

## Immortalization Address No. 5

### The Two Acceptations of Sin

In our last presentation we considered the balancing dual nature of many divine principles and how exclusively focusing on just one of those dual issues will imbalance our understandings to the favor of our own self-validation. This natural oversimplification preference, however, has a leavening effect. One error will always lead to another if there is an absence of recognition and correction.

In order to understand the basis for our qualification to be awarded the divine nature despite our contradictions to that divine nature, we have to understand those contradictions. This is sin. Defining sin has been the primary historic issue of contention in our community since our beloved Dr Thomas wrote Elpis Israel. This issue is usually at the core of every fellowship challenge, even if this subject is not even directly referenced. So what is sin and what are the dual aspects of sin that work with and against the dual aspects of righteousness, the dual categories of death and the dual categories of resurrection?

As we originally noted in our first foundational presentation, the real problems we face in maintaining eternal truths are the unspoken presumptions that we or others bring to a consideration. Bible students often take certain things for granted without defining that presumption. If an incorrect presumption is shared by all parties in a disagreement then no party can completely invalidate any other avenue of reasoning. This is often the case when it comes to defining the two categories of sin.

The unarticulated but highly inappropriate presumption that is often carried silently to many definitions of sin is that it is presumed that any reference to real sin **must** assign a degree of guilt. This presumption completely contradicts the Christadelphian community's **original** understandings, as presented by Dr Thomas's in Elpis Israel. Therefore it seems quite strange that all parties universally quote him as if he somehow presented their position. This presumption that any reference to real sin must assign some measure of guilt is a completely false and illegitimate presumption, invalidated by the God appointed reference for understanding sin. This is Kingdom Law, the divine laws and rituals that Moses was commissioned to introduce at the initiation of the 1st Kingdom Age at Sinai. A separate guilt-free category of sin is a foundational issue in Kingdom Law, which we can certainly validate, over & over & over, with complete clarity. This guilt free sin category was also certainly described in detail in Elpis Israel. However, when two Christadelphian parties oppose each other on the definition of sin but share the same false presumption that any reference to real sin must assign some level of guilt then neither party will be able to completely invalidate the others' position. Real sin is as opposed to sin shadows, personifications and metonymous expressions. We find this to be the case today with some

promoting a fellowship separating definition of sin as assigning a degree of sin-guilt to our mortal nature, actually suggesting that Jesus was guilty before God because he was a human being and that the inheritance of someone else's guilt is a divine principle that has to be ritually satisfied through baptism to even qualify to participate in the resurrection to judgment. Another Christadelphian group, also inappropriately presuming that any reference to sin must assign guilt... or be fake sin, simply shadowed sin ... stumbles through an attempt to suggest that the two acceptations of sin referenced by Dr Thomas are real sin and simply shadowed or fake sin... sin expressed metonymously... that the references to sin that cannot apply to moral failures must fit within a pattern of metonymic expressions... just shadows without substance and can't possibly offer a real application. Both positions dramatically oppose divine testimony as well as the foundational Christadelphian teachings of Bro Thomas, which certainly was not inspired but can serve as an original platform for our community's initial understandings of divine truths and principles.

Now most seem to agree that there are two categories of sin referenced in scripture. It would be rather foolish to deny that observation... as we'll demonstrate. One of those sin categories would have to be behavioral transgressions for which we individually do bear guilt and repentance is required. It is the second category of sin where the disagreements surface.

Many attempts to define sin start and sometimes also end in 1 John 3:4 *Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law*. This application of sin is expressed as the committing of sin... the transgression. This is the first aspect of sin to which everyone agrees. Unfortunately sometimes commentators presume an exclusivity based on this verse. The human heart's inappropriate addiction to simplicity presumes a comprehensiveness that is not declared.... As if John was saying *Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is only the transgression of the law*. The word 'only' certainly doesn't appear in the inspired text, however some commentators prefer to read the verse as if that is the way we must understand it... that the only possible understanding of sin is that it is an overt act of transgression. This particular stumbling pattern is fairly common, this presumption of exclusivity... this implied presence of the term "only" that is supposed to eliminate all other considerations. This is the same mistake that is made when Bible commentators refer to **the** resurrection, without defining which resurrection to which they refer... the resurrection to judgment for the just and unjust or the very separate resurrection to immortality reserved for after the judgment and only for those Christ determines to be just. This oversimplification pattern is the same mistaken thought pattern that the disciples of the instant guaranteed salvation distortion employ when they read Rom 10:10.. *That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved*. Born again Christians unconsciously insert the word

only, expressing it with their emotional emphasis... that we **only** have to believe in our hearts and confess with our lips and salvation is guaranteed. This dramatic oversimplification blinds the admittedly sincere born-again Christians to all the other requirements for salvation clearly and definitively stated in the Bible... such as water baptism, hope and working out our salvation with fear and trembling and continuing faithfully to the end. Each of these issues are scripturally expressed as saving believers, but they are completely invisible to many. Oversimplification is a very common Bible study error, thinking that we are so smart we can quickly plumb the mind of the Creator with very little effort on any one subject. One of our foundational ground rules for this continuing examination of immortalization was that we do understand our Heavenly Father expresses Himself with intentional complexity. He refuses to be approached casually or disrespectfully. Without a circumcised heart we will not be able to progress through that scriptural obstacle course of intentional complexity.

There is no 'only' in John chapter 3. Yes, sin is certainly the transgression of the law. However there is absolutely nothing in John's expression to presume that sin is **only** the transgression of the law.

So, after we witness this definition of sin in 1 John 3 we have to test any understanding that we hope to maintain confidently. Presumption is not allowed when truth and eternal life are at stake. If we want to be comfortable with our presumption that sin is only the transgression of the law, then we have to test that understanding in every scriptural application to see if our presumption is fact or an oversimplification. If we are unwilling to test our presumption, then clearly ... our uncircumcised heart has won. When we do test that exclusive understanding of sin being limited to transgressions of divine law, we find the exclusivity of that limited definition to be completely impossible.

i.e. The Apostle Paul highlights a separate aspect of sin in the context of being an active force operating within us that simply cannot be hammered into any exclusive understanding of sin being only transgressions of divine law.

Rom 7:23 *But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.* Paul emphasizes the **active power** of this 2nd category of sin... this sin that **makes war**.... It actively **takes us prisoner**. This sin... this law of sin... is a **living force** within our members, within our frame. Clearly, there is another aspect to sin than simply a transgression of divine law.

Earlier in this same thought progression in Romans 7, Paul refers to this same active working capacity of what he calls sin, which produces death. Romans 7:13 *But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.* There is an aspect to sin that actually 'works', this aspect of sin attempts to hide but it is God's commandments that uncover sin... revealing this operation of sin that is in our

members. That is why we always have to look to Kingdom laws – God's commandments – in order to define sin, because that is what will uncover or reveal sin (that it might appear sin).

This expression of Paul's is impossible to comprehend if we attempt to understand each of these applications of the word sin to mean simply a transgression of divine law. In addition we have a number of New Testament statements declaring that some form of sin is directly associated with our Messiah, yet we know perfectly well that he had no transgressions of the law. Additionally it would be a God-degrading presumption to assume God would blame His perfect son for the sins of others, that Jesus was some kind of substitutionary offering where the guilt of our sins was somehow pasted on him. If that were the case then we would have to understand he died instead of us as opposed to for us. If he had died instead of us, then there could be no legitimate justification for us to have to still die, if he took our place. Jesus was not a substitutionary offering, like some bull or goat under Mosaic Law. He was a representative offering. The guilt of everyone's law transgressions were not removed from us and magically placed on him. However, if we presume that sin is only the transgression of the law and nothing else, that is a conclusion that would eventually seem quite logical. Another foundational premise we have to remember is that everything is about validating that our Creator is right. Taking the guilt of others and shifting the blame to an innocent man invalidates the righteousness of our Creator.

Let's look at some of the statements concerning how our Messiah had some category of sin assigned to him in the context of his sacrificial death.

In reference to Jesus we read in Hebrews 7:27

*Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.*

In some sense our Messiah was a sin offering for himself, as well as for those for whom he would serve as High Priest. Jesus was the antitypical altar, sin offering and officiating High Priest at his own sacrificial life offering. However, Jesus had no personal transgression of the law for which he was guilty. This would have completely disqualified the eternal effectiveness of his sacrificial death. There has to be another aspect to sin to satisfy how his sacrificial death qualified as a sin offering for himself. There has to be another aspect of sin beyond simply transgressions of the law that assign guilt.

Additionally we read in Heb 9:28

*So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.* Jesus will come again, but the next time he appears it will be without sin... and for our salvation. The first time he appeared it was for our reconciliation, with our salvation only as a future promise. Jesus was the only one saved almost 2,000 years ago... but all believers were reconciled... on the basis of the way in which Christ was offered to bear the sins of many. This difference is confirmed by Paul in Romans 5:10 *For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we*

*shall be saved by his life.* It was the death of Jesus that reconciled us to God. Notice the past tense of the action verb, (we **were** reconciled) as this was already accomplished. It is the life, the resurrection of Jesus, that **will** save us. Notice the future tense of this action verb. We have been reconciled to God and that was accomplished by the sacrificial death of our Messiah. We will, in the future, be saved on the basis of the resurrection of Jesus... his life. When he comes that second time, he comes without sin... as opposed to the first time when he reconciled us by his death. So once again we have this question looming large... what was this category of sin identified directly with Jesus by which he has reconciled us to God in his sacrificial death ? It can't possibly be the sin category that is the transgression of the law... so what is it?

We have a hint where to look for this answer within the records of the birth of our Messiah. We find that the mother of Jesus is required to offer a sin offering simply for the righteous act of giving birth to God's son. This issue alone completely invalidates the absurd and blasphemous doctrine of the trinity that suggests Mary gave birth to the mortal disguise of an immortal God, that immortal nature which would make the child incapable of sin and incapable of death. Luke records how Mary offered the necessary sin offering and the burnt offering for her purification and atonement for giving birth to the son of God.

Lk 2:21-24 *And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called JESUS, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb.* <sup>22</sup> *And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord;* <sup>23</sup> *(As it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord;)* <sup>24</sup> *And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons.* According to the laws of the Kingdom of God given to Moses, a mother's purification was concluded when she made a sin and a burnt offering for herself. The two birds Mary offered constituted a mother's purification offering for a financially destitute mother.

Lev. 12:8 *And if she be not able to bring a lamb, then she shall bring two turtles, or two young pigeons; the one for the burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for her, and she shall be clean.*

The mother of Jesus had to give God a sin offering simply for giving birth to our Messiah, for her own atonement. As Job says in chapter 14:4 ... no one can take a clean thing out of an unclean thing. This would make the baby Jesus, born from an unclean mother, unclean himself and needing to be cleansed. This doesn't indicate any level of guilt whatsoever... just a condition of uncleanness, a divinely unacceptable physical state. There are several conclusions we can make from this record of how Mary gave a sin offering at the temple for having given birth to God's son.

- One is that there absolutely has to be another understanding to the concept of sin than simply limiting sin to transgressions of the law. Giving birth to Jesus was an act of righteousness. It was a great honor and the fulfillment of God's will that Mary give

birth to Jesus. In absolutely no way shape or form was Mary's motherhood a transgression of any divine law. God had commanded mankind after the flood to multiply and replenish the earth. Bearing children is an act of righteous performance of the divine will... yet mothers had to offer a sin and a burnt offering for their own atonement for giving birth. Clearly there is **another** aspect to sin than simply guilty sin from which one needs to repent.

- Another conclusion we can make is that ... if this baby were God or an immortal being as the doctors of divinity demand, then there would have been absolutely no need for Mary to offer a sin offering for having been merely the portal for this already existing entity to emerge in its mortal disguise. This is simply one of an endless stream of contradictions to both the blasphemous doctrines of the trinity as well as the pre-existence of Christ before his birth from Mary.
- Another obvious conclusion is that this other aspect of sin does not assign any guilt whatsoever. No repentance should be necessary for this 2nd aspect of sin, as mothers are fulfilling God's will by giving birth. Mary particularly was doing exactly what the angel required of her. Mary needed no repentance whatsoever... but she did have to give a sin offering for having given birth to our Messiah, to the son of God.

This is the hint we needed to begin to understand what this other aspect of sin must be and how our transgression-free Messiah could have some aspect of sin assigned to him at his sacrificial death but still be completely innocent of any guilt, needing no repentance whatsoever. This second aspect of sin somehow qualifies the repeated statements concerning how our Messiah bore sin and served as a sin offering for himself and the people and how when he returns to save us he will come without sin.

This divine requirement under the laws of the Kingdom of God for a guilt-free sin offering on behalf of a new mother... is not unique. There are other guilt free sin offerings. In fact it is a fascinating observation that just as there were six categories for sin offerings for transgressions of the law through which repentance was possible... there were also six categories of sin offerings where there had been absolutely no transgression of the law and no repentance was needed at all. These six repentance sin offering categories are itemized in Leviticus chapters 4&5, for the High Priest, the nation, a ruler, a common Israelite, a poor common Israelite and a completely destitute Israelite. The fact that there were six categories for each sin aspect is quite validating, as six is the number of the curse of sin and death and all its effects, just as we have noted that the number eight is the number of immortality and salvation. Just as a hint to the significance of this issue (that we will cover more extensively in the 7th presentation in this series) we can observe the design of the golden ark of the covenant. That salvation container had six exterior surfaces and six interior surfaces (front, back, left, right, top and bottom). Two sets of six surfaces that had to be covered in gold on the inside and the outside, by divine command. These six surfaces, these six geometric

planes formed a container by being joined together at 8 corners where 3 of those surfaces were joined together. The ark of the covenant is a mathematical and geometric projection of the promise of immortalization when the divine nature, represented by the number 8, will cover both aspects of sin in the faithful – seen in the dual six inside and outside gold coverings – at the three immortalization events in the divine plan: 1. Christ, 2. the faithful at the beginning of the Millennium Kingdom and 3. the faithful at the end of the Millennium Kingdom. Again this quick reference is simply to demonstrate that true understandings will always be validated in many, many ways. God required 6 sin offerings under the laws of His Kingdom for guilty sin and also 6 sin offerings for guilt-free physical conditions. We will have more to say about the golden ark of the covenant and how its design beautifully confirms the truth of these matters in our 7th address.

Again, the six divisions of the sin offerings required for **repentance** are itemized in Leviticus chapters 4 & 5. These are for the 1) the High priest, 2) the nation, 3) a ruler 4) a common Israelite 5) a common Israelite with limited financial resources and 6) a completely destitute common Israelite. Emphasizing the significance of the quantity of sin offerings as being six we note that the unique sin offering for the High Priest and for the nation where the blood is actually brought into the sanctuary and the priests are forbidden to eat these offerings... there are specifically six physical components God rejects from this offering and demands to have those six components burnt to ashes outside the camp in the exact location where **all** the altar ashes are disposed of.

*Lev. 4:11-12 And the skin of the bullock (1), and all his flesh (2), with his head (3), and with his legs(4), and his inwards(5), and his dung(6), <sup>12</sup> Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt.*

While the instructions would have been just as complete by saying the priests had to take the **entire** remaining components of the bullock carcass outside the camp to burn, God chose to specifically identify six rejected components of the sacrificial animal's carcass. This emphasis of six is also highlighted in the context of the non-guilty category of sin offerings from which no repentance was sought whatsoever, simply a physical cleansing. As we have already noted, there are another 6 sin offerings spread out throughout the Law for physical conditions only, without the need for repenting as there was no guilt assigned from God to these particular sin offerings. This observation has everything to do with identifying that other aspect of sin, that sin that has to be assigned to Jesus in his sacrificial death, the sin aspect with which he reconciled us to the Creator in his death and the sin aspect that he does not have when he returns to save us.

Let's identify these six guilt-free sin offerings within the laws of the Kingdom of God. We have already considered the first, the sin offering a mother had to offer for giving birth. That sin offering along with the accompanying burnt offering achieved an atonement for the mother, despite the absence of any guilt in this birthing. Let's find the other five guilt-free

sin offerings. There were three conditions of physical uncleanness under the laws of the Kingdom of God that each demanded sin offerings for reconciliation... not forgiveness, as no guilt was assigned... just a cleansing, a purging, a reconciliation. Each of these sin offerings highlighted the recovery aspect from that divinely unacceptable condition, the reconciliation from that uncleanness. This sin offering was a purging, a cleansing, but not a repentance. It was not a transgression of the law to touch the dead, with the exception of the High Priest or a Nazarite. In fact touching the dead could even qualify as the righteous performance a divine commandment when it came to burying a hung man before nightfall (Deut 21:22–23). However anyone touching the dead had to participate in two sin offerings over a seven day period. The ashes of the read heifer were defined as a purification for sin and yet there had been no transgression of any law.

Num. 19: 9, 17 *And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up without the camp in a clean place, and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel for a water of separation: it is a **purification for sin**.... And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of **purification for sin**, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel.*

There was no transgression of the law for touching a dead body, but the participation in a sin offering on the 3rd day and again on the seventh day was required for a physically defiled person to be reconciled back into God's community, the body of believers. If they refused to participate, if they insisted that they didn't have to participate in some sin offering that was not associated with guilt... then God's judgment was that they leave the community... leave their family, forever... a banishment for life. Obviously, the issue being shadowed by this ritual has extreme significance. This reconciliation of a physically defiled condition was accomplished by a sin offering that was applied on both the 3rd and the 7th day. It is interesting how both these shadow expressions of the 3rd day and the 7th day actually project the exact same divine day from two different perspectives. There will be two physical cleansings of mankind on the basis of the antitypical red heifer... Jesus Christ. They will both take place in the 7th divine day, the 7th millennium. We know from Psalm 90 and & 2nd Peter 3 that a day with God is like a 1,000 years and a thousand years like a day. One cleansing will take place at the beginning of that 7th day, that seventh millenium... although it will be the 3rd divine day since the death of that antitypical red heifer. Hosea references this particular third day understanding:

Hos 6:1–3 *Come, and let us return unto the LORD: for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up. <sup>2</sup> After two days will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight. <sup>3</sup> Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the LORD: his going forth is prepared as the morning; and he shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth.*

When our Lord comes to us as the latter rain, the harvest rain as opposed to the spring rain... when he comes to us in the dawning of a new day—when darkness is chased away by the enlightenment of that new divine day... it will be after two days... as well as being on the 3rd day. This is just another carefully veiled expression reserved only for us, only for those

with seeing eyes and hearing ears, only for those who actually believe in the resurrection – as opposed to the God despising doctrine of the immortality of the soul. The LORD, through his son, will come to us **after** two millennium days... in order to revive us. There will also be a second revival on that same millennium day, interestingly expressed again as the 3rd day... as opposed to Hosea's previous expression of "after two days." This is just another unique way of expressing how there will be two revivings on that 3rd day ... which can also be understood as the 7th day, since it is the 7th millennium day from when that curse of sin and death was imposed on us through our original ancestors. The first resurrection of the faithful will take place at the beginning of that 7th millennium, which is also the 3rd following the death and resurrection of our Messiah, therefore after the 2nd day. Then there will be a second resurrection or immortalization of the faithful at the end of the 3rd divine day since Christ's resurrection, which can also be understood as the 7th day. The 3rd and 7th day sin offering cleansings accomplished through the ashes of the red heifer subtly reflect the two cleansings mankind will experience through immortalization on the 3rd divine day after the death of the antitypical red heifer, Jesus Christ ... which is also the 7th divine day after the condemnation of death was imposed on creation.

Just as we see the two timing expressions for the same millennium that will host two separate immortalization events in the red heifer ashes ritual and then again in Hosea's prophecy in chapter six, we see this same pattern used in the three records of Christ's transfiguration on the mount... a miraculous projection of the promise of immortalization. This same pattern of dual expression is used in a ritual, a prophecy and now a miracle. This is the principle of God manifestation, that multitudinous singularity where everything is interdependent. It is interesting to note how Matthew and Mark's accounts of this transfiguration event express this as taking place after six days from Christ's promise that *There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.* **After** six days would suggest it would be the 7th day. However, Luke presents this same time frame as being 'about' eight days... not specifically eight days, but around 8 days.. which could easily mean late on the 7th day. The Jewish day ended at sunset. The transfiguration could easily have happened late in the afternoon on that 7th day... which would have certainly been **after** six days but also **about** 8 days. These two different expressions for the exact same timeframe are not inconsequential. When we eventually examine these three records in the context of the rest of scripture we will see how these three records actually project **all three** immortalization events in the divine plan... Christ's immortalization and then the faithful after the 6th millennium, at the very beginning of the restored Kingdom Age and then the 3rd immortalization at the latter end of that Kingdom Age, just before what would have been the eighth millennium. Our point is that expressing the timing of the 2nd and third immortalization events in the divine plan with two separate time references is a repetitive scriptural pattern... such as the 3rd and 7th day for the participation in the ritual sin offering of the red heifer for the cleansing from the defilement

of death... to Hosea's prophetic expression of being revived after two days as well as on the third day and also the timing of the miraculuous transfiguration on the mount as being both **after** 6 days as well as **about** 8 days.

One of our original foundational premises was that when something is true it can be validated in many many ways, not just the beginner steps of concordance and lexicon word studies. Our theme is immortalization. The promise of immortalization includes a cleansing from the defiling physical condition of death. This reconciliation, this cleansing from the unclean condition of mortality is projected in the shadows of the ritual of the red heifer ashes that reconciled the Israelite who was defiled by physical contact with the dead through their participation in this **sin** offering for which no repentance was necessary whatsoever. This was a guilt free sin offering redeeming a person from a divinely unacceptable physical condition. This is the second of the six guilt free sin offerings identified in the laws of the Kingdom of God...as delivered by God's mediator: Moses.

There was no moral failure in suffering with the disease of leprosy, but God demanded a sin offering in conjunction with a recovery from leprosy. A sin offering was demanded where no repentance was necessary. There was no divine command not to contract or suffer from the disease of leprosy. Leprosy served as a disease shadow for the curse of sin and death, where a living person slowly dissolved away as if they were a corpse in the grave. It was a living death. Leprosy served as a divine photograph of the curse of sin and death. Recovery from the physical condition of leprosy required an accompanying sin offering, expressed as achieving a necessary atonement through the combination of a guilt-free sin offering and a burnt offering... just like the new mother. These issues are made perfectly clear in Lev 14... specifically in verses 19-20.

*And the priest shall offer the sin offering, and make an atonement for him that is to be cleansed from his uncleanness; and afterward he shall kill the burnt offering: <sup>20</sup> And the priest shall offer the burnt offering and the meat offering upon the altar: and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and he shall be clean.*

A sin offering was demanded from God where no repentance was necessary. Once again, this sin offering was simply for a cleansing from a divinely unacceptable physical condition. Additionally we see that the concept of atonement is again represented as a cleansing from this divinely unacceptable physical condition.... As seen in that last expression in this verse: *: and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and he shall be clean.*

The 4th guilt free sin offering was for reconciling the physically unclean condition of bodily issues. Leviticus 15 describes this condition as a running issue... perhaps an open sore or a bleeding ulcer or whatever diseased condition results in the physically defiling condition of a running issue in one's body. Now it should be understood that literally everything that comes out of a man's body is unclean, which is an interesting creational validation of a divine principle. However there is one glaring exception for a woman, which is quite

significant. We take **into** our bodies three categories of clean, valuable nutrition... gas, liquids and solids... basically oxygen, water and food. However **everything** that our bodies expel is unclean and cannot be used for sustaining life. We breathe in good air and breathe out poison. We drink in good water and expel unclean liquid waste. We take in good food and expel unclean, solid waste. Literally everything that comes out of a man is unclean, including breath, salty tears, sweat, blood, bodily waste and issues from a diseased condition. The ritual of reconciliation from a temporary running bodily issue is simply a shadow of this same principle of the curse of sin and death... which included the infliction of disease and the suffering of the mortal frame. The one exception for this creational law is for a woman. One product that is issued from the body of a woman is clean. That is mother's milk. This is the one exception in the features of creation under the terms of the curse of sin and death. This is a highly significant observation in the context of the promise of redemption to mankind offered to Adam and Eve in Gen 3:15. We are told the seed of the woman would bruise the serpent's head. It would not be the seed of man, but the seed of the woman, prophesying of the virgin birth of our Messiah. This one clean bodily issue coming exclusively from a woman is a creational projection of this promise of redemption from the seed of the woman. It is also an extension of the comfort Paul offers to sisters constrained with the silence ritual during the Ecclesial Age.

1 Tim 2:12–15 *Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.* <sup>12</sup> *But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.* <sup>13</sup> *For Adam was first formed, then Eve.* <sup>14</sup> *And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.* <sup>15</sup> *Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing.*

While the sisters silence ritual projects the righteous creation policy and the righteous judgment policy of our Creator we see the comforting balance in this diminishing ritual expressed as being saved in childbearing. This is not simply the fact that sisters will have authority over their children despite being under the authority of brethren, as demonstrated in the silence ritual. It is also the fact that salvation will come through a woman and not a man, due to the virgin birth. A woman is **saved** in childbearing. This is creationally demonstrated by womankind being awarded the exclusive distinction of a clean bodily issue... mother's milk.

I realize we are not addressing the guilt free status of the bodily issue sin offering. However, we want to be able to see how every observation, every truth, blends together perfectly. Our consideration of the sin offering for the recovery from a running issue from one's body is part of a theme connected all through scripture and all through creation... the two forms of divine expression... the written word of God and the spoken word of our Creator, who verbally commanded the features of creation into existence. We want to understand there are no contradictions to our progressive understandings... from either the written word of God perspective in scripture or the spoken word of God in the terms of creation.

Once again, there was no divine commandment that one was forbidden to suffer with a bodily issue. Just like leprosy and the touch of death, this is a **physical** expression of the curse of sin and death. We need both a moral and a physical redemption from this curse. The sin offering demanded upon being healed from a running issue was for the purpose of cleansing from a physical defilement... not repentance from a sin transgression. This is our fourth guilt-free sin offering demanded by the eternal Lawgiver that has nothing to do with transgressions of the law but everything do with a physical issue resulting from the curse of sin & death. And once again we see that this cleansing ritual required both a guilt-free sin offering as well as a burnt offering for the pursuit of an atonement from a physically defiled condition.

*Lev 15:15 And the priest shall offer them, the one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the LORD for his issue.*

Now... our fifth and sixth guilt-free sin offerings were not even performed on behalf of human beings. This further validates our understanding that there is more than a single aspect to sin, that sin cannot simply qualify exclusively as a transgression of divine law. Since only mankind, creation's caretaker, even has the capacity to transgress divine commands. Yet we see Yahweh demanding annual sin offerings for the Tabernacle and also seven days of sin offerings for the initial dedication of the bronze altar.

Our fifth guilt-free sin offering was the annual sin offering for the entire Tabernacle. The sin offerings on the Day of Atonement were not just for the priesthood and nation but also for the Tabernacle and everything within the Tabernacle courtyard.

*Lev 16:16-17, 33 And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. <sup>17</sup> And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel... 33. And he shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar; and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation.*

Again, it is obvious that tents and metal and leather and curtains cannot transgress divine laws and cannot bear any guilt. However, they can certainly suffer an unclean condition, which satisfies the guilt-free application of sin. For the fifth time there is no guilt associated with a sin offering under divine law and once again we see an atonement demanded for which no forgiveness was needed.

We should ask on what basis an atonement should be pursued for inanimate objects that have no capacity for contradicting the moral rightness of our Creator. Interestingly, We see this same precedent in relation to the sin offering for a leprous house, within the framework

of our 3rd guilt free sin offering we've already addressed. In Lev 14:48–53 God gives instructions for achieving a necessary atonement for a house that was no longer leprous. Houses don't need forgiveness. Again... on what basis can we understand the divine demand that atonement be pursued for an inanimate object having no capacity to transgress divine commandments? The answer would be that salvation is not all about us and is not limited to ourselves. All of creation was cursed due to Adam and Eve infecting creation with sin. Just as Adam and Eve were condemned to a dying nature so that dying nature was extended to all creation. The ground itself was cursed. Diseases and violence afflict animals and plants. Self worshipping mankind rapes our planet with an insatiable exploitation of its resources with little respect for creation's integrity. Paul personifies creation with this statement to the Roman believers.

Rom 8:22–23 *For we know that **the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain** together until now. <sup>23</sup> And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*

All of creation groans with us waiting for freedom from the oppressive curse of sin. Paul also applies this same groaning expression for the same result to the hopeful enlightened in Corinth when he says: *For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven...* indicating the anxious faithful's anticipation for immortalization, which he describes as mortality being swallowed up of life. All of creation is scripturally expressed as groaning along with the faithful, waiting for relief from the effects of the oppressive curse of sin. This also is a great clue to defining this other aspect of sin that has nothing to do with guilt or repentance, and everything to do with that second category of sin that is repeatedly and directly identified with our Messiah and his sacrificial death. The repeated motivation for these six guilt free sin offerings is cleansing from a divinely unacceptable physical condition. This is exactly the motivation for creation's "groaning". Death, disease, violence, subjugation, fruitlessness, suffering and tears were never the original creational intent. These conditions are all the direct result of the corrupting introduction of sin, the contradiction to the right-ness of our Creator. Respecting the theory that these conditions were part of Earth's environment from the very beginning contradicts the divinely appointed relationship between sin and the necessary effects of sin. Respecting the presumption of these conditions existing prior to the introduction of sin also highly disrespects the standards of our Creator in His declaration that everything was very good following the completion of His six evenings and mornings of creative commands and activity. Clearly there has to be a physical aspect to sin that is separate from any moral guilt. A cleansing is divinely necessary, but no repentance is required in this separate aspect of sin. These cleansings are projected through this series of guilt-free sin offerings. This two-fold application of both sin forgiveness and physical cleansing is distinctly declared in the context of the atonement being sought for the Tabernacle... our fifth guilt free sin offering.

Lev. 16:16 *And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of [1] the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of [2] their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness.*

The purpose for the pursuit of an annual atonement for the Tabernacle, a combination of inanimate objects completely incapable of transgressing any divine laws, was for both the uncleanness of the children of Israel and for their transgressions. There is certainly a guilt-free aspect to sin as well as a guilty aspect. There is also clearly more to atonement than simply repentance. There is a physical cleansing constantly being associated with the process of atonement, as presented by the divinely appointed laws of the Kingdom of God... over and over and over again.

The sixth guilt-free sin offering was on behalf of the bronze altar. That bronze altar of burnt offering had to have repeated sin offerings for its own atonement over a seven day period.

Ex. 29: 36–37 *And thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin offering for atonement: and thou shalt cleanse the altar, when thou hast made an atonement for it, and thou shalt anoint it, to sanctify it. <sup>37</sup> Seven days thou shalt make an atonement for the altar, and sanctify it; and it shall be an altar most holy: whatsoever toucheth the altar shall be holy.*

A metal appliance certainly cannot transgress any divine commandments. There is no wiggle room here to allow any presumption of guilt for the seven-fold emphasis of the sin offering for this bronze roasting platform. This is an entirely guilt-free sin offering. Now we might wonder why our God would demand an atonement ritual be performed on behalf of a bronze appliance. Certainly we can easily and powerfully identify this altar with our Messiah. One of the proofs would be how the priesthood of the Ecclesial Age was different from the priesthood of the Kingdom Age as described in Heb 13:10 ...*We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.* The Priesthood of the Ecclesial Age... ourselves... eat the memorial service bread and wine. We eat from the Christ altar. We eat of the sin offering whose life was brought into the antitypical divine sanctuary... as opposed to the priests of the previous age who were forbidden from eating the flesh of the sin offering when the blood entered the Tabernacle. So, obviously, the bronze altar represents Christ. However, there is even more to this relationship between our Messiah and this altar that needed a sin offering and needed atonement. The connection between this altar and our Messiah is cemented by a unique distinction shared by both in reference to this pattern of reconciling an unclean condition.... Just as there were two requirement categories for pursuing the distinction of holiness... both moral and physical.

There were two physical components of Kingdom Law that could assign a status of automatic holiness on the basis of personal contact. This was the bronze altar and the sin offering, both being obvious shadow projections of our Messiah.

Ex. 29:37 ...*whatsoever toucheth the altar shall be holy.*

Lev. 6:25, 27 *This is the law of the sin offering... Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy*

This distinction of automatic holiness by touch was also a feature of our Messiah during his ministry. When he touched the leper, according to Kingdom Law, Jesus should have become unclean. The reverse took place. The leper became cleansed and had to participate in the repentance-free atonement procedure we just considered. When Jesus touched the dead 12 year old daughter of Jairus he should have become instantly unclean and have to participate in two sin offerings over a seven day term. However, in the pattern of the automatic holiness by touch law of the bronze altar and the sin offering, the child became alive and clean, losing her capacity to make others unclean. Additionally, the woman with a 12 year bodily issue touched the blue fringe of the hem of Christ's garment, drawing healing power from him to resolve her unholy, ritually unclean and unhealthy status. She reached for the one part on the body of Christ that testified to her enlightened belief that his power came from Yahweh, that he was who he said he was... the son of God. She reached for that blue fringe identified with righteous, Godlike behavior (Num 15:37-41). Exactly like the bronze altar, Jesus had the unique touch of holiness. This distinction is opposed to the defiling touch of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 3:3) and the death touch of the burning mountain from which God delivered Kingdom Law with the focus on the condemnation and judgments for sin (Ex 19:12-13).

There is no other identification for the bronze altar other than Jesus Christ. These three elements: the altar, the flesh of the sin offering and the Messiah all shared the touch of holiness. This holiness assignment by touch declares the capacity of our savior to save us from both the guilt of our sins and the uncleanness of our mortal condition... both of the stages of reconciliation and salvation. This identification of the God demanded atonement of this Christ shadow - this bronze altar - utterly obliterates any presumption that any reference to sin must assign guilt. Jesus was not guilty. He needed no repentance. His immortalization (his atonement) was based on the flawless demonstration of his Father's righteousness without a single transgression. Just as the seven days of sin offerings for a bronze appliance highlights an additional aspect of sin outside of any assignment of guilt so the divinely required atonement for this Christ shadow demonstrates that atonement is about more than simply forgiveness.

If we try to pound the square peg of atonement into the round hole of forgiveness we oppose the educational precedents of the laws of the Kingdom of God; we blind ourselves to the non-stop Ecclesial Age references in the New Testament declaring how immortalization should be understood as an eternal spirit **covering/atonement** for our mortal bodies and we limit the application of atonement to only the caretaker of creation - mankind - instead of the entire creation project of our Creator. We do not 'groan' alone waiting for the redemption of our bodies, that promised adoption which is our immortalization. All of creation groans with us waiting for the promised redemption from the oppressive effects of

the curse of sin. Food rots. Metal rusts. Wood rots. We age... painfully. These conditions are all contradictions to the eternal nature of our Creator and His principles. Decay is a feature of what is temporary, not eternal. The glory and the righteousness of our Creator is not demonstrated in the principle of decay. Decay demonstrates the effects of sin. Just as sin must end, so must the effect of sin we know as the principle of decay. Mankind was not exclusively cursed due to the introduction of sin. All of creation has suffered the debilitating curse of sin and death. The serpent was particularly cursed. The ground and vegetation were cursed. Any attempt to limit the peace of the Creator to simply guilty mankind contradicts the principle of God manifestation, which is dependent on the principle of a multitudinous singularity where everything affects everything else. Nothing can be completely independent. Creation needs relief from the curse just as we do. However there is no guilt assigned to the **creational** contradictions of our Creator's right-ness. This necessary second category of sin, that second "acceptation" identified by Dr Thomas is exactly what he describes as human nature, a synonym for sin ... but without any guilt whatsoever.

This is exactly what was determined in the application of the blood in the divinely appointed rituals... a dual application of both remission and purging... reconciliation and salvation. There is certainly a sin forgiveness aspect to the blood and to the principle of atonement... as well as a separate sin cleansing that has nothing to do with forgiveness that are both afforded in the lesson of the blood that was extensively considered in our previous address.

In our next address we will consider the original understandings of our Christadelphian community in the context of our pioneer brethren, particularly the writings and reasoning of Bro Thomas and Bro Roberts concerning how we should understand the two aspects of sin.

Brother Jim Dillingham  
Dunbarton New Hampshire  
USA