

人与上帝的关系：人在罪中的状态
THE DOCTRINE OF MAN IN RELATION TO GOD:
Man in the State of Sin

I. The Origin of Sin 罪的起源

The problem of the origin of the evil that is in the world has always been considered as one of the profoundest problems of philosophy and theology. It is a problem that naturally forces itself upon the attention of man since the power of evil is both great and universal, is an ever present blight on life in all its manifestations, and is a matter of daily experience in the life of every man. Philosophers were constrained to face the problem and to seek an answer to the question as to the origin of all the evil, and particularly of the moral evil, that is in the world. To some it seemed to be so much a part of life itself that they sought the solution for it in the natural constitution of things. Others, however, were convinced that it had a voluntary origin, that is, that it originated in the free choice of man, either in the present or in some previous existence. These are much closer to the truth as it is revealed in the Word of God.

A. 罪的起源：历史上的观点
Historical Views Respecting the Origin of Sin.

1. 早期教父 Early Church Fathers

The earliest Church Fathers do not speak very definitely on the origin of sin, though the idea that it originated in the voluntary transgression and fall of Adam in paradise is already found in the writings of Irenaeus. This soon became the prevailing view in the Church, especially in opposition to Gnosticism, which regarded evil as inherent in matter, and as such the product of the Demiurge. The contact of the human soul with matter at once rendered it sinful. This theory naturally robbed sin of its voluntary and ethical character. Origen sought to maintain this by his theory of pre-existentialism. According to him the souls of men sinned voluntarily in a previous existence, and therefore all enter the world in a sinful condition. This Platonic view was burdened with too many difficulties to meet with wide acceptance. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, however, it was advocated by Mueller and Rueckert, and by such philosophers as Lessing, Schelling, and J. H. Fichte. In general the Greek Church Fathers of the third and fourth centuries showed an inclination to discount the connection between the sin of Adam and those of his descendants, while the Latin Church Fathers taught with ever-increasing clearness that the present sinful condition of man finds its explanation in the first transgression of Adam in paradise.

2. 伯拉纠主义与奥古斯丁主义 Pelagianism and Augustinianism

The teachings of the Eastern Church finally culminated in Pelagianism, which denied that there was any vital connection between the two, while those of the Western Church reached their culmination

in Augustinianism which stressed the fact that we are both guilty and polluted in Adam. Semi-Pelagianism admitted the Adamic connection, but held that it accounted only for the pollution of sin.

3. 中古时期 Middle Ages

During the Middle Ages the connection was generally recognized. It was sometimes interpreted in an Augustinian, but more often in a Semi-Pelagian manner.

4. 宗教改革领袖们，苏希尼派，阿米念主义 Reformers, Socinians, Arminians

The Reformers shared the views of Augustine, and the Socinians those of Pelagius, while the Arminians moved in the direction of Semi-Pelagianism. 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.

5. 康德，Leibnitz，士来马赫，黎敕尔 Kant, Leibnitz, Schleiermacher, Ritschl

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.

6. 巴特 Karl Barth

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 (Urgeschichte). 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.

B. 罪的起源：经文 Scriptural Data Respecting the Origin of Sin.

In Scripture the moral evil that is in the world stands out clearly as sin, that is, as transgression of the law of God. Man ever appears in it as a transgressor by nature, and the question naturally arises, How did he acquire that nature? What does the Bible reveal on that point?

1. 不可視上帝為罪的創始者 God Cannot be Regarded as its Author.

God's eternal decree certainly rendered the entrance of sin into the world certain, but this may not be interpreted so as to make God the cause of sin in the sense of being its responsible author. This idea is clearly excluded by Scripture. "Far be it from God, that He should do wickedness, and from the Almighty, that He should commit iniquity," Job 34:10. He is the holy God, Isa. 6:3, and there is absolutely no unrighteousness in Him, Deut. 32:4; Ps. 92:15. He cannot be tempted with evil, and He Himself tempteth no man, Jas. 1:13. When He created man, He created Him good and in His image. He positively hates sin, Deut. 25:16; Ps. 5:4; 11:5; Zech. 8:17; Luke 16:15, and made provision in Christ for man's deliverance from sin. In the light of all this it would be blasphemous to speak of God as the author of sin. And for that reason all those deterministic views which represent sin as a necessity inherent in the very nature of things should be rejected. They by implication make God the author of sin, and are contrary, not only to Scripture, but also to the voice of conscience, which testifies to the responsibility of man.

Job 34:10

以，你們明理的人要聽我的話。神斷不致行惡；全能者斷不致作孽。

"So listen to me, you men of understanding. Far be it from God to do evil, from the Almighty to do wrong.

Isa. 6:3

此呼喊說：聖哉！聖哉！聖哉！萬軍之耶和華；他的榮光充滿全地！

And they were calling to one another: "Holy, holy, holy is the LORD Almighty; the whole earth is full of his glory."

Deut. 32:4

他是磐石，他的作為完全；他所行的無不公平，是誠實無偽的神，又公義，又正直。

He is the Rock, his works are perfect, and all his ways are just. A faithful God who does no wrong, upright and just is he.

Ps. 92:15

好顯明耶和華是正直的。他是我的磐石，在他毫無不義。

proclaiming, "The LORD is upright; he is my Rock, and there is no wickedness in him."

Jas. 1:13

人被試探，不可說：「我是被神試探」；因為神不能被惡試探，他也不試探人。

When tempted, no one should say, "God is tempting me." For God cannot be tempted by evil, nor does he tempt anyone;

Deut. 25:16

為行非義之事的人都是耶和華—你 神所憎惡的。

For the LORD your God detests anyone who does these things, anyone who deals dishonestly.

Ps. 5:4

因為你不是喜悅惡事的神，惡人不能與你同居。

You are not a God who takes pleasure in evil; with you the wicked cannot dwell.

Ps. 11:5

耶和華試驗義人；惟有惡人和喜愛強暴的人，他心裡恨惡。

The LORD examines the righteous, but the wicked and those who love violence his soul hates.

Zech. 8:17

都不可心裡謀害鄰舍，也不可喜愛起假誓，因為這些事都為我所恨惡。這是耶和華說的。

do not plot evil against your neighbor, and do not love to swear falsely. I hate all this," declares the LORD.

Luke 16:15

耶穌對他們說：你們是在人面前自稱為義的，你們的心，神卻知道；因為人所尊貴的，是神看為可憎惡的。

He said to them, "You are the ones who justify yourselves in the eyes of men, but God knows your hearts.

What is highly valued among men is detestable in God's sight.

2. 罪从天使世界源起 Sin Originated in the Angelic World.

The Bible teaches us that in the attempt to trace the origin of sin, we must even go back of the fall of man as described in Gen. 3, and fix the attention on something that happened in the angelic world. God created a host of angels, and they were all good as they came forth from the hand of their Maker, Gen. 1:31. But a fall occurred in the angelic world, in which legions of angels fell away from God. The exact time of this fall is not designated, but in John 8:44 Jesus speaks of the devil as a murderer from the beginning (kat' arches), and John says in I John 3:8, that he sins from the beginning. The prevailing opinion is that this kat' arches means from the beginning of the history of man. Very little is said about the sin that caused the fall of the angels. From Paul's warning to Timothy, that no novice should be appointed as bishop, "lest being puffed up he fall into the condemnation of the devil," I Tim. 3:6, we may in all probability conclude that it was the sin of pride, of aspiring to be like God in power and authority. And this idea would seem to find corroboration in Jude 6, where it is said that the fallen angels "kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation." They were not satisfied with their lot, with the government and power entrusted to them. If the desire to be like God was their peculiar temptation, this would also explain why they tempted man on that particular point.

创三 Gen. 3

Gen. 1:31

神看著一切所造的都甚好。有晚上，有早晨，是第六日。

God saw all that he had made, and it was very good. And there was evening, and there was morning--the sixth day.

John 8:44

你們是出於你們的父魔鬼，你們父的私慾你們偏要行。他從起初是殺人的，不守真理，因他心裡沒有真理。他說謊是出於自己；因他本來是說謊的，也是說謊之人的父。

You belong to your father, the devil, and you want to carry out your father's desire. He was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies.

I John 3:8

風隨著意思吹，你聽見風的響聲，卻不曉得從那裡來，往那裡去；凡從聖靈生的，也是如此。」

He who does what is sinful is of the devil, because the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the devil's work.

I Tim. 3:6

初入教的不可作監督，恐怕他自高自大，就落在魔鬼所受的刑罰裡。

He must not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgment as the devil.

Jude 6

3. 人类中罪的起源 **The Origin of Sin in the Human Race.**

With respect to the origin of sin in the history of mankind, the Bible teaches that it began with the transgression of Adam in paradise, and therefore with a perfectly voluntary act on the part of man. The tempter came from the spirit world with the suggestion that man, by placing himself in opposition to God, might become like God. Adam yielded to the temptation and committed the first sin by eating of the forbidden fruit. But the matter did not stop there, for by that first sin Adam became the bondservant of sin. That sin carried permanent pollution with it, and a pollution which, because of the solidarity of the human race, would affect not only Adam but all his descendants as well. As a result of the fall the father of the race could only pass on a depraved human nature to his offspring. From that unholy source sin flows on as an impure stream to all the generations of men, polluting everyone and everything with which it comes in contact. It is exactly this state of things that made the question of Job so pertinent, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." Job 14:4. But even this is not all. Adam sinned not only as the father of the human race, but also as the representative head of all his descendants; and therefore the guilt of his sin is placed to their account, so that they are all liable to the punishment of death. It is primarily in that sense that Adam's sin is the sin of all. That is what Paul teaches us in Rom. 5:12: "Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned." The last words can only mean that they all sinned in Adam, and sinned in such a way as to make them all liable to the punishment of death. It is not sin considered merely as pollution, but sin as guilt that carries punishment with it. God adjudges all men to be guilty sinners in Adam, just as He adjudges all believers to be righteous in Jesus Christ. That is what Paul means, when he says: "So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life. For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous," Rom. 5:18,19.

Job 14:4

誰能使潔淨之物出於污穢之中呢？無論誰也不能！

Who can bring what is pure from the impure? No one!

Rom. 5:12

這就如罪是從一人入了世界，死又是從罪來的；於是死就臨到眾人，因為眾人都犯了罪。

12 Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned—

Rom. 5:18, 19

如此說來，因一次的過犯，眾人都被定罪；照樣，因一次的義行，眾人也就被稱義得生命了。

因一人的悖逆，眾人成為罪人；照樣，因一人的順從，眾人也成為義了。

18 Consequently, just as the result of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men.

19 For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous.

c. 人类第一次罪行，即：人类的堕落 The Nature of the First Sin or the Fall of Man.

1. 它的形式 Its Formal Character.

It may be said that, from a purely formal point of view, man's first sin consisted in his eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. We do not know what kind of tree this was. It may have been a date or a fig tree, or any other kind of fruit tree. There was nothing injurious in the fruit of the tree as such. Eating of it was not per se sinful, for it was not a transgression of the moral law. This means that it would not have been sinful, if God had not said, "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat." There is no unanimous opinion as to the reason why the tree was called the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. A rather common view is that the tree was so called, because the eating of it would impart a practical knowledge of good and evil; but this is hardly in keeping with the Scriptural representation that man by eating it would become like God in knowing good and evil, for God does not commit evil, and therefore has no practical knowledge of it. It is far more likely that the tree was so called, because it was destined to reveal (a) whether man's future state would be good or evil; and (b) whether man would allow God to determine for him what was good and evil, or would undertake to determine this for himself. But whatever explanation may be given of the name, the command given by God not to eat of the fruit of the tree simply served the purpose of testing the obedience of man. It was a test of pure obedience, since God did not in any way seek to justify or to explain the prohibition. Adam had to show his willingness to submit his will to the will of his God with implicit obedience.

2. 它的本质 Its Essential and Material Character.

The first sin of man was a typical sin, that is, a sin in which the real essence of sin clearly reveals itself. The essence of that sin lay in the fact that Adam placed himself in opposition to God, that he refused to subject his will to the will of God, to have God determine the course of his life; and that he actively attempted to take the matter out of God's hand, and to determine the future for himself. Man, who had absolutely no claim on God, and who could only establish a claim by meeting the condition of the covenant of works, cut loose from God and acted as if he possessed certain rights as over against God. The idea that the command of God was really an infringement on the rights of man seems to have been

present already in the mind of Eve when, in answer to the question of Satan, she added the words, "Neither shall ye touch it," Gen. 3:3. She evidently wanted to stress the fact that the command had been rather unreasonable. Starting from the pre-supposition that he had certain rights as over against God, man allowed the new center, which he found in himself, to operate against his Maker. This explains his desire to be like God and his doubt of the good intention of God in giving the command. Naturally different elements can be distinguished in his first sin. In the intellect it revealed itself as unbelief and pride, in the will, as the desire to be like God, and in the affections, as an unholy satisfaction in eating of the forbidden fruit.

Gen. 3:3

惟有園當中那棵樹上的果子，神曾說：你們不可吃，也不可摸，免得你們死。
but God did say, 'You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die.' "

D. 人类第一次犯罪（人类的堕落）：试探是诱因 The First Sin or the Fall as Occasioned by Temptation.

1. 魔鬼试探的步骤 The Procedure of the Tempter.

The fall of man was occasioned by the temptation of the serpent, who sowed in man's mind the seeds of distrust and unbelief. Though it was undoubtedly the intention of the tempter to cause Adam, the head of the covenant, to fall, yet he addressed himself to Eve, probably because (a) she was not the head of the covenant and therefore would not have the same sense of responsibility; (b) she had not received the command of God directly but only indirectly, and would consequently be more susceptible to argumentation and doubt; and (c) she would undoubtedly prove to be the most effective agent in reaching the heart of Adam. The course followed by the tempter is quite clear. In the first place he sows the seeds of doubt by calling the good intention of God in question and suggesting that His command was really an infringement of man's liberty and rights. When he notices from the response of Eve that the seed has taken root, he adds the seeds of unbelief and pride, denying that transgression will result in death, and clearly intimating that the command was prompted by the selfish purpose of keeping man in subjection. He asserts that by eating from the tree man would become like God. The high expectations thus engendered induced Eve to look intently at the tree, and the longer she looked, the better the fruit seemed to her. Finally, desire got the upper hand, and she ate and also gave unto her husband, and he ate.

2. 对试探的解释 Interpretation of the Temptation.

Frequent attempts have been made and are still being made to explain away the historical character of the fall. Some regard the whole narrative in Gen. 3 as an allegory, representing man's self-depravation and gradual change in a figurative way. Barth and Brunner regard the narrative of man's original state and of the fall as a myth. Creation and the fall both belong, not to history, but to super-history (Urgeschichte), and therefore both are equally incomprehensible. The story in Genesis merely teaches us that, though man is now unable to do any good and is subject to the law of death, this is not necessarily so. It is possible for a man to be free from sin and death by a life in communion with God. Such is the life portrayed for us in the story of paradise, and it prefigures the life that will be granted to us in Him of whom Adam was but a type, namely, Christ. But it is not the kind of life that man now lives

or ever has lived from the beginning of history. Paradise is not a certain locality to which we can point, but is there where God is Lord, and man and all other creatures are His willing subjects. The paradise of the past lies beyond the pale of human history. Says Barth: "When the history of man began; when man's time had its beginning; when time and history commenced where man has the first and the last word, paradise had disappeared." Brunner speaks in a similar vein when he says: "Just as in respect of the Creation we ask in vain: How, where and when has this taken place, so also is it with the Fall. The Creation and the Fall both lie behind the historical visible reality."

Others who do not deny the historical character of the narrative in Genesis, maintain that the serpent at least should not be regarded as a literal animal, but merely as a name or a symbol for covetousness, for sexual desire, for erring reason, or for Satan. Still others assert that, to say the least, the speaking of the serpent should be understood figuratively. But all these and similar interpretations are untenable in the light of Scripture. The passages preceding and following Gen. 3:1-7 are evidently intended as a plain historical narrative. That they were so understood by the Biblical authors can be proved by many cross-references, such as Job 31:33; Eccl. 7:29; Isa. 43:27; Hos. 6:7; Rom. 5:12,18,19; I Cor. 5:5; II Cor. 11:3; I Tim. 2:14, and therefore we have no right to hold that these verses, which form an integral part of the narrative, should be interpreted figuratively. Moreover, the serpent is certainly counted among the animals in Gen. 3:1, and it would not yield good sense to substitute for "serpent" the word "Satan." The punishment in Gen. 3:14,15 presupposes a literal serpent, and Paul conceives of the serpent in no other way, II Cor. 11:3. And while it may be possible to conceive of the serpent as saying something in a figurative sense by means of cunning actions, it does not seem possible to think of him as carrying on the conversation recorded in Gen. 3 in that way. The whole transaction, including the speaking of the serpent, undoubtedly finds its explanation in the operation of some superhuman power, which is not mentioned in Gen. 3. Scripture clearly intimates that the serpent was but the instrument of Satan, and that Satan was the real tempter, who was working in and through the serpent, just as at a later time he worked in men and swine, John 8:44; Rom. 16:20; II Cor. 11:3; Rev. 12:9. The serpent was a fit instrument for Satan, for he is the personification of sin, and the serpent symbolizes sin (a) in its cunning and deceptive nature, and (b) in its poisonous sting by which it kills man.

Gen. 3:1-7

- 1 耶和華 神所造的，惟有蛇比田野一切的活物更狡猾。蛇對女人說： 神豈是真說不許你們吃園中所有樹上的果子麼？
- 2 女人對蛇說：園中樹上的果子，我們可以吃，
- 3 惟有園當中那棵樹上的果子， 神曾說：你們不可吃，也不可摸，免得你們死。
- 4 蛇對女人說：你們不一定死；
- 5 因為 神知道，你們吃的日子眼睛就明亮了，你們便如神能知道善惡。
- 6 於是女人見那棵樹的果子好作食物，也悅人的眼目，且是可喜愛的，能使人有智慧，就摘下果子來吃了，又給他丈夫，他丈夫也吃了。
- 7 他們二人的眼睛就明亮了，才知道自己是赤身露體，便拿無花果樹的葉子為自己編作裙子。

1 Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, "Did God really say, 'You must not eat from any tree in the garden'?"

2 The woman said to the serpent, "We may eat fruit from the trees in the garden,

3 but God did say, 'You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die.' "

4 "You will not surely die," the serpent said to the woman.

5 "For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil."

6 When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

7 Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized they were naked; so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves.

Job 31:33

我若像亞當（或譯：別人）遮掩我的過犯，將罪孽藏在懷中；
if I have concealed my sin as men do, by hiding my guilt in my heart

Eccl. 7:29

我所找到的只有一件，就是 神造人原是正直，但他們尋出許多巧計。
This only have I found: God made mankind upright, but men have gone in search of many schemes.

Isa. 43:27

你的始祖犯罪；你的師傅違背我。
Your first father sinned; your spokesmen rebelled against me.

Hos. 6:7

他們卻如亞當背約，在境內向我行事詭詐。
Like Adam, they have broken the covenant-- they were unfaithful to me there.

Rom. 5:12, 18, 19

這就如罪是從一人入了世界，死又是從罪來的；於是死就臨到眾人，因為眾人都犯了罪。

如此說來，因一次的過犯，眾人都被定罪；照樣，因一次的義行，眾人也就被稱義得生命了。

因一人的悖逆，眾人成為罪人；照樣，因一人的順從，眾人也成為義了。

12 Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned—

18 Consequently, just as the result of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men.

19 For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous.

I Cor. 5:5

要把這樣的人交給撒但，敗壞他的肉體，使他的靈魂在主耶穌的日子可以得救。
hand this man over to Satan, so that the sinful nature may be destroyed and his spirit saved on the day of the Lord.

II Cor. 11:3

我只怕你們的心或偏於邪，失去那向基督所存純一清潔的心，就像蛇用詭詐誘惑了夏娃一樣。

But I am afraid that just as Eve was deceived by the serpent's cunning, your minds may somehow be led astray from your sincere and pure devotion to Christ.

1 Tim. 2:14

且不是亞當被引誘，乃是女人被引誘，陷在罪裡。

And Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.

Gen. 3:1

耶和華 神所造的，惟有蛇比田野一切的活物更狡猾。蛇對女人說： 神豈是真說不許你們吃園中所有樹上的果子麼？

Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, "Did God really say, 'You must not eat from any tree in the garden'?"

Gen. 3:14, 15

耶和華 神對蛇說：你既作了這事，就必受咒詛，比一切的牲畜野獸更甚。你必用肚子行走，終身吃土。

我又要叫你和女人彼此為仇；你的後裔和女人的後裔也彼此為仇。女人的後裔要傷你的頭；你要傷他的腳跟。

So the LORD God said to the serpent, "Because you have done this, "Cursed are you above all the livestock and all the wild animals! You will crawl on your belly and you will eat dust all the days of your life. 15 And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel."

John 8:44

你們是出於你們的父魔鬼，你們父的私慾你們偏要行。他從起初是殺人的，不守真理，因他心裡沒有真理。他說謊是出於自己；因他本來是說謊的，也是說謊之人的父。

You belong to your father, the devil, and you want to carry out your father's desire. He was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies.

Rom. 16:20

賜平安的神快要將撒但踐踏在你們腳下。願我主耶穌基督的恩常和你們同在！

The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet. The grace of our Lord Jesus be with you.

Rev. 12:9

大龍就是那古蛇，名叫魔鬼，又叫撒但，是迷惑普天下的。他被摔在地上，他的使者也一同被摔下去。

The great dragon was hurled down--that ancient serpent called the devil, or Satan, who leads the whole world astray. He was hurled to the earth, and his angels with him.

4. 试探：堕落的诱因，与人得救的可能 **The Fall by Temptation and Man's Salvability.**

It has been suggested that the fact that man's fall was occasioned by temptation from without, may be one of the reasons why man is salvable, in distinction from the fallen angels, who were not subject to external temptation, but fell by the promptings of their own inner nature. Nothing certain can be said on this point, however. But whatever the significance of the temptation in that respect may be, it

certainly does not suffice to explain how a holy being like Adam could fall in sin. It is impossible for us to say how temptation could find a point of contact in a holy person. And it is still more difficult to explain the origin of sin in the angelic world.

E. 从进化论解释罪的起源 The Evolutionary Explanation of the Origin of Sin.

Naturally, a consistent theory of evolution cannot admit the doctrine of the fall, and a number of liberal theologians have rejected it as incompatible with the theory of evolution. It is true, there are some rather conservative theologians, such as Denney, Gore, and Orr, who accept, though with reservations, the evolutionary account of the origin of man, and feel that it leaves room for the doctrine of the fall in some sense of the word. But it is significant that they all conceive of the story of the fall as a mythical or allegorical representation of an ethical experience or of some actual moral catastrophe at the beginning of history which resulted in suffering and death. This means that they do not accept the narrative of the fall as a real historical account of what occurred in the garden of Eden. Tennant in his Hulsean Lectures on The Origin and Propagation of Sin gave a rather detailed and interesting account of the origin of sin from the evolutionary point of view. He realizes that man could not very well derive sin from his animal ancestors, since these had no sin. This means that the impulses, propensities, desires, and qualities which man inherited from the brute cannot themselves be called sin. In his estimation these constitute only the material of sin, and do not become actual sins until the moral consciousness awakens in man, and they are left in control in determining the actions of man, contrary to the voice of conscience, and to ethical sanctions. He holds that in the course of his development man gradually became an ethical being with an indeterminate will, without explaining how such a will is possible where the law of evolution prevails, and regards this will as the only cause of sin. He defines sin "as an activity of the will expressed in thought, word, or deed contrary to the individual's conscience, to his notion of what is good and right, his knowledge of the moral law and the will of God." As the human race develops, the ethical standards become more exacting and the heinousness of sin increases. A sinful environment adds to the difficulty of refraining from sin. This view of Tennant leaves no room for the fall of man in the generally accepted sense of the word. As a matter of fact, Tennant explicitly repudiates the doctrine of the fall, which is recognized in all the great historical confessions of the Church. Says W. H. Johnson: "Tennant's critics are agreed that his theory leaves no room for that cry of the contrite heart which not only confesses to separate acts of sin, but declares: 'I was shapen in iniquity; there is a law of death in my members.'"

F. 第一次犯罪的结果 The Results of the First Sin.

The first transgression of man had the following results:

1. The immediate concomitant of the first sin, and therefore hardly a result of it in the strict sense of the word, was the total depravity of human nature. The contagion of his sin at once spread through the entire man, leaving no part of his nature untouched, but vitiating every power and faculty of body and soul. This utter corruption of man is clearly taught in Scripture, Gen. 6:5; Ps. 14:3; Rom. 7:18. Total depravity here does not mean that human nature was at once as thoroughly depraved as it could possibly become. In the will this depravity manifested itself as spiritual inability.

Gen. 6:5

耶和華見人在地上罪惡很大，終日所思想的盡都是惡，

The LORD saw how great man's wickedness on the earth had become, and that every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the time.

Ps. 14:3

他們都偏離正路，一同變為污穢；並沒有行善的，連一個也沒有。

All have turned aside, they have together become corrupt; there is no one who does good, not even one.

Rom. 7:18

我也知道在我裡頭，就是我肉體之中，沒有良善。因為，立志為善由得我，只是行出來由不得我。

I know that nothing good lives in me, that is, in my sinful nature. For I have the desire to do what is good, but I cannot carry it out.

2. Immediately connected with the preceding was the loss of communion with God through the Holy Spirit. This is but the reverse side of the utter corruption mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The two can be combined in the single statement that man lost the image of God in the sense of original righteousness. He broke away from the real source of life and blessedness, and the result was a condition of spiritual death, Eph. 2:1,5,12; 4:18.

Eph. 2:1, 5, 12

你們死在過犯罪惡之中，他叫你們活過來。

當我們死在過犯中的時候，便叫我們與基督一同活過來。你們得救是本乎恩。

那時，你們與基督無關，在以色列國民以外，在所應許的諸約上是局外人，並且活在世上沒有指望，沒有神。

1 As for you, you were dead in your transgressions and sins,

5 made us alive with Christ even when we were dead in transgressions--it is by grace you have been saved.

12 remember that at that time you were separate from Christ, excluded from citizenship in Israel and foreigners to the covenants of the promise, without hope and without God in the world.

Eph. 4:18

們心地昏昧，與神所賜的生命隔絕了，都因自己無知，心裡剛硬；

They are darkened in their understanding and separated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them due to the hardening of their hearts.

3. This change in the actual condition of man also reflected itself in his consciousness. There was, first of all, a consciousness of pollution, revealing itself in the sense of shame, and in the effort of our first parents to cover their nakedness. And in the second place there was a consciousness of guilt, which found expression in an accusing conscience and in the fear of God which it inspired.

4. Not only spiritual death, but physical death as well resulted from the first sin of man. From a state of *posse non mori* he descended to a state of *non posse non mori*. Having sinned, he was doomed to return to the dust from which he was taken, Gen. 3:19. Paul tells us that by one man death entered the world and passed on to all men, Rom. 5:12, and that the wages of sin is death, Rom. 6:23.

Gen. 3:19

你必汗流滿面才得糊口，直到你歸了土，因為你是從土而出的。你本是塵土，仍要歸於塵土。

By the sweat of your brow you will eat your food until you return to the ground, since from it you were taken; for dust you are and to dust you will return."

Rom. 5:12

這就如罪是從一人入了世界，死又是從罪來的；於是死就臨到眾人，因為眾人都犯了罪。

12 Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned—

Rom. 6:23

為罪的工價乃是死；惟有神的恩賜，在我們的主基督耶穌裡，乃是永生。

For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

5. This change also resulted in a necessary change of residence. Man was driven from paradise, because it represented the place of communion with God, and was a symbol of the fuller life and greater blessedness in store for man, if he continued steadfast. He was barred from the tree of life, because it was the symbol of the life promised in the covenant of works.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. What different theories are there as to the origin of sin?
2. What Scriptural proof is there that sin originated in the angelic world?
3. Can the allegorical interpretation of the narrative of the fall be maintained in the light of Scripture?
4. Is there any place for the fall in the theory of evolution?
5. Did God will the fall of man or did He merely permit it?
6. Does our Reformed doctrine make God the author of sin?
7. What objections are there to the notion that the souls of men sinned in a previous existence?
8. Was God justified in making the spiritual state of mankind in general contingent on the obedience or non-obedience of the first man?
9. What do Barth and Brunner mean when they speak of the fall of man as super-historical?
10. Why is it that the doctrine of the covenant of works finds so little acceptance outside of Reformed circles?
11. What accounts for the widespread neglect of this doctrine in our day?
12. Why is it important to maintain this doctrine?

LITERATURE:

Bavinck, Geref. Dogm. III, pp. 605-624; III, pp. 1-60; Kuyper, Dict. Dogm., De Foedere, pp. 23-117; De Peccato, pp. 17-26; Vos, Geref. Dogm. II, pp. 32-54; Hodge, Syst. Theol., pp. 117-129; Dabney, Syst. and Polem. Theol., pp. 332-339; Alexander, Syst. of Bibl. Theol. I, pp. 183-196; 216-232; Schmid, Doct. Theol. of the Ev. Luth. Ch., pp. 239-242; Valentine, Chr. Theol. I, pp. 416-420; Litton, Introd. to Dogm. Theol., pp. 133-136; Pope, Chr. Theol. II, pp. 3-28; II, p. 108; II, pp. 50-63; 99; 111; Macintosh, Theol. as an Empirical Science, pp. 216-229; McPherson, Chr. Dogm., pp. 220-242; Orr, God's Image in Man; pp. 197-240; Candlish, The Bibl. Doct. of Sin, pp. 82-89; Talma, De Anthropologie van Calvijn, pp. 69-91; Kuyper, Uit her Woord, De Leer der Verbonden, pp. 3-221; Tennant, The Origin and Propagation of Sin; *ibid*, The Concept of Sin.

II. 罪的本质 The Essential Character of Sin

Sin is one of the saddest but also one of the most common phenomena of human life. It is a part of the common experience of mankind, and therefore forces itself upon the attention of all those who do not deliberately close their eyes to the realities of human life. Some may for a time dream of the essential goodness of man and speak indulgently of those separate words and actions that do not measure up to the ethical standards of good society as mere foibles and weaknesses, for which man is not responsible, and which readily yield to corrective measures; but as time goes on, and all measures of external reform fail, and the suppression of one evil merely serves to release another, such persons are inevitably disillusioned. They become conscious of the fact that they have merely been fighting the symptoms of some deep-seated malady, and that they are confronted, not merely with the problem of sins, that is, of separate sinful deeds, but with the much greater and deeper problem of sin, of an evil that is inherent in human nature. This is exactly what we are beginning to witness at the present time. Many Modernists at present do not hesitate to say that the doctrine of Rousseau respecting the inherent goodness of man has proved to be one of the most pernicious teachings of the Enlightenment, and now call for a greater measure of realism in the recognition of sin. Thus Walter Horton, who pleads for a realistic theology and believes that this calls for the acceptance of some Marxian principles, says: "I believe that orthodox Christianity represents a profound insight into the whole human predicament. I believe that the basic human difficulty is that perversion of the will, that betrayal of divine trust, which is called sin: and I believe that sin is in a sense a racial disease, transmissible from generation to generation. In affirming these things the Christian Fathers and the Protestant Reformers spoke as realists, and could have assembled masses of empirical evidence to support their views." In view of the fact that sin is real and that no man can get away from it in this present life, it is no wonder that philosophers as well as theologians undertook to grapple with the problem of sin, though in philosophy it is known as the problem of evil rather than as the problem of sin. We shall briefly consider some of the most important philosophical theories of evil before we state the Scriptural doctrine of sin.

A. 罪的本质：一些哲学理论 **Philosophic Theories Respecting the Nature of Evil.**

1. 二元论 **The Dualistic Theory.**

This is one of the views that were current in Greek philosophy. In the form of Gnosticism it found entrance into the early Church. It assumes the existence of an eternal principle of evil, and holds that in man the spirit represents the principle of good, and the body, that of evil.

Objections

It is objectionable for several reasons:

(a) The position is philosophically untenable, that there is something outside of God that is eternal and independent of His will.

(b) This theory robs sin of its ethical character by making it something purely physical and independent of the human will, and thereby really destroys the idea of sin.

(c) It also does away with the responsibility of man by representing sin as a physical necessity. The only escape from sin lies in deliverance from the body.

2. 罪只不过是“缺欠” **The Theory that Sin is Merely Privation.**

According to Leibnitz the present world is the best possible one. The existence of sin in it must be considered as unavoidable. It cannot be referred to the agency of God, and therefore must be regarded as a simple negation or privation, for which no efficient cause is needed. The limitations of the creature render it unavoidable. This theory makes sin a necessary evil, since creatures are necessarily limited, and sin is an unavoidable consequence of this limitation. Its attempt to avoid making God the author of sin is not successful, for even if sin is a mere negation requiring no efficient cause, God is nevertheless the author of the limitation from which it results. Moreover, it tends to obliterate the distinction between moral and physical evil, since it represents sin as little more than a misfortune which has befallen man. Consequently, it has a tendency to blunt man's sense of the evil or pollution of sin, to destroy the sense of guilt, and to abrogate man's moral responsibility.

3. 罪是幻觉 **The Theory that Sin is an Illusion.**

For Spinoza, as for Leibnitz, sin is simply a defect, a limitation of which man is conscious; but while Leibnitz regards the notion of evil, arising from this limitation, as necessary, Spinoza holds that the resulting consciousness of sin is simply due to the inadequacy of man's knowledge, which fails to see everything sub specie aeternitatis, that is, in unity with the eternal and infinite essence of God. If man's knowledge were adequate, so that he saw everything in God, he would have no conception of sin; it would simply be non-existent for him. But this theory, representing sin as something purely negative, does not account for its terrible positive results, to which the universal experience of mankind testifies in the most convincing manner. Consistently carried through, it abrogates all ethical distinctions, and reduces such concepts as "moral character" and "moral conduct" to meaningless phrases. In fact, it reduces the whole life of man to an illusion: his knowledge, his experience, the testimony of conscience, and so on, for all his knowledge is inadequate. Moreover, it goes contrary to the experience of mankind, that the greatest intellects are often the greatest sinners, Satan being the greatest of all.

5. 罪是没有“上帝意识”，因为人的“感官（情欲）取向”的本性。 **The Theory that Sin is a Want of God-Consciousness, Due to Man's Sensuous Nature.**

This is the view of Schleiermacher. According to him man's consciousness of sin is dependent on his God-consciousness. When the sense of God awakens in man, he is at once conscious of the opposition of his lower nature to it. This opposition follows from the very constitution of his being, from his sensuous nature, from the soul's connection with a physical organism. It is therefore an inherent imperfection, but one which man feels as sin and guilt. Yet this does not make God the author of sin, since man wrongly conceives of this imperfection as sin. Sin has no objective existence, but exists only in man's consciousness. But this theory makes man constitutionally evil. The evil was present in man even in his original state, when the God-consciousness was not sufficiently strong to control the sensuous nature of man. It is in flagrant opposition to Scripture, when it holds that man wrongly adjudges this evil to be sin, and thus makes sin and guilt purely subjective. And though Schleiermacher wishes to avoid this

conclusion, it does make God the responsible author of sin, for He is the creator of man's sensuous nature. It also rests upon an incomplete induction of facts, since it fails to take account of the fact that many of the most hateful sins of man do not pertain to his physical but to his spiritual nature, such as avarice, envy, pride, malice, and others. Moreover, it leads to the most absurd conclusions as, for instance, that asceticism, by weakening the sensuous nature, necessarily weakens the power of sin; that man becomes less sinful as his senses fail with age; that death is the only redeemer; and that disembodied spirits, including the devil himself, have no sin.

6. 罪就是没有信靠上帝，抵挡祂的国度，因为无知。

The Theory of Sin as Want of Trust in God and Opposition to His Kingdom, Due to Ignorance.

Like Schleiermacher, Ritschl too stresses the fact that sin is understood only from the standpoint of the Christian consciousness. They who are outside of the pale of the Christian religion, and they who are still strangers to the experience of redemption, have no knowledge of it. Under the influence of the redemptive work of God man becomes conscious of his lack of trust in God and of his opposition to the Kingdom of God, which is the highest good. Sin is not determined by man's attitude to the law of God, but by his relation to the purpose of God, to establish the Kingdom. Man imputes his failure to make the purpose of God his own to himself as guilt, but God regards it merely as ignorance, and because it is ignorance, it is pardonable. This view of Ritschl reminds us by way of contrast of the Greek dictum that knowledge is virtue. It fails completely to do justice to the Scriptural position that sin is above all transgression of the law of God, and therefore renders man guilty in the sight of God and worthy of condemnation. Moreover, the idea that sin is ignorance goes contrary to the voice of Christian experience. The man who is burdened with the sense of sin certainly does not feel that way about it. He is grateful, too, that not only the sins which he committed in ignorance are pardonable, but all the others as well, with the single exception of the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

6. 罪就是自私 The Theory that Sin is Selfishness.

This position is taken among others by Mueller and A. H. Strong. Some who take this position conceive of selfishness merely as the opposite of altruism or benevolence; others understand by it the choice of self rather than God as the supreme object of love. Now this theory, especially when it conceives of selfishness as a putting of self in the place of God, is by far the best of the theories named. Yet it can hardly be called satisfactory. Though all selfishness is sin, and there is an element of selfishness in all sin, it cannot be said that selfishness is the essence of sin. Sin can be properly defined only with reference to the law of God, a reference that is completely lacking in the definition under consideration. Moreover, there is a great deal of sin in which selfishness is not at all the governing principle. When a poverty-stricken father sees his wife and children pine away for lack of food, and in his desperate desire to help them finally resorts to theft, this can hardly be called pure selfishness. It may even be that the thought of self was entirely absent. Enmity to God, hardness of heart, impenitence, and unbelief, are all heinous sins, but cannot simply be qualified as selfishness. And certainly the view that all virtue is disinterestedness or benevolence, which seems to be a necessary corollary of the theory under consideration, at least in one of its forms, does not hold. An act does not cease to be virtuous when its performance meets and satisfies some demand of our nature. Moreover, justice, fidelity, humility, forbearance, patience, and other virtues may be cultivated or practiced, not as forms of benevolence,

but as virtues inherently excellent, not merely as promoting the happiness of others, but for what they are in themselves.

7. 罪就是人的低层本能敌对一个渐渐浮现的道德意识

The Theory that Sin Consists in the Opposition of the Lower Propensities of Human Nature to a Gradually Developing Moral Consciousness.

This view was developed, as we pointed out in the preceding, by Tennant in his Hulsean Lectures. It is the doctrine of sin constructed according to the theory of evolution. Natural impulses and inherited qualities, derived from the brute, form the material of sin, but do not actually become sin until they are indulged in contrary to the gradually awakening moral sense of mankind. The theories of McDowall and Fiske move along similar lines. The theory as presented by Tennant halts somewhat between the Scriptural view of man and that presented by the theory of evolution, inclining now to the one and anon to the other side. It assumes that man had a free will even before the awakening of his moral consciousness, so that he was able to choose when he was placed before a moral ideal; but does not explain how we can conceive of a free and indeterminate will in a process of evolution. It limits sin to those transgressions of the moral law, which are committed with a clear consciousness of a moral ideal and are therefore condemned by conscience as evil. As a matter of fact, it is merely the old Pelagian view of sin grafted into the theory of evolution, and is therefore open to all the objections with which Pelagianism is burdened.

批判 CRITIQUE

The radical defect in all these theories is that they seek to define sin without taking into consideration that sin is essentially a breaking away from God, opposition to God, and transgression of the law of God. Sin should always be defined in terms of man's relation to God and to His will as expressed in the moral law.

B. 《圣经》中罪的概念 The Scriptural Idea of Sin.

In giving the Scriptural idea of sin it is necessary to call attention to several particulars.

1. 罪是邪恶的一种，有特定内容（定义） Sin is a Specific Kind of Evil.

At the present time we hear a great deal about evil, and comparatively little about sin; and this is rather misleading. Not all evil is sin. Sin should not be confused with physical evil, with that which is injurious or calamitous. It is possible to speak not only of sin but also of sickness as an evil, but then the word "evil" is used in two totally different senses. Above the physical lies the ethical sphere, in which the contrast between moral good and evil applies, and it is only in this sphere that we can speak of sin. And even in this sphere it is not desirable to substitute the word "evil" for "sin" without any further qualification, for the latter is more specific than the former. Sin is a moral evil. Most of the names that are used in Scripture to designate sin point to its moral character. Chatta'th directs attention to it as an action that misses the mark and consists in a deviation from the right way. 'Avel and 'avon indicate that it is a want of integrity and rectitude, a departure from the appointed path. Pesha refers to it as a revolt or

a refusal of subjection to rightful authority, a positive transgression of the law, and a breaking of the covenant. And resha' points to it as a wicked and guilty departure from the law. Furthermore, it is designated as guilt by 'asham, as unfaithfulness and treason, by ma'al, as vanity, by 'aven, and as perversion or distortion of nature (crookedness) by 'avah. The corresponding New Testament words, such as hamartia, adikia, parabasis, paraptoma, anomia, paranomia, and others, point to the same ideas. In view of the use of these words, and of the way in which the Bible usually speaks of sin, there can be no doubt about its ethical character. It is not a calamity that came upon man unawares, poisoned his life, and ruined his happiness, but an evil course which man has deliberately chosen to follow and which carries untold misery with it. Fundamentally, it is not something passive, such as a weakness, a fault, or an imperfection, for which we cannot be held responsible, but an active opposition to God, and a positive transgression of His law, which constitutes guilt. Sin is the result of a free but evil choice of man. This is the plain teaching of the Word of God, Gen. 3:1-6; Isa. 48:8; Rom. 1:18-32; I John 3:4. The application of the philosophy of evolution to the study of the Old Testament led some scholars to the conviction that the ethical idea of sin was not developed until the time of the prophets, but this view is not borne out by the way in which the earliest books of the Bible speak of sin.

Gen. 3:1-6

1 耶和華 神所造的，惟有蛇比田野一切的活物更狡猾。蛇對女人說： 神豈是真說不許你們吃園中所有樹上的果子麼？ **2** 女人對蛇說：園中樹上的果子，我們可以吃， **3** 惟有園當中那棵樹上的果子， 神曾說：你們不可吃，也不可摸，免得你們死。 **4** 蛇對女人說：你們不一定死； **5** 因為 神知道，你們吃的日子眼睛就明亮了，你們便如神能知道善惡。 **6** 於是女人見那棵樹的果子好作食物，也悅人的眼目，且是可喜愛的，能使人有智慧，就摘下果子來吃了，又給他丈夫，他丈夫也吃了。

1 Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, "Did God really say, 'You must not eat from any tree in the garden?'" 2 The woman said to the serpent, "We may eat fruit from the trees in the garden, 3 but God did say, 'You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die.'" 4 "You will not surely die," the serpent said to the woman. 5 "For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." 6 When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

Isa. 48:8

未曾聽見，未曾知道；你的耳朵從來未曾開通。我原知道你行事極其詭詐，你自從出胎以來，便稱為悖逆的。

You have neither heard nor understood; from of old your ear has not been open. Well do I know how treacherous you are; you were called a rebel from birth.

Rom. 1:18-32

18 原來，神的忿怒從天上顯明在一切不虔不義的人身上，就是那些行不義阻擋真理的人。

19 神的事情，人所能知道的，原顯明在人心裡，因為神已經給他們顯明。

20 自從造天地以來，神的永能和神性是明明可知的，雖是眼不能見，但藉著所造之物就可以曉得，叫人無可推諉。

21 因為，他們雖然知道神，卻不當作神榮耀他，也不感謝他。他們的思念變為虛妄，無知的心就昏暗了。

22 自稱為聰明，反成了愚拙，

23 將不能朽壞之神的榮耀變為偶像，彷彿必朽壞的人和飛禽、走獸、昆蟲的樣式。

24 所以，神任憑他們逞著心裡的情慾行污穢的事，以致彼此玷辱自己的身體。

25 他們將神的真實變為虛謊，去敬拜事奉受造之物，不敬奉那造物的主；主乃是可稱頌的，直到永遠。阿們！

26 因此，神任憑他們放縱可羞恥的情慾。他們的女人把順性的用處變為逆性的用處；

27 男人也是如此，棄了女人順性的用處，慾火攻心，彼此貪戀，男和男行可羞恥的事，就在自己身上受這妄為當得的報應。

28 他們既然故意不認識神，神就任憑他們存邪僻的心，行那些不合理的事；

29 裝滿了各樣不義、邪惡、貪婪、惡毒（或作：陰毒），滿心是嫉妒、兇殺、爭競、詭詐、毒恨；

30 又是讒毀的、背後說人的、怨恨神的（或作：被神所憎惡的）、侮慢人的、狂傲的、自誇的、捏造惡事的、違背父母的。

31 無知的，背約的，無親情的，不憐憫人的。

32 他們雖知道神判定行這樣事的人是當死的，然而他們不但自己去行，還喜歡別人去行。

18 The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness,

19 since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them.

20 For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--his eternal power and divine nature--have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

21 For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened.

22 Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools

23 and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.

24 Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another.

25 They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator--who is forever praised. Amen.

26 Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones.

27 In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

28 Furthermore, since they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, he gave them over to a depraved mind, to do what ought not to be done.

29 They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They are gossips,

30 slanderers, God-haters, insolent, arrogant and boastful; they invent ways of doing evil; they disobey their parents;

31 they are senseless, faithless, heartless, ruthless.

32 Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them.

I John 3:4

犯罪的，就是違背律法；違背律法就是罪。

Everyone who sins breaks the law; in fact, sin is lawlessness.

2. 罪的绝对性 Sin has an Absolute Character.

In the ethical sphere the contrast between good and evil is absolute. There is no neutral condition between the two. While there are undoubtedly degrees in both, there are no gradations between the good and the evil. The transition from the one to the other is not of a quantitative, but of a qualitative character. A moral being that is good does not become evil by simply diminishing his goodness, but only by a radical qualitative change, by turning to sin. Sin is not a lesser degree of goodness, but a positive evil. This is plainly taught in the Bible. He who does not love God is thereby characterized as evil. Scripture knows of no position of neutrality. It urges the wicked to turn to righteousness, and sometimes speaks of the righteous as falling into evil; but it does not contain a single indication that either the one or the other ever lands in a neutral position. Man is either on the right side or on the wrong side, Matt. 10:32,33; 12:30; Luke 11:23; Jas. 2:10.

Matt. 10:32, 33

凡在人面前認我的，我在我天上的父面前也必認他；

凡在人面前不認我的，我在我天上的父面前也必不認他。

"Whoever acknowledges me before men, I will also acknowledge him before my Father in heaven. 33 But whoever disowns me before men, I will disown him before my Father in heaven.

Matt. 12:30

不與我相合的，就是敵我的；不同我收聚的，就是分散的。

"He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters.

Luke 11:23

不與我相合的，就是敵我的；不同我收聚的，就是分散的。

"He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me, scatters.

Jas. 2:10

因為凡遵守全律法的，只在一條上跌倒，他就是犯了眾條。

For whoever keeps the whole law and yet stumbles at just one point is guilty of breaking all of it.

2. 罪必然与上帝和上帝的旨意有关

Sin Always has Relation to God and His Will.

The older dogmatists realized that it was impossible to have a correct conception of sin without contemplating it in relation to God and His will, and therefore emphasized this aspect and usually spoke of sin as "lack of conformity to the law of God." This is undoubtedly a correct formal definition of sin. But the question arises, Just what is the material content of the law? What does it demand? If this question is answered, it will be possible to determine what sin is in a material sense.

Now there is no doubt about it that the great central demand of the law is love to God. And if from the material point of view moral goodness consists in love to God, then moral evil must consist in the opposite. It is separation from God, opposition to God, hatred of God, and this manifests itself in constant transgression of the law of God in thought, word, and deed. The following passages clearly show that Scripture contemplates sin in relation to God and His law, either as written on the tablets of the heart, or as given by Moses, Rom. 1:32, 2:12-14; 4:15; Jas. 2:9; I John 3:4.

Rom. 1:32

他們雖知道神判定行這樣事的人是當死的，然而他們不但自己去行，還喜歡別人去行。

Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them.

Rom. 2:12-14

12 凡沒有律法犯了罪的，也必不按律法滅亡；凡在律法以下犯了罪的，也必按律法受審判。

13（原來在神面前，不是聽律法的為義，乃是行律法的稱義。

14 沒有律法的外邦人若順著本性行律法上的事，他們雖然沒有律法，自己就是自己的律法。

12 All who sin apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who sin under the law will be judged by the law.

13 For it is not those who hear the law who are righteous in God's sight, but it is those who obey the law who will be declared righteous.

14 (Indeed, when Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature things required by the law, they are a law for themselves, even though they do not have the law,

Rom. 4:15

因為律法是惹動忿怒的（或作：叫人受刑的）；那裡沒有律法，那裡就沒有過犯。

because law brings wrath. And where there is no law there is no transgression.

Jas. 2:9

但你們若按外貌待人，便是犯罪，被律法定為犯法的。

But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as lawbreakers.

I John 3:4

犯罪的，就是違背律法；違背律法就是罪。

Everyone who sins breaks the law; in fact, sin is lawlessness.

3. 罪包含罪孽与污秽

Sin Includes Both Guilt and Pollution.

Guilt is the state of deserving condemnation or of being liable to punishment for the violation of a law or a moral requirement. It expresses the relation which sin bears to justice or to the penalty of the law. But even so the word has a twofold meaning. It may denote an inherent quality of the sinner, namely, his demerit, ill-desert, or guiltiness, which renders him worthy of punishment. Dabney speaks of

this as "potential guilt." It is inseparable from sin, is never found in one who is not personally a sinner, and is permanent, so that once established, it cannot be removed by pardon. But it may also denote the obligation to satisfy justice, to pay the penalty of sin, "actual guilt," as Dabney calls it. It is not inherent in man, but is the penal enactment of the lawgiver, who fixes the penalty of the guilt. It may be removed by the satisfaction of the just demands of the law personally or vicariously. While many deny that sin includes guilt, this does not comport with the fact that sin was threatened and is indeed visited with punishment, and clearly contradicts the plain statements of Scripture, Matt. 6:12; Rom. 3:19; 5:18; Eph. 2:3. By pollution we understand the inherent corruption to which every sinner is subject. This is a reality in the life of every individual. It is not conceivable without guilt, though guilt as included in a penal relationship, is conceivable without immediate pollution. Yet it is always followed by pollution. Every one who is guilty in Adam is, as a result, also born with a corrupt nature. The pollution of sin is clearly taught in such passages as Job 14:4; Jer. 17:9; Matt. 7:15-20; Rom. 8:5-8; Eph. 4:17-19.

Matt. 6:12

免我們的債，如同我們免了人的債。

Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.

Rom. 3:19

我們曉得律法上的話都是對律法以下之人說的，好塞住各人的口，叫普世的人都伏在神審判之下。

Now we know that whatever the law says, it says to those who are under the law, so that every mouth may be silenced and the whole world held accountable to God.

Rom. 5:18

如此說來，因一次的過犯，眾人都被定罪；照樣，因一次的義行，眾人也就被稱義得生命了。

18 Consequently, just as the result of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men.

Eph. 2:3

我們從前也都在他們中間，放縱肉體的私慾，隨著肉體和心中所喜好的去行，本為可怒之子，和別人一樣。

All of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our sinful nature and following its desires and thoughts. Like the rest, we were by nature objects of wrath.

Job 14:4

誰能使潔淨之物出於污穢之中呢？無論誰也不能！

Who can bring what is pure from the impure? No one!

Jer. 17:9

人心比萬物都詭詐，壞到極處，誰能識透呢？

The heart is deceitful above all things and beyond cure. Who can understand it?

Matt. 7:15-20

15 你們要防備假先知。他們到你們這裡來，外面披著羊皮，裡面卻是殘暴的狼。

16 憑著他們的果子，就可以認出他們來。荊棘上豈能摘葡萄呢？蒺藜裡豈能摘無花果呢？

17 這樣，凡好樹都結好果子，惟獨壞樹結壞果子。

18 好樹不能結壞果子；壞樹不能結好果子。

19 凡不結好果子的樹就砍下來，丟在火裡。

20 所以，憑著他們的果子就可以認出他們來。

15 "Watch out for false prophets. They come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves.

16 By their fruit you will recognize them. Do people pick grapes from thornbushes, or figs from thistles?

17 Likewise every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit.

18 A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, and a bad tree cannot bear good fruit.

19 Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.

20 Thus, by their fruit you will recognize them.

Rom. 8:5-8

5 因為隨從肉體的人體貼肉體的事，隨從聖靈的人體貼聖靈的事。

6 體貼肉體的，就是死；體貼聖靈的，乃是生命、平安。

7 原來體貼肉體的，就是與神為仇；因為不服神的律法，也是不能服，

8 而且屬肉體的人不能得神的喜歡。

5 Those who live according to the sinful nature have their minds set on what that nature desires; but those who live in accordance with the Spirit have their minds set on what the Spirit desires.

6 The mind of sinful man is death, but the mind controlled by the Spirit is life and peace;

7 the sinful mind is hostile to God. It does not submit to God's law, nor can it do so.

8 Those controlled by the sinful nature cannot please God

Eph. 4:17-19

17 所以我說，且在主裡確實的說，你們行事不要再像外邦人存虛妄的心行事。

18 他們心地昏昧，與神所賜的生命隔絕了，都因自己無知，心裡剛硬；

19 良心既然喪盡，就放縱私慾，貪行種種的污穢。

17 So I tell you this, and insist on it in the Lord, that you must no longer live as the Gentiles do, in the futility of their thinking.

18 They are darkened in their understanding and separated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them due to the hardening of their hearts.

19 Having lost all sensitivity, they have given themselves over to sensuality so as to indulge in every kind of impurity, with a continual lust for more.

5. 罪是从心发出 Sin has its Seat in the Heart.

Sin does not reside in any one faculty of the soul, but in the heart, which in Scriptural psychology is the central organ of the soul, out of which are the issues of life. And from this center its influence and operations spread to the intellect, the will, the affections, in short, to the entire man, including his body. In his sinful state the whole man is the object of God's displeasure. There is a sense in which it can be said that sin originated in the will of man, but then the will does not designate some actual volition as much as it does the volitional nature of man. There was a tendency of the heart underlying the actual volition when sin entered the world. This view is in perfect harmony with the representations of Scripture in such passages as the following: Prov. 4:23; Jer. 17:9; Matt. 15:19,20; Luke 6:45; Heb. 3:12.

Prov. 4:23

你要保守你心，勝過保守一切（或譯：你要切切保守你心），因為一生的果效是由心發出。

Above all else, guard your heart, for it is the wellspring of life.

Jer. 17:9

人心比萬物都詭詐，壞到極處，誰能識透呢？

The heart is deceitful above all things and beyond cure. Who can understand it?

Matt. 15:19, 20

為從心裡發出來的，有惡念、兇殺、姦淫、苟合、偷盜、妄證、謗讟。這都是污穢人的；至於不洗手吃飯，那卻不污穢人。

19 For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false testimony, slander.

20 These are what make a man 'unclean'; but eating with unwashed hands does not make him 'unclean.'"

Luke 6:45

善人從他心裡所存的善就發出善來；惡人從他心裡所存的惡就發出惡來；因為心裡所充滿的，口裡就說出來。

The good man brings good things out of the good stored up in his heart, and the evil man brings evil things out of the evil stored up in his heart. For out of the overflow of his heart his mouth speaks.

Heb. 3:12

兄們，你們要謹慎，免得你們中間或有人存著不信的惡心，把永生神離棄了。

See to it, brothers, that none of you has a sinful, unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God.

7. 罪不仅是外在的罪行

Sin Does Not Consist Exclusively in Overt Acts.

Sin does not consist only in overt acts, but also in sinful habits and in a sinful condition of the soul. These three are related to one another as follows: The sinful state is the basis of the sinful habits, and these manifest themselves in sinful deeds. There is also truth, however, in the contention that repeated sinful deeds lead to the establishment of sinful habits. The sinful acts and dispositions of man must be referred to and find their explanation in a corrupt nature. The passages referred to in the preceding paragraph substantiate this view, for they clearly prove that the state or condition of man is thoroughly sinful. And if the question should still be raised, whether the thoughts and affections of the natural man, called "flesh" in Scripture, should be regarded as constituting sin, it might be answered by pointing to such passages as the following: Matt. 5:22,28; Rom. 7:7; Gal. 5:17,24, and others. In conclusion it may be said that sin may be defined as lack of conformity to the moral law of God, either in act, disposition, or state.

Matt. 5:22, 28

只是我告訴你們：凡（有古卷在凡字下加：無緣無故地）向弟兄動怒的，難免受審斷；凡罵弟兄是拉加的，難免公會的審斷；凡罵弟兄是魔利的，難免地獄的火。

是我告訴你們，凡看見婦女就動淫念的，這人心裡已經與他犯姦淫了。

22 But I tell you that anyone who is angry with his brother will be subject to judgment. Again, anyone who says to his brother, 'Raca, ' is answerable to the Sanhedrin. But anyone who says, 'You fool!' will be in danger of the fire of hell.

Rom. 7:7

這樣，我們可說甚麼呢？律法是罪麼？斷乎不是！只是非因律法，我就不知何為罪。非律法說不可起貪心，我就不知何為貪心。

What shall we say, then? Is the law sin? Certainly not! Indeed I would not have known what sin was except through the law. For I would not have known what coveting really was if the law had not said, "Do not covet."

Gal. 5:17, 24

因為情慾和聖靈相爭，聖靈和情慾相爭，這兩個是彼此相敵，使你們不能做所願意做的。

屬基督耶穌的人，是已經把肉體連肉體的邪情私慾同釘在十字架上了。

17 For the sinful nature desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the sinful nature. They are in conflict with each other, so that you do not do what you want.

24 Those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the sinful nature with its passions and desires.

C. 伯哪纠主义的罪观 **The Pelagian View of Sin.**

The Pelagian view of sin is quite different from that presented above. The only point of similarity lies in this that the Pelagian also considers sin in relation to the law of God, and regards it as a transgression of the law. But in all other particulars his conception differs widely from the Scriptural and Augustinian view.

1. 伯拉纠主义观点的阐述

Statement of the Pelagian View.

Pelagius takes his starting point in the natural ability of man. His fundamental proposition is: God has commanded man to do that which is good; hence the latter must have the ability to do it. This means that man has a free will in the absolute sense of the word, so that it is possible for him to decide for or against that which is good, and also to do the good as well as the evil. The decision is not dependent on any moral character in man, for the will is entirely indeterminate. Whether a man will do good or evil simply depends on his free and independent will. From this it follows, of course, that there is no such thing as a moral development of the individual. Good and evil are located in the separate actions of man. From this fundamental position the doctrinal teaching of Pelagius respecting sin naturally follows. Sin consists only in the separate acts of the will. There is no such thing as a sinful nature, neither are there sinful dispositions. Sin is always a deliberate choice of evil by a will which is perfectly free, and can just as well choose and follow the good. But if this is so, then the conclusion inevitably follows that Adam was not created in a state of positive holiness, but in a state of moral equilibrium. His condition was one of moral neutrality. He was neither good nor bad, and therefore had no moral character; but he chose the course of evil, and thus became sinful. Inasmuch as sin consists only in separate acts of the will, the idea of its propagation by procreation is absurd. A sinful nature, if such a thing should exist, might be passed on from father to son, but sinful acts cannot be so propagated. This is in the nature of the case an impossibility. Adam was the first sinner, but his sin was in no sense passed on to his descendants. There is no such thing as original sin. Children are born in a state of neutrality, beginning exactly where Adam

began, except that they are handicapped by the evil examples which they see round about them. Their future course must be determined by their own free choice. The universality of sin is admitted, because all experience testifies to it. It is due to imitation and to the habit of sinning that is gradually formed. Strictly speaking, there are, on the Pelagian standpoint, no sinners, but only separate sinful acts. This makes a religious conception of the history of the race utterly impossible.

2. 对伯拉纠主义观点的意义 Objections to the Pelagian View.

There are several weighty objections to the Pelagian view of sin, of which the following are the most important:

a. The fundamental position that man is held responsible by God only for what he is able to do, is absolutely contrary to the testimony of conscience and to the Word of God. It is an undeniable fact that, as a man increases in sin, his ability to do good decreases. He becomes in an ever greater measure the slave of sin. According to the theory under consideration this would also involve a lessening of his responsibility. But this is equivalent to saying that sin itself gradually redeems its victims by relieving them of their responsibility. The more sinful a man, the less responsible he is. Against this position conscience registers a loud protest. Paul does not say that the hardened sinners, which he describes in Rom. 1:18-32, were virtually without responsibility, but regards them as worthy of death. Jesus said of the wicked Jews who gloried in their freedom, but manifested their extreme wickedness by seeking to kill Him, that they were bondservants of sin, did not understand His speech, because they could not hear His word, and would die in their sins, John 8:21, 22, 34, 43. Though slaves of sin, they were yet responsible.

Rom. 1:18-32

18 原來，神的忿怒從天上顯明在一切不虔不義的人身上，就是那些行不義阻擋真理的人。

19 神的事情，人所能知道的，原顯明在人心裡，因為神已經給他們顯明。

20 自從造天地以來，神的永能和神性是明明可知的，雖是眼不能見，但藉著所造之物就可以曉得，叫人無可推諉。

21 因為，他們雖然知道神，卻不當作神榮耀他，也不感謝他。他們的思念變為虛妄，無知的心就昏暗了。

22 自稱為聰明，反成了愚拙，

23 將不能朽壞之神的榮耀變為偶像，彷彿必朽壞的人和飛禽、走獸、昆蟲的樣式。

24 所以，神任憑他們逞著心裡的情慾行污穢的事，以致彼此玷辱自己的身體。

25 他們將神的真實變為虛謊，去敬拜事奉受造之物，不敬奉那造物的主；主乃是可稱頌的，直到永遠。阿們！

26 因此，神任憑他們放縱可羞恥的情慾。他們的女人把順性的用處變為逆性的用處；

27 男人也是如此，棄了女人順性的用處，慾火攻心，彼此貪戀，男和男行可羞恥的事，就在自己身上受這妄為當得的報應。

28 他們既然故意不認識神，神就任憑他們存邪僻的心，行那些不合理的事；

29 裝滿了各樣不義、邪惡、貪婪、惡毒（或作：陰毒），滿心是嫉妒、兇殺、爭競、詭詐、毒恨；

30 又是讒毀的、背後說人的、怨恨神的（或作：被神所憎惡的）、侮慢人的、狂傲的、自誇的、捏造惡事的、違背父母的。

31 無知的，背約的，無親情的，不憐憫人的。

32 他們雖知道神判定行這樣事的人是當死的，然而他們不但自己去行，還喜歡別人去行。

18 The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness,

19 since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them.

20 For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--his eternal power and divine nature--have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

21 For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened.

22 Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools

23 and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.

24 Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another.

25 They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator--who is forever praised. Amen.

26 Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones.

27 In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

28 Furthermore, since they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, he gave them over to a depraved mind, to do what ought not to be done.

29 They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They are gossips,

30 slanderers, God-haters, insolent, arrogant and boastful; they invent ways of doing evil; they disobey their parents;

31 they are senseless, faithless, heartless, ruthless.

32 Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them.

John 8:21, 22, 34, 43

21 耶穌又對他們說：我要去了，你們要找我，並且你們要死在罪中。我所去的地方，你們不能到。

22 猶太人說：他說：我所去的地方，你們不能到，難道他要自盡麼？

34 耶穌回答說：我實實在在的告訴你們，所有犯罪的就是罪的奴僕。

43 你們為甚麼不明白我的話呢？無非是因你們不能聽我的道。

21 Once more Jesus said to them, "I am going away, and you will look for me, and you will die in your sin. Where I go, you cannot come."

22 This made the Jews ask, "Will he kill himself? Is that why he says, 'Where I go, you cannot come'?"

34 Jesus replied, "I tell you the truth, everyone who sins is a slave to sin.

43 Why is my language not clear to you? Because you are unable to hear what I say.

b. To deny that man has by nature a moral character, is simply bringing him down to the level of the animal. According to this view everything in the life of man that is not a conscious choice of the will, is deprived of all moral quality. But the consciousness of men in general testifies to the fact that the contrast between good and evil also applies to man's tendencies, desires, moods, and affections, and that these also have a moral character. In Pelagianism, sin and virtue are reduced to superficial appendages of man, in no way connected with his inner life. That the estimate of Scripture is quite different appears from the following passages: Jer. 17:9; Ps. 51:6,10; Matt. 15:19; Jas. 4:1,2.

Jer. 17:9

人心比萬物都詭詐，壞到極處，誰能識透呢？

The heart is deceitful above all things and beyond cure. Who can understand it?

Ps. 51:6, 10

你所喜愛的是內裡誠實；你在我隱密處，必使我得智慧。

神啊，求你為我造清潔的心，使我裡面重新有正直（或譯：堅定）的靈。

6 Surely you desire truth in the inner parts; you teach me wisdom in the inmost place.

10 Create in me a pure heart, O God, and renew a steadfast spirit within me.

Matt. 15:19

為從心裡發出來的，有惡念、兇殺、姦淫、苟合、偷盜、妄證、謗讟。

For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false testimony, slander.

Jas. 4:1, 2

你們中間的爭戰鬥毆是從那裡來的呢？不是從你們百體中戰鬥之私慾來的麼？

你們貪戀，還是得不著；你們殺害嫉妒，又鬥毆爭戰，也不能得。你們得不著，是因為你們不求。

1 What causes fights and quarrels among you? Don't they come from your desires that battle within you?

2 You want something but don't get it. You kill and covet, but you cannot have what you want. You quarrel and fight. You do not have, because you do not ask God.

c. A choice of the will that is in no way determined by man's character, is not only psychologically unthinkable, but also ethically worthless. If a good deed of man simply happens to fall out as it does, and no reason can be given why it did not turn out to be the opposite, in other words, if the deed is not an expression of man's character, it lacks all moral value. It is only as an exponent of character that a deed has the moral value that is ascribed to it.

d. The Pelagian theory can give no satisfactory account of the universality of sin. The bad example of parents and grandparents offers no real explanation. The mere abstract possibility of man's sinning, even when strengthened by the evil example, does not explain how it came to pass that all men actually sinned. How can it be accounted for that the will invariably turned in the direction of sin, and never in the opposite direction? It is far more natural to think of a general disposition to sin.

E. 罗马天主教的罪观 The Roman Catholic View of Sin.

Though the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent are somewhat ambiguous in the doctrine of sin, the prevailing Roman Catholic view of sin may be expressed as follows: Real sin always consists in a conscious act of the will. It is true that the dispositions and habits that are not in accord with the will of God, are of a sinful character; yet they cannot be called sins in the strict sense of the word. The indwelling concupiscence, which lies back of sin, gained the upper hand in man in paradise, and thus precipitated the loss of the donum superadditum of original righteousness, cannot be regarded as sin, but only as the fomes or fuel of sin. The sinfulness of Adam's descendants is primarily only a negative condition, consisting in the absence of something that ought to be present, that is, of original righteousness, which is not essential to human nature. Something essential is wanting only if, as some hold, the justitia naturalis was also lost.

The objections to this view are perfectly evident from what was said in connection with the Pelagian theory. A bare reminder of them would seem to be quite sufficient. In so far as it holds that real sin consists only in a deliberate choice of the will and in overt acts, the objections raised against Pelagianism are pertinent. The idea that original righteousness was supernaturally added to man's natural constitution, and that its loss did not detract from human nature, is an unscriptural idea, as was pointed out in our discussion of the image of God in man. According to the Bible concupiscence is sin, real sin, and the root of many sinful actions. This was brought out when the Biblical view of sin was considered.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Has philosophy succeeded in explaining the origin of sin?
2. Does Scripture bear out the view that sin originally had no ethical quality?
3. What objection is there to the view that sin is mere privation?
4. Must we conceive of sin as a substance?
5. With whose name is this view associated?
6. Does this sin exist apart from the sinner?
7. How can we prove that sin must always be judged by the law of God?
8. Did Paul favor the old Greek dualism, when he spoke of "the body of sin" and used the term "flesh" to denote man's sinful nature?
9. Is the present tendency to speak of 'evil' rather than of 'sin' commendable?
10. What is meant by the social interpretation of sin?
11. Does this recognize sin for what it is fundamentally?

LITERATURE:

Bavinck, Geref. Dogm. III, pp. 121-158; Kuyper, Dict. Dogm., De Peccato, pp. 27-35; Hodge, Syst. Theol. II, pp. 130-192; Vos, Geref. Dogm. II, pp. 21-32; Dabney, Syst. and Polem. Theol., pp. 306-317; McPherson, Chr. Dogm., pp. 257-264; Pope, Chr. Theol. II, pp. 29-42; Orchard, Modern Theories of Sin; Moxon, The Doctrine of Sin; Alexander, Syst. of Bibl. Theol. I, pp. 232-265; Brown, Chr. Theol. in Outline, pp. 261-282; Clarke, An Outline of Chr. Theol., pp. 227-239; Orr, God's Image in Man, pp. 197-246; Mackintosh, Christianity and Sin, cf. Index; Candlish, The Bibl. Doct. of Sin, pp. 31-44; Talma, De Anthropologie van Calvijn, pp. 92-117; Tennant, The Concept of Sin

III. 罪的传递 The Transmission of Sin

Scripture and experience both teach us that sin is universal, and according to the Bible the explanation for this universality lies in the fall of Adam. These two points, the universality of sin, and the connection of Adam's sin with that of mankind in general, now call for consideration. While there has been rather general agreement as to the universality of sin, there have been different representations of the connection between the sin of Adam and that of his descendants.

A. 历史回顾 Historical Review.

1. 宗教改革前 Before the Reformation.

The writings of the Apologists contain nothing definite respecting original sin, while those of Irenaeus and Tertullian clearly teach that our sinful condition is the result of Adam's fall. But the doctrine of the direct imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants is foreign even to them.

Tertullian had a realistic conception of mankind. The whole human race was potentially and numerically present in Adam, and therefore sinned when he sinned and became corrupt when he became corrupt. Human nature as a whole sinned in Adam, and therefore every individualization of that nature is also sinful.

Origen, who was profoundly influenced by Greek philosophy, had a different view of the matter, and scarcely recognized any connection between the sin of Adam and that of his descendants. He found the explanation of the sinfulness of the human race primarily in the personal sin of each soul in a pre-temporal state, though he also mentions some mystery of generation.

Augustine shared the realistic conception of Tertullian. Though he also spoke of "imputation," he did not yet have in mind the direct or immediate imputation of the guilt of Adam to his posterity. His doctrine of original sin is not entirely clear. This may be due to the fact that he hesitated to choose between Traducianism and Creationism. While he stresses the fact that all men were seminally present in Adam and actually sinned in him, he also comes very close to the idea that they sinned in Adam as their representative. However, his main emphasis was on the transmission of the corruption of sin. Sin is passed on by propagation, and this propagation of Adam's sin is at the same time a punishment for his sin. Wiggers states the idea very briefly in these words: "The corruption of human nature, in the whole race, was the righteous punishment of the transgression of the first man, in whom all men already existed."

Augustine's great opponent, Pelagius, denied such a connection between the sin of Adam and those of his posterity. As he saw it, the propagation of sin by generation involved the Traducianist theory of the origin of the soul, which He regarded as a heretical error; and the imputation of Adam's sin to anyone but himself would be in conflict with the divine rectitude.

The Pelagian view was rejected by the Church, and the Scholastics in general thought along the lines indicated by Augustine, the emphasis all the while being on the transmission of the pollution of Adam's sin rather than on that of his guilt. Hugo St. Victor and Peter the Lombard held that actual concupiscence

stains the semen in the act of procreation, and that this stain in some way defiles the soul on its union with the body. Anselm, Alexander of Hales, and Bonaventura stressed the realistic conception of the connection between Adam and his posterity. The whole human race was seminally present in Adam, and therefore also sinned in him. His disobedience was the disobedience of the entire human race. At the same time generation was regarded as the *sine qua non* of the transmission of the sinful nature. In Bonaventura and others after him the distinction between original guilt and original pollution was more clearly expressed. The fundamental idea was, that the guilt of Adam's sin is imputed to all his descendants. Adam suffered the loss of original righteousness, and thereby incurred the divine displeasure. As a result all his descendants are deprived of original righteousness, and as such the objects of divine wrath. Moreover, the pollution of Adam's sin is in some way passed on to his posterity, but the manner of this transmission was a matter of dispute among the Scholastics. Since they were not Traducianists, and therefore could not say that the soul, which is after all the real seat of evil, was passed on from father to son by generation, they felt that something more had to be said to explain the transmission of inherent evil. Some said that it is passed on through the body, which in turn contaminates the soul as soon as it comes in contact with it. Others, sensing the danger of this explanation, sought it in the mere fact that every man is now born in the state in which Adam was before he was endowed with original righteousness, and thus subject to the struggle between the unchecked flesh and the spirit. In Thomas Aquinas the realistic strain again appears rather strongly, though in a modified form. He pointed out that the human race constitutes an organism, and that, just as the act of one bodily member — say, the hand — is regarded as the act of the person, so the sin of one member of the organism of humanity is imputed to the whole organism.

2. 宗教改革后 After the Reformation.

While the Reformers did not agree with the Scholastics as to the nature of original sin, their view of its transmission did not contain any new elements. The ideas of Adam as the representative of the human race, and of the "immediate" imputation of his guilt to his descendants are not yet clearly expressed in their works. According to Luther we are accounted guilty by God because of the indwelling sin inherited from Adam. Calvin speaks in a somewhat similar vein. He holds that, since Adam was not only the progenitor but the root of the human race, all his descendants are born with a corrupt nature; and that both the guilt of Adam's sin and their own inborn corruption are imputed to them as sin. The development of the federal theology brought the idea of Adam as the representative of the human race to the foreground, and led to a clearer distinction between the transmission of the guilt and of the pollution of Adam's sin. Without denying that our native corruption also constitutes guilt in the sight of God, federal theology stressed the fact that there is an "immediate" imputation of Adam's guilt to those whom he represented as the head of the covenant.

Socinians and Arminians both rejected the idea of the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants. Placeus, of the school of Saumur, advocated the idea of "mediate" imputation. Denying all immediate imputation, he held that because we inherit a sinful nature from Adam, we are deserving of being treated as if we had committed the original offense. This was something new in Reformed theology, and Rivet had no difficulty in proving this by collecting a long line of testimonies. A debate ensued in which "immediate" and "mediate" imputation were represented as mutually exclusive doctrines; and in which it was made to appear as if the real question was, whether man is guilty in the sight of God solely on account of Adam's sin, imputed to him, or solely on account of his own inherent sin. The former was not the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, and the latter was not taught in them before the time of Placeus.

The teachings of the latter found their way into New England theology, and became especially characteristic of the New School (New Haven) theology.

In modern liberal theology the doctrine of the transmission of sin from Adam to his posterity is entirely discredited. It prefers to seek the explanation of the evil that is in the world in an animal inheritance, which is not itself sinful. Strange to say, even Barth and Brunner, though violently opposed to liberal theology, do not regard the universal sinfulness of the human race as the result of Adam's sin. Historically, the latter occupies a unique place merely as the first sinner.

B. 罪的普世性 The Universality of Sin.

Few will be inclined to deny the presence of evil in the human heart, however much they may differ as to the nature of this evil and as to the way in which it originated. Even Pelagians and Socinians are ready to **admit that sin is universal. This is a fact that forces itself upon the attention of every one.**

1. 宗教与哲学历史证明。

The History of Religions and of Philosophy Testify to It.

The history of religions testifies to the universality of sin. The question of Job, "How shall a man be just with God?" is a question that was asked not merely in the realm of special revelation, but also outside of it in the Gentile world. The heathen religions testify to a universal consciousness of sin and of the need of reconciliation with a Supreme Being. There is a general feeling that the gods are offended and must be propitiated in some way. There is a universal voice of conscience, testifying to the fact that man falls short of the ideal and stands condemned in the sight of some higher Power. Altars reeking with the blood of sacrifices, often the sacrifices of dear children, repeated confessions of wrongdoing, and prayers for deliverance from evil, — all point to the consciousness of sin. Missionaries find this wherever they go. The history of philosophy is indicative of the same fact. Early Greek philosophers were already wrestling with the problem of moral evil, and since their day no philosopher of name was able to ignore it. They were all constrained to admit the universality of it, and that in spite of the fact they were not able to explain the phenomenon. There was, it is true, a superficial optimism in the eighteenth century, which dreamt of the inherent goodness of man, but in its stupidity flew in the face of the facts and was sharply rebuked by Kant. Many liberal theologians were induced to believe and to preach this inherent goodness of man as gospel truth, but today many of them qualify it as one of the most pernicious errors of the past. Surely, the facts of life do not warrant such optimism.

2. 《圣经》清楚教导。

The Bible Clearly Teaches It.

There are direct statements of Scripture that point to the universal sinfulness of man, such as I Kings 8:46; Ps. 143:2; Prov. 20:9; Eccl. 7:20; Rom. 3:1-12,19,20,23; Gal. 3:22; Jas. 3:2; I John 1:8,10. Several passages of Scripture teach that sin is the heritage of man from the time of his birth, and is therefore present in human nature so early that it cannot possibly be considered as the result of imitation, Ps. 51:5; Job 14:4; John 3:6. In Ephesians 2:3 Paul says of the Ephesians that they "were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest." In this passage the term "by nature" points to something

inborn and original, as distinguished from what is subsequently acquired. Sin, then, is something original, in which all men participate, and which makes them guilty before God. Moreover, according to Scripture, death is visited even upon those who have never exercised a personal and conscious choice, Rom. 5:12-14. This passage implies that sin exists in the case of infants prior to moral consciousness. Since infants die, and therefore the effect of sin is present in their case, it is but natural to assume that the cause is also present. Finally, Scripture also teaches that all men are under condemnation and therefore need the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. Children are never made an exception to this rule, cf. the preceding passages and also John 3:3, 5; I John 5:12. This is not contradicted by those passages which ascribe a certain righteousness to man, such as, Matt. 9:12,13; Acts 10:35; Rom. 2:14; Phil. 3:6; I Cor. 1:30, for this may be either civil righteousness, ceremonial or covenant righteousness, the righteousness of the law, or the righteousness which is in Christ Jesus.

I Kings 8:46

你的民若得罪你（世上沒有不犯罪的人），你向他們發怒，將他們交給仇敵擄到仇敵之地，或遠或近，

"When they sin against you--for there is no one who does not sin--and you become angry with them and give them over to the enemy, who takes them captive to his own land, far away or near;

Ps. 143:2

求你不要審問僕人；因為在你面前，凡活著的人沒有一個是義的。

Do not bring your servant into judgment, for no one living is righteous before you.

Prov. 20:9

誰能說，我潔淨了我的心，我脫淨了我的罪？

Who can say, "I have kept my heart pure; I am clean and without sin"?

Eccl. 7:20

常行善而不犯罪的義人，世上實在沒有。

There is not a righteous man on earth who does what is right and never sins.

Rom. 3:1-12, 19, 20, 23

1 這樣說來，猶太人有甚麼長處？割禮有甚麼益處呢？

2 凡事大有好處：第一是神的聖言交託他們。

3 即便有不信的，這有何妨呢？難道他們的不信就廢掉神的信麼？

4 斷乎不能！不如說，神是真實的，人都是虛謊的。如經上所記：你責備人的時候，顯為公義；被人議論的時候，可以得勝。

5 我且照著人的常話說，我們的不義若顯出神的義來，我們可以怎麼說呢？神降怒，是他不義麼？

6 斷乎不是！若是這樣，神怎能審判世界呢？

7 若神的真實，因我的虛謊越發顯出他的榮耀，為甚麼我還受審判，好像罪人呢？

8 為甚麼不說，我們可以作惡以成善呢？這是毀謗我們的人說我們有這話。這等人定罪是該當的。

9 這卻怎麼樣呢？我們比他們強麼？決不是的！因我們已經證明，猶太人和希利尼人都在罪惡之下。

10 就如經上所記：沒有義人，連一個也沒有。

11 沒有明白的；沒有尋求神的；

12 都是偏離正路，一同變為無用。沒有行善的，連一個也沒有。

19 我們曉得律法上的話都是對律法以下之人說的，好塞住各人的口，叫普世的人都伏在神審判之下。

20 所以凡有血氣的，沒有一個因行律法能在神面前稱義，因為律法本是叫人知罪。

23 因為世人都犯了罪，虧缺了神的榮耀；

1 What advantage, then, is there in being a Jew, or what value is there in circumcision?

2 Much in every way! First of all, they have been entrusted with the very words of God.

3 What if some did not have faith? Will their lack of faith nullify God's faithfulness?

4 Not at all! Let God be true, and every man a liar. As it is written: "So that you may be proved right when you speak and prevail when you judge."

5 But if our unrighteousness brings out God's righteousness more clearly, what shall we say? That God is unjust in bringing his wrath on us? (I am using a human argument.)

6 Certainly not! If that were so, how could God judge the world?

7 Someone might argue, "If my falsehood enhances God's truthfulness and so increases his glory, why am I still condemned as a sinner?"

8 Why not say--as we are being slanderously reported as saying and as some claim that we say--"Let us do evil that good may result"? Their condemnation is deserved.

9 What shall we conclude then? Are we any better? Not at all! We have already made the charge that Jews and Gentiles alike are all under sin.

10 As it is written: "There is no one righteous, not even one;

11 there is no one who understands, no one who seeks God.

12 All have turned away, they have together become worthless; there is no one who does good, not even one."

19 Now we know that whatever the law says, it says to those who are under the law, so that every mouth may be silenced and the whole world held accountable to God.

20 Therefore no one will be declared righteous in his sight by observing the law; rather, through the law we become conscious of sin.

23 for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God,

Gal. 3:22

聖經把眾人都圈在罪裡，使所應許的福因信耶穌基督，歸給那信的人。

But the Scripture declares that the whole world is a prisoner of sin, so that what was promised, being given through faith in Jesus Christ, might be given to those who believe.

Jas. 3:2

原來我們在許多事上都有過失；若有人在話語上沒有過失，他就是完全人，也能勒住自己的全身。

We all stumble in many ways. If anyone is never at fault in what he says, he is a perfect man, able to keep his whole body in check.

I John 1:8, 10

我們若說自己無罪，便是自欺，真理不在我們心裡了。

我們若說自己沒有犯過罪，便是以神為說謊的，他的道也不在我們心裡了。

8 If we claim to be without sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.

10 If we claim we have not sinned, we make him out to be a liar and his word has no place in our lives.

Ps. 51:5

我是在罪孽裡生的，在我母親懷胎的時候就有了罪。

Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me.

Job 14:4

誰能使潔淨之物出於污穢之中呢？無論誰也不能！

Who can bring what is pure from the impure? No one!

John 3:6

從肉身生的就是肉身；從靈生的就是靈。

Flesh gives birth to flesh, but the Spirit gives birth to spirit.

Ephesians 2:3

我們從前也都在他們中間，放縱肉體的私慾，隨著肉體和心中所喜好的去行，本為可怒之子，和別人一樣。

All of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our sinful nature and following its desires and thoughts. Like the rest, we were by nature objects of wrath.

Rom. 5:12-14

這就如罪是從一人入了世界，死又是從罪來的；於是死就臨到眾人，因為眾人都犯了罪。

沒有律法之先，罪已經在世上；但沒有律法，罪也不算罪。

然而從亞當到摩西，死就作了王，連那些不與亞當犯一樣罪過的，也在他的權下。亞當乃是那以後要來之人的豫像。

12 Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned—

13 for before the law was given, sin was in the world. But sin is not taken into account when there is no law.

14 Nevertheless, death reigned from the time of Adam to the time of Moses, even over those who did not sin by breaking a command, as did Adam, who was a pattern of the one to come.

John 3:3, 5

耶穌回答說：「我實實在在地告訴你，人若不重生，就不能見神的國。

耶穌說：「我實實在在的告訴你，人若不是從水和聖靈生的，就不能進神的國。

3 In reply Jesus declared, "I tell you the truth, no one can see the kingdom of God unless he is born again.

5 Jesus answered, "I tell you the truth, no one can enter the kingdom of God unless he is born of water and the Spirit.

1 John 5:12

人有了神的兒子就有生命，沒有神的兒子就沒有生命。

He who has the Son has life; he who does not have the Son of God does not have life.

Matt. 9:12, 13

耶穌聽見，就說：康健的人用不著醫生，有病的人才用得著。

上說：我喜愛憐恤，不喜愛祭祀。這句話的意思，你們且去揣摩。我來本不是召義人，乃是召罪人。

12 On hearing this, Jesus said, "It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick. 13 But go and learn what this means: 'I desire mercy, not sacrifice.' For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners."

Acts 10:35

原來，各國中那敬畏主、行義的人都為主所悅納。

but accepts men from every nation who fear him and do what is right.

Rom. 2:14

有律法的外邦人若順著本性行律法上的事，他們雖然沒有律法，自己就是自己的律法。

(Indeed, when Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature things required by the law, they are a law for themselves, even though they do not have the law,

Phil. 3:6

就熱心說，我是逼迫教會的；就律法上的義說，我是無可指摘的。

as for zeal, persecuting the church; as for legalistic righteousness, faultless.

I Cor. 1:30

但你們得在基督耶穌裡，是本乎神，神又使他成為我們的智慧、公義、聖潔、救贖。

It is because of him that you are in Christ Jesus, who has become for us wisdom from God--that is, our righteousness, holiness and redemption.

B. 亚当的罪与人类的罪的接连

The Connection of Adam's Sin with that of the Race.

1. 否认这接连的立场 The Denial of This Connection.

Some deny the causal connection of the sin of Adam with the sinfulness of the human race either wholly or in part.

a. Pelagians and Socinians deny absolutely that there is any necessary connection between our sin and the sin of Adam. The first sin was Adam's sin only and does not concern his posterity in any way. The most they will admit is that the evil example of Adam led to imitation.

b. Semi-Pelagians and the earlier Arminians teach that man inherited a natural inability from Adam, but is not responsible for this inability, so that no guilt attaches to it, and it may even be said that God is somewhat under obligation to provide a cure for it. The Wesleyan Arminians admit that this inborn corruption also involves guilt.

c. The New School (New Haven) theory teaches that man is born with an inherent tendency to sin, in virtue of which his moral preference is invariably wrong; but that this tendency cannot itself be called sin, since sin always consists exclusively in conscious and intentional transgression of the law.

d. The Theology of crisis stresses the solidarity of sin in the human race, but denies that sin originated in an act of Adam in paradise. The fall belongs to pre- or super-history, and is already a thing of the past when the historical Adam appears upon the scene. It is the secret of God's predestination. The story of the fall is a myth. Adam appears as the type of Christ in so far as it can be seen in him that life without sin is possible in communion with God. Says Brunner: "In Adam all have sinned — that is the Biblical statement; but how? The Bible does not tell us that. The doctrine of original sin is read into it."

2. 解释此连接的不同理论

Different Theories to Explain the Connection.

a. 惟实论 The realistic theory.

The earliest method of explaining the connection between the sin of Adam and the guilt and pollution of all his descendants was the realistic theory. This theory is to the effect that human nature constitutes, not only generically but numerically as well, a single unit. Adam possessed the whole human nature, and in him it corrupted itself by its own voluntary apostatizing act in Adam. Individual men are not separate substances, but manifestations of the same general substance; they are numerically one. This universal human nature became corrupt and guilty in Adam, and consequently every individualization of it in the descendants of Adam is also corrupt and guilty from the very beginning of its existence. This means that all men actually sinned in Adam before the individualization of human nature began. This theory was accepted by some of the early Church Fathers and by some of the Scholastics, and was defended in more recent times by Dr. Shedd.

异议 OBJECTIONS

However, it is open to several objections:

(1) By representing the souls of men as individualizations of the general spiritual substance that was present in Adam, it would seem to imply that the substance of the soul is of a material nature, and thus to land us inevitably in some sort of materialism.

(2) It is contrary to the testimony of consciousness and does not sufficiently guard the interests of human personality. Every man is conscious of being a separate personality, and therefore far more than a mere passing wave in the general ocean of existence.

(3) It does not explain why Adam's descendants are held responsible for his first sin only, and not for his later sins, nor for the sins of all the generations of forefathers that followed Adam.

(4) Neither does it give an answer to the important question, why Christ was not held responsible for the actual commission of sin in Adam, for He certainly shared the same human nature, the nature that actually sinned in Adam.

b. 行为之约 The doctrine of the covenant of works.

This implies that Adam stood in a twofold relationship to his descendants, namely, that of the natural head of all mankind, and that of the representative head of the entire human race in the covenant of works.

(1) The natural relationship. In his natural relationship Adam was the father of all mankind. As he was created by God he was subject to change, and had no rightful claim to an unchangeable state. He was in duty bound to obey God, and this obedience did not entitle him to any reward. On the other hand, if he sinned, he would become subject to corruption and to punishment, but the sin would be only his own, and could not be placed to the account of his descendants. Dabney holds that, according to the law that like begets like, his corruption would have passed on to his descendants. But however this may be — and it is rather useless to speculate about it — they certainly could not have been held responsible for this corruption. They could not have been considered guilty in Adam merely in virtue of the natural relationship in which Adam stood to the race. The usual Reformed representation is a different one.

(2) The covenant relationship. To the natural relationship in which Adam stood to his descendants God graciously added a covenant relationship containing several positive elements:

[a] An element of representation. God ordained that in this covenant Adam should not stand for himself only, but as the representative of all his descendants. Consequently, he was the head of the race not only in a parental, but also in a federal sense.

[b] An element of probation. While apart from this covenant Adam and his descendants would have been in a continual state of trial, with a constant danger of sinning, the covenant guaranteed that persistent perseverance for a fixed period of time would be rewarded with the establishment of man in a permanent state of holiness and bliss.

[c] An element of reward or punishment. According to the terms of the covenant Adam would obtain a rightful claim to eternal life, if he fulfilled the conditions of the covenant. And not only he, but all his descendants as well would have shared in this blessing. In its normal operation, therefore, the covenant arrangement would have been of incalculable benefit for mankind. But there was a possibility that man would disobey, thereby reversing the operation of the covenant, and in that case the results would naturally be correspondingly disastrous. Transgression of the covenant commandment would result in death. 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 a result they are born in a depraved and sinful condition as well, and this inherent corruption also involves guilt. This doctrine explains why only the first sin of Adam, and not his following sins nor the sins of our other forefathers, is imputed to us, and also safeguards the sinlessness of Jesus, for He was not a human person and therefore not in the covenant of works.

c. 间接归算论。 The theory of mediate imputation.

This theory denies that the guilt of Adam's sin is directly imputed to his descendants, and represents the matter as follows: Adam's descendants derive their innate corruption from him by a process of natural generation, and only on the basis of that inherent depravity which they share with him are they also considered guilty of his apostasy. They are not born corrupt because they are guilty in Adam, but they are considered guilty because they are corrupt. Their condition is not based on their legal status,

but their legal status on their condition. This theory, first advocated by Placeus, was adopted by the younger Vitranga and Venema, by several New England theologians, and by some of the New School theologians in the Presbyterian Church.

异议 OBJECTIONS

This theory is objectionable for several reasons:

- (1) A thing cannot be mediated by its own consequences. The inherent depravity with which the descendants of Adam are born is already the result of Adam's sin, and therefore cannot be considered as the basis on which they are guilty of the sin of Adam.
- (2) It offers no objective ground whatsoever for the transmission of Adam's guilt and depravity to all his descendants. Yet there must be some objective legal ground for this.
- (3) If this theory were consistent, it ought to teach the mediate imputation of the sins of all previous generations to those following, for their joint corruption is passed on by generation.
- (4) It also proceeds on the assumption that there can be moral corruption that is not at the same time guilt, a corruption that does not in itself make one liable to punishment.
- (5) And finally, if the inherent corruption which is present in the descendants of Adam can be regarded as the legal ground for the explanation of something else, there is no more need of any mediate imputation.

IV. 人类历史中的罪 Sin in the Life of the Human Race

A. 原罪 Original Sin.

The sinful state and condition in which men are born is designated in theology by the name *peccatum originale*, which is literally translated in the English "original sin." This term is better than the Holland name "erfzonde," since the latter, strictly speaking, does not cover all that belongs to original sin. It is not a proper designation of original guilt, for this is not inherited but imputed to us. This sin is called "original sin," (1) because it is derived from the original root of the human race; (2) because it is present in the life of every individual from the time of his birth, and therefore cannot be regarded as the result of imitation; and (3) because it is the inward root of all the actual sins that defile the life of man. We should guard against the mistake of thinking that the term in any way implies that the sin designated by it belongs to the original constitution of human nature, which would imply that God created man as a sinner.

1. 历史回顾 Historical Review.

早期教父 Early Church Fathers

The early Church Fathers contain nothing very definite about original sin. According to the Greek Fathers there is a physical corruption in the human race, which is derived from Adam, but this is not sin and does not involve guilt. The freedom of the will was not affected directly by the fall, but is affected only indirectly by the inherited physical corruption.

伯拉纠主义 Pelagianism

The tendency apparent in the Greek Church finally culminated in Pelagianism, which flatly denied all original sin. In the Latin Church a different tendency appeared especially in Tertullian, according to whom the propagation of the soul involves the propagation of sin. He regarded original sin as a hereditary sinful taint or corruption, which did not exclude the presence of some good in man. Ambrose advanced beyond Tertullian by regarding original sin as a state and by distinguishing between the inborn corruption and the resulting guilt of man. The free will of man was weakened by the fall.

奥古斯丁 Augustine

It is especially in Augustine that the doctrine of original sin comes to fuller development. According to him the nature of man, both physical and moral, is totally corrupted by Adam's sin, so that he cannot do otherwise than sin. This inherited corruption or original sin is a moral punishment for the sin of Adam. It is such a quality of the nature of man, that in his natural state, he can and will do evil only. He has lost the material freedom of the will, and it is especially in this respect that original sin constitutes a punishment. In virtue of this sin man is already under condemnation. It is not merely corruption, but also guilt.

版伯拉纠主义 Semi-Pelagianism

Semi-Pelagianism reacted against the absoluteness of the Augustinian view. It admitted that the whole human race is involved in the fall of Adam, that human nature is tainted with hereditary sin, and that all men are by nature inclined to evil and not able, apart from the grace of God, to complete any good work; but denied the total depravity of man, the guilt of original sin, and the loss of the freedom of the will.

中古时期：经院主义 Middle Ages: Scholasticism

This became the prevalent view during the Middle Ages, though there were some prominent Scholastics who were on the whole Augustinian in their conception of original sin. Anselm's view of original sin was altogether in harmony with that of Augustine. It represents original sin as consisting of the guilt of nature (the nature of the entire human race), contracted by a single act of Adam, and the resulting inherent corruption of human nature, handed down to posterity and manifesting itself in a tendency to sin. This sin also involves the loss of the power of self-determination in the direction of holiness (material freedom of the will), and renders man a slave of sin. The prevailing opinion among the Scholastics was that original sin is not something positive, but rather the absence of something that ought to be present, particularly the privation of original righteousness, though some would add a positive element, namely, an inclination to evil.

Thomas Aquinas held that original sin, considered in its material element, is concupiscence, but considered in its formal element, is the privation of original justice. There is a dissolution of the harmony in which original justice consisted, and in this sense original sin can be called a languor of nature.

宗教改革 Protestant Reformers

Speaking generally, the Reformers were in agreement with Augustine, though Calvin differed from him especially on two points, by stressing the fact that original sin is not something purely negative, and is not limited to the sensuous nature of man.

苏希尼派与阿米念主义 Socinians and Arminians

At the time of the Reformation the Socinians followed the Pelagians in the denial of original sin, and in the seventeenth century the Arminians broke with the Reformed faith, and accepted the Semi-Pelagian view of original sin.

Since that time various shades of opinion were advocated in the Protestant Churches both in Europe and in America.

2. 原罪的两个要素 The Two Elements of Original Sin.

Two elements must be distinguished in original sin, namely:

a. 原罪的罪孽 Original guilt.

The word "guilt" expresses the relation which sin bears to justice or, as the older theologians put it, to the penalty of the law. He who is guilty stands in a penal relation to the law. We can speak of guilt in a twofold sense, namely, as *reatus culpae* and as *reatus poenae*. The former, which Turretin calls "potential guilt," is the intrinsic moral ill-desert of an act or state. This is of the essence of sin and is an inseparable part of its sinfulness. It attaches only to those who have themselves committed sinful deeds, and attaches to them permanently. It cannot be removed by forgiveness, and is not removed by justification on the basis of the merits of Jesus Christ, and much less by mere pardon. Man's sins are inherently ill-deserving even after he is justified. Guilt in this sense cannot be transferred from one person to another. The usual sense, however, in which we speak of guilt in theology, is that of *reatus poenae*. By this is meant desert of punishment, or obligation to render satisfaction to God's justice for self-determined violation of the law. Guilt in this sense is not of the essence of sin, but is rather a relation to the penal sanction of the law. If there had been no sanction attached to the disregard of moral relations, every departure from the law would have been sin, but would not have involved liability to punishment. Guilt in this sense may be removed by the satisfaction of justice, either personally or vicariously. It may be transferred from one person to another, or assumed by one person for another. It is removed from believers by justification, so that their sins, though inherently ill-deserving, do not make them liable to punishment. Semi-Pelagians and the older Arminians or Remonstrants deny that original sin involves guilt. The guilt of Adam's sin, committed by him as the federal head of the human race, is imputed to all his descendants. This is evident from the fact that, as the Bible teaches, death as the punishment of sin passes on from Adam to all his descendants. Rom. 5:12-19; Eph. 2:3; I Cor. 15:22.

Rom. 5:12-19

這就如罪是從一人入了世界，死又是從罪來的；於是死就臨到眾人，因為眾人都犯了罪。

沒有律法之先，罪已經在世上；但沒有律法，罪也不算罪。

然而從亞當到摩西，死就作了王，連那些不與亞當犯一樣罪過的，也在他的權下。亞當乃是那以後要來之人的豫像。

只是過犯不如恩賜，若因一人的過犯，眾人都死了，何況神的恩典，與那因耶穌基督一人恩典中的賞賜，豈不更加倍的臨到眾人麼？

因一人犯罪就定罪，也不如恩賜，原來審判是由一人而定罪，恩賜乃是由許多過犯而稱義。

若因一人的過犯，死就因這一人作了王，何況那些受洪恩又蒙所賜之義的，豈不更要因耶穌基督一人在生命中作王麼？

如此說來，因一次的過犯，眾人都被定罪；照樣，因一次的義行，眾人也就被稱義得生命了。

一人的悖逆，眾人成為罪人；照樣，因一人的順從，眾人也成為義了。

12 Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned—

13 for before the law was given, sin was in the world. But sin is not taken into account when there is no law.

14 Nevertheless, death reigned from the time of Adam to the time of Moses, even over those who did not sin by breaking a command, as did Adam, who was a pattern of the one to come.

15 But the gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died by the trespass of the one man, how much more did God's grace and the gift that came by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, overflow to the many!

16 Again, the gift of God is not like the result of the one man's sin: The judgment followed one sin and brought condemnation, but the gift followed many trespasses and brought justification.

17 For if, by the trespass of the one man, death reigned through that one man, how much more will those who receive God's abundant provision of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ.

18 Consequently, just as the result of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men.

19 For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous

Eph. 2:3

我們從前也都在他們中間，放縱肉體的私慾，隨著肉體和心中所喜好的去行，本為可怒之子，和別人一樣。

All of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our sinful nature and following its desires and thoughts. Like the rest, we were by nature objects of wrath.

I Cor. 15:22

在亞當裡眾人都死了；照樣，在基督裡眾人也都要復活。

For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive.

b. 原罪的玷污 Original pollution.

Original pollution includes two things, namely, the absence of original righteousness, and the presence of positive evil. It should be noted:

(1) That original pollution is not merely a disease, as some of the Greek Fathers and the Arminians represent it, but sin in the real sense of the word. Guilt attaches to it; he who denies this does not have a Biblical conception of original corruption.

(2) That this pollution is not to be regarded as a substance infused into the human soul, nor as a change of substance in the metaphysical sense of the word. This was the error of the Manichaeans and of Flacius Illyricus in the days of the Reformation. If the substance of the soul were sinful, it would have to be replaced by a new substance in regeneration; but this does not take place.

(3) That it is not merely a privation. In his polemic with the Manichaeans, Augustine not merely denied that sin was a substance, but also asserted that it was merely a privation. He called it a *privatio boni*. But original sin is not merely negative; it is also an inherent positive disposition toward sin. This original pollution may be considered from more than one point of view, namely, as total depravity and as total inability.

c. 完全墮落 Total depravity.

In view of its pervasive character, inherited pollution is called total depravity. This phrase is often misunderstood, and therefore calls for careful discrimination. Negatively, it does not imply: (1) that every man is as thoroughly depraved as he can possibly become; (2) that the sinner has no innate knowledge of the will of God, nor a conscience that discriminates between good and evil; (3) that sinful man does

not often admire virtuous character and actions in others, or is incapable of disinterested affections and actions in his relations with his fellow-men; nor (4) that every unregenerate man will, in virtue of his inherent sinfulness, indulge in every form of sin; it often happens that one form excludes the other. Positively, it does indicate:

- (1) that the inherent corruption extends to every part of man's nature, to all the faculties and powers of both soul and body; and
- (2) that there is no spiritual good, that is, good in relation to God, in the sinner at all, but only perversion. This total depravity is denied by Pelagians, Socinians, and seventeenth century Arminians, but is clearly taught in Scripture, John 5:42; Rom. 7:18,23; 8:7; Eph. 4:18; II Tim. 3:2-4; Tit. 1:15; Heb. 3:12.

John 5:42

我知道，你們心裡沒有神的愛。

but I know you. I know that you do not have the love of God in your hearts.

Rom. 7:18, 23

我也知道在我裡頭，就是我肉體之中，沒有良善。因為，立志為善由得我，只是行出來由不得我。

但我覺得肢體中另有個律和我心中的律交戰，把我擄去，叫我附從那肢體中犯罪的律。

I know that nothing good lives in me, that is, in my sinful nature. For I have the desire to do what is good, but I cannot carry it out.

but I see another law at work in the members of my body, waging war against the law of my mind and making me a prisoner of the law of sin at work within my members.

Rom. 8:7

原來體貼肉體的，就是與神為仇；因為不服神的律法，也是不能服，

the sinful mind is hostile to God. It does not submit to God's law, nor can it do so.

Eph. 4:18

他們心地昏昧，與神所賜的生命隔絕了，都因自己無知，心裡剛硬；

They are darkened in their understanding and separated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them due to the hardening of their hearts.

II Tim. 3:2-4

2 因為那時人要專顧自己、貪愛錢財、自誇、狂傲、謗讟、違背父母、忘恩負義、心不聖潔、

3 無親情、不解怨、好說讒言、不能自約、性情兇暴、不愛良善、

4 賣主賣友、任意妄為、自高自大、愛宴樂、不愛神，

2 People will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boastful, proud, abusive, disobedient to their parents, ungrateful, unholy,

3 without love, unforgiving, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not lovers of the good,

4 treacherous, rash, conceited, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God--

Tit. 1:15

在潔淨的人，凡物都潔淨；在污穢不信的人，甚麼都不潔淨，連心地和天良也都污穢了。

To the pure, all things are pure, but to those who are corrupted and do not believe, nothing is pure. In fact, both their minds and consciences are corrupted.

Heb. 3:12

弟兄們，你們要謹慎，免得你們中間或有人存著不信的惡心，把永生神離棄了。
See to it, brothers, that none of you has a sinful, unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God.

d. 完全无能 Total inability.

With respect to its effect on man's spiritual powers, it is called total inability. Here, again, it is necessary to distinguish. By ascribing total inability to the natural man we do not mean to say that it is impossible for him to do good in any sense of the word. Reformed theologians generally say that he is still able to perform: (1) natural good; (2) civil good or civil righteousness; and (3) externally religious good. It is admitted that even the unrenewed possess some virtue, revealing itself in the relations of social life, in many acts and sentiments that deserve the sincere approval and gratitude of their fellow-men, and that even meet with the approval of God to a certain extent. At the same time it is maintained that these same actions and feelings, when considered in relation to God, are radically defective. Their fatal defect is that they are not prompted by love to God, or by any regard for the will of God as requiring them. When we speak of man's corruption as total inability, we mean two things:

(1) that the unrenewed sinner cannot do any act, however insignificant, which fundamentally meets with God's approval and answers to the demands of God's holy law; and

(2) that he cannot change his fundamental preference for sin and self to love for God, nor even make an approach to such a change. In a word, he is unable to do any spiritual good.

There is abundant Scriptural support for this doctrine: John 1:13; 3:5; 6:44; 8:34; 15:4,5; Rom. 7:18,24; 8:7,8; 1 Cor. 2:14; II Cor. 3:5; Eph. 2:1,8-10; Heb. 11:6.

伯拉纠主义与阿米年主义 Pelagians and Arminians

Pelagians, however, believe in the plenary ability of man, denying that his moral faculties were impaired by sin.

Arminians speak of a gracious ability, because they believe that God imparts His common grace to all men, which enables them to turn to God and believe.

新英格兰神学 New England Theology

The New School theologians ascribe to man natural as distinguished from moral ability, a distinction borrowed from Edwards' great work *On the Will*. The import of their teaching is that man in his fallen state is still in possession of all the natural faculties that are required for doing spiritual good

(intellect, will, etc.), but lacks moral ability, that is, the ability to give proper direction to those faculties, a direction well-pleasing to God. The distinction under consideration is advanced, in order to stress the fact that man is wilfully sinful, and this may well be emphasized. But the New School theologians assert that man would be able to do spiritual good if he only wanted to do it. This means that the "natural ability" of which they speak, is after all an ability to do real spiritual good.

一般的批判 GENERAL CRITIQUE

On the whole it may be said that the distinction between natural and moral ability is not a desirable one, for:

(1) it has no warrant in Scripture, which teaches consistently that man is not able to do what is required of him;

(2) it is essentially ambiguous and misleading: the possession of the requisite faculties to do spiritual good does not yet constitute an ability to do it;

(3) "natural" is not a proper antithesis of "moral," for a thing may be both at the same time; and the inability of man is also natural in an important sense, that is, as being incident to his nature in its present state as naturally propagated; and

(4) the language does not accurately express the important distinction intended; what is meant is that it is moral, and not either physical or constitutional; that it has its ground, not in the want of any faculty, but in the corrupt moral state of the faculties, and of the disposition of the heart.

John 1:13

這等人不是從血氣生的，不是從情慾生的，也不是從人意生的，乃是從神生的。
children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband's will, but born of God.

John 3:5

耶穌說：「我實實在在的告訴你，人若不是從水和聖靈生的，就不能進神的國。
Jesus answered, "I tell you the truth, no one can enter the kingdom of God unless he is born of water and the Spirit.

John 6:44

不是差我來的父吸引人，就沒有能到我這裡來的；到我這裡來的，在末日我要叫他復活。

"No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him, and I will raise him up at the last day.

John 8:34

耶穌回答說：我實實在在的告訴你們，所有犯罪的就是罪的奴僕。
Jesus replied, "I tell you the truth, everyone who sins is a slave to sin.

John 15:4, 5

你們要常在我裡面，我也常在你們裡面。枝子若不常在葡萄樹上，自己就不能結果子；你們若不常在我裡面，也是這樣。

我是葡萄樹，你們是枝子。常在我裡面的，我也常在他裡面，這人就多結果子；因為離了我，你們就不能做甚麼。

4 Remain in me, and I will remain in you. No branch can bear fruit by itself; it must remain in the vine. Neither can you bear fruit unless you remain in me.

5 "I am the vine; you are the branches. If a man remains in me and I in him, he will bear much fruit; apart from me you can do nothing.

John 7:18, 24

人憑著自己說，是求自己的榮耀；惟有求那差他來者的榮耀，這人是真的，在他心裡沒有不義。

不可按外貌斷定是非，總要按公平斷定是非。

18 He who speaks on his own does so to gain honor for himself, but he who works for the honor of the one who sent him is a man of truth; there is nothing false about him.

24 Stop judging by mere appearances, and make a right judgment."

John 8:7, 8

他們還是不住的問他，耶穌就直起腰來，對他們說：你們中間誰是沒有罪的，誰就可以先拿石頭打他。

於是又彎著腰，用指頭在地上畫字。

7 When they kept on questioning him, he straightened up and said to them, "If any one of you is without sin, let him be the first to throw a stone at her."

8 Again he stooped down and wrote on the ground.

1 Cor. 2:14

然而，屬血氣的人不領會神聖靈的事，反倒以為愚拙，並且不能知道，因為這些事惟有屬靈的人才能看透。

The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned.

II Cor. 3:5

並不是我們憑自己能承擔甚麼事；我們所能承擔的，乃是出於神。

Not that we are competent in ourselves to claim anything for ourselves, but our competence comes from God.

Eph. 2:1

你們死在過犯罪惡之中，他叫你們活過來。

As for you, you were dead in your transgressions and sins,

Heb. 11:6

人非有信，就不能得神的喜悅；因為到神面前來的人必須信有神，且信他賞賜那尋求他的人。

And without faith it is impossible to please God, because anyone who comes to him must believe that he exists and that he rewards those who earnestly seek him.

2. 原罪与人的自由 Original Sin and Human Freedom.

In connection with the doctrine of the total inability of man the question naturally arises, whether original sin then also involves the loss of freedom, or of what is generally called the liberum arbitrium, the free will. This question should be answered with discrimination for, put in this general way, it may be answered both negatively and positively. In a certain sense man has not, and in another sense he has, lost his liberty. There is a certain liberty that is the inalienable possession of a free agent, namely, the liberty to choose as he pleases, in full accord with the prevailing dispositions and tendencies of his soul. Man did not lose any of the constitutional faculties necessary to constitute him a responsible moral agent. He still has reason, conscience, and the freedom of choice. He has ability to acquire knowledge, and to feel and recognize moral distinctions and obligations; and his affections, tendencies, and actions are spontaneous, so that he chooses and refuses as he sees fit. Moreover, he has the ability to appreciate and do many things that are good and amiable, benevolent and just, in the relations he sustains to his fellow-beings. But man did lose his material freedom, that is, the rational power to determine his course in the direction of the highest good, in harmony with the original moral constitution of his nature. Man has by nature an irresistible bias for evil. He is not able to apprehend and love spiritual excellence, to seek and do spiritual things, the things of God that pertain to salvation. This position, which is Augustinian and Calvinistic, is flatly contradicted by Pelagianism and Socinianism, and in part also by Semi-Pelagianism and Arminianism. Modern liberalism, which is essentially Pelagian, naturally finds the doctrine, that man has lost the ability to determine his life in the direction of real righteousness and holiness, highly offensive, and glories in the ability of man to choose and do what is right and good. On the other hand the dialectical theology (Barthianism) strongly reasserts the utter inability of man to make even the slightest move in a Godward direction. The sinner is a slave of sin and cannot possibly turn in the opposite direction.

3. 新正统神学与原罪 The Theology of Crisis and Original Sin.

Barth

It may be well at this point to define briefly the position of the Theology of Crisis or of Barthianism with respect to the doctrine of original sin. Walter Lowrie correctly says: "Barth has much to say about the Fall — but nothing about 'original sin.' That man is fallen we can plainly see; but the Fall is not an event we can point to in history, it belongs decidedly to pre-history, Urgeschichte, in a metaphysical sense."

Brunner

Brunner has something to say about it in his recent work on Man in Revolt. He does not accept the doctrine of original sin in the traditional and ecclesiastical sense of the word. The first sin of Adam was not and could not be placed to the account of all his descendants; nor did this sin result in a sinful state, which is passed on to his posterity, and which is now the fruitful root of all actual sin. "Sin is never a state, but it is always an act. Even being a sinner is not a state but an act, because it is being a person." In Brunner's estimation the traditional view has an undesirable element of determinism in it, and does not sufficiently safeguard the responsibility of man. But his rejection of the doctrine of original sin does

not mean that he sees no truth in it at all. It rightly stresses the solidarity of sin in the human race, and the transmission "of the spiritual nature, of the 'character,' from parents to children." However, he seeks the explanation of the universality of sin in something else than in "original sin." The man whom God created was not simply some one man, but a responsible person created in and for community with others. The isolated individual is but an abstraction. "In the Creation we are an individualized, articulated unity, one body with many members." If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it. He goes on to say: "If that is our origin, then our opposition to this origin cannot be an experience, an act, of the individual as an individual. . . . Certainly each individual is a sinner as an individual; but he is at the same time the whole in its united solidarity, the body, actual humanity as a whole."

There was therefore solidarity in sinning; the human race fell away from God; but it belongs to the very nature of sin that we deny this solidarity in sin. The result of this initial sin is that man is now a sinner; but the fact that man is now a sinner should not be regarded as the cause of his individual sinful actions. Such a causal connection cannot be admitted, for every sin which man commits is a fresh decision against God. The statement that man is a sinner does not mean that he is in a state or condition of sin, but that he is actually engaged in rebellion against God. As Adam we turned away from God, and "he who commits this apostasy can do no other than repeat it continually, not because it has become a habit, but because this is the distinctive character of this act." Man cannot reverse the course, but continues to sin right along. The Bible never speaks of sin except as the act of turning away from God. "But in the very concept of 'being a sinner' this act is conceived as one which determines man's whole existence." There is much in this representation that reminds one of the realistic representation of Thomas Aquinas.

4. 对完全堕落与完全无能的异议

Objections to the Doctrine of Total Depravity and Total Inability.

- a. 与人的道德责任不一致。It is inconsistent with moral obligation.

The most obvious and the most plausible objection to the doctrine of total depravity and total inability, is that it is inconsistent with moral obligation. It is said that a man cannot be held justly responsible for anything for which he has not the required ability. But the general implication of this principle is a fallacy. It may hold in cases of disability resulting from a limitation which God has imposed on man's nature; but it certainly does not apply in the sphere of morals and religion, as already pointed out in the preceding. We should not forget that the inability under consideration is self-imposed, has a moral origin, and is not due to any limitation which God has put upon man's being. Man is unable as a result of the perverted choice made in Adam.

- b. 除去道德努力的动力。It removes all motives for exertion.

A second objection is that this doctrine removes all motives for exertion and destroys all rational grounds for the use of the means of grace. If we know that we cannot accomplish a given end, why should we use the means recommended for its accomplishment? Now it is perfectly true that the sinner, who is enlightened by the Holy Spirit and is truly conscious of his own natural inability, ceases from work-righteousness. And this is exactly what is necessary. But it does not hold with respect to the natural man, for he is thoroughly self-righteous. Moreover, it is not true that the doctrine of inability naturally tends to foster neglect in the use of the means of grace ordained by God. On this principle the farmer

might also say, I cannot produce a harvest; why should I cultivate my fields? But this would be utter folly. In every department of human endeavor the result depends on the cooperation of causes over which man has no control. The Scriptural grounds for the use of means remain: God commands the use of means; the means ordained by God are adapted to the end contemplated; ordinarily the end is not attained, except by the use of the appointed means; and God has promised to bless the use of those means.

c. 鼓励人延迟信主（归正）。It encourages delay in conversion.

It is also asserted that this doctrine encourages delay in conversion. If a man believes that he cannot change his heart, cannot repent and believe the gospel, he will feel that he can only passively abide the time when it will please God to change the direction of his life. Now there may be, and experience teaches that there are, some who actually adopt that attitude; but as a rule the effect of the doctrine under consideration will be quite different. If sinners, to whom sin has grown very dear, were conscious of the power to change their lives at will, they would be tempted to defer it to the last moment. But if one is conscious of the fact that a very desirable thing is beyond the compass of his own powers, he will instinctively seek help outside of himself. The sinner who feels that way about salvation, will seek help with the great Physician of the soul, and thus acknowledge his own disability.

c. 本罪（罪行）

Actual Sin.

Roman Catholics and Arminians minimized the idea of original sin, and then developed doctrines, such as those of the washing away of original sin (though not only that) by baptism, and of sufficient grace, by which its seriousness is greatly obscured. The emphasis is clearly altogether on actual sins. Pelagians, Socinians, modern liberal theologians, and — strange as it may seem — also the Theology of Crisis, recognize only actual sins. It must be said, however, that this theology does speak of sin in the singular as well as in the plural, that is, it does recognize a solidarity in sin, which some of the others have not recognized. Reformed theology has always given due recognition to original sin and to the relation in which it stands to actual sins.

1. 原罪与本罪（罪行）的关系

The Relation Between Original and Actual Sin.

The former originated in a free act of Adam as the representative of the human race, a transgression of the law of God and a corruption of human nature, which rendered him liable to the punishment of God. In the sight of God his sin was the sin of all his descendants, so that they are born as sinners, that is in a state of guilt and in a polluted condition. Original sin is both a state and an inherent quality of pollution in man. Every man is guilty in Adam, and is consequently born with a depraved and corrupt nature. And this inner corruption is the unholy fountain of all actual sins.

本罪：广义“Actual Sin”：Comprehensive Sense

When we speak of actual sin or peccatum actuale, we use the word "actual" or "actuale" in a comprehensive sense. The term "actual sins" does not merely denote those external actions which are

accomplished by means of the body, but all those conscious thoughts and volitions which spring from original sin. They are the individual sins of act in distinction from man's inherited nature and inclination. Original sin is one, actual sin is manifold.

心中的本罪（罪行）“Interior”Actual Sin

Actual sin may be interior, such as a particular conscious doubt or evil design in the mind, or a particular conscious lust or desire in the heart; but they may also be exterior, such as deceit, theft, adultery, murder, and so on. While the existence of original sin has met with widespread denial, the presence of actual sin in the life of man is generally admitted.

人们失去罪罪的意识 Loss of Consciousness of Sin

This does not mean, however, that people have always had an equally profound consciousness of sin. We hear a great deal nowadays about the "loss of the sense of sin," though Modernists hasten to assure us that, while we have lost the sense of sin, we have gained the sense of sins, in the plural, that is, of definite actual sin. But there is no doubt about it that people have to an alarming extent lost the sense of the heinousness of sin, as committed against a holy God, and have largely thought of it merely as an infringement on the rights of one's fellow-men. They fail to see that sin is a fatal power in their lives which ever and anon incites their rebellious spirits, which makes them guilty before God, and which brings them under a sentence of condemnation. It is one of the merits of the Theology of Crisis that it is calling attention once more to the seriousness of sin as a revolt against God, as a revolutionary attempt to be like God.

2. 本罪的分类 Classification of Actual Sins.

小罪，重罪 Venial Sins and Mortal Sins

It is quite impossible to give a unified and comprehensive classification of actual sins. They vary in kind and degree, and can be differentiated from more than one point of view. Roman Catholics make a well known distinction between venial and mortal sins, but admit that it is extremely difficult and dangerous to decide whether a sin is mortal or venial. They were led to this distinction by the statement of Paul in Gal. 5:21 that they "who do such things (as he has enumerated) shall not inherit the kingdom of God." One commits a mortal sin when one wilfully violates the law of God in a matter which one believes or knows to be important. It renders the sinner liable to eternal punishment. And one commits a venial sin when one transgresses the law of God in a matter that is not of grave importance, or when the transgression is not altogether voluntary. Such a sin is forgiven more easily, and even without confession. Forgiveness for mortal sins can be obtained only by the sacrament of penance.

这种分辨不符合《圣经》；《圣经》中的分辨
Distinction is Unscriptural; Distinctions in Scripture

The distinction is not a Scriptural one, for according to Scripture every sin is essentially anomia

(unrighteousness), and merits eternal punishment. Moreover, it has a deleterious effect in practical life, since it engenders a feeling of uncertainty, sometimes a feeling of morbid fear on the one hand, or of unwarranted carelessness on the other. The Bible does distinguish different kinds of sins, especially in connection with the different degrees of guilt attaching to them. The Old Testament makes an important distinction between sins committed presumptuously (with a high hand), and sins committed unwittingly, that is, as the result of ignorance, weakness, or error, Num. 15:29-31. The former could not be atoned by sacrifice and were punished with great severity, while the latter could be so atoned and were judged with far greater leniency. The fundamental principle embodied in this distinction still applies. Sins committed on purpose, with full consciousness of the evil involved, and with deliberation, are greater and more culpable than sins resulting from ignorance, from an erroneous conception of things, or from weakness of character. Nevertheless the latter are also real sins and make one guilty in the sight of God, Gal. 6:1; Eph. 4:13; I Tim 1:13; 5:24. The New Testament further clearly teaches us that the degree of sin is to a great extent determined by the degree of light possessed. The heathen are guilty indeed, but they who have God's revelation and enjoy the privileges of the gospel ministry are far more guilty, Matt. 10:15; Luke 12:47,48; 23:34; John 19:11; Acts 17:30; Rom. 1:32; 2:12; I Tim. 1:13,15,16.

Gal. 5:21

嫉妒（有古卷在此有：兇殺二字）、醉酒、荒宴等類。我從前告訴你們，現在又告訴你們，行這樣事的人必不能承受神的國。

and envy; drunkenness, orgies, and the like. I warn you, as I did before, that those who live like this will not inherit the kingdom of God.

Num. 15:29-31

29 以色列中的本地人和寄居在他們中間的外人，若誤行了甚麼事，必歸一樣的條例，

30 但那擅敢行事的，無論是本地人是寄居的，他褻瀆了耶和華，必從民中剪除。

31 因他藐視耶和華的言語，違背耶和華的命令，那人總要剪除；他的罪孽要歸到他身上。

29 One and the same law applies to everyone who sins unintentionally, whether he is a native-born Israelite or an alien.

30 " 'But anyone who sins defiantly, whether native-born or alien, blasphemes the LORD, and that person must be cut off from his people.

31 Because he has despised the LORD's word and broken his commands, that person must surely be cut off; his guilt remains on him.' "

Gal. 6:1

弟兄們，若有人偶然被過犯所勝，你們屬靈的人就當用溫柔的心把他挽回過來；又當自己小心，恐怕也被引誘。

Brothers, if someone is caught in a sin, you who are spiritual should restore him gently. But watch yourself, or you also may be tempted.

Eph. 4:13

等到我們眾人在真道上同歸於一，認識神的兒子，得以長大成人，滿有基督長成的身量，

until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ.

I Tim 1:13

我從前是褻瀆神的，逼迫人的，侮慢人的；然而我還蒙了憐憫，因我是不信不明白的時候而做的。

Even though I was once a blasphemer and a persecutor and a violent man, I was shown mercy because I acted in ignorance and unbelief.

I Tim 5:24

有些人的罪是明顯的，如同先到審判案前；有些人的罪是隨後跟了去的。

The sins of some men are obvious, reaching the place of judgment ahead of them; the sins of others trail behind them.

Matt. 10:15

我實在告訴你們，當審判的日子，所多瑪和蛾摩拉所受的，比那城還容易受呢！

I tell you the truth, it will be more bearable for Sodom and Gomorrah on the day of judgment than for that town.

Luke 12:47, 48

僕人知道主人的意思，卻不預備，又不順他的意思行，那僕人必多受責打；惟有那不知道的，做了當受責打的事，必少受責打；因為多給誰，就向誰多取；多託誰，就向誰多要。

47 "That servant who knows his master's will and does not get ready or does not do what his master wants will be beaten with many blows. 48 But the one who does not know and does things deserving punishment will be beaten with few blows. From everyone who has been given much, much will be demanded; and from the one who has been entrusted with much, much more will be asked.

Luke 23:34

下耶穌說：父阿！赦免他們；因為他們所做的，他們不曉得。兵丁就拈鬮分他的衣服。

Jesus said, "Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing." And they divided up his clothes by casting lots.

John 19:11

耶穌回答說：若不是從上頭賜給你的，你就毫無權柄辦我。所以，把我交給你的那人罪更重了。

Jesus answered, "You would have no power over me if it were not given to you from above. Therefore the one who handed me over to you is guilty of a greater sin."

Acts 17:30

世人蒙昧無知的時候，神並不監察，如今卻吩咐各處的人都要悔改。

In the past God overlooked such ignorance, but now he commands all people everywhere to repent.

Rom. 1:32

他們雖知道神判定行這樣事的人是當死的，然而他們不但自己去行，還喜歡別人去行。

Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them.

Rom. 2:12

沒有律法犯了罪的，也必不按律法滅亡；凡在律法以下犯了罪的，也必按律法受審判。

All who sin apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who sin under the law will be judged by the law.

I Tim. 1:13, 15, 16

我從前是褻瀆神的，逼迫人的，侮慢人的；然而我還蒙了憐憫，因我是不信不明白的時候而做的。

督耶穌降世，為要拯救罪人。這話是可信的，是十分可佩服的。在罪人中我是個罪魁。

然而，我蒙了憐憫，是因耶穌基督要在我這罪魁身上顯明他一切的忍耐，給後來信他得永生的人作榜樣。

13 Even though I was once a blasphemer and a persecutor and a violent man, I was shown mercy because I acted in ignorance and unbelief.

15 Here is a trustworthy saying that deserves full acceptance: Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners--of whom I am the worst.

16 But for that very reason I was shown mercy so that in me, the worst of sinners, Christ Jesus might display his unlimited patience as an example for those who would believe on him and receive eternal life.

3. 不能获赦的罪 The Unpardonable Sin.

Several passages of Scripture speak of a sin that cannot be forgiven, after which a change of heart is impossible, and for which it is not necessary to pray. It is generally known as the sin or blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The Saviour speaks of it explicitly in Matt. 12:31,32 and parallel passages; and it is generally thought that Heb. 6:4-6; 10:26,27, and John 5:16 also refer to this sin.

Matt. 12:31, 32

所以我告訴你們：人一切的罪和褻瀆的話都可得赦免，惟獨褻瀆聖靈，總不得赦免。

凡說話干犯人子的，還可得赦免；惟獨說話干犯聖靈的，今世來世總不得赦免。

31 And so I tell you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven.

32 Anyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but anyone who speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come.

Heb. 6:4-6

4 論到那些已經蒙了光照、嘗過天恩的滋味、又於聖靈有分，

5 並嘗過神善道的滋味、覺悟來世權能的人，

6 若是離棄道理，就不能叫他們從新懊悔了。因為他們把神的兒子重釘十字架，明明的羞辱他。

4 It is impossible for those who have once been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, who have shared in the Holy Spirit,

5 who have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the coming age,

6 if they fall away, to be brought back to repentance, because to their loss they are crucifying the Son of God all over again and subjecting him to public disgrace.

Heb. 10:26, 27

為我們得知真道以後，若故意犯罪，贖罪的祭就再沒有了；
惟有戰懼等候審判和那燒滅眾敵人的烈火。

26 If we deliberately keep on sinning after we have received the knowledge of the truth, no sacrifice for sins is left,

27 but only a fearful expectation of judgment and of raging fire that will consume the enemies of God.

John 5:16

以猶太人逼迫耶穌，因為他在安息日做了這事。

So, because Jesus was doing these things on the Sabbath, the Jews persecuted him.

a. 关于这种罪的错误观念 Unwarranted opinions respecting this sin.

There has been quite a variety of opinions respecting the nature of the unpardonable sin.

(1) Jerome and Chrysostom thought of it as a sin that could be committed only during Christ's sojourn on earth, and held that it was committed by those who were convinced in their hearts that Christ performed His miracles by the power of the Holy Spirit, but in spite of their conviction refused to recognize these miracles as such and ascribed them to the operation of Satan. However, this limitation is entirely unwarranted, as the passages in Hebrews and I John would seem to prove.

(2) Augustine, the Melancthonian dogmatists of the Lutheran Church, and a few Scottish theologians (Guthrie, Chalmers) conceived of it as consisting in impenitentia finalis, that is, impenitence persisted in to the end. A related view is that expressed by some in our own day, that it consists in continued unbelief, a refusal up to the very end to accept Jesus Christ by faith. But on this supposition it would follow that every one who died in a state of impenitence and unbelief had committed this sin, while according to Scripture it must be something of a very specific nature.

(3) In connection with their denial of the perseverance of the saints, later Lutheran theologians taught that only regenerate persons could commit this sin, and sought support for this view in Heb. 6:4-6. But this is an unscriptural position, and the Canons of Dort reject, among others, also the error of those who teach that the regenerate can commit the sin against the Holy Spirit.

Heb. 6:4-6

4 論到那些已經蒙了光照、嘗過天恩的滋味、又於聖靈有分，

5 並嘗過神善道的滋味、覺悟來世權能的人，

6 若是離棄道理，就不能叫他們從新懊悔了。因為他們把神的兒子重釘十字架，明明的羞辱他。

4 It is impossible for those who have once been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, who have shared in the Holy Spirit,

5 who have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the coming age,

6 if they fall away, to be brought back to repentance, because to their loss they are crucifying the Son of God all over again and subjecting him to public disgrace.

b. 改革宗观点 The Reformed conception of this sin.

The name "sin against the Holy Spirit" is too general, for there are also sins against the Holy Spirit that are pardonable, Eph. 4:30. The Bible speaks more specifically of a "speaking against the Holy Spirit," Matt. 12:32; Mark 3:29; Luke 12:10. It is evidently a sin committed during the present life, which makes conversion and pardon impossible. The sin consists in the conscious, malicious, and wilful rejection and slandering, against evidence and conviction, of the testimony of the Holy Spirit respecting the grace of God in Christ, attributing it out of hatred and enmity to the prince of darkness. It presupposes, objectively, a revelation of the grace of God in Christ, and a powerful operation of the Holy Spirit; and, subjectively, an illumination and intellectual conviction so strong and powerful as to make an honest denial of the truth impossible. And then the sin itself consists, not in doubting the truth, nor in a simple denial of it, but in a contradiction of it that goes contrary to the conviction of the mind, to the illumination of the conscience, and even to the verdict of the heart. In committing that sin man wilfully, maliciously, and intentionally attributes what is clearly recognized as the work of God to the influence and operation of Satan. It is nothing less than a decided slandering of the Holy Spirit, an audacious declaration that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the abyss, that the truth is the lie, and that Christ is Satan. It is not so much a sin against the person of the Holy Spirit as a sin against His official work in revealing, both objectively and subjectively, the grace and glory of God in Christ. The root of this sin is the conscious and deliberate hatred of God and of all that is recognized as divine. It is unpardonable, not because its guilt transcends the merits of Christ, or because the sinner is beyond the renewing power of the Holy Spirit, but because there are also in the world of sin certain laws and ordinances, established by God and maintained by Him. And the law in the case of this particular sin is, that it excludes all repentance, sears the conscience, hardens the sinner, and thus renders the sin unpardonable. In those who have committed this sin we may therefore expect to find a pronounced hatred to God, a defiant attitude to Him and all that is divine, delight in ridiculing and slandering that which is holy, and absolute unconcern respecting the welfare of their soul and the future life. In view of the fact that this sin is not followed by repentance, we may be reasonably sure that they who fear that they have committed it and worry about this, and who desire the prayers of others for them, have not committed it.

Eph. 4:30

不要叫神的聖靈擔憂；你們原是受了他的印記，等候得贖的日子來到。

And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, with whom you were sealed for the day of redemption.

Matt. 12:32

說話干犯人子的，還可得赦免；惟獨說話干犯聖靈的，今世來世總不得赦免。

Anyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but anyone who speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come.

Mark 3:29

凡褻瀆聖靈的，卻永不得赦免，乃要擔當永遠的罪。

But whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will never be forgiven; he is guilty of an eternal sin.

Luke 12:10

凡說話干犯人子的，還可得赦免；惟獨褻瀆聖靈的，總不得赦免。

And everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but anyone who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven

c. 新约书信。Remarks on the passages in the Epistles that speak of it.

Except in the Gospels, this sin is not mentioned by name in the Bible. Thus the question arises, whether the passages in Heb. 6:4-6; 10:26, 27, 29, and I John 5:16 also refer to it. Now it is quite evident that they all speak of an unpardonable sin; and because Jesus says in Matt. 12:31, "Therefore I say unto you, Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven," thereby indicating that there is but one unpardonable sin, it is but reasonable to think that these passages refer to the same sin. It should be noted, however, that Heb. 6 speaks of a specific form of this sin, such as could only occur in the apostolic age, when the Spirit revealed itself in extraordinary gifts and powers. The fact that this was not borne in mind, often led to the erroneous opinion that this passage, with its unusually strong expressions, referred to such as were actually regenerated by the Spirit of God. But Heb. 6:4-6, while speaking of experiences that transcend those of the ordinary temporal faith, yet do not necessarily testify to the presence of regenerating grace in the heart.

Heb. 6:4-6

4 論到那些已經蒙了光照、嘗過天恩的滋味、又於聖靈有分，5 並嘗過神善道的滋味、覺悟來世權能的人，6 若是離棄道理，就不能叫他們從新懊悔了。因為他們把神的兒子重釘十字架，明明的羞辱他。

4 It is impossible for those who have once been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, who have shared in the Holy Spirit,

5 who have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the coming age,

6 if they fall away, to be brought back to repentance, because to their loss they are crucifying the Son of God all over again and subjecting him to public disgrace.

Heb. 10:26, 27, 29

為我們得知真道以後，若故意犯罪，贖罪的祭就再沒有了；

惟有戰懼等候審判和那燒滅眾敵人的烈火。

況人踐踏神的兒子，將那使他成聖之約的血當作平常，又褻慢施恩的聖靈，你們想，他要受的刑罰該怎樣加重呢！

26 If we deliberately keep on sinning after we have received the knowledge of the truth, no sacrifice for sins is left,

27 but only a fearful expectation of judgment and of raging fire that will consume the enemies of God.

29 How much more severely do you think a man deserves to be punished who has trampled the Son of God under foot, who has treated as an unholy thing the blood of the covenant that sanctified him, and who has insulted the Spirit of grace?

I John 5:16

人若看見弟兄犯了不至於死的罪，就當為他祈求，神必將生命賜給他；有至於死的罪，我不說當為這罪祈求。

If anyone sees his brother commit a sin that does not lead to death, he should pray and God will give him life. I refer to those whose sin does not lead to death. There is a sin that leads to death. I am not saying that he should pray about that.

Matt. 12:31

所以我告訴你們：人一切的罪和褻瀆的話都可得赦免，惟獨褻瀆聖靈，總不得赦免。

And so I tell you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. What objections are raised to the idea of the federal headship of Adam?
2. What Scriptural ground is there for the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants?
3. Was Placeus' theory of mediate imputation in any way connected with Amyraldus' view of universal atonement?
4. What objection does Dabney raise to the doctrine of immediate imputation?
5. Is the doctrine of inherited evil the same as the doctrine of original sin, and if not, how do they differ?
6. How do Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, and Arminians differ in their view of original sin?
7. How does the doctrine of original sin affect the doctrine of infant salvation?
8. Does the Bible teach that one can be lost purely as the result of original sin?
9. What is the connection between the doctrine of original sin and that of baptismal regeneration?
10. What becomes of the doctrine of original sin in modern liberal theology?
11. How do you account for the denial of original sin in Barthian theology?
12. Can you name some additional classes of actual sins?

LITERATURE:

Bavinck, *Geref. Dogm.* III, pp. 61-120; Kuyper, *Dict. Dogm.*, *De Peccato*, pp. 36-50, 119-144; Vos, *Geref. Dogm.* II, pp. 31-76; Hodge, *Syst. Theol.* II, pp. 192-308; McPherson, *Chr. Dogma*, pp. 242-256; Dabney, *Syst. and Polem. Theol.*, pp. 321-351; Litton, *Intro. to Dogm. Theol.*, pp. 136-174; Schmid, *Doct. Theol. of the Ev. Luth. Ch.*, pp. 242-276; Valentine, *Chr. Theol.* I, pp. 420-476; Pope, *Chr. Theol.* II, pp. 47-86; Raymond, *Syst. Theol.* II, pp. 64-172; Wilmers, *Handbook of the Chr. Religion*, pp. 235-238; Mackintosh, *Christianity and Sin*, cf. Index; Girardeau, *The Will in its Theological Relations*; Wiggers, *Augustinism and Pelagianism*; Candlish, *The Bibl. Doct. of Sin*, pp. 90-128; Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, pp. 114-166.

V. 罪的惩罚 The Punishment of Sin

Sin is a very serious matter, and is taken seriously by God, though men often make light of it. It is not only a transgression of the law of God, but an attack on the great Lawgiver Himself, a revolt against God. It is an infringement on the inviolable righteousness of God, which is the very foundation of His throne (Ps. 97:2), and an affront to the spotless holiness of God, which requires of us that we be holy in all manner of living (I Pet. 1:16). In view of this it is but natural that God should visit sin with punishment. In a word of fundamental significance He says: "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me," Ex. 20:5. The Bible abundantly testifies to the fact that God punishes sin both in this life and in the life to come.

Ps. 97:2

密雲和幽暗在他的四圍；公義和公平是他寶座的根基。

Clouds and thick darkness surround him; righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne.

I Pet. 1:16

因為經上記著說：「你們要聖潔，因為我是聖潔的。」

for it is written: "Be holy, because I am holy."

Ex. 20:5

不可跪拜那些像，也不可事奉他，因為我耶和華—你的神是忌邪的神。恨我的，我必追討他的罪，自父及子，直到三四代；

You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me,

A. 自然的惩罚，正面的惩罚

Natural and positive penalties.

A rather common distinction applied to the punishments for sin, is that between natural and positive penalties. There are punishments which are the natural results of sin, and which men cannot escape, because they are the natural and necessary consequences of sin. Man is not saved from them by repentance and forgiveness. In some cases they may be mitigated and even checked by the means which God has placed at our disposal, but in other cases they remain and serve as a constant reminder of past transgressions. The slothful man comes to poverty, the drunkard brings ruin upon himself and his family, the fornicator contracts a loathsome and incurable disease, and the criminal is burdened with shame and even when leaving the prison walls finds it extremely hard to make a new start in life. The Bible speaks of such punishments in Job 4:8; Ps. 9:15; 94:23; Prov. 5:22; 23:21; 24:14; 31:3. But there are also positive punishments, and these are punishments in the more ordinary and legal sense of the word. They presuppose not merely the natural laws of life, but a positive law of the great Lawgiver with added sanctions. They are not penalties which naturally result from the nature of the transgression, but penalties which are attached to the transgressions by divine enactments. They are superimposed by the divine law, which is of absolute authority. It is to this type of punishment that the Bible usually refers. This is particularly evident in the Old Testament. God gave Israel a detailed code of laws for the regulation of its civil, moral, and religious life, and clearly stipulated the punishment to be meted out in the case of each transgression, cf. Ex. 20-23. And though many of the civil and religious regulations of this law were, in the form in which they were couched, intended for Israel only, the fundamental

principles which they embody also apply in the New Testament dispensation. In a Biblical conception of the penalty of sin we shall have to take into account both the natural and necessary outcome of wilful opposition to God and the penalty legally affixed and adjusted to the offense by God. Now there are some Unitarians, Universalists, and Modernists who deny the existence of any punishment of sin, except such consequences as naturally result from the sinful action. Punishment is not the execution of a sentence pronounced by the divine Being on the merits of the case, but simply the operation of a general law. This position is taken by J. F. Clarke, Thayer, Williamson, and Washington Gladden. The latter says: "The old theology made this penalty (penalty of sin) to consist in suffering inflicted upon the sinner by a judicial process in the future life . . . The penalty of sin, as the new theology teaches, consists in the natural consequences of sin. . . . The penalty of sin is sin. Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." The idea is not new; it was present to the mind of Dante, for in his famous poem the torments of hell symbolize the consequences of sin; and Schelling had it in mind, when he spoke of the history of the world as the judgment of the world. It is abundantly evident from Scripture, however, that this is an entirely unbiblical view. The Bible speaks of penalties, which are in no sense the natural result or consequences of the sin committed, for instance in Ex. 32:33; Lev. 26:21; Num. 15:31; I Chron. 10:13; Ps. 11:6; 75:8; Isa. 1:24,28; Matt. 3:10; 24:51. All these passages speak of a punishment of sin by a direct act of God. Moreover, according to the view under consideration there is really no reward or punishment; virtue and vice both naturally include their various issues. Furthermore, on that standpoint there is no good reason for considering suffering as punishment, for it denies guilt, and it is exactly guilt that constitutes suffering a punishment. Then, too, it is in many cases not the guilty that receives the severest punishment, but the innocent as, for instance, the dependents of a drunkard or a debauchee. And, finally, on this view, heaven and hell are not places of future punishment, but states of mind or conditions in which men find themselves here and now. Washington Gladden expresses this very explicitly.

Job 4:8

我所見，耕罪孽、種毒害的人都照樣收割。

As I have observed, those who plow evil and those who sow trouble reap it.

Ps. 9:15

外邦人陷在自己所掘的坑中；他們的腳在自己暗設的網羅裡纏住了。

The nations have fallen into the pit they have dug; their feet are caught in the net they have hidden.

Ps. 94:23

他叫他們的罪孽歸到他們身上。他們正在行惡之中，他要剪除他們；耶和華—我們的神要把他們剪除。

He will repay them for their sins and destroy them for their wickedness; the LORD our God will destroy them.

Prov. 5:22

惡人必被自己的罪孽捉住；他必被自己的罪惡如繩索纏繞。

The evil deeds of a wicked man ensnare him; the cords of his sin hold him fast.

Prov. 23:21

因為好酒貪食的，必致貧窮；好睡覺的，必穿破爛衣服。

for drunkards and gluttons become poor, and drowsiness clothes them in rags.

Prov. 24:14

你心得了智慧，也必覺得如此。你若找著，至終必有善報；你的指望也不致斷絕。

Know also that wisdom is sweet to your soul; if you find it, there is a future hope for you, and your hope will not be cut off.

Prov. 31:3

不要將你的精力給婦女；也不要為敗壞君王的行為。
do not spend your strength on women, your vigor on those who ruin kings.

Ex. 20-23

Ex. 32:33

耶和華對摩西說：誰得罪我，我就從我的冊上塗抹誰的名。
The LORD replied to Moses, "Whoever has sinned against me I will blot out of my book.

Lev. 26:21

你們行事若與我反對，不肯聽從我，我就要按你們的罪加七倍降災與你們。
'If you remain hostile toward me and refuse to listen to me, I will multiply your afflictions seven times over, as your sins deserve.

Num. 15:31

因他藐視耶和華的言語，違背耶和華的命令，那人總要剪除；他的罪孽要歸到他身上。
Because he has despised the LORD's word and broken his commands, that person must surely be cut off; his guilt remains on him.' "

I Chron. 10:13

這樣，掃羅死了。因為他干犯耶和華，沒有遵守耶和華的命；又因他求問交鬼的婦人，
Saul died because he was unfaithful to the LORD; he did not keep the word of the LORD and even consulted a medium for guidance,

Ps. 11:6

他要向惡人密布網羅；有烈火、硫磺、熱風，作他們杯中的分。
On the wicked he will rain fiery coals and burning sulfur; a scorching wind will be their lot.

Ps. 75:8

耶和華手裡有杯，其中的酒起沫，杯內滿了攪雜的酒；他倒出來，地上的惡人必都喝這酒的渣滓，而且喝盡。
In the hand of the LORD is a cup full of foaming wine mixed with spices; he pours it out, and all the wicked of the earth drink it down to its very dregs.

Isa. 1:24,28

因此，主—萬軍之耶和華、以色列的大能者說：哎！我要向我的對頭雪恨，向我的敵人報仇。
但悖逆的和犯罪的必一同敗亡；離棄耶和華的必致消滅。

24 Therefore the Lord, the LORD Almighty, the Mighty One of Israel, declares: "Ah, I will get relief from my foes and avenge myself on my enemies. 28 But rebels and sinners will both be broken, and those who forsake the LORD will perish.

Matt. 3:10

在斧子已經放在樹根上，凡不結好果子的樹就砍下來，丟在火裡。

The ax is already at the root of the trees, and every tree that does not produce good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.

Matt. 24:51

重重的處治他（或作：把他腰斬了），定他和假冒為善的人同罪；在那裡必要哀哭切齒了。

He will cut him to pieces and assign him a place with the hypocrites, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

B. 惩罚的本质与目的

Nature and Purpose of Punishments.

The word "punishment" is derived from the Latin poena, meaning punishment, expiation, or pain. It denotes pain or suffering inflicted because of some misdeed. More specifically, it may be defined as that pain or loss which is directly or indirectly inflicted by the Lawgiver, in vindication of His justice outraged by the violation of the law. It originates in the righteousness or punitive justice of God, by which He maintains Himself as the Holy One and necessarily demands holiness and righteousness in all His rational creatures. Punishment is the penalty that is naturally and necessarily due from the sinner because of his sin; it is, in fact, a debt that is due to the essential justice of God. The punishments of sin are of two different kinds. There is a punishment that is the necessary concomitant of sin, for in the nature of the case sin causes separation between God and man, carries with it guilt and pollution, and fills the heart with fear and shame. But there is also a kind of punishment that is superimposed on man from without by the supreme Lawgiver, such as all kinds of calamities in this life and the punishment of hell in the future. Now the question arises as to the object or the purpose of the punishment of sin. And on this point there is considerable difference of opinion. We should not regard the punishment of sin as a mere matter of vengeance and as inflicted with the desire to harm one who has previously done harm. The following are the three most important views respecting the purpose of punishment.

1. 高举上帝的公义

To Vindicate Divine Righteousness or Justice.

Turretin says: "If there be such an attribute as justice belonging to God, then sin must have its due, which is punishment." The law requires that sin be punished because of its inherent demerit, irrespective of all further considerations. This principle applies in the administration of both human and divine laws. Justice requires the punishment of the transgressor. Back of the law stands God, and therefore it may also be said that punishment aims at the vindication of the righteousness and holiness of the great Lawgiver. The holiness of God necessarily reacts against sin, and this reaction manifests itself in the punishment of sin. This principle is fundamental to all those passages of Scripture that speak of God as a righteous Judge, who renders unto every man according to his deserts. "He is the rock, His work is perfect: for all His ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He," Deut.

32:4. "Far be it from God, that He should do wickedness; and from the Almighty, that He should commit iniquity. For the work of a man shall He render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways," Job. 34:10,11. "Thou renderest to every man according to his work," Ps. 62:12. "Righteous art thou, O Lord, and upright are thy judgments," Ps. 119:37. "I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth," Jer. 9:24. "And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgest according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear," I Pet. 1:17. The vindication of the righteousness and holiness of God, and of that just law which is the very expression of His being, is certainly the primary purpose of the punishment of sin. There are two other views, however, which erroneously put something else in the foreground.

Deut. 32:4

他是磐石，他的作為完全；他所行的無不公平，是誠實無偽的神，又公義，又正直。

He is the Rock, his works are perfect, and all his ways are just. A faithful God who does no wrong, upright and just is he.

Job. 34:10, 11

所以，你們明理的人要聽我的話。神斷不致行惡；全能者斷不致作孽。必按人所做的報應人，使各人照所行的得報。

10 "So listen to me, you men of understanding. Far be it from God to do evil, from the Almighty to do wrong. 11 He repays a man for what he has done; he brings upon him what his conduct deserves.

Ps. 62:12

主啊，慈愛也是屬乎你，因為你照著各人所行的報應他。

and that you, O Lord, are loving. Surely you will reward each person according to what he has done.

Ps. 119:37

求你叫我轉眼不看虛假，又叫我在你的道中生活。

Turn my eyes away from worthless things; preserve my life according to your word.

Jer. 9:24

誇口的卻因他有聰明，認識我是耶和華，又知道我喜悅在世上施行慈愛、公平，和公義，以此誇口。這是耶和華說的。

but let him who boasts boast about this: that he understands and knows me, that I am the LORD, who exercises kindness, justice and righteousness on earth, for in these I delight," declares the LORD.

I Pet. 1:17

你們既稱那不偏待人、按各人行為審判人的主為父，就當存敬畏的心度你們在世寄居的日子，

Since you call on a Father who judges each man's work impartially, live your lives as strangers here in reverent fear.

2. 改革罪人 To Reform the Sinner.

The idea is very much in the foreground at the present time that there is no punitive justice in God which inexorably calls for the punishment of the sinner, and that God is not angry with the sinner

but loves him, and only inflicts hardships upon him, in order to reclaim him and to bring him back to his Father's home. This is an unscriptural view, which obliterates the distinction between punishment and chastisement. The penalty of sin does not proceed from the love and mercy of the Lawgiver, but from His justice. If reformation follows the infliction of punishment, this is not due to the penalty as such, but is the fruit of some gracious operation of God by which He turns that which is in itself an evil for the sinner into something that is beneficial. The distinction between chastisement and punishment must be maintained. The Bible teaches us on the one hand that God loves and chastens His people, Job 5:17; Ps. 6:1; Ps. 94:12; 118:18; Prov. 3:11; Isa. 26:16; Heb. 12:5-8; Rev. 3:19; and on the other hand, that He hates and punishes evil-doers, Ps. 5:5; 7:11; Nah. 1:2; Rom. 1:18; 2:5,6; II Thess. 1:6; Heb. 10:26,27. Moreover, a punishment must be recognized as just, that is, as according to justice, in order to be reformatory. According to this theory a sinner who has already reformed could no more be punished; nor could one beyond the possibility of reformation, so that there could be no punishment for Satan; the death penalty would have to be abolished, and eternal punishment would have no reason for existence.

Job 5:17

神所懲治的人是有福的！所以你不可輕看全能者的管教。

“Blessed is the man whom God corrects; so do not despise the discipline of the Almighty.

Ps. 6:1

（大衛的詩，交與伶長。用絲弦的樂器，調用第八。）耶和華啊，求你不要在怒中責備我，也不要再在烈怒中懲罰我！

O LORD, do not rebuke me in your anger or discipline me in your wrath.

Ps. 94:12

和華啊，你所管教、用律法所教訓的人是有福的！

Blessed is the man you discipline, O LORD, the man you teach from your law;

Ps. 118:18

耶和華雖嚴嚴地懲治我，卻未曾將我交於死亡。

The LORD has chastened me severely, but he has not given me over to death.

Prov. 3:11

我兒，你不可輕看耶和華的管教（或譯：懲治），也不可厭煩他的責備；

My son, do not despise the LORD's discipline and do not resent his rebuke,

Isa. 26:16

耶和華啊，他們在急難中尋求你；你的懲罰臨到他們身上，他們就傾心吐膽禱告你。

LORD, they came to you in their distress; when you disciplined them, they could barely whisper a prayer.

Heb. 12:5-8

5 你們又忘了那勸你們如同勸兒子的話，說：我兒，你不可輕看主的管教，被他責備的時候也不可灰心；**6** 因為主所愛的，他必管教，又鞭打凡所收納的兒子。**7** 你們所忍受的，是神管教你們，待你們如同待兒子。焉有兒子不被父親管教的呢？**8** 管教原是眾子所共受的，你們若不受管教，就是私子，不是兒子了。

5 And you have forgotten that word of encouragement that addresses you as sons: "My son, do not make light of the Lord's discipline, and do not lose heart when he rebukes you, 6 because the Lord

disciplines those he loves, and he punishes everyone he accepts as a son." 7 Endure hardship as discipline; God is treating you as sons. For what son is not disciplined by his father? 8 If you are not disciplined (and everyone undergoes discipline), then you are illegitimate children and not true sons.

Rev. 3:19

凡我所疼愛的，我就責備管教他；所以你要發熱心，也要悔改。

Those whom I love I rebuke and discipline. So be earnest, and repent.

Ps. 5:5

狂傲人不能站在你眼前；凡作孽的，都是你所恨惡的。

The arrogant cannot stand in your presence; you hate all who do wrong.

Ps. 7:11

神是公義的審判者，又是天天向惡人發怒的神。

God is a righteous judge, a God who expresses his wrath every day.

Nah. 1:2

耶和華是忌邪施報的神。耶和華施報大有忿怒；向他的敵人施報，向他的仇敵懷怒。

The LORD is a jealous and avenging God; the LORD takes vengeance and is filled with wrath. The LORD takes vengeance on his foes and maintains his wrath against his enemies.

Rom. 1:18

原來，神的忿怒從天上顯明在一切不虔不義的人身上，就是那些行不義阻擋真理的人。

The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness,

Rom. 2:5,6

你竟任著你剛硬不悔改的心，為自己積蓄忿怒，以致神震怒，顯他公義審判的日子來到。

他必照各人的行為報應各人。

5 But because of your stubbornness and your unrepentant heart, you are storing up wrath against yourself for the day of God's wrath, when his righteous judgment will be revealed. 6 God "will give to each person according to what he has done."

II Thess. 1:6

神既是公義的，就必將患難報應那加患難給你們的人；

God is just: He will pay back trouble to those who trouble you

Heb. 10:26,27

為我們得知真道以後，若故意犯罪，贖罪的祭就再沒有了；

惟有戰懼等候審判和那燒滅眾敵人的烈火。

26 If we deliberately keep on sinning after we have received the knowledge of the truth, no sacrifice for sins is left, 27 but only a fearful expectation of judgment and of raging fire that will consume the enemies of God.

3. 阻止人不犯罪 To Deter Men from Sin.

Another theory rather prevalent in our day is that the sinner must be punished for the protection of society, by deterring others from the commission of similar offenses. There can be no doubt about it that this end is often secured in the family, in the state, and in the moral government of the world, but this is an incidental result which God graciously effects by the infliction of the penalty. It certainly cannot be the ground for the infliction of the penalty. There is no justice whatever in punishing an individual simply for the good of society. As a matter of fact the sinner is always punished for his sin, and incidentally this may be for the good of society. And here again it may be said that no punishment will have a deterring effect, if it is not just and right in itself. Punishment has a good effect only when it is evident that the person on whom it is afflicted really deserves punishment. If this theory were true, a criminal might at once be set free, if it were not for the possibility that others might be deterred from sin by his punishment. Moreover, a man might rightly commit a crime, if he were only willing to bear the penalty. According to this view punishment is in no sense grounded in the past, but is wholly prospective. But on that supposition it is very hard to explain how it invariably causes the repentant sinner to look back and to confess with contrite heart the sins of the past, as we notice in such passages as the following: Gen. 42:21; Num. 21:7; I Sam. 15:24,25; II Sam. 12:13; 24:10; Ezra 9:6,10, 13; Neh. 9:33-35; Job 7:21; Ps. 51:1-4; Jer. 3:25. These examples might easily be multiplied. In opposition to both of the theories considered it must be maintained that the punishment of sin is wholly retrospective in its primary aim, though the infliction of the penalty may have beneficial consequences both for the individual and for society.

Gen. 42:21

們彼此說：我們在兄弟身上實在有罪。他哀求我們的時候，我們見他心裡的愁苦，卻不肯聽，所以這場苦難臨到我們身上。

They said to one another, "Surely we are being punished because of our brother. We saw how distressed he was when he pleaded with us for his life, but we would not listen; that's why this distress has come upon us."

Num. 21:7

百姓到摩西那裡，說：我們怨讎耶和華和你，有罪了。求你禱告耶和華，叫這些蛇離開我們。於是摩西為百姓禱告。

The people came to Moses and said, "We sinned when we spoke against the LORD and against you. Pray that the LORD will take the snakes away from us." So Moses prayed for the people.

I Sam. 15:24, 25

掃羅對撒母耳說：我有罪了，我因懼怕百姓，聽從他們的話，就違背了耶和華的命令和你的言語。

現在求你赦免我的罪，同我回去，我好敬拜耶和華。

Then Saul said to Samuel, "I have sinned. I violated the LORD's command and your instructions. I was afraid of the people and so I gave in to them. 25 Now I beg you, forgive my sin and come back with me, so that I may worship the LORD."

II Sam. 12:13

大衛對拿單說：我得罪耶和華了！拿單說：耶和華已經除掉你的罪，你必不至於死。

Then David said to Nathan, "I have sinned against the LORD." Nathan replied, "The LORD has taken away your sin. You are not going to die."

II Sam. 24:10

大衛數點百姓以後，就心中自責，禱告耶和華說：我行這事大有罪了。耶和華啊，求你除掉僕人的罪孽，因我所行的甚是愚昧。

David was conscience-stricken after he had counted the fighting men, and he said to the LORD, "I have sinned greatly in what I have done. Now, O LORD, I beg you, take away the guilt of your servant. I have done a very foolish thing."

Ezra 9:6, 10, 13

說：我的神啊，我抱愧蒙羞，不敢向我神仰面；因為我們的罪孽滅頂，我們的罪惡滔天。

「我們的 神啊，既是如此，我們還有甚麼話可說呢？因為我們已經離棄你的命令，

神啊，我們因自己的惡行和大罪，遭遇了這一切的事，並且你刑罰我們輕於我們罪所當得的，又給我們留下這些人。

6 and prayed: "O my God, I am too ashamed and disgraced to lift up my face to you, my God, because our sins are higher than our heads and our guilt has reached to the heavens.

10 "But now, O our God, what can we say after this? For we have disregarded the commands

13 "What has happened to us is a result of our evil deeds and our great guilt, and yet, our God, you have punished us less than our sins have deserved and have given us a remnant like this.

Neh. 9:33-35

在一切臨到我們的事上，你卻是公義的；因你所行的是誠實，我們所做的是邪惡。

我們的君王、首領、祭司、列祖都不遵守你的律法，不聽從你的誠命和你警戒他們的話。

他們在本國裡沾你大恩的時候，在你所賜給他們這廣大肥美之地上不事奉你，也不轉離他們的惡行。

33 In all that has happened to us, you have been just; you have acted faithfully, while we did wrong.

34 Our kings, our leaders, our priests and our fathers did not follow your law; they did not pay attention to your commands or the warnings you gave them.

35 Even while they were in their kingdom, enjoying your great goodness to them in the spacious and fertile land you gave them, they did not serve you or turn from their evil ways.

Job 7:21

為何不赦免我的過犯，除掉我的罪孽？我現今要躺臥在塵土中；你要殷勤地尋找我，我卻不在了。

Why do you not pardon my offenses and forgive my sins? For I will soon lie down in the dust; you will search for me, but I will be no more."

Ps. 51:1-4

1（大衛與拔示巴同室以後，先知拿單來見他；他作這詩，交與伶長。） 神啊，求你按你的慈愛憐恤我！按你豐盛的慈悲塗抹我的過犯！

2 求你將我的罪孽洗除淨盡，並潔除我的罪！

3 因為，我知道我的過犯；我的罪常在我面前。

4 我向你犯罪，惟獨得罪了你；在你眼前行了這惡，以致你責備我的時候顯為公義，判斷我的時候顯為清正。

1 Have mercy on me, O God, according to your unfailing love; according to your great compassion blot out my transgressions.

2 Wash away all my iniquity and cleanse me from my sin.

3 For I know my transgressions, and my sin is always before me.

4 Against you, you only, have I sinned and done what is evil in your sight, so that you are proved right when you speak and justified when you judge.

Jer. 3:25

我們在羞恥中躺臥罷！願慚愧將我們遮蓋；因為從立國（原文是幼年）以來，我們和我們的列祖常常得罪耶和華—我們的神，沒有聽從耶和華—我們神的話。Let us lie down in our shame, and let our disgrace cover us. We have sinned against the LORD our God, both we and our fathers; from our youth till this day we have not obeyed the LORD our God."

D. 罪的具体惩罚 The actual penalty of sin.

The penalty with which God threatened man in paradise was the penalty of death. The death here intended is not the death of the body, but the death of man as a whole, death in the Scriptural sense of the word. The Bible does not know the distinction, so common among us, between a physical, a spiritual, and an eternal death; it has a synthetic view of death and regards it as separation from God. The penalty was also actually executed on the day that man sinned, though the full execution of it was temporarily stayed by the grace of God. In a rather unscriptural way some carry their distinction into the Bible, and maintain that physical death should not be regarded as the penalty of sin, but rather as the natural result of the physical constitution of man. But the Bible knows of no such exception. It acquaints us with the threatened penalty, which is death in the comprehensive sense of the word, and it informs us that death entered the world through sin (Rom. 5:12), and that the wages of sin is death (Rom. 6:23). The penalty of sin certainly includes physical death, but it includes much more than that. Making the distinction to which we have grown accustomed, we may say that it includes the following:

Rom. 5:12

這就如罪是從一人入了世界，死又是從罪來的；於是死就臨到眾人，因為眾人都犯了罪。

12 Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned—

Rom. 6:23

為罪的工價乃是死；惟有神的恩賜，在我們的主基督耶穌裡，乃是永生。

For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

1. 属灵的死 Spiritual Death.

There is a profound truth in the saying of Augustine that sin is also the punishment of sin. This means that the sinful state and condition in which man is born by nature form part of the penalty of sin. They are, it is true, the immediate consequences of sin, but they are also a part of the threatened penalty. Sin separates man from God, and that means death, for it is only in communion with the living God that man can truly live. In the state of death, which resulted from the entrance of sin into the world, we are burdened with the guilt of sin, a guilt that can only be removed by the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. We are therefore under obligation to bear the sufferings that result from transgression of the law. The natural man carries the sense of the liability to punishment with him wherever he goes. Conscience is a constant reminder of his guilt, and the fear of punishment often fills the heart. Spiritual death means not only guilt, but also pollution. Sin is always a corrupting influence in life, and this is a part of our death. We are by nature not only unrighteous in the sight of God, but also unholy. And this unholiness manifests itself in our thoughts, in our words, and in our deeds. It is always active within us like a poisoned fountain polluting the streams of life. And if it were not for the restraining influence of the common grace of God, it would render social life entirely impossible.

2. 生命中的痛苦 The Sufferings of Life.

The sufferings of life, which are the result of the entrance of sin into the world, are also included in the penalty of sin. Sin brought disturbance in the entire life of man. His physical life fell a prey to weaknesses and diseases, which result in discomforts and often in agonizing pains; and his mental life became subject to distressing disturbances, which often rob him of the joy of life, disqualify him for his daily task, and sometimes entirely destroy his mental equilibrium. His very soul has become a battlefield of conflicting thoughts, passions, and desires. The will refuses to follow the judgment of the intellect, and the passions run riot without the control of an intelligent will. The true harmony of life is destroyed, and makes way for the curse of the divided life. Man is in a state of dissolution, which often carries with it the most poignant sufferings. And not only that, but with and on account of man the whole creation was made subject to vanity and to the bondage of corruption. The evolutionists especially have taught us to look upon nature as "red in tooth and claw." Destructive forces are often released in earthquakes, cyclones, tornadoes, volcanic eruptions, and floods, which bring untold misery on mankind. Now there are many, especially in our day, who do not see the hand of God in all this, and do not regard these calamities as a part of the penalty of sin. And yet that is exactly what they are in a general sense. However, it will not be safe to particularize, and to interpret them as special punishments for some grievous sins committed by those who live in the stricken areas. Neither will it be wise to ridicule the idea of such a causal connection as existed in the case of the Cities of the Plain (Sodom and Gomorrah), which were destroyed by fire from heaven. We should always bear in mind that there is a collective responsibility, and that there are always sufficient reasons why God should visit cities, districts or nations with dire calamities. It is rather a wonder that He does not more often visit them in His wrath and in His sore displeasure. It is always well to bear in mind what Jesus once said to the Jews who brought to Him the report of a calamity which had befallen certain Galileans, and evidently intimated that these Galileans must have been very sinful: "Think ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they have suffered these things? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Luke 13:2-5.

Luke 13:2-5

3. 身体的死亡 Physical Death.

The separation of body and soul is also a part of the penalty of sin. That the Lord had this in mind also in the threatened penalty is quite evident from the explication of it in the words, "dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return," Gen. 3:19. It also appears from the whole argument of Paul in Rom. 5:12-21 and in I Cor. 15:12-23. The position of the Church has always been that death in the full sense of the word, including physical death, is not only the consequence but the penalty of sin. The wages of sin is death. Pelagianism denied this connection, but the North African General Synod of Carthage (418) pronounced an anathema against any man who says "that Adam, the first man, was created mortal, so that whether he sinned or not he would have died, not as the wages of sin, but through the necessity of nature." Socinians and Rationalists continued the Pelagian error, and in even more recent times it was reproduced in the systems of those Kantian, Hegelian, or Ritschlian theologians who virtually make sin a necessary moment in man's moral and spiritual development. Their views found support in present day natural science, which regards physical death as a natural phenomenon of the human organism. Man's physical constitution is such that he necessarily dies. But this view does not commend itself in view of the fact that man's physical organism is renewed every seven years, and that comparatively few people die in old age and from complete exhaustion. By far the greater number of them die as the result of sickness and accidents. It is also contrary to the fact that man does not feel that death is something natural, but fears it as an unnatural separation of that which belongs together.

Gen. 3:19

你必汗流滿面才得糊口，直到你歸了土，因為你是從土而出的。你本是塵土，仍要歸於塵土。

By the sweat of your brow you will eat your food until you return to the ground, since from it you were taken; for dust you are and to dust you will return."

Rom. 5:12-21

這就如罪是從一人入了世界，死又是從罪來的；於是死就臨到眾人，因為眾人都犯了罪。

沒有律法之先，罪已經在世上；但沒有律法，罪也不算罪。

然而從亞當到摩西，死就作了王，連那些不與亞當犯一樣罪過的，也在他的權下。亞當乃是那以後要來之人的豫像。

只是過犯不如恩賜，若因一人的過犯，眾人都死了，何況神的恩典，與那因耶穌基督一人恩典中的賞賜，豈不更加倍的臨到眾人麼？

因一人犯罪就定罪，也不如恩賜，原來審判是由一人而定罪，恩賜乃是由許多過犯而稱義。

若因一人的過犯，死就因這一人作了王，何況那些受洪恩又蒙所賜之義的，豈不更要因耶穌基督一人在生命中作王麼？

如此說來，因一次的過犯，眾人都被定罪；照樣，因一次的義行，眾人也就被稱義得生命了。

一人的悖逆，眾人成為罪人；照樣，因一人的順從，眾人也成為義了。

律法本是外添的，叫過犯顯多；只是罪在那裡顯多，恩典就更顯多了。

就如罪作王叫人死；照樣，恩典也藉著義作王，叫人因我們的主耶穌基督得永生。

12 Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned—

13 for before the law was given, sin was in the world. But sin is not taken into account when there is no law.

14 Nevertheless, death reigned from the time of Adam to the time of Moses, even over those who did not sin by breaking a command, as did Adam, who was a pattern of the one to come.

15 But the gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died by the trespass of the one man, how much more did God's grace and the gift that came by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, overflow to the many!

16 Again, the gift of God is not like the result of the one man's sin: The judgment followed one sin and brought condemnation, but the gift followed many trespasses and brought justification.

17 For if, by the trespass of the one man, death reigned through that one man, how much more will those who receive God's abundant provision of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ.

18 Consequently, just as the result of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men.

19 For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous.

20 The law was added so that the trespass might increase. But where sin increased, grace increased all the more,

21 so that, just as sin reigned in death, so also grace might reign through righteousness to bring eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

I Cor. 15:12-23

12 既傳基督是從死裡復活了，怎麼在你們中間有人說沒有死人復活的事呢？

13 若沒有死人復活的事，基督也就沒有復活了。

14 若基督沒有復活，我們所傳的便是枉然，你們所信的也是枉然；

15 並且明顯我們是為神妄作見證的，因我們見證神是叫基督復活了。若死人真不復活，神也就沒有叫基督復活了。

16 因為死人若不復活，基督也就沒有復活了。

17 基督若沒有復活，你們的信便是徒然，你們仍在罪裡。

18 就是在基督裡睡了的人也滅亡了。

19 我們若靠基督，只在今生有指望，就算比眾人更可憐。

20 但基督已經從死裡復活，成為睡了之人初熟的果子。

21 死既是因一人而來，死人復活也是因一人而來。

22 在亞當裡眾人都死了；照樣，在基督裡眾人都都要復活。

23 但各人是按著自己的次序復活：初熟的果子是基督；以後，在他來的時候，是那些屬基督的。

12 But if it is preached that Christ has been raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?

13 If there is no resurrection of the dead, then not even Christ has been raised.

14 And if Christ has not been raised, our preaching is useless and so is your faith.

15 More than that, we are then found to be false witnesses about God, for we have testified about God that he raised Christ from the dead. But he did not raise him if in fact the dead are not raised.

16 For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised either.

17 And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile; you are still in your sins.

- 18 Then those also who have fallen asleep in Christ are lost.
 19 If only for this life we have hope in Christ, we are to be pitied more than all men.
 20 But Christ has indeed been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep.
 21 For since death came through a man, the resurrection of the dead comes also through a man.
 22 For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive.
 23 But each in his own turn: Christ, the firstfruits; then, when he comes, those who belong to him.

4. 永远的死 Eternal Death.

This may be regarded as the culmination and completion of spiritual death. The restraints of the present fall away, and the corruption of sin has its perfect work. The full weight of the wrath of God descends on the condemned. Their separation from God, the source of life and joy, is complete, and this means death in the most awful sense of the word. Their outward condition is made to correspond with the inward state of their evil souls. There are pangs of conscience and physical pain. And the smoke of their torment goeth up for ever and ever. Rev. 14:11. The further discussion of this subject belongs to eschatology.

Rev. 14:11

他受痛苦的煙往上冒，直到永永遠遠。那些拜獸和獸像，受他名之印記的，晝夜不得安寧。

And the smoke of their torment rises for ever and ever. There is no rest day or night for those who worship the beast and his image, or for anyone who receives the mark of his name."

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Why do many modern liberals deny all positive punishments for sin?
2. Is the position at all tenable that the punishments of sin consist exclusively in the natural consequences of sin?
3. What objections do you have to this position?
4. How do you account for the widespread aversion to the idea that the punishment of sin is a vindication of the law and of the righteousness of God?
5. Do the punishments of sin also serve as deterrents, and as means of reformation?
6. What is the Biblical conception of death?
7. Can you prove from Scripture that it includes physical death?
8. Is the doctrine of eternal death consistent with the idea that the punishment of sin serves merely as a means of reformation, or as a deterrent?

LITERATURE:

Bavinck, Geref. Dogm. III, pp. 158-198; Kuyper, Dict. Dogm., De Peccato, pp. 93-112; Strong, Syst. Theol., pp. 652-660; Raymond, Syst. Theol. II, pp. 175-184; Shedd, Doctrine of Endless Punishment; Washington Gladden, Present Day Theology, Chaps. IV and V; Kennedy, St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, pp. 103-157; Dorner, Syst. of Chr. Doct. III, pp. 114-132.