Tim's Question
Is <Christ was tempted> compatible with <Christ was unable to sin>?

1. The Peccability Argument

1. If a person is tempted, then that person is capable of sinning.
2. Christ is tempted.
3. Thus, Christ is capable of sinning.
4. If a person is capable of sinning, then that person is not impeccable.
5. So Christ is not impeccable.

2. Reject (2) - A Weakened Account of Temptation

Temptation (Weak): ‘An affectively charged cognitive event in which an object or activity that is associated with pleasure or relief or discomfort is in focal attention, yet the object of that desire conflicts with the person's values and goals.’

So: temptation need not be temptation to do something sinful per se.

Comment (A): What is at stake in this dispute? Is it a verbal dispute?
Comment (B): Won't this account of temptation overgeneralize? E.g., Susan case

3. Reject (4)

1. The truth conditions for ‘S is peccable’ and ‘S is impeccable’ are as follows:
   A) S is peccable just in case S has a concrete nature such that something with that nature as her own would be able to sin by means of that nature.
   B) S is impeccable just in case S has a concrete nature such that it is not the case that someone with that nature as her own would be able to sin by means of that nature. [Assumption]
2. Christ has a concrete human nature that has all the same powers that other humans have. [Assumption]
3. Humans have the power to do things that, under particular circumstances, are sinful. (And there is no further power to sin per se.) [Assumption]
4. If X has the power to do something that, under particular circumstances, is sinful, then X has the power to sin. [Assumption]
5. Christ, in his concrete human nature, has the power to sin. [2, 3, 4]
6. Christ has a concrete nature such that something with that nature would be able to sin by means of that nature. [5]
7. So Christ is peccable qua human. [1, 6]
8. Christ has a concrete divine nature such that it is not the case that someone with that nature as his own would be able to sin by means of that nature. [Assumption]
9. So Christ is impeccable qua divine. [1, 8]
10. If Christ is X qua human and Christ is Y qua divine, then Christ is X and Y
11. Christ is peccable and impeccable. [7, 9]

Comment: How do we make sense of (10) when X and Y are seemingly conflicting properties?