

Adventist International Institute  
of Advanced Studies  
Theological Seminary

DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN: A HISTORICAL-  
BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF THE THEORIES OF  
ORIGINAL SIN AS SUGGESTED BETWEEN  
THE 16<sup>TH</sup> AND THE 18<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES

A Dissertation  
Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

by  
Kyung Ho Song  
October 1998

## TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	1
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	1
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	4
Purpose and Significance of the Study . . . . .	9
Presuppositions . . . . .	10
Delimitations of the Study . . . . .	13
Methodology and Procedure . . . . .	15
Review of Relevant Literature . . . . .	17
The Theology of Original Sin . . . . .	18
The History of the Doctrine of Original Sin . . . . .	28
Summary . . . . .	32
2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN BETWEEN THE 2ND AND THE 15TH CENTURIES . . . . .	34
Church Fathers before Augustine . . . . .	35
Church Fathers up to Irenaeus . . . . .	36
Justin Martyr . . . . .	37
Irenaeus . . . . .	40
Greek Fathers . . . . .	43
Origen . . . . .	44
Gregory of Nyssa . . . . .	47
John Chrysostom . . . . .	49
Latin Fathers . . . . .	51
Tertullian . . . . .	51
Cyprian . . . . .	53
Ambrose . . . . .	55
The Pelagian Controversy . . . . .	57
Pelagianism . . . . .	58
The Doctrine of Human Freedom . . . . .	58
The Relation of Adam's Sin to That of His Posterity . . . . .	61

Infant Baptism . . . . .	62
Augustinianism . . . . .	63
The Doctrine of Divine Grace . . . . .	64
The Doctrine of Original Sin . . . . .	66
Infant Baptism . . . . .	69
The Condemnation of Pelagianism . . . . .	70
Synod of Carthage, 411 . . . . .	70
Councils of Carthage and Milevis, 416 . . . . .	71
Council of Carthage, 418 . . . . .	72
Council of Ephesus, 431 . . . . .	73
Semi-Pelagianism . . . . .	74
The Ideas of Semi-Pelagianism . . . . .	75
Council of Orange II, 529 . . . . .	76
Middle Ages . . . . .	77
Early Scholastic Period . . . . .	78
Anselm . . . . .	79
Peter Abelard . . . . .	83
Late Scholastic Period . . . . .	86
Bonaventure . . . . .	87
Thomas Aquinas . . . . .	89
Duns Scotus . . . . .	94
Summary . . . . .	96

3. THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN IN THE 16TH CENTURY . . . . .	100
Lutheranism . . . . .	101
Theologians . . . . .	102
Martin Luther . . . . .	102
Philip Melanchthon . . . . .	106
Symbols . . . . .	108
The Augsburg Confession, 1530 . . . . .	109
The Smalcald Articles, 1537 . . . . .	110
The Formula of Concord, 1577 . . . . .	111
Reformed Protestantism . . . . .	114
Theologians . . . . .	114
Huldrych Zwingli . . . . .	115
John Calvin . . . . .	118
Henry Bullinger . . . . .	122
Symbols . . . . .	125
The Gallican Confession, 1559 . . . . .	126
The Belgic Confession, 1561 . . . . .	127
The Second Helvetic Confession, 1566 . . . . .	128
The Anabaptist Movement . . . . .	130
Theologians . . . . .	131
Balthasar Hubmaier . . . . .	131

Pilgram Marpeck . . . . .	134
Menno Simons . . . . .	136
Peter Rideman . . . . .	139
Dirk Philips . . . . .	141
Symbols . . . . .	143
Ridemann's Rechenschaft, 1504 . . . . .	143
The Waterland Confession, 1580 . . . . .	144
Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism . . . . .	144
Roman Catholicism: the Council of Trent, 1545-63 . . . . .	146
Anglicanism: the Thirty-nine Articles, 1563 and 1571 . . . . .	152
Summary . . . . .	154
4. THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN IN THE 17TH AND THE 18TH CENTURIES . . . . .	158
Calvinistic View Developed in the 17th Century . . . . .	159
The Federal Theology . . . . .	160
The Theory of Mediate Imputation . . . . .	163
Joshua Placæus . . . . .	164
The Helvetic Consensus Formula, 1675 . . . . .	165
François Turretin . . . . .	167
Calvinistic Symbols . . . . .	168
The Irish Articles of Religion, 1615 . . . . .	169
The Canons of the Synod of Dort, 1619 . . . . .	170
The Westminster Confession of Faith, 1647 . . . . .	173
The Confession of the Waldenses, 1655 . . . . .	175
Arminian View of Original Sin . . . . .	176
Arminius and the Remonstrants . . . . .	177
James Arminius . . . . .	177
The Remonstrants . . . . .	181
The Five Arminian Articles, 1610 . . . . .	184
George Fox and the Society of Friends . . . . .	186
George Fox . . . . .	186
Robert Barclay . . . . .	188
Fifteen Theses of Robert Barclay, 1675 . . . . .	189
John Wesley and Methodism . . . . .	191
John Wesley . . . . .	192
Richard Watson . . . . .	196

Methodist Articles of Religion, 1784 . . . . .	199
The New England Theology . . . . .	200
Jonathan Edwards . . . . .	201
The New Divinity . . . . .	205
Joseph Bellamy . . . . .	205
Samuel Hopkins . . . . .	207
Nathaniel Emmons . . . . .	209
The New Haven Theology . . . . .	213
Timothy Dwight . . . . .	214
Nathaniel Taylor . . . . .	217
Summary . . . . .	222

5. BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF THE VIEWS OF ORIGINAL SIN SUGGESTED BETWEEN THE 16TH AND THE 18TH CENTURIES . . . . .	225
The Nature of Sin and Guilt . . . . .	226
Threefold Meaning of Sin . . . . .	226
Sin as an Attitude . . . . .	227
Sin as a State . . . . .	231
Relationship between Sin and Guilt . . . . .	232
The Definition of Guilt . . . . .	233
Guilt in the Old Testament . . . . .	235
Guilt in the New Testament . . . . .	236
The Biblical Idea of the Fall and Original Sin . . . . .	240
The State and Status of Adam before the Fall . . . . .	240
The Image of God . . . . .	240
Sinless Nature . . . . .	242
Freedom of Will . . . . .	243
The Head of the Human Race . . . . .	246
Biblical Evidences for Adam's Headship . . . . .	247
Adam as the Father and Representative . . . . .	248
The Effects of the First Sin on Adam Himself . . . . .	251
Guilt . . . . .	252
Death . . . . .	253
Physical Death . . . . .	254
Spiritual Death . . . . .	255
Eternal Death . . . . .	256
Sinful Nature . . . . .	257
The First Sin of Adam and the Human Race . . . . .	260

The Use of Verb "to Impute" in the Bible . . . . .	260
Are the Descendants of Adam Punished Because of His Sin? . . . . .	263
The Effects of the First Sin on Adam's Posterity . . . . .	269
Physical and Spiritual Effects . . . . .	269
Inheritance of Sinful Nature . . . . .	274
Freedom of Human Will after the Fall . . . . .	277
Evaluation of the Theories of Original Sin . . . . .	281
Augustinian-Calvinistic Theories . . . . .	282
The Theories of Realism and Federalism . . . . .	282
The Theory of Mediate Imputation . . . . .	283
Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism . . . . .	283
Non-Calvinistic Theories . . . . .	284
Anabaptism . . . . .	285
Arminianism . . . . .	286
New Divinity and New Haven Theology . . . . .	286
Summary . . . . .	287
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	291
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	300

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The doctrine of original sin was and is still considered one of the most important topics in Christian dogmatics. As Anthony Hoekema argues, this doctrine "has always been an essential aspect of the Christian doctrine of man."<sup>1</sup> Though this doctrine basically belongs to anthropology among the various areas of Christian dogmatics, its significance is not limited to this area. The importance of the doctrine of original sin even extends to the area of soteriology.<sup>2</sup> A different view of original sin

---

<sup>1</sup>Anthony A. Hoekema, Created in God's Image (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 143. Otto Weber emphasizes the importance of the doctrine of original sin in the area of anthropology, stating, "Anthropology revolves around the two concepts of 'image of God' and 'original sin'" (Otto Weber, Foundation of Dogmatics, trans. Darrell L. Grader [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981], 1:596).

<sup>2</sup>Hoekema suggests two reasons why the doctrine of original sin is so important, and why it is intimately connected to the salvation of sinners. "The reason why this doctrine is so important is twofold: (1) the Bible teaches it, and (2) it is only when we understand man's condition by nature (that is, apart from God's grace) that we can appreciate his need for the rebirth and total renewal that redemption in Christ brings about" (Hoekema, 148). Norman Gulley also observes the close relationship between the doctrine of original sin and soteriology as follows: "What are the implications of this fact that we are sinners by

may create a different understanding of the "how" of salvation. In this sense, this doctrine is not less important than any other Christian doctrine. However, it is to be recognized that, in spite of its importance, the doctrine of original sin has been regarded as one of the most difficult and controversial topics of Christian theology.<sup>1</sup>

The idea of original sin has a long history. Some allusions to the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity are found in the writings of some of the earlier Greek and

---

birth, separated from God in conception and birth and subsequently sinners by act? When we can grasp the utterly desperate condition of the race, we can better appreciate how great is the gift of the Savior and our salvation" (Norman R. Gulley, "Preliminary Consideration of the Effects and Implications of Adam's Sin," Adventist Perspectives 2 [1988]: 38-39).

<sup>1</sup>Geoffrey W. Bromiley notes that "original sin raises difficult problems" (Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Historical Theology: An Introduction [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978], 183). G. C. Berkouwer regards the doctrine of original sin as "an area in which a strenuous and emotional debate has been constantly waged throughout the entire history of the Church and her theology" (G. C. Berkouwer, Sin [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971], 424). Then he correctly observes that "the debate is still going strong in our own day" (ibid.). James Leo Garrett also recognizes the difficulty in the study of original sin: "To affirm the universality of sin is easy and to affirm the universality of depravity is not difficult, but to settle on the relationship of the sin of Adam and Eve to our sin is indeed difficult" (James Leo Garrett, Systematic Theology: Biblical, Historical, & Evangelical [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990], 1:493). Hoekema, too, agrees that the doctrine of original sin is "one of the most difficult topics in dogmatics" (Hoekema, 148).

Latin Fathers.<sup>1</sup> But the formulation of the doctrine was a byproduct of the fourth century's debate upon man's free will, mainly between Pelagius and Augustine.<sup>2</sup> In that controversy Augustine developed the doctrine of original sin for the first time in the history of Christian theology. For this reason "it is generally agreed that Augustine was

---

<sup>1</sup>The Greek Fathers were mainly concerned with theology and Christology. Accordingly, in their discussions of anthropological questions, they touched them only lightly. Nevertheless, their views on the imputation of Adam's sin, though not so definite, are found here and there in their writings. The Greek Fathers generally agreed that the physical corruption was propagated in the human race. But for them this physical corruption itself was not sin, and did not involve Adam's posterity in guilt. On the other hand, the traditional Western view of original sin was proposed even before Augustine by some Latin Fathers such as Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, and Ambrose. They held that all men have sinned in Adam, and are therefore born as sinners. See Louis Berkhof, The History of Christian Doctrines (Privately printed, 1937; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1969), 127-30 (page references are from the reprinted edition). See also John H. McKenna, "Infant Baptism: Theological Reflections," Worship 70 (May 1996): 195-96. The ideas of both the Greek and Latin Fathers related to the imputation of Adam's sin are examined in chapter 2.

<sup>2</sup>Pelagius (d. c. 419) was a British lay monk and Christian moralist. His main works are Commentary on Paul to the Romans, Exposition of the Thirteen Epistles of Paul, and Faith in the Trinity.

<sup>3</sup>Born in Tagate, Augustine (Aurelius Augustinus) of Hippo (354-430) was the Bishop of Hippo Regius in Numidia, in Roman North Africa. Among the great number of his writings, the most outstanding are The Confessions (c. 397-410), The City of God (c. 413-27), The Trinity (399-419), and Christian Instruction (395-426).

the first to formulate" the doctrine.<sup>1</sup> From then on, the doctrine of original sin has been one of the most debated subjects in dogmatics throughout the history of the Christian church.

### Statement of the Problem

The study of original sin seeks to answer the question about the relationship between the sin of Adam and that of his descendants.<sup>2</sup> This main question is the hub of a cluster of other related questions, which may be summarized into three:<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>David Parker, "Original Sin: A Study in Evangelical Theory," The Evangelical Quarterly 61 (January 1989): 52. See also Gabriel Daly, "Original Sin," The New Dictionary of Theology, ed. Joseph A. Komonchak (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987), 727; and Mckenna, 196.

<sup>2</sup>Mentioning the necessity of the study of original sin, Garrett points out that the core of the study is to find out the relationship between the sin of the first men and that of the human race: "If all human beings, except Jesus Christ, have sinned and do sin, if all human beings have a depraved or corrupted nature, if sin is more than the individual acts of isolated individual human beings, and if human sin did commence with the sin of Adam and Eve, then the question must be asked: How is the sin of Adam and Eve related to the depravity and sinning of the rest of humankind, and vice versa?" (Garrett, 1:483-84). Millard Erickson, too, shows a similar view in his definition of original sin: "By 'original sin' we mean the dimension of sin with which we begin life, or the effect which the sin of Adam has upon us as a precondition of our lives" (Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983-85], 631).

<sup>3</sup>Gulley, 28-29.

1. Does every sin result from the first sin of Adam?
2. Does the human race share in the guilt of Adam's sin, or only in the results of his sin?
3. Are infants born as sinners?

Various answers have been suggested to these significant questions throughout the long history of the formulation of the Christian doctrines. Several theories concerning original sin have been subdivided or designated by different names,<sup>1</sup> but of all them finally break down into three major views: Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Gulley groups these theories in six: Augustinian, Pelagian, Arminian, Federal, mediate imputation, and the New School or New Haven theory (Gulley, 29-30). Louis Berkhof does the same, but divides them only in two: theories which deny the connection of Adam's sin with that of the race, and theories which acknowledge the connection. According to his understanding, the former includes Pelagianism and Socinianism, Semi-Pelagianism and earlier Arminianism, the New School (New Haven) theory, and the Theology of Crisis, while the latter includes the realistic theory, the doctrine of the covenant of works, and the theory of mediate imputation (Louis Berkhof, Systematic Theology [Privately printed, 1939; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1958], 240-43 [pages references are from the reprinted edition]). Garrett, like Berkhof, classifies all the theories of imputation into two categories--theories teaching the imputation of guilt and theories not teaching the imputation of guilt. He includes three theories in the former--of realism or of the oneness of human nature in Adam, covenantal or federal or representative, and of mediate imputation through depravity; and five in the latter--of bad example, of social as well as biological transmission or moral evil, of "Voluntarily Appropriated Depravity," of an "Inevitable" defect or bias in the human will, and theory of uncondemnable depravity--in the latter (Garrett, 1:486-90).

Augustinianism.<sup>1</sup> Pelagianism teaches that "Adam's sin does not affect his posterity."<sup>2</sup> Semi-Pelagianism argues that "Adam's sin as guilt is not passed on, but his sin caused a loss of 'original righteousness' which makes man unable to attain righteousness without the Spirit."<sup>3</sup> And finally Augustinianism holds that "both the effects and guilt of Adam's sin are imputed to the race."<sup>4</sup> In short, in Pelagianism there is no inheritance of sin; in Semi-Pelagianism what is inherited is the corrupted nature; and in Augustinianism both the corrupted nature and the guilt are inherited.

The majority of today's evangelical theologians, especially Reformed theologians, hold, in one form or another, the Augustinian view of original sin. They strongly believe that all men have sinned in Adam's first act of sin, so that all his descendants have inherited not

---

<sup>1</sup>Semi-Pelagianism and Augustinianism are also designated respectively as "Arminianism" and "Calvinism." Cf. Erickson, 633-34.

<sup>2</sup>Gulley, 31. Pelagians "deny absolutely that there is any necessary connection between our sin and the sin of Adam." For them, "the first was Adam's sin only and does not concern his posterity in any way" (Berkhof, Systematic Theology, 240).

<sup>3</sup>Gulley, 31. Semi-Pelagians argue that "man inherited a natural inability from Adam, but is not responsible for this inability, so that no guilt attaches to it" (Berkhof, Systematic Theology, 241).

<sup>4</sup>Gulley, 31.

only his corrupted nature (pollution) but also the guilt of his sin.<sup>1</sup> Hoekema defines these two elements of original sin as follows:

Original sin includes both guilt and pollution. Guilt is a judicial or legal concept describing one's relationship to the law--in this case, specifically to God's law. . . . Pollution, in distinction from guilt, is a moral concept; it has to do with our moral condition rather than with our status before the law.

---

<sup>1</sup>The following quotations are from the writings of some outstanding evangelical theologians of this century. "It is because of Adam's sin that we are born depraved and subject to God's penal inflictions. . . . Adam's sin is the cause and ground of the depravity, guilt, and condemnation of all his posterity, simply because Adam and his posterity are one, and by virtue of their organic unity, the sin of Adam is the sin of the race" (Augustus Hopkins Strong, Systematic Theology [Philadelphia: Judson, 1907], 593). "We all were involved in Adam's sin, and thus receive both the corrupted nature that was his after the fall, and the guilt and condemnation that attach to his sin" (Erickson, 639). "The point is that all sin because they are sinners. The original sin of Adam and the guilt of sin in some inevitable way passed upon the entire human race. The biblical view is that God holds the entire race to be guilty because of Adam's transgression" (James Montgomery Boice, Foundation of the Christian Faith: A Comprehensive & Readable Theology, rev. ed. [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1986], 205). "Adam's sin was imputed to each member of the human race because each member of the human race actually sinned in Adam when Adam sinned" (Charles C. Ryrie, Basic Theology [Wheaton, IL: Victor, 1987], 224). "All members of the human race were represented by Adam in the time of testing in the Garden of Eden. As our representative, Adam sinned, and God counted us guilty as well as Adam. God counted Adam's guilt as belonging to us, and since God is the ultimate judge of all things in the universe, and since his thoughts are always true, Adam's guilt does in fact belong to us. God rightly imputed Adam's guilt to us" (Wayne Grudem, Systematic Theology [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994], 495).

We can define original pollution as the corruption of our nature that is the result of sin and produces sin.<sup>1</sup>

The Augustinian view has been regarded as the "traditional" theory of original sin. But in Christian theology the meaning of the term "traditional" is ambiguous. Moreover, "traditional" does not necessarily mean "biblical."

---

<sup>1</sup>Hoekema, 148-50.

<sup>2</sup>Parker, 66.

<sup>3</sup>As to the meaning of religious tradition, the Encyclopaedia Britannica reads: "In certain religions, tradition signifies essential doctrines or tenets that are not explicitly set down in sacred scriptures but are accepted as so orthodox and authoritative that they have equal authority with sacred writings and are sometimes used to interpret them" (The New Encyclopaedia Britannica (EB), 1978 rev. ed., s.v. "Tradition"). E. Glenn Hinson's definition of Christian tradition also shows that tradition does not necessarily harmonize with the Bible: "Tradition refers both (1) to the body of beliefs shared with past generations and handed on to succeeding ones and (2) to the process by which those beliefs are transmitted" (E. Glenn Hinson, "Tradition," A New Handbook of Christian Theology, ed. Donald W. Musser and Joseph L. Price [Nashville: Abingdon, 1992], 489-90). Hinson, then, points out that many of the present Protestant doctrines do not originate from the Scriptures but from tradition: "The Protestant Reformers--Luther, Calvin, and others--seized on the principle of 'Scripture alone,' accentuating it more and more in consolidating their position against the Council of Trent's veneration of traditions 'with an equal affection of piety and reverence.' In actual practice, however, tradition did play a role in Protestant theology and practice. Both Luther and Calvin, for instance, accepted the first seven ecumenical councils, cited the church fathers, and invoked tradition to document their interpretation of the Bible" (ibid., 490).

Several questions are raised against the Augustinian view of original sin. The primary and greatest question is whether this theory is really supported by the Bible. Important as this question is, there are several others also demanding satisfactory answers. Does this theory harmonize with the biblical teaching on sin in general? Which was Adam's first sin, his sinful act or his wrong decision previous to the act? If Adam was the head or representative of the race, why did only his first sin affect his posterity? Why not his second or third sin?<sup>1</sup> Is the argument that every man is born guilty based on biblical evidence?

### **Purpose and Significance of the Study**

This study focuses mainly on some relevant moments in the history of the doctrine of original sin. Thus, this study aims to achieve two basic purposes: (1) to compare and analyze the various theories of original sin suggested

---

<sup>1</sup>The Federal Theory holds that Adam stood as the representative head of the entire human race, and that his first sin affected all his descendants. Berkhof explains, "Adam chose the course of disobedience, corrupted himself by sin, became guilty in the sight of God, and as such subject to the sentence of death. And because he was the federal representative of the race, his disobedience affected all his descendants. In His righteous judgment God imputes the guilt of the first sin, committed by the head of the covenant, to all those that are federally related to him. And as result they are born in a depraved and sinful condition as well, and this inherent corruption also involves guilt" (Berkhof, Systematic Theology, 242).

throughout the history of the Christian church, especially between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries; and (2) in evaluation, to search for appropriate biblical answers to the main questions raised by this doctrine.

This study is significant for at least two reasons. First, the survey of the development of the doctrine of original sin provides the necessary historical background to the current controversy centered on this doctrine. Since most of the Protestant churches were established between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, the examination of the developments of the doctrine during this period helps to understand the bases of the current teaching of each Protestant denomination on this subject. Secondly, only a biblical evaluation of the controversial points of the doctrine of original sin can provide a Scripture-based solution to conflicting views.

### **Presuppositions**

Two presuppositions are to be referred to at the outset of this study. The first is related to the degree of credibility to be recognized in the narratives of the Creation and Fall as recorded in Genesis 1-3. Most of the

liberal and neoorthodox theologians deny the historicity of these stories.<sup>1</sup> But, along with most conservative Bible

---

<sup>1</sup>Concerning the views of liberal theologians on the doctrine of creation, Berkhof writes, "In the eighteenth century . . . under the dominating influence of Pantheism and Materialism, Science launched an attack on the Church's doctrine of creation. It substituted the idea of evolution or development for that of absolute origination by a divine fiat. The world was often represented as a necessary manifestation of the Absolute. Its origin was pushed back thousands and even millions of years into an unknown past. And soon theologians were engaged in various attempts to harmonize the doctrine of creation with the teachings of science and philosophy. Some suggested that the first chapters of Genesis should be interpreted allegorically or mythically; others, that a long period elapsed between the primary creation of Gen 1:1, 2 and the secondary creation of the following verses; and still others, that the days of creation were in fact long periods of time" (Berkhof, Systematic Theology, 127). In relation to the arguments of liberal and neoorthodox theologians on the fall of Adam, he states, "Under the influence of Rationalism and evolutionary philosophy the doctrine of the fall of man and its fatal effects on the human race was gradually discarded. The idea of sin was replaced by that of evil, and this evil was explained in various ways. Kant regarded it as something belonging to the supersensible sphere, which he could not explain. For Leibnitz it was due to the necessary limitations of the universe. Schleiermacher found its origin in the sensuous nature of man, and Ritschl, in human ignorance, while the evolutionist ascribes it to the opposition of the lower propensities to a gradually developing moral consciousness. Barth speaks of the origin of sin as the mystery of predestination. Sin originated in the fall, but the fall was not a historical event; it belongs to superhistory. Adam was indeed the first sinner, but his disobedience cannot be regarded as the cause of the sin of the world. The sin of man is in some manner bound up with his creatureliness. The story of paradise simply conveys to man the cheering information that he need not necessarily be a sinner" (ibid., 220). Langdon Gilkey also observes that both liberalism and neoorthodoxy deny the historicity of the creation and fall: "Neoorthodoxy agreed with liberalism that the whole area of spatio-temporal fact and event is the valid object of scientific inquiry, with the result that the hypotheses of science in the areas of

students, this research presupposes that these stories are the objective records of historical events of real occurrence.

The other presupposition is related to the use of the expression "original sin." The expression is used for both the "first sin"<sup>1</sup> of Adam, and the "inherited sin"<sup>2</sup> of his posterity. In this study, however, the phrase "original sin" exclusively designates the "inherited sin."<sup>3</sup>

---

natural and historical events were regarded as authoritative if not exhaustive. Thus, although such symbols as 'creation out of nothing' and the 'fall of Adam' again became important theologically, neoorthodoxy did not quarrel with scientific explanations of the origin of nature and human life" (Langdon Gilkey, "Neoorthodoxy," A New Handbook of Christian Theology, 335).

<sup>1</sup>Latin: *peccatum originale originans*

<sup>2</sup>Latin: *peccatum originale originatum*

<sup>3</sup>Wolfhart Pannenberg, Anthropology in Theological Perspective, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985), 119. The Catholic Encyclopedia, too, observes a twofold application of the term "original sin": "The term original sin designates a number of things. One is a condition of guilt, weakness, or debility found in human beings historically (or in which they are personally situated), prior to their own free option for good or evil. This is a state of being rather than a human act or its consequence. The other meaning has to deal with the origin of that state: its cause or source" (C. J. Peter, "Original Sin: In Catholic Faith and Theology," New Catholic Encyclopedia (NCE), [1967], 10:777).

<sup>4</sup>Some scholars prefer to use the expression "inherited sin" instead of "original sin" to avoid misunderstanding. In relation to this matter, Wayne Grudem argues that "the phrase 'inherited sin' is much more immediately understandable and less subject to misunderstanding" (Grudem, 494). This study, however, uses

Whenever Adam's first sin is referred to, it is designated as "first sin."

### Delimitations of the Study

This dissertation focuses mainly on the history of the doctrine of original sin between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. The development of this doctrine up to the Middle Ages is only briefly and selectively surveyed. In principle, this study does not deal with the development of the doctrine in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, though here and there the views of modern theologians are referred to, especially in their relationship to some new understandings of the theories formulated up to the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

As already referred to, the doctrine of original sin is closely related to many other areas of Christian theology such as the doctrines of Christ, of salvation, and of the sacraments. Concerning Christology, the views on original sin determine the quality of the human nature ascribed to Christ;<sup>1</sup> concerning soteriology, what is held on original

---

the term "original sin" which is more commonly used than "inherited sin" in Christian theology today.

<sup>1</sup>Concerning the relationship between the doctrine of original sin and that of Christ's human nature, Gulley observes: "If every man is born a sinner, (a fallen being, separated from God, needing salvation) as the result of Adam's sin, then how could Christ be sinless and yet enter the race through a human mother? The immaculate conception of Catholicism side-steps this question by leaving Mary unaffected by Adam's sin. Rather than this immaculate

sin deeply influences the concept of "the how" of salvation;<sup>1</sup> and related to the doctrine of the sacraments, the meaning assigned to baptism.<sup>2</sup> However, since this dissertation focuses mainly on the concept of original sin, these related doctrines are not dealt with in depth in this study.

As the title of this research indicates, this study is of a historical nature. Thus, names and dates are to be

---

conception, it is the miraculous conception that is designated by Scripture (Romans 5, et al.)" (Gulley, 39).

<sup>1</sup>Arthur W. Pink presents three reasons why regeneration is necessary for man: (1) man's natural degeneration, (2) his total depravity, and (3) his unsuitedness to God. In relation to man's total depravity, he states, "Every member of Adam's race is a fallen creature, and every part of his complex being has been corrupted by sin. . . . In the day that Adam ate of the forbidden fruit, he died spiritually, and a person who is spiritually dead cannot beget a child who possesses spiritual life. . . . Every child is born entirely destitute of a single spark of spiritual life, and therefore if ever it is to enter the kingdom of God which is the realm of spiritual life (Rom 14:17), it must be born into it" (A. W. Pink, The Doctrine of Salvation [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975], 14). Charles M. Horne, too, emphasizes that the transmission of Adam's sin to his posterity is one of the most important reasons why salvation is necessary (Charles M. Horne, The Doctrine of Salvation [Chicago: Moody, 1971], 2).

<sup>2</sup>The Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia points out the close connection between the doctrine of original sin and that of baptism, stating, "Augustine's victory over Pelagius on the side of the doctrine of original sin did much to enhance a sacramentalist view of baptism" (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia (SDAE), 1976 rev. ed., s.v. "Baptism"). The Roman Catholic Church, the strongest supporter of sacramentalism, believes that "the remission of original sin" is one of the effects of baptism (T. M. DeFerari, "Baptism [Theology of]", NCE, 2:65).

expected, including some biographical information, mostly in footnotes, as background to the respective formulations.<sup>1</sup>

### **Methodology and Procedure**

This dissertation is basically a historical study which seeks to analyze the theories or views concerning original sin between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. But its purpose is not limited to historical information. It also includes a biblical evaluation of the theories. To achieve these goals, it is necessary to explore the more significant available historical documents which deal with the development of the doctrine of original sin during the period under consideration. For the study of the 16<sup>th</sup> century views, books and other documents written by the Reformers, the radical reformers, and the Roman Catholic scholars of that century have been carefully explored, including the official confessions and catechisms formulated in those days.

For the views of original sin during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, mainly the works of Protestant authors have been consulted. Regarding the evaluation of the theories

---

<sup>1</sup>In this study, an author's profile contains only the dates of birth and death, the position he or she took, and his or her main works. However, not all the individuals mentioned in this study are so introduced. Only the theologians between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries whose views are studied in this research are introduced in the footnotes.

and views of original sin suggested between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, the writings of modern Christian authors serve as fitting tools.

This study is structured to accomplish the purposes outlined above. Chapter 1 provides a general introduction which includes the statement of the problem, the purpose and significance of the study, the presuppositions and delimitations, the methodology and procedure of the study, and a review of relevant literature.

Chapter 2 briefly surveys the development of the doctrine of original sin between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries. Only the main contributions during those centuries are surveyed in this chapter.

Chapter 3 explores the theories of original sin advanced during the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The chapter focuses on the views of the Reformers and radical reformers, the confessions and catechisms formulated, and the theological definitions of the Roman Catholic Church.

Chapter 4 provides an overview of the development of the doctrine of original sin during the 17<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. It deals mainly with the views of original sin of the period suggested by a number of Protestant writers who belonged to the various denominations. Some of them are regarded as the founders of their respective denominations.

Chapter 5 concentrates on the evaluation of the main theories of original sin formulated between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. It seeks to find the biblical teaching on original sin and to analyze and evaluate accordingly the theories of original sin. Finally, chapter 6 summarizes the major findings and contains the conclusions of the study.

### **Review of Relevant Literature**

The sources examined for this research do not offer any source bearing directly on the development of the doctrine of original sin between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, though some of the studies provide important contributions to certain aspects of the subject. The reviewed sources are classified into two categories--works dealing with the theology of original sin, and those dealing with the history of the doctrine.

In order to reveal the particular views on the doctrine of original sin among the Christian scholars, this review includes writings of authors belonging to different schools of interpretation such as Catholicism, Anglicanism, Calvinism, and Arminianism, who are considered outstanding contemporary scholars in systematic theology, some of them especially noteworthy in the area of hamartiology, more specifically the doctrine of original sin. This review is selective rather than exhaustive.