

One or Two Acceptations of Sin... Two Forms of Sin? What Is Central Christadelphian Doctrine?

This document only supplies page images showing that a particular item Jim Luke, Brian Luke and John Martin portray as "Berean, Old Paths, and Unamended" is exactly what John Thomas, H. P. Mansfield and all genuine Christadelphians have taught since the Christadelphian community was established. Readers should view another page as well: "[John Thomas, H. P. Mansfield on Atonement and Covering](#)" which is another doctrine [they are claiming](#) is "Berean, Old Paths, and Unamended".

Australian clean-flesh teachers have recently appealed to John Carter and L.G. Sargent. But will they listen when L.G. Sargent and John Carter speak?

'Sin in human life has two aspects. First our nature itself has a bias towards sin and an inbred mortality which is the consequence of sin. That nature Christ shared with us. But secondly, in us the nature expresses itself in acts of sin for which we are individually responsible.' L.G.S., *The Christadelphian*, 1940, p. 348; John Carter editor.

- 1 — Physical Human Nature
- + 1 — Acts of sin a.k.a. Transgression
-
- = 2 — "two aspects" "sin... used in a secondary sense" "two principal acceptations"
"two forms" "two classes" "a term of double import" "two principal ways"
"two manifestations" "two ways" "two kinds" "the word also has secondary uses"

Now, will the clean-flesh teachers accuse L.G. Sargent, John Carter, John Thomas or HP Mansfield of leaning towards the teachings of Andrewism, Old Paths, or the Bereans? Will they please advise?

THE CONSTITUTION OF SIN.

"The creature was made subject to evil, not willingly, but by the arranging in hope."

The introduction of *sin* into the world necessitated the constitution of things as they were laid in the beginning. If there had been no sin there would have been no "*enmity*" between God and man; and consequently no antagonism by which to educe good out of evil. Sin and evil are as cause and effect. God is the author of evil, but not of sin; for the evil is the punishment of sin. "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things."² "Shall there be evil in a city and the Lord hath not done it?"³ The evil then to which man is subjected is the Lord's doing. War, famine, pestilence, flood, earthquake, disease, and death, are the terrible evils which God inflicts upon mankind for their transgressions. Nations cannot go to war when they please, any more than they can shake the earth at their will and pleasure; neither can they preserve peace, when he proclaims war. Evil is the artillery with which he combats the enemies of his law, and of his saints; consequently, there will be neither peace nor blessedness for the nations, until sin is put down, his people avenged, and truth and righteousness be established in the earth.

This is the constituted order of things. It is the constitution of the world; and as the world is sin's dominion, or the kingdom of the adversary, it is the constitution of the kingdom of sin.

The word *sin* is used in two principal acceptations in the scripture. It signifies in the first place, "*the transgression of law*;" and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature, which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh "*which has the power of death*;" and it is called *sin*, because the developement, or fixation, of this *evil* in the flesh, was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled "*sinful flesh*," that is, *flesh full of sin*; so that *sin*, in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called *man*. In human flesh "*dwells no good thing*;"⁴ and all the evil a man does is the result of this principle dwelling in him.⁴ Operating upon the brain, it excites the "*propensities*," and these set the "*intellect*" and "*sentiments*" to work. The propensities are blind, and so are the intellect and sentiments in a purely natural state; when, therefore, the latter operate under the sole impulse of the propensities, "*the understanding is darkened through ignorance, because of the blindness of the heart.*"⁵ The nature of the lower animals is as full of this physical evil prin-

"The word 'sin' is used in two principal acceptations in the Scriptures."

John Thomas, [*Elpis Israel*](#)

Image from the 1849 London edition, p. 113.

DENIAL OF HIMSELF

Sin in human life has two aspects. First our nature itself has a bias towards sin and an inbred mortality which is the consequence of sin. That nature Christ shared with us. But secondly, in us the nature expresses itself in acts of sin for which we are individually responsible. This Jesus triumphed over in himself: and by a paradox of spiritual heroism it was part of the very triumph of God's will in him that he voluntarily took upon himself to be "lifted up" as the type and representative of sinful men.

Whenever Jesus says, "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this age shall keep it unto life eternal" (John 12:25)—he says it with his coming death in view: it is his own exposition of his own death, making that death the declaration of a principle for all who would follow him. And, as an earlier essay has endeavoured to show, the paradox there stated is at root nothing less than a choice between self-negation and extinction of being.

"Sin in human life has two aspects. First our nature itself has a bias towards sin and an inbred mortality which is the consequence of sin. That nature Christ shared with us. But secondly, in us the nature expresses itself in acts of sin for which we are individually responsible."

L.G. Sargent / John Carter; [*The Christadelphian*, 1940, p. 348](#)

"he also himself likewise" - these are terms of emphasis. The Apostle stresses the humanity of Jesus, that as far as his physical nature was concerned there was absolutely no difference between him and his brethren. There is no more powerful verse in the Scriptures to illustrate the principles involved in the sacrifice of our Lord than this one. Inherent in human nature are those propensities which are heavily biased towards evil, and which left to themselves inevitably lead to sin, causing the Apostle to exclaim in another place, "in my flesh dwelleth no good thing" (Rom.7v18). These same propensities were latent in our Lord's body as well, because of which it is said concerning him that he was made "sin for us who knew no sin" (II Cor.5v21). "Sin" here being used in a secondary sense.

page 19

"Sin' here being used in a secondary sense"

"as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins" - Under the Law, Aaron offered for himself and for the people in two separate offerings (Lev.16v11). This epistle repeatedly states that Christ also must offer for himself (see 1v3, 7v27, 9v12, 13v20). However, the point of difference between him and Aaron ought to be clearly noted. Whereas Aaron offered "for himself and for the people" in TWO SEPARATE offerings, Christ did the same in the ONE representative sacrifice (7v27). In the verse just quoted, the term "once" signifies this, and does not denote a point of contrast between what some suppose to be the daily offering and the high priest under the Law, as against the one sacrifice which Christ made. This

page 36

"TWO SEPARATE offerings, Christ did the SAME in the ONE"

"offered up himself" - note the parallel ideas. The removal of sin is comparable to the offering up of himself. We have this stated more clearly in 9v26, "But now once in the end of the age hath he appeared to put away SIN by the sacrifice of HIMSELF." We have just pointed out that the Lord being sin-less was able to incorporate the two parties in one body. Now we are suggesting that he "took away sin" by offering up himself, which would seem to be contradictory. But sin can be used in a secondary sense, that is, of the latent propensities in human nature which if uncontrolled by the indwelling influence of the word of life would break forth

page 60

"But sin can be used in a secondary sense"

"Because of his oneness in nature it could therefore be said of him that 'he was made sin for us'"

61.
into open violation of God's law. Our Lord being made in all points like unto his brethren was in physical nature no different than they (2v14), and consequently in his flesh there was nothing of intrinsic value, and he himself taught that it "profited nothing" (John 6v63). Howbeit, his whole life was a life of dedication, and the propensities were mortified by the power of the spirit word which dwelt within him (II Cor.13v4, Gal.5v24). Because of his oneness in nature it could therefore be said of him that "he was made sin for us" (II Cor.5v21) even though the Apostle goes on to say that he knew no sin, that is, he was not a personal sinner.

page 61

"Jesus was 'made sin for us', by reason of being born with our nature" -- NB John Martin: was his 'nature' moral or physical?

John Martin [[prior to his departure](#) from Christadelphian teaching on the atonement], *Hebrews Study Notes*

"by the sacrifice of himself" - Notice how Paul equates "the putting away of sin" with the "sacrifice of himself." Jesus was "made sin for us" (II Cor.5v21), by reason of being born with our nature, and thus "bearing our sins in his own body" (I Pet.2v24). When the Jews crucified the Lord of glory, they looked upon this

page 83

The contradictions of our critic would be amusing in a subject less serious. In an article dated 28/8/46 (approximately six months before he addressed the vote of welcome to us), and untruthfully entitled "The Logos Supports Andrewism," this same critic who today states, "Brother Roberts is wrong and unscriptural in his ideas," warned against the danger of "rejecting Brother Roberts' premises." There he emerged as the champion of Brother Roberts, and this, let it be remembered, in a subject closely related to the one referred to in the recent article. Twelve months ago he did not say "Brother Roberts is unscriptural and wrong"; he wrote that "The Logos" editor "has failed to interpret Brother Roberts aright!"

Further, twelve months ago he lauded Brother H. Fry, of England, as expressing perhaps more clearly than anybody else the truth of this doctrine, and sent to the Adelaide Arranging Brethren a book entitled "ECHOES OF PAST CONTROVERSIES," to be incorporated in the Ecclesial Library so as brethren might have access to a work which would correctly express the truth on the nature and sacrifice of Christ. This book was written by Brother Fry. In his preface Brother Fry wrote: "We have some . . . objecting to the use of the word 'sin' in the physical or secondary sense at all, and stumbling over the use of the word 'unclean' and 'sinful' in their application to the nature we possess, and which Christ shared in common with us all. None can gainsay the fact that our nature is sinful in its tendency, and corruptible in its constitution. Surely, then, it is no misnomer to describe it as 'unclean' and 'defiled'; and if Christ partook of 'the same' (as testified in Heb. 2-14), why stumble over these expressions when applied to his nature?" ("Preface"). Having presented this book to us, why should he complain: "The Logos" is re-introducing similar phraseology among us with reference to Christ."

One can learn the lesson from the book he supplies. **WHY WE** We present this reply to satisfy those who have asked for it. **REPLY** Doubtless it will be followed by a further screed exceeding those already received. Do not let our readers interpret our silence on future occasions as that of consent. We are too busy with the constructive features of the Truth to devote our energies answering these personal attacks. If our critic was so fond of unity and peace among the Ecclesias as he claims, one would imagine he would couch his lucubrations in different terms, and would, at least, manifest a consistency of thought.

The reason for the attack is not hard to place. Some time back we dared to question some aspects of a roneoed attack he made on another brother. Until then, although the policy of "The Logos" has always been the same, no attack had been made. Since then, however, attack after attack has been levelled against us. Our critic suffers from a persecution mania. This is exhibited in the phraseology he uses. Such dramatics as "If I am to bear the brunt of the trials and afflictions," etc., do not come from quiet, careful, logical thought. What "trials" and "afflictions" is he referring to!

"We have some... objecting to the use of the word 'sin' in the physical or secondary sense at all and stumbling over the use of the word 'unclean'..."

(The contradiction was that the critic was using "sin nature" as Harry Fry deceitfully used it: as a moral rather than physical issue)

NB Jim Luke:
"stumbling over the use of the word 'unclean' and 'sinful' in their application to the nature we possess...". Jim, was HP Mansfield a "pharisee" in viewing uncleanness as physical?

NB Jim Cowie: "why should he complain: 'The Logos' is reintroducing similar phraseology among us with reference to the work of Christ"? Your argument of changed language in Logos is not original, nor is your position in relation to Logos original.

*All will agree with this statement when the word, sin, is limited to its primary meaning of transgression of law, but the word also has secondary uses. For instance, we read, "God made Christ to be sin for us" (2 Cor. 5: 21. See also Rom. 5: 19; 6: 10; Heb. 9: 28, etc.); God did not make Christ a transgressor of the law . . . Editor.

Logos, July 1951, p. 259

"the word also has secondary uses"

LOGOS

likeness of sinful flesh, and for (on account of) sin condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3).

"He was made sin for us, who knew no sin" (2 Cor. 5:21).

"He put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. . . and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. 9:26,28).

This construction of the language of the Bible enables us to see how Jesus could "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," as he thereby put off the sin nature, and attained to the divine nature in which the principle of sin does not exist. Consequently, when he returns he will be "without sin," or that "which has the power of death" in his nature. We only have to render the Apostle's words in Heb. 9:28 as they are interpreted by some, to see the folly of their contention. Thus if we are to use the term *sin* only in the sense of *transgression*, we should be compelled to render the statement: "He shall appear a second time without transgression," implying that he was once a transgressor! Or if we use the term in the sense of *sin offering*, we would be compelled to render: "He shall appear a second time without a sin offering," which is wrong, because, as the prophecy of Ezekiel's Temple, and other places, abundantly show, sins will be forgiven in the Age to come through the same offering as they do now. Moreover, at that time, the "one offering" will again be symbolised or represented, by animal sacrifice, as the prophets clearly set forth.

The Two Forms Of "Sin"

It is obvious, then, that the word *sin* is used in two principal

ways in Scripture. It denotes firstly, actual transgression; and, secondly, human nature, as being the source of sin. Human nature is given the designation of sin, because the form in which it is found now, came as the result of sin in the first instance.

Recognising sin in its two manifestations, we are in a position to better understand the important words of Paul in describing our state in Christ. We can understand such expressions as *sin that dwelleth in me, the law of sin which is in my members, sin in the flesh*, and so forth. They warn that human nature, the lusts of the flesh, and the seat of sin, will lead to transgression, or *actual sin*, if permitted to manifest its natural tendencies unchecked.

Of Christ it is said that "he died unto sin once" (Rom. 6:10).

What sin was he related to which he had to die? Only sin in its secondary sense: human nature, the natural desires of which must be silenced, or put to death, in order that God might be served without stint. His death on the cross demonstrates that. It shows to his followers that the way to life is through death, for he served God in dying.

And he did so on a representative basis. For, in context with the statement above, Paul makes the observation: "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" (Rom. 6:2). In what sense are we "dead to sin"? Only in the sense that we have figuratively "crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. 5:24), or have "mortified (put to death our members which are upon the earth" (Col. 3:5),

"Two Forms of 'Sin'"

"Two principal ways"

"Two manifestations"

"sin in its secondary sense"

H.P. Mansfield; [Logos](#), 1976, p. 77

WHAT IS SIN ?

Sin is used in two ways in Scripture: to describe an act, and to define a condition. In *Elpis Israel*, Brother Thomas writes:

"The word 'sin' is used in two principal acceptations in the Scriptures. It signifies in the first place, the transgression of law; and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature, which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh 'which has the power of death'; and it is called 'sin', because the development or fixation of this evil in the flesh, was the result of transgression" (p.113).

"Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence, the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean" (p.114).

"This view of sin in the flesh is enlightening in the things concerning Jesus. The Apostle says, 'God made him sin for us, who knew no sin' (2 Cor. 5:21); and this he explains in another place by saying, that, 'He sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh' (Rom. 8:3)." (p.115).

"Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and that which is born of the flesh is flesh or sin. This is a misfortune, not a crime. They did not will to be born sinners. They have no choice in the case; for, it is written, 'the creature,' that is, the animal man 'made made subject to the evil, not willingly, but according to the arranging of hope (Rom. 8:20) . . . Hence, the Apostle says, 'by Adam's disobedience the many were made sinners' (Rom. 5:19); that is, they were endowed with a nature like his, which had become unclean, as a result of his disobedience" (p.116).

This view of flesh, so consistently set forth in the Word, so prominent in our standard works,

provides the starting point of the doctrine of the Atonement, and therefore, of the Truth. At the same time, it tolls the death-knell of the clean-flesh theory.

If human nature is termed "sin," it obviously cannot be considered "clean" as alleged by that theory; nor aligned with the "very good" state in which it was created, as defined in Genesis 1:31; Ecc. 7:29; Rom. 8:20.

But is human nature described as "sin"?

The Renunciationists, and related theories, deny that it is. They claim that sin is only used in the sense of transgression. A Queensland correspondent claims that John's definition ("sin is the transgression of the law" — 1 John 3:4) holds good wherever the word "sin" occurs.

But does it?

Certainly not if the Scriptures are carefully considered.

For example, Paul wrote: "He (God) hath made him (Jesus) to be sin for us who knew no sin" Did God make Jesus to be a transgressor of the Law?

Of course not!

But at this point, the theorist will impatiently interject that here the word "sin" is used in the sense of "sin offering": "He made him to be a sin-offering"

Whilst we do not agree with this interpretation (for we believe that the quotation is clearly stating that whereas Jesus came in

"Sin is used in two ways in Scripture: to describe an act, and to define a condition"

H.P. Mansfield, [Logos](#),
[September 1970, p.](#)
[459](#)

What is Sin?

The word sin is used in two principal acceptations in the Scripture. It signifies in the first place "the transgression of law"; and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh "which as the power of death"; and it is called sin because the development, or fixation, of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled "sinful flesh"; that is, "flesh full of sin"; so that sin in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called man.

In human flesh "dwells no good thing" (Rom. 7, 18, 17), and all the evil a man does is the result of this principle dwelling in him.—Dr. J. Thomas.

"two principal
acceptations"

Logos, May, 1945, p.
216

antitype of stone; in the character, the antitype of unhewn stone.

Now look a little more closely at the manner in which the altar of Exodus 29:36 had to be cleansed. It was not by washing, which might fittingly foreshadow baptism as you suggest, but by the shedding of blood, and that of a sin offering!

The instructions are more explicit in Ezekiel's description:

"Thou shalt give to the priests... a young bullock for a sin offering. And thou shalt take of the blood thereof, and put it on the four horns of it (i.e. the altar), and on the four corners of the settle, and upon the border round about; thus shalt thou cleanse and purge it" — or make an atonement for it (Ezek. 43:19-20).

The altar was thus cleansed through the shedding of blood. Whose blood was shed to cleanse the Jesus-altar? None other than his own, in spite of what the clean-flesh theorists might say (see *Watchman*). This is proved beyond all shadow of doubt in that Paul shows that the offering of the bullock for sin pointed forward to the offering of the Lord Jesus (Heb. 13:11-12). Obviously, if a sin-offering was required to cleanse the altar, and Jesus is our altar, he must have been related to sin in some fashion. Now sin, in Scripture, is used to describe both actual transgression or human nature. Jesus never sinned in the former acceptation of the word, but he was "made sin for us" in the second meaning of it (2 Cor. 5:21). Thus the obvious teaching of both Exodus and Ezekiel is that Christ our altar, was cleansed from human nature through his own offering, by being raised from the dead to life eternal.

This is the clear teaching of Paul in Phil. 2:8:

"Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; THEREFORE God also hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name."

Hebrews 13 establishes three points of doctrinal importance:

1. Christ is our altar — v.10.
2. He is the sin offering — vv. 11-12.
3. He was brought from the dead to eternal life through his own blood — v. 20.

Please note the significance of this last statement. It reads:

"Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant..."

How did the Lord attain unto eternal life?

Through the blood of the everlasting covenant, Paul answers.

And what does the blood of the covenant signify?

It is a figure of speech representing the dedicated life of the Lord unto death upon the stake. Through rendering perfect obedience in life, and giving himself to a sacrificial death, he gained life eternal, and opened the way for us to do so also.

Paul clearly teaches that it was imperative for the Lord Jesus to die in order to live. If he had avoided the sacrificial death commanded by the Father, he would not have attained unto life. For that matter, neither will we (see Rom. 6:3).

We suggested in our previous article, that the altar was treated as "unclean" because of its association with a people who were unclean. You take exception to

"Now sin, in Scripture, is used to describe both actual transgression or human nature"

H.P. Mansfield, *Logos*,
December 1970, p.
106

March, 1971

LOGOS

which must be noted.

Paul, in his unerring utterances, throws much light upon the subject. He wrote:

"By one man sin entered into the world" (Rom. 5:12).

This is not merely an act of disobedience, but something that resulted from such, and that "entered into the world" (not merely the man) as a result. What "sin" entered the world consequent upon Adam's transgression? There is only one possible answer: That which is described as sin in the flesh. Paul referred to it as:

"Sin that dwelleth in me" (Rom. 7:20).

How did "sin" dwell in Paul? Obviously not in a literal sense. Those who claim that sin invariably relates to an act of disobedience are hard put to it to explain such expressions as this. But when it is acknowledged that sin is used in a secondary sense, for the motions of the flesh that lead to sin (i.e. sin the flesh), we can understand Paul's words.

The suggestion is sometimes advanced without any attempt at proof, that death obtains merely because Adam was cut off from the Tree of life, but this is quite inadequate to explain the Scripture references to the introduction and perpetuation of sin and death.

Any view which destroys the reason which the Scriptures assign for death should be promptly dismissed. Adam died because he broke the law of his Maker, and his descendants share the curse because they inherit (minus his guilt) his sinful, death-doomed nature.

Death Is Unnatural

To man death is not natural — it is most unnatural. It is anomalous, loathsome, and abhorrent. We naturally shrink from it and contact with it. Natural, by no means! It may be natural to birds, beasts, and fishes; but man was made for a higher destiny! To thinking man, made in the likeness

"not merely an act of disobedience"

"sin is used in a secondary sense"

A.J., *Logos*, March 1971, p. 207

from the sanctuary, seems to point to ceremonial washing as a universal law for the nations of the earth. Baptism will probably be administered individually and collectively: collectively, because all who go up to the Temple will pass through the water; and individually, by immersion, at the option and discretion of those who discern the necessity of their case. After the type in Egypt (1st Cor. x. 1-2), all nations will be baptized in the cloud and in the water as they pass into the sanctuary, under its cloud and through its flowing stream. And individually, after the pattern of Jesus, those who desire to fulfil all righteousness, may be buried in water, a portion of which will be deep enough for the purpose.

The provision for baptism, in addition to the provision for sacrifice in the Temple, would indicate the concurrent existence of these two ordinances. This will not be a matter of surprise to those who remember that there are two classes of sins from which the human race need deliverance. First, those to which men are related by reason of racial descent (Rom. v. 12-14); second, individual trespasses. In immersion there is a recognition of the first; and, by the offering of sacrifice, there is confession of the second. It is probable that those who go up to the Temple, and undergo the administration of baptism, will not need to be baptized a second time: "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet" (John xiii. 10).

If this be the significance of Ezekiel's passage through the water, then there is much to "see" in it, even apart from the satisfactory explanation of the way in which each individual gate contributes its quota of water, until the stream increases to a full-flowing river within the space of three thousand cubits. We may well turn to the testimony, and read again those deeply-interesting words spoken to Ezekiel by his guide, after taking him through the waters:—"SON OF MAN, HAST THOU SEEN THIS?"

laid before the reader, few others in passing under two heads: the

A.—THE NEGATIVE

1. Nearly all expos character of the prop a building which has

2. The prophecy is mysterious one; and never yet been publis

3. Many attempts exposition. The nu the diversity of theor tory nature of these on the assumption dred cubits square, in its outer measureme wonder that every att basis of such a radica

4. No plan of the s to be in complete agre Some measures are worse than all, some vanced. None of the exposition now submi

B.—THE

The accuracy of t book has been demon cannot be successful these considerations:-

1. The building se peared "like the fra city. [See Frontispi

2. The buildings although its outside one read thick which

"two classes of sin from which the human race need deliverance"

Henry Sulley; [*The Temple of Ezekiel's Prophecy*, 1887, p. 76](#)

availed? Could not sins have been "imputed" to them? As a matter of fact, so far as the imputation of sins was possible, they were so imputed to the sacrifice by the ceremonies connected with it. If, therefore, that were the principle involved, there would be no difference in this respect between the sacrifices of the old and new covenants. Consequently this cannot be the meaning of the statement before us. Besides, the Law was only a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of them. If the association between Jesus and sin were precisely the same as that between the Mosaic sacrifices and sin, then shadow and substance would be alike on one of their most important points, and that would be absurd. No shadow can ever equal the substance; the substance is real, the shadow is intangible. The statement that "he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" evidently implies that in some way sin was associated with Jesus. Yet it is testified of him that he was "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners," though it is also declared that he was the antitype of the high priest who offered first for his own sins and then for the sins of the people (Heb. vii, 27).

The difficulty, if such it may be termed, is only apparent. Sin is a term of double import in the Scriptures; it has a physical as well as a moral application. When Adam and Eve were first created, sin had no association with them in any way. They were very

"Sin is a term of double import in the Scriptures; it has a physical as well as a moral application."

WH Boulton; [*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 181](#)

Students of Harry Fry :
Note his argument against the ceremonial imputation of sins as a continuation of the Mosaic type.

that his blood was shed for his own redemption as well as for that of his people. But when he offered for himself he also offered for his people. The two aspects of the antitypical offering were combined in one act, but, though combined, the two relations of the one act are plainly separate. Christ himself was first saved *out of* death (Heb. 5:9 — Gr.), afterward they that are Christ's at his coming (1 Cor. 15:23). There is nothing in this incompatible with the frequent declaration that "Christ died for us." Indeed, all he did was for us. He was born, suffered, died for us. All he did benefits us. Is it incongruous, or wrong, that he, too, should share the benefit? Was he not of our nature? Was not that nature brought under the power of the "law of sin and death" through transgression (Rom. 5:12; 7:23; 8:2)? Did he not share the physical condition of those whom he came to save? Did he not need redemption from its state equally as those whom he came to save? In a very beautiful manner, the doctrine of the Atonement emphasises that God is both just and merciful in all His dealings with mankind.

Paul taught:

"This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (1 Tim. 1:15).

In other words, Christ came into the world to die. He could do that in a way that is unjust, or in a way that is just. If we reason that Christ died as a substitute, and that he had no need to die for his personal redemption, we accuse God of being unjust. Is it

just that a righteous man should die on behalf of others, with no obligation or benefit to himself? Where is there justice in demanding that another die for the sins of others, if conferring no benefit on the principal offerer? But if the benefactor benefits himself, and if it be an element in the salvation of others, that he also gains substantially by his offering, then all can applaud the wisdom, justness, and mercy of the Author of redemption.

Because sin upset the balance of creation in the beginning, the plan of God requires death as the pathway of life. A follower of the Lord is called upon to "mortify the deeds of the body," or *put them to death* as the word signifies (Rom. 8:13; Col. 3:5). This forms part of his "living sacrifice" (Rom. 12:1) by which he will commend himself unto God, and lead others to Him also (Matt. 5:16). Christ's ministry on earth was a living death to the desires of the flesh, summed up in his words to the Father: "Not my will but Thine be done." His life of perfect obedience was "for others," for without it we could not be saved. But was it not also for himself, that he might help others? Without a doubt.

The Law of Moses, the ordinances of which he fulfilled both to the letter and in the spirit, appointed death as the way to life. To fulfil it *he* had to observe the Passover festival; *he* had to acknowledge that deliverance was possible only through death; *he* had to eat thereof. In doing so, therefore, *he* acknowledged that he would personally benefit from the means of

"But when he offered for himself he also offered for his people. The two aspects of the antitypical offering were combined in one act, but, though combined, the two relations of the one act are plainly separate."

H.P. Mansfield, [Logos, 1976, p 117](#)

man nature, in no sense whatever did the apostle associate "sin" — as acts of transgression — with the Son of God. The full emphasis of his comments in the verses referred to from Romans 7 is related to the *nature* which Christ bore when he came into the world. Thus, the inherent weakness in human nature was something which had to be overcome. Even in God's own Son.

Continuing this reasoning, Paul added: "He (Christ) died *unto sin once* ..." (v10). Since the Lord was never guilty of actual transgression, "sin" is here stated by metonymy.*

Biblical Definitions of "Sin"

Sin is used in two ways in Scripture: one is to describe actual transgression of divine commandments; the other, to define a physical condition. Upon this aspect of the subject, some pertinent comments from *Elpis Israel* should be considered:

"The word *sin* is used in two principle acceptations in the Scriptures. It signifies, in the first place, the transgression of the law; and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh 'which has the power of death'; and it is called 'sin' because the development or fixation of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression..." (p. 126, 1942 ed.).

"Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence, the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean..." (p. 127).

"This view of sin in the flesh is enlightening in the things concerning Jesus. The Apostle says, 'God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin' (2 Cor. 5:21); and this he explains in another place by saying, that, 'He sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh...' (Rom. 8:3)." (p. 128).

"Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh' or sin. This is a misfortune, not a crime. They did not will to be born sinners. They have no choice in the case; for, it is written, 'The creature was made subject to the evil, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected it in hope' (Rom. 8:20)... Hence, the Apostle says, 'By Adam's disobedience the many were made sinners' (Rom. 5:19); that is, they were endowed with a nature like his, which had become unclean, as a result of disobedience..." (p. 130).

Whilst readily acknowledging the truth of Brother Thomas' assertion that "sin is used in two principal acceptations in the Scriptures" we believe it exhortatory to consider two manifestations of "sin" as the "transgression of law". The first of these is the sin which occurs as the result of weakness in an individual whose disposition is to *repudiate* sin. "All unrighteousness is sin" (1 Jn. 5:17). Forgiveness may be sought and found for such sins when a correct and humble disposition is manifested (1 Jn. 1:9-10).

Sinning Wilfully

A second form of active sin, is that which is freely and knowingly practised. With such persons, sin is accepted as a way of life. They reveal an uncaring attitude towards sin; or, perhaps, live a way of life which is a blatant and impudent denial of divine precepts. Such an attitude towards sin is expressed in the words of John: "The sin is *the* lawlessness..." (1 Jn. 3:4, lit. Gk.).

The word rendered "lawlessness" (*anomia*) signifies "*against* law". Note the expression "whosoever *committeth* sin..." The word "committeth" does not relate to a single

John Ullman, [Logos](#),
December 1987, p. 87

* "Metonymy" signifies the using of a word to represent the thing *actually* meant; i.e. the term "the crown" is at times used to represent the personage of the Monarch. Here, as elsewhere, "sin" is used to represent the flesh, i.e. Adamic nature. Christ was related to "sin" because he bore our nature. He was also related to death for the same reason.

Redemption In Christ

THE sin of Adam brought consequences for the whole of the human race every member of which inherited a proneness to sin and the certainty of death. Men are in no way responsible for Adam's sin nor is there any guilt attaching to them on account of the nature which they bear, even though it is unclean and tends only to sin. Man's guilt is for his own sin, actual transgression of God's law, and not for the natural state in which he finds himself.

Man's plight was such that there was no remedy and no hope for life eternal except by the grace of God. The weakness of man's flesh meant that men not only have the tendency to sin, they all become actual sinners. None can redeem himself, still less his brother.

The Scriptures describe two kinds of sin in relation to man. The first is the personal sins which we have committed, the sins which can be forgiven in Christ. The second relates to the law of sin and death at work in our members which, because it is the root cause of sin, is described as sin, although it is not attributed to us as guilt before God.

Redemption was wrought by the love and grace of God, and provides deliverance from both kinds of sin, the sins we have committed and the body in which they were done. The means of our redemption was by God's provision of a righteous man who fully bore our nature with its mortality and proneness to sin.

"The Scriptures describe two kinds of sin"

H.P. Mansfield, [Logos](#),
[September 1981, p.](#)
[365](#)

This is not an exhaustive search but rather intended to help interested readers in identifying those who have abandoned Central Christadelphian teaching in Australia: Jim Luke, Brian Luke and John Martin are the leadership of the present departure from the Biblical Truth held by Christadelphians since 1848.

From the Clean-Flesh Video Presentation

The fundamental difference recognised

The position of the Berean, Old Paths, and Unamended fellowships is this:

- The word 'sin' used in two principal acceptations in Scripture
- Two disabilities bar men from complete fellowship with God
- These disabilities are:
 - (1) Impurity of nature
 - (2) Impurity of character

The first is inherited, the latter is acquired. Both require Atonement.

"Can we learn from the Past" Page 13
R. Pursell 1985 (Unamended fellowship)