fallen angels introduced evil into creation and authored the first sin. Satan and the fallen angels became the essence of evil, and the tempter of mankind. Out of evil, hatred, and malice Satan opposes God at every turn. Satan "has sinned from the beginning 1 John 3: The fall of Man and Original Sin God warned Adam from the beginning, "You are free to eat from any of the trees of the garden except the tree of knowledge of good and bad. From that tree you shall not eat; the moment you eat from it you are surely doomed to die" Genesis 2: The parable of the Garden of Eden focuses on the first sin of Adam and Eve. The Garden of Eden contained two special trees. The first was the forbidden tree of knowledge of good and bad and the second tree was the tree of everlasting life. They freely chose to defy God by eating from the forbidden tree of good and bad. The Church teaches us that this first sin of man constituted a loss of trust in man for God and an abuse of the freedom of mankind. Because man had disobeyed their creator and indulged in sin, man finally knew of evil and lost his original justice and holiness. For the first time, death entered into the world and man was doomed to experience a terminal nature. Man was now destined to toil and work for a living for, "by the sweat of your face shall you get bread to eat" Genesis 3: Women received the pains of child birth and were placed under the dominion of man, "I will intensify the pang of your childbearing; in pain shall you bring forth children. Yet your urge shall be for your husband, and he shall be your master Genesis 3: In toil shall you eat its yield all the days of your life. Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to you, as you eat of the plants of the field" Genesis 3: In addition, the will of man is forever weakened by the first sin. Original sin, the loss of original justice and holiness, impacted the progeny of Adam and Eve through weakness of will. Man no longer harbors original justice and holiness and instead is drawn toward evil and selfish pleasures. We call this weakness of the will concupiscence. The continuing temptations of Satan and the loss of the gifts of original holiness and justice marred the soul of Adam, and as he is the head of the human race all of his descendants were likewise convicted. The stain of original sin is inherited by all humans at the moment of conception and brings its effects of ignorance,

concupiscence, death and suffering. Original sin has separated God from man and weakens the will of man to prefer evil. Job laments, "Who can make him clean that is conceived of unclean seed? The passion, death and resurrection of Jesus was offered once and for all for the sins of mankind, so that man can be saved by the grace of God. Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation; so also by the justice of one, unto all men to justification of life" Romans 5: The redemption of Jesus Christ is a gift to the world for the expiation of original sin and personal sins. Choose the gift of everlasting life The redemption is extraordinary in that it has been offered to all men for the forgiveness and of sin. Yet like all gifts, we must choose to accept it. Thus God will not force his love and grace upon us; we must choose the grace of God and offer our souls to conformity with his will. Christ says, "unless a man be born again by water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" John 3: Baptism, the sacrament of faith, cleanses the soul and sanctifies it with grace of the Holy Spirit. Christ also tells us, "if thou will enter into life, keep the commandments" Matthew By baptism, faith and obedience to God, we can attain the graces of God for remission of sin and purification of the soul. Appendix For a more thorough explanation of Justification by Grace, refer to the article The Catholic Doctrine of Justification by Grace in the Salvation section of this website. Also, a more detailed explanation of grace and its effects can be found in the article, Grace: A Precious Gift of God located in the Theology section. An article on the redemption of humanity through Jesus Christ is also available. Catechism of the Catholic Church.

2: BBC - Religions - Christianity: The Trinity

During the spring I took a philosophy class, and while going over Medieval philosophy I felt sort of lost. My parents are both Christian, and are from very Christian households, but they never took us to church or told us what to believe.

Philosophy and Christian Theology In the history of Christian theology, philosophy has sometimes been seen as a natural complement to theological reflection, whereas at other times practitioners of the two disciplines have regarded each other as mortal enemies. Some early Christian thinkers such as Tertullian were of the view that any intrusion of secular philosophical reason into theological reflection was out of order. Thus, even if certain theological claims seemed to fly in the face of the standards of reasoning defended by philosophers, the religious believer should not flinch. Other early Christian thinkers, such as St. Augustine of Hippo, argued that philosophical reflection complemented theology, but only when these philosophical reflections were firmly grounded in a prior intellectual commitment to the underlying truth of the Christian faith. Thus, the legitimacy of philosophy was derived from the legitimacy of the underlying faith commitments. It was during this time however that St. Thomas Aquinas offered yet another model for the relationship between philosophy and theology. According to the Thomistic model, philosophy and theology are distinct enterprises, differing primarily in their intellectual starting points. Philosophy takes as its data the deliverances of our natural mental faculties: These data can be accepted on the basis of the reliability of our natural faculties with respect to the natural world. Theology, on the other hand takes as its starting point the divine revelations contained in the Bible. These data can be accepted on the basis of divine authority, in a way analogous to the way in which we accept, for example, the claims made by a physics professor about the basic facts of physics. Since this way of thinking about philosophy and theology sharply demarcates the disciplines, it is possible in principle that the conclusions reached by one might be contradicted by the other. According to advocates of this model, however, any such conflict must be merely apparent. Since God both created the world which is accessible to philosophy and revealed the texts accessible to theologians, the claims yielded by one cannot conflict with the claims yielded by another unless the philosopher or theologian has made some prior error. Since the deliverances of the two disciplines must then coincide, philosophy can be put to the service of theology and perhaps vice-versa. How might philosophy play this complementary role? First, philosophical reasoning might persuade some who do not accept the authority of purported divine revelation of the claims contained in religious texts. Thus, an atheist who is unwilling to accept the authority of religious texts might come to believe that God exists on the basis of purely philosophical arguments. Second, distinctively philosophical techniques might be brought to bear in helping the theologian clear up imprecise or ambiguous theological claims. Thus, for example, theology might provide us with information sufficient to conclude that Jesus Christ was a single person with two natures, one human and one divine, but leave us in the dark about exactly how this relationship between divine and human natures is to be understood. The philosopher can provide some assistance here, since, among other things, he or she can help the theologian discern which models are logically inconsistent and thus not viable candidates for understanding the relationship between the divine and human natures in Christ. For most of the twentieth century, the vast majority of English language philosophy—“including philosophy of religion”—went on without much interaction with theology at all. While there are a number of complex reasons for this divorce, three are especially important. The first reason is that atheism was the predominant opinion among English language philosophers throughout much of that century. A second, quite related reason is that philosophers in the twentieth century regarded theological language as either meaningless, or, at best, subject to scrutiny only insofar as that language had a bearing on religious practice. The former belief is. Since much theological language, for example, language describing the doctrine of the Trinity, lacks empirical content, such language must be meaningless. The latter belief, inspired by Wittgenstein, holds that language itself only has meaning in specific practical contexts, and thus that religious language was not aiming to express truths about the world which could be subjected to objective philosophical scrutiny. In the last forty years, however, philosophers of religion have returned to the business of theorizing about many of the traditional doctrines of Christianity and have begun to apply the tools of

contemporary philosophy in ways that are somewhat more eclectic than what was envisioned under the Augustinian or Thomistic models. In keeping with the recent academic trend, contemporary philosophers of religion have been unwilling to maintain hard and fast distinctions between the two disciplines. As a result, it is often difficult in reading recent work to distinguish what the philosophers are doing from what the theologians and philosophers of past centuries regarded as strictly within the theological domain. In what follows, we provide a brief survey of work on the three topics in contemporary philosophical theology that “aside from general issues concerning the nature, attributes, and providence of God” have received the most attention from philosophers of religion over the past quarter century. We thus leave aside such staple topics in philosophy of religion as traditional arguments for the existence of God, the problem of evil, the epistemology of religious belief, the nature and function of religious language. We also leave aside a variety of important but less-discussed topics in philosophical theology, such as the nature of divine revelation and scripture, original sin, the authority of tradition, and the like.

Trinity From the beginning, Christians have affirmed the claim that there is one God, and three persons—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—each of whom is God. Although we profess three persons we do not profess three substances but one substance and three persons. If we are asked about the individual Person, we must answer that he is God. No doubt this is an understatement. Indeed, it looks like we can derive a contradiction from the doctrine, as follows: Either way, however, we have a problem. If the Father is identical to God and the Son is identical to God, then by the transitivity of identity the Father is identical to the Son, contrary to the doctrine. On the other hand, if the Father is divine and the Son is divine and the Father is distinct from the Son, then there are at least two divine persons. Either way, then, the doctrine seems incoherent. At first blush, it might seem rather easy to solve. The answer, in short, is that the Christian tradition has set boundaries on how the doctrine is to be explicated, and these sorts of models fall afoul of those boundaries. Modalism confounds the persons. It is the view that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are mere manifestations, modes, or roles played by the one and only God. Ruling out modalism thus rules out analogies like the Superman analogy just given. Tritheism divides the substance. It is a bit tricky because controversial to say exactly what tritheism, or polytheism more generally, is. For discussion, see Rea. But whatever else it might be, it is certainly implied by the view that there are three distinct divine substances. Assuming the items in your shopping cart count as multiple distinct substances, then, the problem with the shopping cart analogy is that it suggests polytheism. In what follows, we will consider several more sophisticated models of the trinity: These do not exhaust the field of possible solutions, but they are the ones to which the most attention has been paid in the recent literature. For more detailed surveys, see Rea and, at book length, McCall. This suggests the analogy of a family, or, more generally, a society. Thus, the persons of the trinity might be thought of as one in just the way that the members of a family are one: Since there is no contradiction in thinking of a family as three and one in this way, this analogy appears to solve the problem. Those who attempt to understand the trinity primarily in terms of this analogy are typically called social trinitarians. This approach has been controversially associated with the Eastern Church, tracing its roots to the Cappadocian Fathers—Basil of Caesarea, his brother Gregory of Nyssa, and their friend Gregory Nazianzen. Against this practice, see especially Ayres and Barnes. Consider, for example, the children of Chronos in Greek mythology, of whom Zeus was the liberator. These children included Zeus, Hera, Ares, and a variety of other Olympian deities—all members of a divine family. Nobody, however, thinks that the fact that Zeus and his siblings nor even, say, Zeus and his begotten daughter Athena count in any meaningful sense as one god. For this reason, social trinitarians are often quick to note that there are other relations that hold between members of the trinity that contribute, along with their being members of a single divine family, to their counting as one God. Richard Swinburne, for example, has defended a version of this view according to which the unity among the divine persons is secured by several facts in conjunction with one another. First, the divine persons share all of the essential characteristics of divinity: Second, unlike the deities of familiar polytheistic systems, their wills are necessarily harmonious, so that they can never come into conflict with one another. Third, they stand in a relationship of perfect love and necessary mutual interdependence. On this sort of view, there is one God because the community of divine persons is so closely interconnected that, although they are three distinct persons, they nonetheless function as if they were a single

entity. One might think that if we were to consider a group of three human persons who exhibited these characteristics of necessary unity, volitional harmony, and love, it would likewise be hard to regard them as entirely distinct. And that is, of course, just the intuition that the view aims to elicit. Still, many regard the sort of unity just described as not strong enough to secure a respectable monotheism. Thus, some social trinitarians have attempted to give other accounts of what unifies the divine persons. Perhaps the most popular such account is the part-whole model. Moreland and William Lane Craig have argued that the relation between the persons of the Trinity can be thought of as analogous to the relation we might suppose to obtain between the three dog-like beings that compose Cerberus, the mythical guardian of the underworld. One might say that each of the three heads—or each of the three souls associated with the heads—is a fully canine individual, and yet there is only one being, Cerberus, with the full canine nature. At this point, therefore, it is natural to wonder what exactly it is that makes both proposals count as versions of social trinitarianism. Unfortunately, this is a question to which self-proclaimed social trinitarians have not given a very clear answer. However, this answer is less than fully illuminating. What is needed is some characterization of the common core underlying the diverse views that are generally regarded as versions of social trinitarianism. The following two theses seem to capture that core: One of the more serious problems is that it is inconsistent with the Nicene Creed. Likewise, the Creed says that Father and Son are consubstantial. This claim is absolutely central to the doctrine of the trinity, and the notion of consubstantiality lay at the very heart of the debates in the 4th Century C. But the three souls, or centers of consciousness, of the heads of Cerberus are not in any sense consubstantial. Other versions of the part-whole model raise further worries. A cube, for example, is a seventh thing in addition to its six sides; but we do not want to say that God is a fourth thing in addition to its three parts. The reason is that saying this forces a dilemma: Either God is a person, or God is not. If the former, then we have a quaternity rather than a trinity. If the latter, then we seem to commit ourselves to claims that are decidedly anti-theistic: Bad news either way, then. Thus, many are motivated to seek other models. Historically, the use of psychological analogies is especially associated with thinkers in the Latin-speaking West, particularly from Augustine onward. Augustine himself suggested several important analogies, as did others in the medieval Latin tradition. However, since our focus in this article is on more contemporary models, we will pass over these here and focus instead on two more recently developed psychological analogies.

3: Philosophy and Christian Theology (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Trinity, Incarnation, and Original Sin in Christianity NOTE: The material written in red is a bit advanced for the purposes of this course, so you can skip it if you prefer. That material is there for your own edification, and to give you a more complete picture of these complicated theological issues.

The Eastern Orthodox Church considers itself to be the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church established by Christ and his apostles. For the early years of the church, much of what was conveyed to its members was in the form of oral teachings. Within a very short period of time traditions were established to reinforce these teachings. The Eastern Orthodox Church asserts to have been very careful in preserving these traditions. When questions of belief or new concepts arise, the Church always refers back to the primitive faith. Eastern Orthodox see the Bible as a collection of inspired texts that sprang out of this tradition, not the other way around; and the choices made in forming the New Testament as having come from comparison with already firmly established faith. The Bible has come to be a very important part of " Tradition ", but not the only part. It does not, however, believe that truth changes and therefore always supports its previous beliefs all the way back to what it holds to be the direct teachings from the Apostles. The Church also understands that not everything is perfectly clear; therefore, it has always accepted a fair amount of contention about certain issues, arguments about certain points, as something that will always be present within the Church. It is this contention which, through time, clarifies the truth. The Church sees this as the action of the Holy Spirit on history to manifest truth to man. The Church is unwavering in upholding its dogmatic teachings, but does not insist upon those matters of faith which have not been specifically defined. The Eastern Orthodox believe that there must always be room for mystery when speaking of God. Individuals are permitted to hold theologoumena private theological opinions so long as they do not contradict traditional Eastern Orthodox teaching. Sometimes, various Holy Fathers may have contradictory opinions about a certain question, and where no consensus exists, the individual is free to follow his or her conscience. Tradition also includes the Nicene Creed , the decrees of the Seven Ecumenical Councils , the writings of the Church Fathers , as well as Eastern Orthodox laws canons , liturgical books and icons , etc. In defense of extrabiblical tradition, the Eastern Orthodox Church quotes Paul: The Eastern Orthodox Church also believes that the Holy Spirit works through history to manifest truth to the Church, and that He weeds out falsehood in order that the Truth may be recognised more fully. Consensus of the Fathers[edit] See also: Theoria and Hesychasm Eastern Orthodoxy interprets truth based on three witnesses: The consensus of the Church over time defines its catholicity –that which is believed at all times by the entire Church. Vincent of Lerins , wrote in his Commonitoria AD , that Church doctrine, like the human body, develops over time while still keeping its original identity: Even those considered to be authentic "Fathers" may have some theological opinions that are not universally shared, but are not thereby considered heretical. Some Holy Fathers have even made statements that were later defined as heretical, but their mistakes do not exclude them from position of authority heresy is a sin of pride ; unintended error does not make one a heretic, only the refusal to accept a dogma which has been defined by the church. Thus an Eastern Orthodox Christian is not bound to agree with every opinion of every Father, but rather with the consensus of the Fathers, and then only on those matters about which the church is dogmatic. Some of the greatest theologians in the history of the church come from the 4th century, including the Cappadocian Fathers and the Three Hierarchs. However, the Eastern Orthodox do not consider the " Patristic era " to be a thing of the past, but that it continues in an unbroken succession of enlightened teachers i. Scripture[edit] A page from a rare Georgian Bible, A. D, depicting the Raising of Lazarus. Many modern Christians approach the Bible and its interpretation as the sole authority to the establishment of their beliefs concerning the world and their salvation. From the Eastern Orthodox point of view, the Bible represents those texts approved by the church for the purpose of conveying the most important parts of what it already believes. The Church more or less accepted the preexisting Greek Septuagint version of Hebrew Scriptures as handed down to them from the Jews; but the New Testament texts were written to members or congregations of the Church which already existed. These texts were not universally considered

canonical until the church reviewed, edited, accepted and ratified them in AD. The Greeks, having a highly sophisticated and philosophical language, have always understood that certain sections of Scripture, while containing moral lessons and complex truth, do not necessarily have to be interpreted literally. The Eastern Orthodox also understand that a particular passage may be interpreted on many different levels simultaneously. However, interpretation is not a matter of personal opinion 2 Peter 1: For this reason, Eastern Orthodox depend upon the consensus of the Holy Fathers to provide a trustworthy guide to the accurate interpretation of Scripture. A large portion of the Daily Office is made up of either direct portions of scripture Psalms , lections or allusions to scriptural passages or themes hymnography such as that contained in the Octoechos , Triodion , Pentecostarion , etc. The entire Psalter is read in the course of a week twice during Great Lent. The entire New Testament with the exception of the Book of Revelation is read during the course of the year, and numerous passages are read from the Old Testament at Vespers and other services. The Gospel Book is considered to be an icon of Christ, and is placed in a position of honour on the Holy Table altar. The Gospel Book is traditionally not covered in leather the skin of a dead animal because the Word of God is considered to be life-giving. Traditionally, the Gospel is covered in gold or cloth. Eastern Orthodox Christians are encouraged to read and study the Bible daily, especially making use of the writings of the Holy Fathers for guidance. Recent essays have emerged by various contemporary Eastern Orthodox scholars which attempt to reconcile and react to both the Creationist interpretation of Genesis and the strict Darwinist theory of human evolution. The Holy Trinity is three "unconfused" and distinct divine persons hypostases , who share one divine essence ousia ; uncreated, immaterial and eternal. The Father is the eternal source of the Godhead, from whom the Son is begotten eternally and also from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally. The essence of God being that which is beyond human comprehension and cannot be defined or approached by human understanding. Throughout the ages this has been a point of contention between schismatic Christian theological factions heterodox and the mainstream body of Christian believers orthodox. Christ had a divine will, or set of desires and spiritual incentives, and a human will with fleshly drives. He had a human body, human mind, and human spirit able to be tempted with sin and to suffer the same way as we would. In this way God is said to have suffered and died in the flesh of Jesus, although the divine nature is itself impassible and immortal. Eastern Orthodox Christians believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Messiah of the Jews, the God of Israel come to be with His people, the Redeemer of the human race who saves the world from sin and its effects, the comprehensible self-revelation of the incomprehensible God, and the pre-eternal Son begotten of the Father before all ages: Eastern Orthodox Christians believe in the betrayal, trial, execution, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, that he truly rose from the dead on the third day following his crucifixion. The feast of the resurrection of Christ, which is called "Easter" in Germanic languages, is known as Pascha in the Eastern Orthodox Church. This is the Aramaic variant the language spoken at the time of Jesus of the Hebrew Pesach, meaning "Passover". The resurrection of Christ is the Christian Passover. Essence and energies[edit] Main article: Energies and essence are both inseparably God. The divine energies are the expressions of divine being in action according to Eastern Orthodox doctrine, whereas the persons of the Trinity are divine by nature. Hence, created beings are united to God through participation in the divine energies and not the divine essence or ousia. The Eastern Orthodox theologian Olivier Clement , [8] wrote: There is no need for Christians to create a special theory for justifying God theodicy. It only remains for the faithful to partake of this Love: Much of these Gnostic sects attacked the Jewish creator YHWH as inferior due to the Jewish God allowing his creation to be imperfect or allowing the occurrence of negative events. The clearest example of this foolish or wicked creator god is in modern terms expressed in the philosophical concept termed " the problem of evil. The Church taught against the Gnostics that the cosmos is fallen but not due to God creating it dysfunctional, but rather because Man misused his freedom of will to choose a path which separates him from God, i. When humanity made this choice it is taught in Eastern patristics that reality or every sphere of human influence and participation "fell" and was corrupted, leading indeterminacy a necessary condition for morally significant free will in a mode of separation from God to be infused into human existence. As a result of this randomness or indeterminacy, good and bad befall all people whether they are of good or bad character. The first condition of this change was the Eastern understanding of creation

which stands in radical contrast to the fatalist approach to sin as taught by the Gnostic sectarians, and later by strict Augustinians. In that God created sarx "the flesh" as a provision for Man, led by the Spirit of God, to remedy his fallen state by using his time on earth to seek and reconcile with God, even while our common sarx separates us from God. Eastern Orthodox view of sin The Eastern Orthodox approach to sin, and how it is dealt with, shuns perceived Western "legalism. Sin, therefore, does not merely imply guilt for violating a commandment, but rather the impetus to become something other than what we are. A traditional practice of Eastern Orthodoxy is, as in other apostolic churches, to have a spiritual mentor and guide to whom one confesses and who treats the sin on an individual basis. An experienced and spiritually mature guide will know how and when to apply strictness in dealing with sin and when to administer mercy. Original sin[edit] In Eastern Orthodoxy, God created man perfect with free will and gave man a direction to follow. Man Adam and Woman Eve chose rather to disobey God by eating from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil , thus changing the "perfect" mode of existence of Man to the flawed or "fallen" mode of existence of Man. This fallen nature and all that has come from it is a result of " original sin. The union of humanity with divinity in Jesus Christ restored, in the Person of Christ, the mode of existence of humanity, so that those who are incorporated in him may participate in this renewal of the perfect mode of existence, be saved from sin and death, and be united to God in deification. Original sin is cleansed in humans through baptism or, in the case of the Theotokos , the moment Christ took form within her. This view differs from the Roman Catholic doctrine of original sin, the legacy of Latin father Augustine of Hippo , in that Man is not seen as inherently guilty of the sin committed by Adam, conceived as the federal head and legal representative of the human race. The Orthodox Church does not teach that all are born guilty and deserving of damnation, and Protestant doctrines such as predestination which are derived from the Augustinian theory of original sin and are especially prominent in the Lutheran and Calvinist traditions, are not a part of Orthodox belief. In the book Ancestral Sin, John S. Romanides addresses the concept of original sin, which he understands as an inheritance of ancestral sin from previous generations. Romanides asserts that original sin understood as innate guilt is not an apostolic doctrine of the Church nor cohesive with the Eastern Orthodox faith, but rather an unfortunate innovation of later church fathers such as Augustine. In the realm of ascetics it is by choice, not birth, that one takes on the sins of the world.

4: Socinianism - Wikipedia

The Doctrines of Original Sin and the Trinity and millions of other books are available for Amazon Kindle. Learn more Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App.

Bible and why Christians believe in the Trinity The Bible and why Christians believe in the Trinity Christianity adopted this complicated idea of God because it was the only way they could make sense of One God in the context of the events and teaching of the Bible. The idea of the Trinity does not supersede monotheism; it interprets it, in the light of a specific set of revelatory events and experiences. It also taught that Christians should only worship God. Finally, it taught that there was only one God: We must worship only God We must worship God the Father We must worship God the Son We must worship God the Holy Spirit There is only one God This seemed to put Christians in an impossible position from which they were rescued by the doctrine of the Trinity, which solved the puzzle by stating that God must be simultaneously both Three and One. Scripture and the Trinity For obvious reasons the Trinity is not referred to in the Old Testament, although many writers think that the Old Testament does drop heavy hints about it - for example when it uses a plural Hebrew noun to refer to God. The New Testament of the Bible never explicitly refers to the Trinity as such, but it does contain a number of references to the Economic Trinity: Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one The mystery of the Trinity: This idea that three persons add up to one individual seems like nonsense. And logically, it is. God is not like us One way out of the problem is to say that God is not like human beings and human beings get in a mess when they try to describe God using the same sort of language and understanding that they use to describe other human beings. God is a mystery, before which humanity should stand in awe. The doctrine of the Trinity has other functions: Making use of the Trinity Is the Trinity a useful idea? The Christian doctrine of the Trinity is not just an abstract belief, but something that has real practical use for those who believe it. Absolutely nothing worthwhile for the practical life can be made out of the doctrine of the Trinity taken literally. Karen Kilby Until quite recently, many theologians thought that the doctrine of the Trinity was pretty pointless. And the churches themselves disagree about the content of the doctrine; the most common Western statement of the Trinity is not accepted by the Eastern churches. And yet somehow it remains at the heart of the Christian faith: It is impossible to overemphasise the importance of the Christian doctrine that God is one in three persons. This has correctly been called the teaching distinctive of the Christian faith, that which sets the approach of Christians to the "fearful mystery" of the deity apart from all other approaches. Christians worship God in the presence of Christ and with the Holy Spirit within them. The creed, the fundamental statement of Christian belief, sets out the Trinitarian nature of God. Baptism is carried out "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit". Eucharistic prayers are firmly Trinitarian in concept. The traditional doxology is Trinitarian: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, World without end. Amen Many hymns are explicitly Trinitarian, such as this one: Early in the morning our song shall rise to thee; Holy, holy, holy! Merciful and mighty, God in three Persons, blessed Trinity! Or this I bind unto myself today the strong name of the Trinity, by invocation of the same, the Three in One, and One in Three. Many Christians see the relationship between the persons of the Trinity as providing a recipe for the best sort of human relationships. These are relationships in which individuality is balanced with relationship; relationships whose basis is mutual love and perfect communication. The relationship that exists within the Godhead is the basis for unity in every human relationship, be it marriage, family, or church. Patrick Henry Reardon The American theologian Catherine LaCugna suggested that the doctrine of the Trinity helps humanity answer the question How are we to live and relate to others so as to be most Godlike? The Trinity and the Christian Life And the key teaching within this doctrine of relationship is that the best relationships are those of equality and mutuality. Social implications The Trinity as a power structure The relationships within God as a Trinity discredit any hierarchical power structure in which those lower down are dominated and oppressed by those

above them. Instead, using the example of the Trinity leads to an ideal structure of mutual interdependence and support in pursuit of a common aim. Thus the Trinity shows the way God wants the world to be run and the power structures that he recommends to human society. This idea can be developed in Church life: In this the members communicate with each other in a spirit of love that accepts responsibility for the well-being of each individual and that of the whole community. In this way the Church, and each church and community become a unity in which diversity flourishes and in which differences are seen as valuable and essential elements in the substance of these institutions. The Trinity and Liberation Theology The liberation theologians thought it was essential to start thinking about the Trinity by focusing on its three-ness first, then its oneness. They saw the Trinity as first and foremost a community of divine persons whose essence was in their shared existence, their shared relationship and their surrender to each other. They objected to the hierarchical model of One God, because they thought that it justified political power structures that oppressed the poor and allowed the Church to continue with a patriarchal model that was out of date and unhelpful to the poor. So the liberation theologians took the Trinitarian theology of relationships to a grand scale. They used it to promote the ideal human society as a closely related and unified group of equal people living so as to promote the good of society as a whole. The leading liberation theologian Leonardo Boff said the Trinity was a "model for any, just, egalitarian while respecting differences , social organisation. Essential and Economic Trinity Essential and Economic Trinity Some of the problems of the Trinity arise from confusion between the internal life and nature of the Trinity itself and the external life or "self-revelation" of God. The only thing humankind can directly know of God is his external life. There are two ways of looking at God in Trinitarian terms: The Essential also called Immanent or Ontological Trinity looks at the essence or substance of God; at what God is actually like in himself as he stands outside the created universe. This is how God appears to humanity. Some theologians point out that only the Son and the Spirit are directly met in the Economic Trinity. The Economic and Essential Trinities are not two separate entities - just two ways of looking at God. Are these two the same? Is his face something he merely displays, or does his face unambiguously disclose his heart? Victor Shepherd The Western Churches believe that they are pretty much the same and that human beings meet God fully and completely as he is through his actions. Karl Rahner, The Trinity, To put it another way: And since God acts as a threefold God, God himself must be threefold. Some Western writers hint at the idea that there is no more to God than his actions in the world. The Eastern Churches disagree, and teach there is much more to God than human experience can reveal.

5: The Doctrine of Original Sin

Some countries, such as Chile, Iceland, Hungary and Israel, appear to suffering from 'original sin mystery trinity' as satisfying a plausible level of good governance and implementing a flexible exchange rate regime but not being able to reducing OSIN below around unity.

Article V “Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation The Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the church. The names of the canonical books are: All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account canonical. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses as touching ceremonies and rites doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral. Article VII “Of Original or Birth Sin Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam as the Pelagians do vainly talk , but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually. Article VIII “Of Free Will The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith, only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly: When you have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants. Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after justification. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and, by the grace of God, rise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as long as they live here; or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent. Article XIV “Of Purgatory The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardon, worshiping, and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the Word of God. Article XV “Of Speaking in the Congregation in Such a Tongue as the People Understand It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood by the people. For the contemporary interpretation of this and similar articles, i. The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves condemnation, as St. Article XVII “Of Baptism Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration or the new birth. The Baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church. Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of our Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith. Article XX “Of the One Oblation of Christ, Finished upon the Cross The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in the which it is commonly said that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the

dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the rites and ceremonies of the church to which he belongs, which are not repugnant to the Word of God, and are ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like, as one that offendeth against the common order of the church, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren. Every particular church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification. Article XXIII

â€” Of the Rulers of the United States of America The President, the Congress, the general assemblies, the governors, and the councils of state, as the delegates of the people, are the rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the Constitution of the United States and by the constitutions of their respective states. And the said states are a sovereign and independent nation, and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability. It was not one of the Articles of Religion voted upon by the three churches. It is a legislative enactment but is not a part of the Constitution.

6: WHAT DO UNITED METHODISTS BELIEVE

The Christian doctrines of original sin and the historical fall of Adam have been in retreat since the rise of modernity. Here leading scholars present a theological, biblical, and scientific case for the necessity of belief in original sin and the historicity of Adam and Eve in response to contemporary challenges.

The official United Methodist doctrine is that Jesus was the Son of God, the child of the virgin Mary and the Holy Spirit, truly God and truly Man, who for us and for our salvation came down from heaven. He is eternal Savior and Mediator, who intercedes for us and by him all persons will be judged. As ministering servant he lived, suffered and died on the cross. He was buried, rose from the dead and ascended into heaven to be with the Father, from whence he shall return. He is eternal Savior and Mediator, who intercedes for us, and by him all persons are to be judged. The official United Methodist doctrine is that sin separated all persons from God. Christ, very God and very Man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original sin, but also for the actual sins of people. The official United Methodist doctrine is this: A person by strength of will power alone cannot forsake sin and please God. Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God. In his own strength, without divine grace, man cannot do good works pleasing and acceptable to God. The Holy Spirit takes up residence in that person, teaching and equipping him or her to be a disciple of Christ, and confirming that the person is indeed a child of God. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith, only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort. By this new birth the believer becomes reconciled to God and is enabled to serve him with the will and the affections. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord. I believe in the Holy Spirit. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power and eternity - - - the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. He is infinite in power, wisdom, justice, goodness and love, and rules with gracious regard for the well-being and salvation of men, to the glory of his name. We believe the one God reveals himself as the Trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, distinct but inseparable, eternally one in essence and power. The official United Methodist doctrine is that the Bible was inspired by God and contains all things necessary for salvation. When read under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the Bible is our true rule and guide for faith and practice. Although the law given from God by Moses concerning ceremonies and rites does not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral. It is to be received through the Holy Spirit as the true rule and guide for faith and practice. Whatever is not revealed in or established by the Holy Scriptures is not to be made an article of faith nor is it to be taught as essential to salvation. The official United Methodist doctrine is that Jesus will judge the living and the dead. We believe in the resurrection of the dead; the righteous to life eternal and the wicked to endless condemnation. The official United Methodist doctrine is that Jesus Christ will return again in glory, bringing human history to a close, and inaugurating his Kingdom in all its fullness. The Holy Spirit convinces the world of sin, and leads persons to a response in faith to the gospel. He convinces the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment. He leads persons through faithful response to the gospel into the fellowship of the Church. He comforts, sustains, and empowers the faithful and guides them into all truth. The official United Methodist doctrine is that the baptism of believers signifies repentance and forgiveness of sin, new birth, and the entry into Christian discipleship. Young children, with or without baptism, are under the atonement of Christ and as heirs of the Kingdom of God are acceptable subjects for Christian baptism. For them baptism is a symbol of God taking the initiative toward them. Their baptism should be followed by Christian nurture within the church. Hopefully, they will be led at a later time to receive the gift of salvation through profession of faith in Christ. The Baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church. We believe Baptism signifies entrance into the household of faith, and is a symbol of repentance and inner cleansing from sin, a representation of the new birth in Christ Jesus and a mark of Christian discipleship. Children of believing parents through Baptism become the special responsibility of the Church. They should be nurtured and led to personal acceptance of Christ, and by profession of faith confirm their Baptism. Those who in faith eat the broken bread and drink the

blessed cup partake of the body and blood of Christ in a spiritual manner until He comes in glory. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith. Those who rightly, worthily and in faith eat the broken bread and drink the blessed cup partake of the body and blood of Christ in a spiritual manner until he comes.

7: Catalog Record: The doctrines of Original Sin and the Trinity | Hathi Trust Digital Library

I believe that the United States of America did not escape the original sin of racism. To paraphrase the great theologian James Cone, speaking at Trinity, Wall Street on January 20, , the Founding Fathers of America founded America while owning slaves and they saw nothing wrong with it.

Its genius and character, its doctrines, precepts, and objects cannot be treated as matters of private opinion or deduction, unless we may reasonably so regard the Spartan institutions or the religion of Mahomet. It may indeed legitimately be made the subject-matter of theories; what is its moral and political excellence, what its due location in the range of ideas or of facts which we possess, whether it be divine or human, whether original or eclectic, or both at once, how far favourable to civilization or to literature, whether a religion for all ages or for a particular state of society, these are questions upon the fact, or professed solutions of the fact, and belong to the province of opinion; but to a fact do they relate, on an admitted fact do they turn, which must be ascertained as other facts, and surely has on the whole been so ascertained, unless the testimony of so many centuries is to go for nothing. Christianity is no theory of the study or the cloister. It has long since passed beyond the letter of documents and the reasonings of individual minds, and has become public property. Its "sound has gone out into all lands," and its "words unto the ends of the world. All such views of Christianity imply that there is no sufficient body of historical proof to interfere with, or at least to prevail against, any number whatever of free and independent hypotheses concerning it. But this, surely, is not self-evident, and has itself to be proved. Till positive reasons grounded on facts are adduced to the contrary, the most natural hypotheses, the most agreeable to our mode of proceeding in parallel cases, and that which takes precedence of all others, is to consider that the society of Christians, which the Apostles left on earth, were of that religion to which the Apostles had converted them; that the external continuity of name, profession, and communion, argues a real continuity of doctrine; that, as Christianity began by manifesting itself as of a certain shape and bearing to all mankind, therefore it went on so to manifest itself; and that the more, considering that prophecy had already determined that it was to be a power visible in the world and sovereign over it, characters which are accurately fulfilled in that historical Christianity to which we commonly give the name. It is not a violent assumption, then, but rather mere abstinence from the wanton admission of a principle which would necessarily lead to the most vexatious and preposterous scepticism, to take it for granted, before proof to the contrary, that the Christianity of the second, fourth, seventh, twelfth, sixteenth, and intermediate centuries is in its substance the very religion which Christ and His Apostles taught in the first, whatever may be the modifications for good or for evil which lapse of years, or the vicissitudes of human affairs, have impressed upon it. It is possible; but it must not be assumed. The onus probandi is with those who assert what it is unnatural to expect; to be just able to doubt is no warrant for disbelieving. Accordingly, some writers have gone on to give reasons from history for their refusing to appeal to history. They say, in the words of Chillingworth, "There are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age: This is a fair argument, if it can be maintained, and it brings me at once to the subject of this Essay. On the contrary, I shall admit that there are in fact certain apparent variations in its teaching, which have to be explained; thus I shall begin, but then I shall attempt to explain them to the exculpation of that teaching in point of unity, directness, and consistency. Meanwhile, before setting about this work, I will address one remark to Chillingworth and his friends: It might, I grant, be clearer on this great subject than it is. This is no great concession. History is not a creed or a catechism, it gives lessons rather than rules; still no one can mistake its general teaching in this matter, whether he accept it or stumble at it. Bold outlines and broad masses of colour rise out of the records of the past. They may be dim, they may be incomplete; but they are definite. And this one thing at least is certain; whatever history teaches, whatever it omits, whatever it exaggerates or extenuates, whatever it says and unsays, at least the Christianity of history is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth, it is this. And Protestantism has ever felt it so. I do not mean that every writer on the Protestant side has felt it; for it was the fashion at first, at least as a

rhetorical argument against Rome, to appeal to past ages, or to some of them; but Protestantism, as a whole, feels it, and has felt it. This is shown in the determination already referred to of dispensing with historical Christianity altogether, and of forming a Christianity from the Bible alone: It is shown by the long neglect of ecclesiastical history in England, which prevails even in the English Church. It is melancholy to say it, but the chief, perhaps the only English writer who has any claim to be considered an ecclesiastical historian, is the unbeliever Gibbon. To be deep in history is to cease to be a Protestant. And this utter incongruity between Protestantism and historical Christianity is a plain fact, whether the latter be regarded in its earlier or in its later centuries. Protestants can as little bear its Ante-nicene as its Post-tridentine period. I have elsewhere observed on this circumstance: No; he must allow that the alleged deluge has done its work; yes, and has in turn disappeared itself; it has been swallowed up by the earth, mercilessly as itself was merciless. Here then I concede to the opponents of historical Christianity, that there are to be found, during the years through which it has lasted, certain apparent inconsistencies and alterations in its doctrine and its worship, such as irresistibly attract the attention of all who inquire into it. They are not sufficient to interfere with the general character and course of the religion, but they raise the question how they came about, and what they mean, and have in consequence supplied matter for several hypotheses. A second and more plausible hypothesis is that of the Anglican divines, who reconcile and bring into shape the exuberant phenomena under consideration, by cutting and casting away as corruptions all usages, ways, opinions, and tenets, which have not the sanction of primitive times. They maintain that history first presents to us a pure Christianity in East and West, and then a corrupt; and then of course their duty is to draw the line between what is corrupt and what is pure, and to determine the dates at which the various changes from good to bad were introduced. Such a principle of demarcation, available for the purpose, they consider they have found in the dictum of Vincent of Lerins, that revealed and Apostolic doctrine is "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus," a principle infallibly separating, on the whole field of history, authoritative doctrine from opinion, rejecting what is faulty, and combining and forming a theology. That "Christianity is what has been held always, everywhere, and by all," certainly promises a solution of the perplexities, an interpretation of the meaning, of history. What can be more natural than that divines and bodies of men should speak, sometimes from themselves, sometimes from tradition? Here, then, we have a short and easy method for bringing the various informations of ecclesiastical history under that antecedent probability in its favour, which nothing but its actual variations would lead us to neglect. Here we have a precise and satisfactory reason why we should make much of the earlier centuries, yet pay no regard to the later, why we should admit some doctrines and not others, why we refuse the Creed of Pius IV. Such is the rule of historical interpretation which has been professed in the English school of divines; and it contains a majestic truth, and offers an intelligible principle, and wears a reasonable air. It is congenial, or, as it may be said, native to the Anglican mind, which takes up a middle position, neither discarding the Fathers nor acknowledging the Pope. It lays down a simple rule by which to measure the value of every historical fact, as it comes, and thereby it provides a bulwark against Rome, while it opens an assault upon Protestantism. Such is its promise; but its difficulty lies in applying it in particular cases. The rule is more serviceable in determining what is not, than what is Christianity; it is irresistible against Protestantism, and in one sense indeed it is irresistible against Rome also, but in the same sense it is irresistible against England. It strikes at Rome through England. It admits of being interpreted in one of two ways: It cannot at once condemn St. Bernard, and defend St. This general defect in its serviceableness has been heretofore felt by those who appealed to it. It was said by one writer; "The Rule of Vincent is not of a mathematical or demonstrative character, but moral, and requires practical judgment and good sense to apply it. How many Fathers, how many places, how many instances, constitute a fulfilment of the test proposed? It is, then, from the nature of the case, a condition which never can be satisfied as fully as it might have been. It admits of various and unequal application in various instances; and what degree of application is enough, must be decided by the same principles which guide us in the conduct of life, which determine us in politics, or trade, or war, which lead us to accept Revelation at all, for which we have but probability to show at most, nay, to believe in the existence of an intelligent Creator. So much was allowed by this writer; but then he added: Peter or his successors were and are universal Bishops, that they have the whole of Christendom for their one diocese in a

way in which other Apostles and Bishops had and have not. He wished to maintain that the sacred doctrines admitted by the Church of England into her Articles were taught in primitive times with a distinctness which no one could fancy to attach to the characteristic tenets of Rome. This may be considered as true. Let us allow that the whole circle of doctrines, of which our Lord is the subject, was consistently and uniformly confessed by the Primitive Church, though not ratified formally in Council. But it surely is otherwise with the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. I do not see in what sense it can be said that there is a consensus of primitive divines in its favour, which will not avail also for certain doctrines of the Roman Church which will presently come into mention. And this is a point which the writer of the above passages ought to have more distinctly brought before his mind and more carefully weighed; but he seems to have fancied that Bishop Bull proved the primitiveness of the Catholic doctrine concerning the Holy Trinity as well as that concerning our Lord. Now it should be clearly understood what it is which must be shown by those who would prove it. Moreover the statements of a particular father or doctor may certainly be of a most important character; but one divine is not equal to a Catena. We must have a whole doctrine stated by a whole Church. The Catholic Truth in question is made up of a number of separate propositions, each of which, if maintained to the exclusion of the rest, is a heresy. This is true, and admits of application to certain other doctrines besides that of the Blessed Trinity in Unity; but there is as little room for such antecedent probabilities as for the argument from suggestions and intimations in the precise and imperative *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, as it is commonly understood by English divines, and is by them used against the later Church and the see of Rome. Now let us look at the leading facts of the case, in appealing to which I must not be supposed to be ascribing any heresy to the holy men whose words have not always been sufficiently full or exact to preclude the imputation. They make mention indeed of a Three; but that there is any mystery in the doctrine, that the Three are One, that They are coequal, coeternal, all increate, all omnipotent, all incomprehensible, is not stated, and never could be gathered from them. Of course we believe that they imply it, or rather intend it. God forbid we should do otherwise! But nothing in the mere letter of those documents leads to that belief. To give a deeper meaning to their letter, we must interpret them by the times which came after. Again, there is one and one only great doctrinal Council in Ante-nicene times. It was held at Antioch, in the middle of the third century, on occasion of the incipient innovations of the Syrian heretical school. Dionysius of Alexandria, and St. Dionysius is accused by St. Basil of having sown the first seeds of Arianism [Note 6]; and St. Gregory is allowed by the same learned Father to have used language concerning our Lord, which he only defends on the plea of an economical object in the writer [Note 7]. Methodius speaks incorrectly at least upon the Incarnation [Note 9]; and St. Cyprian does not treat of theology at all. Such is the incompleteness of the extant teaching of these true saints, and, in their day, faithful witnesses of the Eternal Son. Clement, Tertullian, and the two SS. Dionysii would appear to be the only writers whose language is at any time exact and systematic enough to remind us of the Athanasian Creed. If we limit our view of the teaching of the Fathers by what they expressly state, St. Ignatius may be considered as a Patripassian, St. Justin arianizes, and St. Hippolytus is a Photinian. Again, there are three great theological authors of the Ante-nicene centuries, Tertullian, Origen, and, we may add, Eusebius, though he lived some way into the fourth. Further, Bishop Bull allows that "nearly all the ancient Catholics who preceded Arius have the appearance of being ignorant of the invisible and incomprehensible immensam nature of the Son of God [Note 12]; an article expressly taught in the Athanasian Creed under the sanction of its anathema. It must be asked, moreover, how much direct and literal testimony the Ante-nicene Fathers give, one by one, to the divinity of the Holy Spirit? This alone shall be observed, that St. Basil, in the fourth century, finding that, if he distinctly called the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity by the Name of God, he should be put out of the Church by the Arians, pointedly refrained from doing so on an occasion on which his enemies were on the watch; and that, when some Catholics found fault with him, St. Athanasius took his part [Note 13]. Could this possibly have been the conduct of any true Christian, not to say Saint, of a later age? And now, as to the positive evidence which those Fathers offer in behalf of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, it has been drawn out by Dr. Burton and seems to fall under two heads.

Eastern Orthodox theology is the theology particular to the Eastern Orthodox Church (officially the Orthodox Catholic Church).

Even more Christians are ignorant of its history and origin: Finally, most Christians do not know the fact that the doctrine of original sin is really a theory. In fact, there are more than three differing theories of original sin. The admission of A. Strong as to the unsatisfactory nature of even the best of these theories is very interesting: We must grant that no one, even of these latter theories, is wholly satisfactory. Now let us see what the advocates of the doctrine theory of original sin teach: The whole human race sinned in Adam when he sinned. When Adam sinned, human nature was corrupted, so that now all men are born with a sinful nature. Man sins by nature and cannot help but sin. Even newborn babies open their eyes in this world under the "wrath and curse" of God. They are guilty and condemned from the moment of their birth. This is the incredible dogma that is unblushingly taught by those who hold to the doctrine of original sin. Up to this point we have spoken of the theory of original sin without distinguishing between the differing theories. But now, let us look at the historical origin of each of the three main theories, along with their distinctive features, as outlined below: This theory was formulated by Augustine in the fifth century A. The Augustinian Theory affirms that, by virtue of organic unity, the whole human race existed in Adam at the time of his transgression. It had its origin with Cocceius in the 17th century A. According to this theory, God made a covenant with Adam, agreeing to bestow upon all his descendants eternal life for his obedience, but making the penalty for his disobedience to be the condemnation of all his descendants. Since our legal representative or federal head did sin, God imputes his sin, guilt, and condemnation to all his descendants. It was thought that this theory was necessary because of the problem in the Augustinian Theory of accounting for the non-imputation of the subsequent sins of Adam and less remote ancestors for if real existence in Adam explained our responsibility for his first sin, why should not real existence in Adam and in subsequent ancestors make us guilty for those sins, too? The Theory of Mediate Imputation. This theory is also called the Theory of Condemnation for Depravity. This is the theory formulated by Placeus in the 17th century A. But when his first view was condemned by the Synod of the French Reformed Church in , he published this later view. According to this view, all men are born with a depraved nature and are guilty and condemnable for that nature. They are not viewed as being guilty because of the sin of Adam, as in the Federal Theory. Instead it is the corrupted nature which they inherit from Adam that is sufficient cause and legal ground for God to condemn them. It is probably shocking for the Christian who has been taught these theories as Bible truths to be told that not one word of any of them can be found in the Bible. Christians believe these theories to be Bible doctrines because theologians, preachers, and Sunday school teachers teach them as if they were Bible doctrines quoted directly from the Bible, and give them a semblance of credence with Bible texts quoted out of context. However, these theories are not Bible doctrines. Where can you find written in the Bible that "The whole human race existed in Adam at the time of his transgression"? Or where can it be found written in the Bible that "Adam was the federal head and moral representative of the race, and God made a covenant with Adam, agreeing to bestow upon all his descendants eternal life for his obedience and making the penalty for his disobedience to be the condemnation of all his descendants"? Or where in the Bible can it be found written that "All men are guilty and condemnable for the depraved nature with which they are born"? These theories are not in the Bible. You can search the Bible through from cover to cover and you will never find a word of these theories on its pages. The fact that mere men have had the boldness to teach these theories as Bible truths is a serious and sobering fact. God has twice warned men not to tamper with his Holy Word, neither adding to it nor taking from it. There is another sobering fact that should be of interest to every Christian who has ever been an adherent of the doctrine of original sin. The theologians themselves, who advocate the doctrine of original sin, prove conclusively that it is false. For instance, those theologians who advocate the Realistic Theory the Augustinian Theory prove conclusively that the Federal and Mediate Imputation Theories are unscriptural and false. On the other hand, those theologians who advocate the Federal Theory prove just as conclusively that the Realistic and Mediate

Imputation Theories are unscriptural and false. Each theologian, in his turn, proves all the other theories to be false. Hodge is an advocate of the Federal theory of original sin. His arguments show conclusively that the Realistic Theory is false: The realistic theory cannot be admitted. The assumption that we acted thousands of years before we were born, so as to be personally responsible for such act, is a monstrous assumption. It is, as Baur says, an unthinkable proposition; that is, one to which no intelligible meaning can be attached. We did not then exist. We had no being before our existence in this world; and that we should have acted before we existed is an absolute impossibility. The doctrine, therefore, which supposes that we are personally guilty of the sin of Adam on the ground that we were the agents of that act, that our will and reason were so exercised in that action as to make us personally responsible for it and for its consequences, is absolutely inconceivable. Berkhof is also an advocate of the Federal Theory. These are some of his arguments against the Realistic Theory: And, If in Adam human nature as a whole sinned, and that sin was therefore the actual sin of every part of that human nature, then the conclusion cannot be escaped that the human nature of Christ was also sinful and guilty because it had actually sinned in Adam. Strong, who advocates the theory which the above theologians have rejected, in his turn, rejects the Federal Theory which they advocate: It impugns the justice of God by implying: We not only never authorized Adam to make such a covenant, but there is no evidence that he ever made one at all. It is not even certain that Adam knew he should have posterity. This is not only to assume a false view of the origin of the soul, but also to make God directly the author of sin. Hodge himself, although he is an advocate of the Federal Theory of original sin, still admits that it is somewhat difficult to reconcile his view with the justice and goodness of God: It may be difficult to reconcile the doctrine of innate evil dispositions with the justice and goodness of God, but that is a difficulty which does not pertain to this subject. A malignant being is an evil being, if endowed with reason, whether he was so made or so born. And a benevolent rational being is good in the universal judgment of men, whether he was created or so born. We admit that it is repugnant to our moral judgments that God should create an evil being; or that any being should be born in a state of sin, unless his being so born is the consequence of a just judgment. All the above theologians reject the Mediate Imputation Theory. Man is not only condemned for a sinfulness of which God is the author, but is condemned without any real probation. Sheldon, who rejects all three of these theories makes this comment on the Mediate Imputation Theory: An evil which is matter of pure inheritance cannot rationally be made the ground of the moral reprobation of the person inheriting. To him it is calamity, and more properly calls for compassion than for condemnation. If it is irrational cruelty to blame one for a bodily deficit which was thus given, rather than acquired by personal misconduct, it is, in like manner, gross injustice to blame one for a spiritual deficit which was imposed outright and in no part was acquired. From this, we see that the dogma of original sin is proven false by its very advocates. If, then, it is false, where did it come from and how did it come to be received as a Christian doctrine? I quote again from Finney: It is a relic of heathen philosophy, and was foisted in among the doctrines of Christianity by Augustine, as everyone may know who will take the trouble to examine for himself. The above statement by Finney can be confirmed by a simple reading of church history. Church history records that from the second and third centuries A. This influence was profound. There was gross licentiousness on the one hand and extreme asceticism on the other; veneration and worship of saints, relics, images, and pictures; the development of a priesthood with priestly rituals and ceremonies; magical and spiritual powers ascribed to water, sacred words, and signs; water baptism for the remission of sins; and the baptism of infants. Heathen mythology was introduced and given a Christian form. The heathen concept of a purgatory was accepted with its doctrine of the purging of sins in the after life, and the saying of masses and prayers for the dead. Many of the theologians during these first centuries were converts from heathenism, who wedded their pagan philosophical concepts to Christianity. These were literary men, educated in the philosophies, who gave the concepts of their heathen beliefs to Christianity, thereby corrupting its purity. To read the theological writings of some of these early "church fathers" is like reading a fantastic story! And it was these early church fathers, from the second and third centuries on, who made the first allusions to a doctrine of original sin. Tertullian was one of the first church fathers to allude to a doctrine of original sin. His views on sin harmonize with his stoic philosophy. He believed that the soul was physical and that it was propagated by the parents in procreation. He gives an account of a Montanist prophetess, who

professed to have seen a soul and attempted to describe its outward appearance. Because of his materialistic concept the stoical idea of the essential unity of matter and spirit, i. He taught that sin is a physical taint that is propagated from the parent to the child through procreation. Origen was another of the church fathers who taught a doctrine of original sin. He was a student of all the current philosophies and far outstripped Tertullian in wild philosophical speculation. His theology bears the unmistakable marks of both Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism. He taught the preexistence of souls and that all men sinned and fell in a former existence. His belief was that men, before their existence in this world, were spirits without bodies, and that the material world was created by God for the disciplining and purifying of these fallen spirits. Fallen man had been banished into material bodies to be disciplined and purified. He taught that this estrangement of fallen spirits would some day come to an end, and all men would be saved. Even the devil and demons would someday be restored to God. Origen believed in a purgatorial fire where souls would be punished and prepared for the presence of God.

9: Eastern Orthodox theology - Wikipedia

A profession of faith formulated by the Councils of Nicea () and Constantinople (), the Nicene Creed articulates the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Nicene Creed Augustine in the fourth century, the doctrine of Original Sin states that the sin of Adam and Eve affected all of humanity, so that all human beings are born with a sinful nature.

Edit You play two Source Hunters who devote their lives to ridding a mysterious energy known as Source from the world of Rivelon. A routine murder investigation unfolds into a much larger and dangerous adventure and the fate of something much larger is placed into your hands. Original Sin goes back to the values of memorable cRPGs: There is only one main goal, and how you get there is completely up to you. Original Sin does all these things with a modern, state-of-the-art 3D representation. Experience Gripping, Party and Turn-based Combat Make optimal use of your action points, skills, spells, equipment, and even the environment to overcome the challenges set before you. Hire henchmen to balance out your party. See through the behaviors, and the strengths and weaknesses of your opponents. Bend combat rules to your advantage or suffer miserable defeat. Just like in a pen and paper RPG, we allow the party members to weigh in on decisions. With our unique coop dialogue system, there is no party leader. If both heroes are close enough to a dialogue, both participate and make the final decision together. This does mean one party member could run off and talk to people and make decisions all by himself. Yes, we support trolls. Every decision adds to a social stat: Will they end up as friends and even lovers, or do they have to learn to live together out of sheer necessity? Get Your Hands Dirty: Original Sin presents you with a familiar world in another era. Global reputation, individual attitudes, factions, different types of persuasion, bribing, bidding, stealing, lock picking, pick pocketing, line of sight, hearing, patrols, jail break There are dozens upon dozens of items to find, and even if they do seem useless, experiment with combining items! Found a nice, sturdy branch and some devilishly sharp nails? You now have all the ingredients you need to make a nasty mace For instance, you can manipulate the four elements to work together and against each other as you would expect them to e. Explore a World Brimming with Diverse Environments, Myriad Creatures and Tons of Desirable Items From coastal towns to haunted woods; from war-torn farmlands to frozen wastes inhabited all by creatures that are frightening, lethal and even grotesque, Original Sin has it all. And to go up against your foes even more weapons, equipment and all kinds of magical paraphernalia can be obtained. When will this be out? We are currently aiming for November Will there be a physical release? Will this be DRM free? What engine is this? This is our own in-house engine. Do we get to create our own characters? When you start a new game, you will have to create two heroes. You choose their sex, appearance, and you customize your starting builds by distributing stat points and by choosing their first skills. What about character development? Character development follows the philosophy of the game: Just like other Divinity games, Divinity Original Sin is classless. We are still playing around with the balancing, but there are currently 6 primary stats, a whole lot of secondary stats, and social stats that you gather throughout the game. At the moment, you get one statpoint per level-up. You also get one skillpoint per level-up, and you can freely choose any skill from any school. There are 6 schools: Yes, the equipment they wear changes their 3D model in game. Combat is turn-based, huh? So what are the rules? Turn order is defined by initiative. At the moment, we have rules such as flanking, backstabbing and attack of opportunity. Turn based with 2 characters I thought this was party based. With, like, a bigger party Each hero can hire a henchman. And you can summon elementals. So party size can grow up to four. And you get to equip them, level them, and manage their inventories. Is there friendly fire? So you could be a complete donkey about it? Also concerning loot drops: Are there races in the world other than orcs and humans? Is it possible to talk your way out of combat? Where it makes sense, yes it is possible. Is it possible to sneak past enemies? Not in our current build, but yes, we are working on that. Is it possible to flee combat? What languages will this be translated to? How does coop work? This makes him the host or server and you just jump right in. You take over one of his two heroes. The host will be able to decide what you will can do to them e. The game is saved on his computer. Why is it called Original Sin? The title will become clear as you play through the main story. Is choice and consequence important? Your choices have an impact

on the world, and on your party. Sometimes immediately, sometimes it will become clear only after a couple of hours. Choice and consequence for us is important, because it makes the world feel alive, real, and it makes you feel like you have an impact on the world, its inhabitants and its stories. It adds to the replayability. To you, as a player, it will often be hard to make a choice, because it will not always be clear what right or wrong is, or how it will affect the world. How big is the game? How long does it take to finish it? This is always a tough question. Do you read everything you see, leave no stone unturned? Do you want to see every pixel on the map? Do you want to try out different dialogue options and quicksave and reload after trying different things? We think we are making a game that should take on average 40 hours to finish. We also thought this of Divine Divinity, and certain people can finish that in 20 hours, while others spend more than hours in one playthrough Our users are encouraged to use our released products for the creation of playthroughs, instructional videos, and similar content. Feel free to publish videos featuring our content on your own website or through services like YouTube and Vimeo. However, we ask you not to take assets e. Larian Studios is not responsible for contacting YouTube on your behalf in order to grant permission for use of our content. If you encounter any trouble in this area, a link to this page should suffice as proof of fair use. Larian Studios reserves the right to change or cancel this permission at any time in its sole discretion. What about the Linux version of Divinity:

The witness of the sun Persistence of human passions Ecg in emergency medicine and acute care Social violence in the prehispanic American Southwest Abbot, F. E. The scientific method. Pt. XIII: Adolescent medicine In a corner of the United States Integrated science bill tillery The Complete Poetry of Edgar Allan Poe The family law reform act To the girls and boys. Explaining long-term economic change The Zander Family Step 2 : Identify the sources of the conflict Charlemagnes Legacy High Medieval Franc (High Medieval) Fung kingdom of Sennar Blackbeards time Robinson, J. The cause of heaven in Mexico. Faster, smaller, cheaper The Complete Wordstudy Dictionary Lineage of Diamond Light (Crystal Mirror) Biomonitoring our streams Pistoltown (Buckskin, No 3) Merino laminates price list 2017 Sociology And Ethics Nuclear physics for engineers and scientists Piety and Profession Facilitating community, enabling democracy: new roles for local government managers John Nalbandian Electron diffraction in the electron microscope Tales from the Devils ice Excel vba shell script file Igcse maths formula sheet 2018 Economics Selections Machine generated contents note: Profogue Part One Forest Food Webs (Early Bird Food Webs) A cute love story Literature review on ing difficulties Making sense out of standardized test scores Introduction to quantum gis The USSR and Arabia