

## SUPPOSED PROOF TEXTS OF ORIGINAL SIN

The doctrine of *Original Sin* boils down to this:

- I have a sinful nature by birth.
- I have "inherited" this sinful nature from Adam.
- This sinful nature is going to make me sin against my will.
- God is going to condemn me to Hell for having this sinful nature.

Now, I am going to go through some verses that supposedly prove the doctrine of original sin. Like the trinity doctrine, scriptures are taken out of context and ideas placed in the minds of people what scriptures do not teach.

### Gen. 5:3

And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, **after his image**; and called his name Seth.

This passage of scripture supposedly teaches that man lost the image of God because he has inherited the sin of Adam. Nowhere in the passage is it stating anything about the spiritual and moral state at Seth's birth. One cannot imply or attempt to redefine sin as a *genetic substance* rather than a choice.

Adam begot children in his own likeness, after his image, in the sense of *outward appearance*, flesh. It does not state or imply that we are born in Adam's *moral* likeness.

Everyone is made in the image of God just as Adam was originally created. To say that man has lost the image of God because of Adam's sin is untrue. Furthermore, Gen. 9:6 refutes the assumption that we lost the image of God and born sinful. The New Testament confirms all are created in the image of God. (1 Cor. 11:7 and James 3:9) Man has not lost the image of God, but rather he has *corrupted that image* through sinful choices.

### Gen. 6:5

The LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

The passage is not referring to babies or what constitution they were born with. Please read the context of the passage. What God said preceded the flood. These people lived in wickedness and the wickedness was great. God told Noah, who was not wicked, whose heart was not continuously evil, that he would destroy those on the earth with a flood. This great wickedness was not the result of babies whose intentions and thoughts were continually evil, but something the *adults* were doing.

This verse does not teach universal depravity or babies born inherently evil. The condemnation is the fact that they engaged in wicked deeds (God "**saw**") not that they were born in sin.

### Ex. 20:5; 34:7; Deut 5:9

You are not to bow down to them [idols] in worship or serve them; because I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the iniquity of the parents, to the third and fourth generations of those who hate me. (Ex. 20:5)

He graciously loves thousands, and forgives iniquity, transgression, and sin. But he does not leave the guilty unpunished, visiting the iniquity of the ancestors on their children, and on their children's children to the third and fourth generation. (Ex. 34:7)

You are not to bow down to them in worship or serve them; because I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the iniquity of their parents, to the third and fourth generations of those who hate me. (Deut. 5:9)

The verses speak of God visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children and the children's children, to the **third and the fourth generations**.

Ezek. 18:20 is clear that God does not hold the son guilty for the father's sin. Furthermore, if sin is "transmitted" to the third or fourth generations, how can any of us be guilty of Adam's sin since we are way beyond the third and fourth generation?

Ex. 20:5 shows the same, but keep reading and notice **why** God is visiting:

...visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation **of them that HATE ME**.

However:

And **showing mercy unto thousands** of them **that love me and keep my commandments**. (Deut. 5:10)

There is nothing said about born guilty, born in sin, nor any mention of Adam's sin.

### **Ps. 58:3**

The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies.

This one verse is taken out of context to prove that all babies are born sinful. Notice the words; "go astray as soon as they are born," not that they were born that way.

Upon closer examination, it actually opposes the argument that all mankind are born sinners and in a lost state. How so? Notice the RIGHTEOUS in verse 10 who do not go astray. If one wants to take the interpretation of the passage literally, then let us at least be consistent.

If we read the whole context, we find two classes of people:

- The wicked
- The righteous

It is apparent that the wicked go astray, but then we have the righteous that do not; therefore, all are not born astray. How can one be born lost and go astray when they are already astray! You cannot go off course if you already are.

Please read the whole Psalm. Notice it is not addressed to babies, but *adults*. He speaks to the *congregation*, to the sons of men (v.1). He also says, "No, in heart you work unrighteousness; on earth you weigh out the violence of your hands" (v.2). This is not about seeking vengeance on babies. It is about taking vengeance on the wicked that do nothing but engage in violence.

### **Isa 48:8**

Surely you did not hear, surely you did not know; Surely from **long ago** your ear was not opened. For I knew that you would deal very treacherously, and were called a **transgressor from the womb**.

This verse in Isa. 48 is similar to the previous verse. The house of Jacob is addressed, not babies. These people are rebellious and very wicked, and they were that way from “long ago,” from “the womb,” meaning, from their **youth** (the same word for “womb” is translated as “**youth**” in Gen. 8:21). Because they were transgressors from their youth, God knew what they would become. God is not saying babies are born wicked and commit transgressions when they are born from their mother’s womb. Babies are not born sinning. What baby do you know who comes out of the womb committing sin?

### **Jer. 17:9**

The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?

Again, context. If we read the verse following it, God tells us what he means by the deceitful heart. He said, "I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." Scripture says it is a man's ways, it is the "fruit of his DOINGS." There is nothing that says it was the *state of his being*.

### **Ps. 51:5**

Now we come to the mother of all verses. Without a doubt, this is the most quoted verse to try to prove we are all born sinners. The verse reads:

Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.

Be careful of the NIV because it states, “*Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me.*” This is not a translation, but rather an interpretation and shows the bias of the translators to promote the original sin doctrine. In the New Testament, they use the phrase “sinful nature” such as in Rom. 7:18, 25. There is no such adjective (sinful) found before the word nature (except in the NIV!).

No one is sinful before or at birth! Sin is not inherited, it is committed! It is a transgression of God’s law (1 John 3:4). To be a sinner, one must commit sins.

According to original sin advocates, we are to believe that from the moment of conception a sinner is being formed in the mother’s womb, that the essence of his substance will be saturated with sin that is passed down from Adam.

First, David did not say this is the state of his constitution, nor is it a decree against all mankind. David makes no mention of Adam or Adam's sin. Secondly, David does not state that he was born guilty or born a sinner. Verse one describes the guilt of his mother who engaged in a sexual union that was an act of sin which produced David. He is not blaming his mother for him being a sinner or born a sinner. He is simply stating the fact that he was born into a sinful world, into a sinful environment, "brought forth in iniquity." Sin is all around him from birth just like the rest of us when we were born.

Consider parallel language in Acts 2:8. People were born in a native language or tongue:

And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?

Were they born in a language? Did they speak a certain language because they were born in it? No. The people around them spoke it, so eventually they learned it. Likewise, David was not guilty of sin from birth, but he was born into a sinful environment and into sinful influences, thus, he soon learned to sin as one learns a language.

### **Job 14: 4; 15:14; 25:4**

Who can produce a clean thing from an unclean thing? No one! (14:4)

What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? (15:14)

How then can man be justified with God? Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? (25:4)

These verses are supposed to prove original sin. The fact is, the entire human race, "born of a woman," falls into voluntary moral depravity because of the combination of influences in that direction (the world, the flesh, and the devil). The verses do not say every woman is inherently unclean or that all are born depraved.

The questions from Job 25:4 (pronounced Jobe not Job) and 15:14 are directed to Job by his friends in response to Job declaring his innocence. The statements from his friends are not God's position on man. This is Bildad the Shuhite's opinion in chapter 25 who was echoing Eliphaz the Temanite in chapter 15.

When it comes to Job's friends, God ordered them to offer sacrifices in Job's presence and to have Job pray for their forgiveness because of their folly (Job 42).

### **Ecc. 7:20**

For there is not a just man on earth who does good and does not sin.

This is supposed to support man's depravity, but yet verse 29 is ignored where it says that *God made man upright*. The book of Ecclesiastes draws a contrast between good and evil. It shows what is righteous and what is wicked. Nowhere does it prove that all men are born sinners. It simply shows the enormous difference between a righteous person and wicked person.

### **Jer. 13:23**

Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may you also do good, that are accustomed to do evil.

This is not a doctrinal statement on mankind about their nature. It has to do with people who were "accustomed to doing evil," it does not say they were born that way. God does not hold a leopard accountable for not being able to change its spots nor an Ethiopian change his skin. However, original sin advocates will use this verse to prove that since they cannot change, so also the sinner cannot choose anything other than to sin, it is his nature. This is quite concerning since Ezek. 33:13-16 teaches that all man has *freewill* to do good or evil and will be judged regarding his conduct.

### **Rom. 3:10-12**

As it is written, "There is no one righteous; no, not one. There is no one who understands. There is no one who seeks after God. They have all turned away. They have together become unprofitable. There is no one who does good, no, not so much as one."

This refers back to Ps. 14:1-3; Ps. 53:1-6. God looks upon the children of men as a whole, but there are always some exceptions. All through scripture it speaks of righteous people in contrast to the wicked (ex. Gen. 7:1; Gen. 18:23; Gen. 38:26; Job 1:1; Luke 1:6; etc.) There are many occurrences of people like Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Zechariah, Sarah, Ruth, Abigail, Elisabeth and a host of others, both in the Old and New Testaments, who are spoken of as righteous.

All who do evil are the ones who have become corrupt. "Will those who do evil ever learn?" (Ps. 14:4). The lack of understanding is a moral failure. It is not that man is unable to understand. Understanding is always accessible to those who want to know the truth (Ps. 119:104, 130; Isa. 8:10; John 7:17, etc.). To

make Romans 3:10 ("there is none that seeketh after God") a doctrinal statement of all mankind is to make the scriptures to be in contradiction. The LORD says:

You shall seek me, and find me, when you search for me with all your heart. (Jer. 29:13)

### **Rom. 3:23**

For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.

Note Paul did not say all babies are born sinners. He said, "all **have** sinned." The word "have" indicates an activity on every individual's part. Sin is voluntary. *All that have sinned are the ones who have sinned*, all who have broken God's law. What law does a baby break? Infants are incapable of sinning.

### **Rom. 5:12**

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

Notice this does not say men are born in sin. It says death comes because we **HAVE SINNED**.

The word "sinned" is an action verb. This means we have an active part in our own failure. Sin is something we **DO**. Sinning is an act we commit. We are not born condemned. The act of Adam gave man the choice to sin because sin was not present. Adam had two options:

- Obedience
- Disobedience

God gave us freewill. Adam chose the wrong path and so do many others. Adam's act brings death. If we choose to follow Adam's path we die. Jesus' act brings life. In choosing to follow Jesus' path we live. But whether in Adam or the last Adam (Christ), we make a choice. The end result is the result of that choice.

I also want to mention that Romans 5 is not speaking about physical death. It is about spiritual death (which separates us from God. I will explain later). Suffice to say, the context of Romans 5:12-21, Paul speaks of condemnation and justification. The condemnation is referring to spiritual death, for those *who are justified still die physically*. In addition, if "death" as in Romans 6:23 means physical death, *being justified* would mean that **we would not die physically!**

### **Rom. 5:19**

Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all men.

Neither does Romans 5:19 prove that all are born sinners. In Adam we do not die until we choose to disobey. In Christ we do not live until we choose to obey.

Adam's disobedience does not make every baby born lost any more than Christ's death automatically makes every human being found. Through Adam sin has been set before us. Through Christ righteousness has been set before us. If every human was born separated from God because Adam sinned and died, then every human being would be spiritually alive (saved) because Jesus obeyed and lives. But we cannot be saved unless we make a decision and choose to follow Christ (which the end result would be inheriting the kingdom with a life of immortality). Likewise, we do not die spiritually until we choose to disobey God (which the end result is to perish. John 3:16). Ultimately, whether we live or die comes about by the choices we make.

Again, if all are condemned in Adam, then all are saved in Christ. We cannot make one absolute and the other conditional. In other words, **IF** Romans 5 says sin is transmitted to us through Adam in the unconditional sense, then the same chapter as well teaches that the entire race of humans are ALL saved unconditionally because of what Christ did. This would teach Universalism! There is no other way around it. One cannot wrest the scriptures one way while interpreting the identical words another way. The truth is that we are condemned when we commit sins (v. 12), but are saved when we obey and follow Christ.

### **Eph 2:1-3**

You were dead in your trespasses and sins. At that time, you walked in the way of this world, in conformity to the ruler of the domain of the air—the ruler of the spirit who is now operating in the sons of disobedience. We too all lived among them in the cravings of our flesh, indulging the desires of the flesh and the mind. By nature we were children of wrath, just like the others.

It is clear from reading the verses that before conversion we were dead in trespasses and sins. People like to misquote the verse by saying we are all "**born**" dead in trespasses and sins." That is not what the bible says. "Born" is not in the passage.

Furthermore, it does not mention Adam, Adam's sin, or us inheriting the guilt of Adam. They were dead because of sins in *which they once walked* (v2), and conducted themselves in the lusts of the flesh (v3). What the verses prove is that:

1. It contradicts inherited depravity and proves that people sin because of *their own conduct*.
2. "Nature" in the text refers to a *person's character*, which comes because of *repeated practice*, not by inheritance.

What does one do with Rom. 2:14 where it says some people *by nature* obey God's will? The false doctrine of total depravity says that is impossible.

### **1 Co. 15:21-22**

For since by man came death, by Man also came the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive.

This passage is used to support that ALL (spiritually and physically) die due to the transmission of Adam's sin. However, this passage is strictly speaking of physical death as the context is referencing the future (physical) resurrection of the dead. Hence, "even so in Christ all SHALL BE (future) made alive".

According to Paul, physical death is a consequence springing from the man (Adam), just as a glorified body shall come in the future through the man, Jesus the Messiah.

Now, how is it man dies on an account of Adam's sin? I believe Adam was created mortal, that is, flesh and blood (Gen. 2:7; 3:19; 1 Co. 15:45-50). Through his personal act of disobedience, he lost for himself (and descendants) physical access to the "tree of life" (Gen. 3:22) which he (and we) must eat from to physically "live forever" in this *physical body*. As follows, man physically dies due to separation from this tree. Jesus, a living human being, born as all others, came under the same physical consequences. He had a body that aged. He had blood cells that died and reproduced. With each passing day, he was growing older. He got tired, hungry, needed sleep, thirsty, et cetera. If Jesus had lived to be an old man, he would have eventually physically died.

As you can understand by now, the doctrine of original sin did not originate with the bible. Its origins can be traced to Augustine. Calvin, who was a student of Augustine's writings, popularized this false doctrine. It is the influence of Greek philosophy that crept into Christianity.

To make someone a sinful substance from the time of conception is to attack the character of God. How can we say enslavement to sin is a constitutional fault in our makeup? How can God hold us responsible for something we did not choose? Again, this doctrine is blasphemy against God's character. It also leaves us with the conclusion that sinners should be pitied rather than punished because we were born of such a substance (sin) and therefore cannot help but choose to live a life of sin. This makes sin a calamity, not a crime. This makes God out to be some kind of monster. The only reasonable conclusion is that since by nature we cannot choose other than evil, then we cannot be blamed. Furthermore, if this is our nature (sinful) and we had no choice in the matter and condemned for having it, this makes God unjust.

My dear brothers and sisters, God never made us a sinner against our will. We should not expect pity from anyone, especially God, for claiming or implying that He made us subject to have no control over our will by virtue of our natural birth and thus could not help but sin. Let us not disregard what scripture tells us:

Did not he that made me in the womb make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb? (Job 31:15)

Have we not all one Father? Has not one God created us? (Malachi 2:10)

Know that Yahweh, he is God. It is he who has made us, and we are his. We are his people, and the sheep of his pasture. (Psalm 100:3)

Your hands have made me and formed me. (Psalm 119:73)

Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright...(Ecclesiastes 7:29)

Notice the last verse. The full verse says:

Behold, I have found only this, that God made men upright, but they have sought out many devices.

Many will try to say that the “**they**” refers to Adam. Adam is not called, “they.” It has to do with his descendants that were involved in committing all kinds of lawlessness. They were guilty before God and had no forgiveness unless they repented (stop) their sinful behavior:

**Let the wicked forsake his way**, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him **return unto the LORD**, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for **he will abundantly pardon**. (Isa 55:7)

God did not make us with a corrupt nature. The bible is clear that man *corrupts himself*, not born that way:

And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for **all flesh had corrupted his way** upon the earth." (Genesis 6:5-7, 11-12)

(They) **have corrupted themselves**; They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it. (Exodus 32:7-8)

Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have **sought out many inventions**. (Ecclesiastes 7:29)

For I know that after my death ye will utterly **corrupt yourselves**, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you. (Deut. 31:29)

They **have corrupted themselves**, their spot is not the spot of his children: they are a perverse and crooked generation. (Deuteronomy 32:5)

Why do people sin? Why did Lucifer sin? Why did the angels sin? Why did Adam and Eve sin? Did Adam have a sinful nature before he sinned? Did it cause him to sin? After all, he sinned! Does anyone need a "sinful nature" to sin? Of course not. The bible says:

But each one is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it has conceived, bears sin; and the sin, when it is full grown, produces death. (James 1:14-15).

The bible says each one is tempted when he is drawn away by "his own lust," not by some fabricated story of some *dual personality*, otherwise known as *sinful nature*, the *Adamic nature*, and *old nature*.

Sin is something that happens after we are born, not something that is in our genes, DNA, or chromosomes. This doctrine makes sin to be a physical problem, and this is exactly the belief in the majority of Christendom and the world.

There are Scientists who think that some day they will find the cure for the "sin gene." Jehovah Witnesses believe *sin is in the blood*. The Watchtower teaches:

The blood in any person is in reality the person himself. It contains all the peculiarities of the individual from whence it comes. This includes hereditary taints, disease susceptibilities, poisons due to personal living, eating and drinking habits... The poisons that produce the impulse to commit suicide, murder, or steal are in the blood."<sup>1</sup>

Watchtower is saying that such sins reside in physical blood. This is one of the reasons why they will not allow blood transfusions. I also find it ironic that most Christians will accuse me of being a Jehovah's Witness when they have this teaching in common with them.

Sin does not reside in the blood nor does righteousness. The bible does use terms like "innocent blood" and "righteous blood," but nowhere does it give us the idea that *moral properties* reside in the blood. Here are two quotes some may use to try to prove blood has moral properties:

For he took his life in his hand and he struck down the Philistine, and the LORD worked a great salvation for all Israel. You saw it, and rejoiced. Why then will you sin against **innocent blood** by killing David without cause? (1 Sam 19:5)

That upon you may come all the **righteous blood** shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. (Matt. 23:35)

Note it is obvious that it is not referring to *moral properties* in the blood, for physical blood has no moral properties. An innocent person is the one who is free from guilt; not having done wrong or violated any law.

---

<sup>1</sup> Watchtower 9/15/1961, page 564

Some people try to prove that Jesus had "righteous blood" (or "*divine blood*") flowing in his veins by quoting 1 Peter 1:19 for support. Nowhere in the passage does it say anything about "righteous blood." The text says *precious blood*:

...but with the **precious blood** of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot. He was foreknown before the foundation of the world but was made manifest in the last times for the sake of you who through him are believers in God, who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope are in God. (1Pet. 19:20-21)

"Precious" means of great price, costly as a precious stone, highly valued, and much esteemed. There is nothing in there about moral properties in the blood of Jesus Christ. Nothing about the fleshly body of Jesus was different than anyone else ever born on this earth.

### ***Sin Is Not a Physical Problem, It Is a MORAL Problem***

A careful examination of the Hebrew Testament scriptures reveals that no one bears the iniquity of the father. Please take the time to read Ezekiel 18:19-21 very carefully. Nowhere in scripture does it say we are accountable to God for Adam's sin. Each person is responsible for his or her own choices.

Most religions teach that the *Adamic sin* is not something that is forgiven, but something that must be *cleansed* and this will not happen *until we die*. This is simply false.

We have seen in the scriptures that sin is not inherited and nowhere does it say we lost the image of God. What we have done is *abuse that image*. We have corrupted ourselves morally and physically.

In mainstream Christianity (and non-Christians), who believe we are inbred with a sin nature that causes us to sin, end up calling it a *disease*. Thus, alcoholism is a disease, addicted to pornography is a disease, stealing is a disease, et cetera. To be convinced and comforted that sin is a disease that leaves one powerless is simply the perfect excuse of a *learned habit* that someone is not yet willing to give up. What mainstream Christianity has managed to do is convince the world that sin is no longer defined by what we DO, but rather by what we ARE!

Teaching that we are born morally depraved violates reason and scripture, and makes God a cosmic tyrant. Why? Because God condemns us for being born a sinner, totally incapable of doing any good, and condemns us for it.

I would like to conclude here what Charles Finney said concerning this awful doctrine of sinful nature:

Men plead a sinful nature for their excuse. And pray, what is this sinful nature? Do you mean by it that every faculty and even the very essence of your constitution were poisoned and made sinful in Adam, and came down in this polluted state by inheritance to you? Do you mean that you were so born in sin that the substance of your being is all saturated with it, and so that all the faculties of your constitution are themselves sin? Do you believe this?

I admit if this were true, it would make out a hard case. A hard case indeed! Until the laws of my reason are changed, it would compel me to speak out openly and say--Lord, this is a hard case, that Thou shouldst make my nature itself a sinner, and then charge the guilt of its sin upon me! I could not help saying this; the deep echoings of my inner being would proclaim it without ceasing, and the breaking of ten thousand thunderbolts over my head would not deter me from thinking and saying so. The reason God has given me would forever affirm it.

But the dogma is an utter absurdity. For, pray, what is sin? God answers--"transgression of law." And now you hold that your nature is itself a breach of the law of God--nay, that it has always been a

breach of God's law, from Adam to the day of your birth; you hold that the current of this sin came down in the veins and blood of your race--and who made it so? Who created the veins and blood of man? From whose hand sprang this physical constitution and this mental constitution? Was man his own creator? Did sin do a part of the work in creating your physical and your mental constitution? Do you believe any such thing? No; you ascribe your nature and its original faculties to God, and upon Him, therefore, you charge the guilty authorship of your "sinful nature."

But how strange a thing is this! If man is in fault for his sinful nature, why not condemn man for having blue or black eyes? The fact is, sin never can consist in having a nature, nor in what nature is; but only and alone in the bad use which we make of our nature. This is all. Our Maker will never find fault with us for what He has Himself done or made; certainly not. He will not condemn us if we will only make a right use of our powers--of our intellect, our sensibility, and our will. He never holds us responsible for our original nature. If you will observe, you will find that God has given no law prescribing what sort of nature and constitutional powers we should have. He has given no law on these points, the transgression of which, if given, might somewhat resemble the definition of sin. But now since there is no law about nature, nature cannot be a transgression.

Here let me say, that if God were to make a law prescribing what nature or constitution a man must have, it could not possibly be otherwise than unjust and absurd, for the reason that man's nature is not a proper subject for legislation, precept, and penalty, inasmuch as it lies entirely without the pale of voluntary action, or of any action of man at all. And yet thousands of men have held the dogma that sin consists in great part in having a sinful nature. Yes, through long ages of past history, grave theologians have gravely taught this monstrous dogma; it has resounded from pulpits, and has been stereotyped for the press, and men have seemed to be never weary of glorifying this dogma as the surest test of sound orthodoxy! Orthodoxy!! There never was a more infamous libel on Jehovah! It would be hard to name another dogma which more violently outrages common sense. It is nonsense--absurd and utter NONSENSE! I would to God that it were not even worse than nonsense! Think what mischief it has wrought! Think how it has scandalized the law, the government, and the character of God! Think how it has filled the mouths of sinners with excuses from the day of its birth to this hour!

Now I do not mean to imply that the men who have held this dogma have intelligently insulted God with it. I do not imply that they have been aware of the impious and even blasphemous bearings of this dogma upon Jehovah;--I am happy to think that some at least have done all this mischief ignorantly. But the blunder and the mischief have been none the less for the honest ignorance in which they were done.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Oberlin Evangelist, October 25, 1848 *EXCUSES CONDEM GOD*; Sermon by C.G. Finney. Reported by the Editory.

