

**DISCUSSION ON THE NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST**  
**DISCUSSION IS LED BY RICHARD STONE**  
**TRANSCRIPTION BY JIM PHILLIPS FROM A TAPE RECORDING**  
**FOOTNOTED BY JIM PHILLIPS**  
**CLASS 2**

(Richard Stone) I've been handed some verses here<sup>1</sup>, and we said that we would answer questions at the beginning of class tonight. So if you'd like, we'll go over these verses quickly and there are one or two that I'd like to leave for the end, for instance Heb. 13:20-21: I'd like to leave because I deal with that specifically, and also Rom. 8:3.

Let's look at Heb. 7:27. I know these verses are quoted sometimes by brethren who suppose they lend countenance to the idea that Christ offered for his own nature and so forth. But these verses, Heb. 7:27 read: "For such an high priest became who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; Who needeth not daily as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself."

Now v. 26 affirms the fact that he was absolutely without sin. He was holy. He was born holy, he was holy all his life. He was absolutely harmless, he was completely undefiled. Undefiled is used in a moral term.<sup>2</sup> He was separated from sinners, for he was never tainted by sin, and for this reason he was indeed made higher than the heavens. Because he was obedient to the Father, God highly exalted him and gave him a name which is above every name.

And he needs not daily, as those high priests, (that is under the law,) to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, and then for the people's. And the High Priest had to do this. Before he could offer for the people he had to offer for himself. And only after he offered for himself was he in position to be a type of Christ, sinless<sup>3</sup>. Then he offered for the people. The High Priest

---

<sup>1</sup> Where it becomes most evident that the concepts put forward by bro. Stone are the new ideas, and those which are put forth by the Berean brotherhood are the "Old Paths" is in the examination of the relevant verses. Bro. Stone, (as did bro. A. D. Strickler in his booklet "A Defence"), quotes bits and pieces from the works of bre. Roberts and Thomas to attempt to show that his view points are the traditional ones. And to those who are unfamiliar with the context of the quotes, his point can appear to be valid.

But isn't it reasonable to suggest that if the teaching of bro. Stone is in harmony with that of bre. Roberts and Thomas, that the way they use the relevant verses should be similar? Yet when we examine the verses relevant to this subject, we find bro. Stone and bre. Roberts and Thomas are at variance at every point. If the pioneer brethren agree with bro. Stone, as he alleges; then we should find them agreeing on these key verses. Instead, as we saw in Lecture One, in considering Heb. 5:3, their interpretations are completely opposite. The verses the pioneers attributed to Christ, bro. Stone argues do not apply. This shows, more than any other single point that bro. Stone is out of harmony with the pioneer brethren.

<sup>2</sup> It is true that Jesus was morally undefiled, in that he never sinned. This is not argued. What is argued is that physically, he bore the same defiled nature as we have, as recognized in the B.A.S.F. "A sentence which defiled his nature".

<sup>3</sup> This is not a correct statement. The high priest was a type of Christ before he offered "first for his own sins". The bathing in the laver typified Christ's baptism. The putting on the of priestly apparel typified Christ's growth and development during his life time. The placing of the final piece, the frontal piece which said "Holiness To The Lord" is acknowledged by bro. Stone elsewhere to have been typical of what Christ did, prior to offering the sacrifice. The High Priest was a type of Christ all the time, not just after he had offered an offering for himself. Bro. Stone knows that, but the force of this verse causes him to invent a new limitation to put on the symbolism involved.

The key to the matter are these limitations. We agree with bro. Stone in most of the things that he affirms about Christ. Our disagreement lies in the area which he denies apply to Christ. In order to make these denials, he has to take so many beautiful and powerful scriptures, and rob them of their meanings. If he only accepted them, he would see the whole picture, not just the narrow view he is taking through limiting and misapplying Bible types and figures.

was only a type of Christ only after he offered for himself. Then he offered for the people.

And this he did once, when he offered up himself. What did Christ do? He made one sacrifice that atoned for the High Priest, and atoned for the people's too<sup>4</sup>. If we interpret this to mean that this, meaning he offered for his own sins first and then for the people, then you have Christ offering for sins, s-i-n-s,<sup>5</sup> of which he had none. It would strain that to make it sin nature. And you could only place this interpretation on it if it were plainly revealed elsewhere.<sup>6</sup>

But to place an interpretation upon these verses that would place them in opposition<sup>7</sup> to what is elsewhere plainly stated, or to place a first principle upon an interpretation of this, would be very difficult. And Comments?

(Ellis Higham) You say it strains it, I don't see how it strains it. To me that just exactly what it says.

(Richard Stone) What does it say to you?

(Ellis Higham) It says that he needeth not daily as the High Priest to offer sacrifice, first for his own sins, then for the peoples, so this he did once. He did it.

---

Also, here is the start of another basic flaw in bro. Stone's method of interpretation. He treats the sacrifices under the law as if they actually had the power to forgive sins, which of course they did not. Paul said in Hebrews 10:4: "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." The Law only had strength, in that it prophesied of what Jesus was actually going to do. As bro. Stone has correctly said, the Law was a ritual prophesy". It prophesied of Jesus's great sacrifice. But it had no power of itself. This is important.

Therefore, the high priest was actually no different in his actual relationship to sin after he offered his sacrifice, than he was before. He "prospectively" had his sins forgiven, in that they would be forgiven because of what Jesus was going to do. But actually, there was no change. Bro. Stone ridicules (correctly) the Unamended brethren for the chemical reaction they appear to believe in at baptism, (the water automatically releasing a man from the power of the grave.) But he has his own "chemical reaction" in the sacrifices under the law. He believes that if a man offered a sacrifice for something, then he was forgiven instantly at that point. That is simply not the case, or, as Paul points out, "then would they have ceased to be offered."

The Mosaic sacrifices had no effect whatsoever, until they had been ratified through the sacrifice of Christ. Had Christ not come and successfully lived a perfect life, and lay down his life as his Father commanded him to do; the sacrifices under the law would have been of no effect. So the High Priest was not literally sinless after he offered the sacrifice because those sacrifices did not have the power to take away sin. It was all a type, all a shadow. It all prefigured what Christ would actually do.

<sup>4</sup> This is a true statement, but the careful slicing away of that which is inconvenient causes a careless interpretation by bro. Stone. He says that Christ offered for the sins of the High Priest, and for the people's. This is a true statement. Christ did offer for the sins of the high priest, and of the people. Who was the high priest? Paul just told us. It was Jesus. So as the high priest, when he offered for the high priest, and then for the people; he was offering as this verse says, first for his own sins, and then for the people's. His own sins, of course, being his own sin nature.

Of course, this is not what bro. Stone means. He means that Jesus offered for the High Priests under the law, and then for the people. But the High Priest, under the law, if not functioning as High Priest, was simply not the High Priest. The interpretation offered by bro. Stone therefore, is impossible.

<sup>5</sup> Please refer to footnote 16 in Class One.

<sup>6</sup> Of course this is revealed elsewhere. Rom. 8:3; Rom. 8:23; Heb. 5:3; Heb. 7:27; Heb. 9:12 all being examples.

<sup>7</sup> To say that the statement that Christ offered for sin-nature, is in opposition to what is revealed in Scriptures, shows how rooted these brethren are in this teaching. Clearly there is no opposition in the Scripture to this idea. The Bible never says "Christ did not offer for his nature". The opposition has always been from brethren who do not see the whole picture, denying what is plainly taught.

(Richard Stone) What did he do?

(Ellis Higham) He offered for the people's personal transgression and for his sin in the flesh.

(Richard Stone) It doesn't say that. If it says anything it says he offered for his own sins<sup>8</sup>. Now if that's the way you are going to interpret it, you run into all kinds of difficulty, because it just affirmed in v. 26 that he was sinless.

(John Hensley) Richard, when it says that the high Priest, this is back under the Mosaic Law, offered first for his own sins, s-i-n-s, what was the sins that the priest offered for in relation to himself. I never did read..., do you know a place where in the Mosaic Law where there was an offering for sin nature?

(Richard Stone) No.

(John Hensley) Well, when it says that the High Priest offered first for his own sins, what was it, his own sins, that the high Priest offered for?

(Richard Stone) That's found in Lev. 16, isn't it?

(John Hensley) Does it mean that the High Priest offered for his own sin nature? I don't think so. You'll find other parts where he talks about error and faults, things like that the word is used.

(Richard Stone) That's true. Nowhere does it say he offered for sin nature.

(John Hensley) May I say something that I think will clear it up? I see what the difficulty is with this comment. Perhaps this will stave off a lot of difficulty. You know there are two ways to say a thing. Sometimes it correct to say a thing a certain way, and sometimes you say it in a different way and its not correct. Now for instance if you say that the high Priest offered first for his own sins, that would be absolutely true for he did first have to make an offering for his own transgressions. His own sins was his own transgressions. And he went into the Most Holy, and then came back. Then he had to make another one, for the people. But what the High Priest offered for, his own sins, was his faults, his transgressions, his errors.

---

<sup>8</sup> A good point by bro. Stone. If this verse says anything, it says that he offered for his own sins. This is a true statement. I recommend any concerned with this should reference as many works on this verse as possible. You will see the trouble that the churches have with verse, which is the same problem bro. Stone is having. How can Christ be said to have sins. They have invented all sorts of ways around it. Some put parenthesis around certain portions, to try to isolate what the High Priest did from what Christ did, even though Paul's whole argument is a comparison of what the High Priest and Christ did. Others emphasize the words "needeth not" and say that the High Priest needed to, but Christ "needeth not" do this, which violates any reasonable attention to sentence structure. Still others take bro. Stone's usual approach (when he's being less candid than he was in this sentence where he admits the verse says Jesus offered for his own sins) and say that Paul was teaching that Jesus offered for the sins of the High Priests under the law, and for the sins of the people. Please refer to footnote 4. But my favorite is from 19th century Anglican churchman named Westcott. He dealt with all the different excuses and shot holes in them all. Then he simply observed that the verse says that Jesus offered for his own sins. Westcott reasons that he didn't have any sins. He suggests that the matter be left there, and go on. Westcott could do that, for he denied the complete inspiration of the Bible. Not troubled by the question of inspiration, he observed the truth of what the verse taught, and then ignored it. True Christadelphians do not have that liberty.

<sup>9</sup> There is no difficulty here. The previous verse just affirmed that Jesus was morally sinless. Bro. Stone pointed out in reading this verse that the subject of the verse was his moral perfection. But this verse goes on to affirm that he offered for sin. What sin? The bible is clear that Jesus had "sin in the flesh". Sin could not have been condemned in the flesh of Jesus, if it had not existed there. Therefore, there was sin in his flesh. It wasn't a moral sin, something Jesus was guilty of. It was a physical condition. It was his misfortune through Adam that Jesus bore this sin in his flesh. It was not a crime that he should do so. But since its existence was a reality, it required the atoning sacrifice which Jesus made as the High priest for its removal. There is no difficulty with this for anyone who sees the whole complete picture.

Now I don't think anybody would want to say that Christ offered for his own sins in the same way that the High Priest offered for his own sins. Because Christ didn't have any own sins. Now the Mosaic law being a type there must have been a reason why God separated the two offerings and made the High Priest offer two different offerings, one for himself and another for the people. God ordained that. Now he could have had the High Priest just offer one offering that would cover both his transgressions and the transgressions of the people, but for some reason or another God separated where the High Priest had to make two different offerings.

Now brethren before, I'm not quoting any special brethren, I'm not quoting at all because I know that this class is based... But brethren have seen in this type the reason why it was divided in two, that there was something that Christ had to offer for in relation to himself. So it would be incorrect to say his own sins. If anybody said that, that Christ offered for his own sins, just right out like that, I'd say that he didn't have any sins of his own; but he did have something that he needed changed. He did have something that qualified him to be our representative and die for us on the cross. That was of course his sin nature.

And perhaps the Mosaic Law, to show that there would be something that he would offer for, as the High Priest had something to offer for, though not the same thing. It would be incorrect to say that Christ offered for the same thing that the High Priest offered for. He offered for his transgressions. Christ had something to offer for, but not his transgressions. So that the type was made, I think this should satisfy you, as the High Priest has something in relation to himself that he offered for, which was separate from that of the people, so Christ had something, in relation to himself, though not the same thing. He had something in relation to himself that involved him that he would benefit from, it was necessary for him to make this offering, and would cover him and probably much, much more than would have been required of himself if alone. But God wouldn't let the High Priest offer one offering to cover both himself and the others.

Now it has been said of Christ, that along with the type, that Christ offered for himself, but not in the same sense or the extent, in which he offered for us. We're transgressors. We're sinners. We have sins of our own. And he offered for that. But you can't say he has sins of his own. That can never be correct.

But it would be correct to say that he was involved in it. That which qualified him to die for us, and offer for us, and offer for us, was his physical nature which needed changed... which change he received when he received immortal life. Does that satisfy you, Les?<sup>10</sup>

(Ellis Higham) Well first off, the statement was made that nobody knew of any sacrifice under the law for sin nature. I would take exception to that, the burnt offering was for sin nature and I don't feel that way myself, there's a whole chapter in the Law of Moses that the Burnt Offering was for sin nature. Not only under the law, but Noah offered a sacrifice for sin nature. That was the burnt offering that Noah offered when the ark landed. The offering that Able offered was for sin nature, the offering that Abraham offered when they came into the land. That was for sin... that was a burnt offering and the offering for their sin nature and this is pointed out in the section called "The Burnt Offering" in the book of the "Law of Moses". So there is a sacrifice for sin nature albeit it is not the sin offering, it is the burnt offering, and that's what it stands for.

---

<sup>10</sup> Actually, this would be very satisfactory, if we did not know what bro. John Hensley meant, as he himself explains later. Bro. John is always freer with his words than bro. Stone. When he says he offered for his sin nature, he does not mean the same thing as the rest of us, as will become apparent later. He means that Christ had his sin nature changed as a result of his obedience in going through with the sacrifice. He does not mean that Christ atoned for sin nature in his death.

(John Hensley) Les, did burnt offering take away sin nature?<sup>11</sup>

(Richard Stone) A lot of them offered burnt offering.

(John Hensley) I never heard of a one who had sin nature taken away. If you offer the sin offering or the trespass offering you had your sin taken away, you had trespass taken away. I never heard very much. I always thought, and I thought it was agreed by every body that the burnt offering typified total dedication. I never did know that it represented sin nature.<sup>12</sup> Now

---

<sup>11</sup> Again note the mechanical or chemical relationship which these brethren imagine between the sacrifice of animals and sin. Please refer to footnote 3.

<sup>12</sup> This statement by bro. John has always bothered me. Both bre. Stone and Hensley are as familiar with the section in the Law of Moses on the burnt offering as anyone. To act like bro. Ellis Higham is introducing foreign thought into the discussion, saying they thought everyone agreed that the Burnt Offering represented complete dedication, strikes me as less than sincere. To disagree is one thing. To knowingly alter facts is quite another.

Bro. Roberts wrote: "The diversity of offerings is a little perplexing at first; and it is some time before we discover the difference between them. They all seem indiscriminately sacrifices-animals to be slain and consumed in the fire of the altar. By and by, we naturally ask, what are burnt offerings as distinguished from sin offerings and trespass offerings? and why should there be a trespass offering in addition to a sin offering, seeing that trespass is sin? The light gradually dawns. We find they represent gradations of the same subject. All were for atonement, [NOTE: Burnt offering was for atonement] but atonement for different degrees of sin, as we might express it. There was a form of sin for which there was no atonement. "The soul that doeth aught presumptuously"... reproacheth the Lord: that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Because he hath despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken his commandment, that soul shall utterly be cut off: his iniquity shall be upon him" (that is, shall not be purged by sacrifice) (Num. 15: 30-31). But this was not a common case. The common case was sin not of presumption: sin of natural state, [NOTE: this is sin-nature] sin of ignorance, and sin of weakness: the first, the constitutional uncleanness that has come into the World by sin, which is "no more I, but sin that dwelleth in me" (Rom. 7: 20): the second, where men do wrong without knowing it as in "sin of ignorance": and third, acts of known disobedience but not deliberate or intentional but the result of infirmity deplored. For these three phases of sin, the burnt offering, the sin offering, and the trespass offering appear to have been provided, differing in methods and accessories according to the respective cases.

"1. THE BURNT OFFERING--The burnt offering was burnt wholly on the altar (Lev. 1: 89). It was left to smoulder all night into ashes, and the ashes were removed in the morning. It was called the burnt offering "because of the burning upon the altar all night unto the morning " (6: 9). It was an act of worship on the part of a mortal being, apart from guilt of specific offence. Thus Noah, saved from destruction by the flood, "took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar" (Gen. 8: 20). Thus also the test of Abraham's faith was to offer Isaac "for burnt offering" (Gen. 22: 2). That burnt offering should be required in the absence of particular offence shows that our unclean state as the death-doomed children of Adam itself unfits us for approach to the Deity apart from the recognition and acknowledgment of which the burnt offering was the form required and supplied. It was "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel ", as well as "because of their transgressions in all their sins", that atonement was required for even the tabernacle of the congregation (Lev. 16 : 16).

"The type involved in complete burning is self-manifest: it is consumption of sin-nature. This is the great promise and prophecy and requirement of every form of the truth: the destruction of the body of sin (Rom. 6: 6). It was destroyed in Christ's crucifixion -the "one great offering"; we ceremonially share it in our baptism: "crucified with Christ", "baptized unto his death". We morally participate in it in putting the old man to death in "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts": and the hope before us is the prospect of becoming subject to such a physical change as will consume mortal nature and change it into the glorious nature of the Spirit. "We shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye!"

"The whole process of consumption is the work of the Spirit, whether we consider the sending forth of Christ to condemn sin in the flesh, or our association with his death in baptism or our repudiation of the old man as the rule of life, or our change at the judgment seat into the incorruptible and glorious nature of the Son of God. When the work is finished, flesh and blood, with all its weakness and its woe, will have ceased from the earth, and given place to a glad and holy

I realize that sin nature had to be changed, its a very real problem there's no question about that. But I always thought burnt offering represented total dedication and the only one really that totally dedicated himself, that the burnt offering itself could really foreshadow was the Lord Jesus Christ.

(Richard Stone) The church doctrine is that the burnt offering represents sin being burnt up, consumed. But this is not the type. The type is that it was to be to God a sweet smelling savor,<sup>13</sup> and it represented complete and total dedication of one's faculties, properties to God.

(John Hensley) Les, Christ did have his nature changed, and it was essential that he offered himself, that he offered himself as a sacrifice for sin in order that he could save us. I don't know what more we could say. He had to do everything exactly as he did. What proof, where would you have to go farther, what more would you have to say?

(Richard Stone) Unless he offered himself upon the cross his glorification would have been out of the question.<sup>14</sup>

(John Hensley) I would say, as many say, many say if you can treat Christ separately and say that he himself personally, what would he, what would God have required of him personally if he hadn't been dying for others and been unconnected with transgressions and so forth and answer I don't know.<sup>15</sup>

---

race of men immortal and "equal to the angels". It was a beautiful requirement of the wisdom of God in the beginning of things that He should require an act of worship that typified the repudiation of sinful nature as the basis of divine fellowship and acceptability. Those who deny Christ's participation thereof, deny its removal by sacrifice, and therefore deny the fundamental testimony of the gospel, that he is "the Lamb of God, taking away the sin of the world". They think they honour him by saying his flesh-nature was a clean nature. In reality, they deny his qualification for the work he was sent to do. They mistake holiness of character for holiness of nature, and by a wrong use of truth, destroy."

From the above, we can see that the pioneer position was that the burnt offering represented the consumption of sin's flesh. The key to which view is correct lies in the fact that the burnt offering was for atonement. LEV 1:4 And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. Atonement for what? If it was to show total dedication, as suggested by bre. Stone and Hensley and other Central writers, there would be no mention of atonement. The fact that it is for atonement, in the absence of any specified sin; shows that it is not for dedication, but for the natural condition or constitution of man, which is the constitution (body) of sin.

<sup>13</sup> Bro. Stone here starts to show his failure to understand human nature. He finds the idea that God would be pleased with the consumption of sin nature to be problematic. Why? Sin nature is bemoaned by Paul. (Rom. 7:24) It is fought against by the mind of the spirit. It is enmity against God. (Rom 8:6,7) There is nothing good in it. How could its destruction be anything other than pleasing to God? That bro. Stone has a problem with this shows how far from the truth his theory has taken him.

<sup>14</sup> This is, as has been pointed out before, the way that these brethren can say that Jesus offered for himself. They say that Jesus offered for himself, and we should be satisfied. If they would say that Jesus offered for himself an atoning sacrifice for redemption of his body from sin in the flesh, we would be quite satisfied. But instead, they deny that there was any atonement involved. They deny that there is anything literal called sin in the flesh. They deny that sin nature is sin. They reason (correctly) that Jesus had to be obedient to his death on the cross, or he would not have obtained salvation. But they see obedience as the only issue, not as one of the issues, as the Truth really is. His obedience was necessary. His atonement for sin nature was also an indispensable part of his great sacrifice.

<sup>15</sup> In this point, bro. Hensley is trying introduce a matter which bro. J.J. Andrew introduced on the first night of the debate that he had with bro. Roberts. What would Christ have to do if there had been no one else to save. Bro. Roberts always avoided this question as irrelevant, as bro. Ellis Higham will do. If there was no sin at the beginning, no savior or Christ would have been necessary. Jesus was provided to die for sin. What would his position have been if there was no sin? We don't know.

(Ellis Higham) But that's completely an irrelevant question.

(John Hensley) O.K. But I don't know how much farther we could go with that. He had to do exactly as he did. And he did have to have his sin nature changed and sin nature does have to be changed. There's no possibility of God immortalizing sin nature, after a natural life. What further more emphatic statement could we make?

(Ellis Higham) That we could go to the extent that I believe historically Christadelphians have gone and state that sin nature requires atoning sacrifice. That's how much further you could go.

(Richard Stone) But that would be unscriptural.<sup>16</sup>

(John Hensley) But Les, Christ would have had to have done the same thing he did had he died for himself and you already said that that's in the category of hypothesis. I don't know what God would require of sin nature if no transgression were in the picture whatever. I don't know and I leave that an open question. Wouldn't you be willing to leave that an open question? Because it couldn't have happened.

(Ellis Higham) Well I don't believe it was left an open question in 1873, or 1910, or 1920.<sup>17</sup>

(John Hensley) Well, I don't want to go into it now, but you are going to be shocked and surprised when you read what bro. Roberts said back then. But I'm not going into that now because this class is not based on it. But that's all I wanted to say, Richard. I hope you don't consider me an intrusion.

---

<sup>16</sup> Here bro. Stone clearly, and without mixing words, plainly calls the doctrine that Christ offered an atoning sacrifice for the redemption of his nature to be "unscriptural". Some brethren try to confuse this point. They try to say that we simply do not understand what bro. Stone is saying. They introduce the Andrew teaching, and say that the moral relationship that bro. Andrew believed Jesus was "guilty" of is what bro. Stone is fighting. But bro. Stone never argues this way, only those who would apologize for him do so. Bro. Stone is very clear. To teach that Christ offered a sacrifice for the atonement of sin nature is unscriptural.

While bro. Stone clearly teaches that the idea that atonement was necessary for human nature is unscriptural, the apostle Paul is equally clear that it is Scriptural: ROM 8:22-23 "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. 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." What does the body need to be redeemed from? Bro. Stone says the body only needs to be changed. Paul taught it needed to be redeemed. "Redemption" is from the greek word "apolutrosis", and it means the act of ransoming. It is from the root "apo", meaning "off, in relation to time and place"; and "lutron", meaning "something to loosen with", "the ransom price, or figuratively, an atonement."

Our body, according to Paul, needs to be redeemed, ransomed, or atoned. So to say that it is unscriptural to affirm this, is to go against clear apostolic precept.

<sup>17</sup> Bro. Ellis Higham misunderstood the question. He was not arguing that the matter of what Christ would have to do if he had been alone, was not left an open question, (which bro. Hensley keeps trying to bring into the discussion) but rather he was saying that the matter of Christ dying to atone for sin nature had not been left an open question in 1873 and the Renunciationist heresy, 1910 and the Bell heresy in Australasia, and 1920 and the Strickler heresy in North America.

Bro. Hensley would like to get started on the question of Christ alone, for if one reasons the matter out, it would work this way. Christ inherited sin nature from his descent from his mother, Mary. But what if he had not inherited anything? What if he had been in Adam's position before he sinned. Then he would not have had to atone for anything, because there would be nothing in his nature to atone for. If bro. Hensley can get bro. Higham to consider Christ alone, not the descendant in the condemned line of Adam, Abraham, and David; then he could get him to say that Christ would not have had to offer for his (and their) nature. He wouldn't have had their nature. Bro. Higham pointed out from the start that this is irrelevant.

(Richard Stone) No, not at all.

(John Hensley) I don't go quite that far as that because I don't think there's anything in Scriptures. Your treading on a hypothesis, because if there hadn't been transgression at the beginning of humanity, then there wouldn't be any sin nature. We really don't separate the thing.

(Richard Stone) Well when Christ offered upon the cross, he offered for our sins, we all agree with that. When we are baptized, we are baptized for the remission of our sins. Now if we say that he was baptized for sin nature, I mean that he was offered for sin nature, then we too must be baptized for sin nature. And yet we know that there is not a solitary idea in the Bible that supports the idea.<sup>18</sup>

(A-1) Why was our baptism, I mean why would our baptism have to be...

(Richard Stone) Because our baptism is an invitation of his death on the cross. We join with him at the cross, don't we? Crucified with Christ. When we are buried with him, we are buried with him by baptism into his death, and if Christ had to offer for his sin offering, [EDITOR'S NOTE: Bro. Stone meant sin nature] don't you think that we too would have to offer for our sin offering, by his sacrifice? He offered for our sins, and if he had to atone for sin nature, do ye not think we would have to atone for sin nature also?

(Ellis Higham) In a sense its done potentially. Only potentially at baptism, and then sin nature is taken care of upon the resurrection and immortalization. But potentially its done at baptism.

(Richard Stone) Well potentially, we have immortality.

(Ellis Higham) Right.

(Richard Stone) But we don't have it, and if we don't have it in our possession, its only a possibility made possible. Baptism is a step in the right direction. Our sins had to be remitted. What ever is done at baptism, that what is remitted is no longer with us. And if sin nature is

---

<sup>18</sup> Once again we have bro. Stone at variance with the clear teaching of the Scriptures. Paul clearly taught this in COL 2:10-12 "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

In our baptism, we are baptized for the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh, or human nature. We identify in baptism, with what Jesus actually accomplished in his death. Some would reason that this is wrong because we still have sinful flesh after we are baptized, and of course we do. The act of baptism is not chemical or mechanical, as suggested by the Unamended brethren, and by bre. Stone and Hensley. This is seen in COL 2:13 "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;" We are not yet "quicken together with" Christ, though we are reckoned as "quicken". "Quicken" means immortalized. It hasn't happened yet for us, even though we are baptized. It has happened to Christ. But it will happen to those who are faithful until the end, and so Paul speaks of the end of the process as if it has already occurred. It is not a chemical, or mechanical reaction as argued for by bre. Andrew of the Advocates, and bro. Stone of Central. Its a process. In this sense, we are baptized for the removal of our body of the sins of the flesh.

Bro. Roberts said the same thing in the section on the burnt offering earlier. Highlighting the point again he wrote: "The type involved in complete burning is self-manifest: it is consumption of sin-nature. This is the great promise and prophecy and requirement of every form of the truth: the destruction of the body of sin (Rom. 6: 6). It was destroyed in Christ's crucifixion -the "one great offering"; we ceremonially share it in our baptism: "crucified with Christ", "baptized unto his death"."



atoned for or taken away at baptism, we ought to have clean nature now, but we don't.<sup>19</sup>

(John Hensley) Richard, instead of saying potentially, wouldn't it have been better to say prospectively?

(Richard Stone) Yes, that would be a better word.

(John Hensley) 'Cause that potentially..., I haven't had a bit of physical change.

(A-2) Well, you haven't been nailed to the cross either.

(John Hensley) Well, that's prospectively though. And that a better word, don't you think?

(A-2) Well John, you haven't been nailed to the cross either, you haven't been literally crucified either, in our baptism we're not literally nailed to a cross when we are crucified.

(Richard Stone) We don't have to be. We're not potentially, nor are we prospectively crucified. But we are in the Scriptural sense, aren't we? How does the Bible describe our present condition? Turn to the fifth chapter of Romans.

We're justified by faith, justified at our baptism. And he says in Rom. 5:1 "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:".

At one time we were at enmity with God. He was hostile to us because we were in our sins. Now we have peace with God. By him we have access also by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in the hope and glory of God. So we're in a state of grace. And not only that but in verse 8-9: "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more them being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him."

Our present position is one of justification. We have been reconciled to God. We are justified, and we are in a state of peace, a state of grace. And in verse 10 it says: "For if, when, we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more them being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him."

Now, saved from wrath and saved by his life take place at the resurrection. But now we are justified and we are reconciled to God. And we are reconciled because our sins have been forgiven. Our sin nature has nothing to do with it, its not even mentioned. And its never mentioned as a stumbling block between man and God. What is it that separates us from God? Is it not our sins? As Isaiah told Israel, your sins separate you from God and your iniquity that he will not hear you. Its our sins that separate us from God, and when we are baptized, our sins are forgiven and we are no longer separated from God morally. We are part of His family.

There is what you might call a physical separation. But baptism has nothing to do with that except of course to pave the way for it to happen later on. But the physical redemption comes with the coming of Christ. We are now reconciled, much more being reconciled ye shall be saved by his life. But we aren't saved yet, and we don't have eternal life yet. But we are reconciled and justified. What else can we say? And where do you find anywhere it speaks of sin nature?

That incidently, we must remember is a man made term to describe our physical constitution. And its called sin nature because its a nature that inevitably produces sin. But it is not the object of wrath until sin is committed, and then God takes us to task for our sins. But not because we are in possession of sin nature.

---

<sup>19</sup> Again note the chemical relationship bro. Stone imagines baptism to have.

The very fact that after we are baptized we still have sin nature and we are still reconciled to God and have peace with him is indication that sin nature is no barrier to reconciliation with God. But it isn't God's intention that we should forever remain in this state. John?

(John Hensley) Richard, I know of only two cleansings in the New Testament Scripture, moral and physical. The moral has to do with forgiveness of sins, doesn't it? Moral cleansing.

(Richard Stone) You cleanse your hands, or you say let us cleanse our hands from all uncleanness of the flesh and so forth, yes.

(John Hensley) And we receive that, don't we, at baptism? That doesn't necessarily mean however, that we will be saved at the judgment seat and receive the physical cleansing then does it? Not necessarily. As you said, potentially or prospectively, not actually for there have been some who had their sins forgiven at baptism and then went and sinned a good amount who will be rejected. But a physical cleansing, and immortalization is a physical cleansing, isn't it?

(Richard Stone) I suppose so, but the word cleansing is never used of the physical change.<sup>20</sup>

(John Hensley) Well, I know but we use the expression though. Immortalization is a physical cleansing is an expression that a well respected brother has used so if you want to go into details you can't cleanse sin nature. But there is a physical cleansing, its called a change. And he shall change our vile bodies like unto his own. Let's say that there are two cleansing, a moral and a physical. Now we will speak of physical cleansing to be immortalization.

All right, now Christ didn't need any moral cleansing, nobody says that he needed moral cleansing, but he did need a change of his physical nature that's in us. Now, when he was immortalized, resurrected, immortalized, he received at his immortalization a physical cleansing, didn't he? Now that is a physical change in his nature and so on. Now, whenever you're immortalized, you receive that physical cleansing. I don't know any other physical cleansing

---

<sup>20</sup> It is statements like this that cause bro. Stone's teaching to be labeled "clean flesh". He clearly states that no cleansing is necessary for the flesh. It only needs to be changed. If it doesn't need to be cleansed, then certainly it must be clean. Also, this is the reason why we find earlier statements by bro. Hensley, that Jesus offered for his sin nature, to be inadequate. This explains perfectly what he means, which is quite different from what the truth is.

In the historical sense, the teaching of bro. Stone and the teaching of bro. Strickler should have been called something other than "clean flesh". The renunciationist heresy, which is historically the true "clean flesh" teaching, taught that Christ's nature was different from ours. It taught that we have a defiled nature, but that in order to have a defiled nature, one must have a human mother and father. As Jesus did not, he had a clean nature, different from Adam.

Bro. Stone (as did bro. Strickler) teaches something different. He teaches that Christ and us have the same nature, unlike the historical "clean flesh teaching"; but that there is no such thing as a defiled nature. **It amounts to the same thing.** If the nature does not need cleansing through Jesus's atoning sacrifice, it must already be clean. The renunciationist recognized that our nature needed to be cleansed, but felt that Jesus's did not. Bro. Stone teaches that nobody's nature needs to be cleansed. This is the difference. In this sense bro. Stone's error is as serious to the nature of man, as it is to the nature and sacrifice of Christ.

Yet we can see similarities between the controversy of 1873 and the current teaching in Central. For instance, the issue of no "cleansing" being necessary as bro. Stone has just mentioned recalls this question which bro. Roberts dealt with in 1873. Bro. Roberts asked: "Paul says that as it was necessary that the pattern-things in the Mosaic system should be purged with blood, so it was necessary that the **THINGS SIGNIFIED** should be purged, but with a better sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice of Christ. (Heb. 9:23) The Christ of YOUR theory NEEDETH NO "PURGING". Therefore does it not follow that **HE IS NOT THE CHRIST OF PAUL**, who required purging from the law of sin and death **BY HIS OWN SACRIFICE**?"

This question is still valid. Since the Christ of bro. Stone needed no purging, or cleansing: is it not clear that it is not the Christ of the apostle Paul?

or any other time we receive a physical cleansing. Could you say that Christ received a physical cleansing while he was on the cross? Hardly.

(Richard Stone) No, you couldn't.

(John Hensley) A dying body dies. While he was in the grave buried...well, the grave has always needed cleansed and so on, so we wouldn't say that he was cleansed. Almost anyone would say that he received that physical cleansing when he was immortalized. Now, what I want to ask is when a person's immortalized, does he need any other kind of a cleansing or is that absolutely complete? Because I've made mention that Christ received physical purification, a physical cleansing when he was immortalized, but I've been told that he had to receive more cleansing than that. What more cleansing would Christ need than the physical cleansing with immortalization. I thought immortalization covered absolutely everything, that you'd live forever, you don't have a trace of sin any more at all. I thought a physical cleansing was absolutely complete but there are some that say, "oh no, other kinds of cleansing are needed." Well, what would you need more than a physical cleansing.

Before we can receive physical cleansing or immortalization we have to receive more. We have to receive forgiveness of sins. But Christ, when he received physical cleansing, I thought that was absolute, complete, nothing else. Now, what do you say, Les?

(Richard Stone) Well, the Scriptures speak of his cleansing as you put it in different ways. It uses the word perfect very often, doesn't it? He was made perfect through sufferings. He was not yet perfected. In three days I shall be made perfect. But if you make something perfect, by God giving him glory as Peter said, God raised him from the dead and gave him glory, then that would be complete. That's perfection then, that is physically. He was already perfect morally. Holy, harmless, undefiled. Never committed a single sin, so he was morally perfect. He became physically on the third day when God raised him from the dead and made him a life giving spirit, or as Paul says in the 1 Cor. 15: "a quickening spirit".

(John Hensley) Well, in the physical, in the physical purification, cleansing; change of nature; whatever you want to call it. Completeness there is nothing beyond that it there, that's absolute. Well he hadn't received anything till he was resurrected and immortalized. Had he remained on the cross and remained in the grave, you couldn't have said that he had been cleansed in any sense. Dead body doesn't cleanse anything.

(A-2) Christ was tempted in every manner?

(Richard Stone) U-huh.

(A-2) If he...I agree that he was perfect and if his sin...I mean his flesh needed no sacrifice,<sup>21</sup> his perfect nature, where did he get this ability to be tempted? I mean, if there was nothing about him that was fleshly, do you understand what I am saying? How could he...where does the temptation come from?

(Richard Stone) Well he was fleshly, physically; if that's what you want to call it. He came in the flesh and John emphasizes many times in his writing, he came in the flesh in order to be tempted as we are. And the purpose of that was, we are told in the second chapter of

---

<sup>21</sup> Here is proof of Paul's statement, that a little leaven leavens the whole lump. The force of bro. Stone's teaching deceived the simple. The Long Beach Central group had asked for this class because they felt that what bro. Stone taught was wrong, and they wanted him to explain how it wasn't. Instead, bro. Stone defends his error, and makes converts to his way of thinking. This is what is wrong with fellowshiping error. This is what is wrong with giving errorists a platform from which to spread their error. This is why the Spirit in writing to the Thyatirans condemned not only "Jezebel", but those who "sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants...". This is the wicked works John warns us of, that we will be partakers (GK. fellowshipers) of, if we receive them into our house.

Hebrews: is that he might be a faithful high priest in things pertaining to God. "For having himself been tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." You'll notice at verse 17 of Heb. 2: "Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself had suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted."

He can minister unto the needs because he suffered temptation. He knows what it is. That prepared him for it.

(A-2) I know that, that's not what I'm asking.

(John Hensley) I would like to say one thing. He had to offer himself, as a sacrifice for us, in order for himself to be saved.

(A-2) I...

(John Hensley) I want to be sure that that's understood. There is no possibility of his having eternal life, without us having, also at the appointed time. O.K. I wanted to be sure.

(Ellis Higham) One thing. We are going around in areas that we all agree on. #1, we all here agree that Christ had no personal transgression. That ground we all hold in common and there is no disagreement there. #2, we all agree that Christ had to die for our personal transgressions. The area of disagreement lies in did the nature of Christ require a sin atoning sacrifice as our nature requires a sin atoning sacrifice, and that's the crux of where the disagreement is.

(Richard Stone) Well, I would say that our sin nature would not require a sin atoning sacrifice, either. Our sins do. But if we say, what do the Scriptures say, then we're at a dead end. The Scriptures do not say.

(Ellis Higham) That's where the conflict lies, right there, Dick.

(Richard Stone) All right. The Bible does not say you know, that he was crucified for sin nature, or that sin nature is cleansed at baptism, or anything else. Why do we tread an area of which the Scriptures say nothing. Is it not wise to leave it alone? The Bible simply says that he died for our sins and our sins are forgiven at baptism. Why go beyond this? Why introduce an alien thought, in which you have to invent terms in order to support?<sup>22</sup>

(John Hensley) You might add this. He died for our sins, so that our sin nature could be changed, at the judgment seat. Its not just merely the forgiveness of sins, its forgiveness of sins with a view towards changing our sin nature at the judgment seat.

(A-2) Why is this view in the constitution?

(Ellis Higham) The reason why it is an issue is because the Christadelphians stand for over 100 years has been that the way that God showed forth his righteousness was in the public condemnation of sin in the flesh on the cross. And that demonstrated God's righteousness, and that's why Christadelphians have dealt with it.

(Richard Stone) I couldn't agree with you Les, that this has been the historic stand of the Christadelphians. Because I don't think it has been. And if we go back to the writings of the pioneers which I don't want to do at this point, but we can have some classes in which we discuss only the writings of the pioneers, that's perfectly all right with me, but right now, regardless of what's been taught 100 years ago, or 50 years ago, we want to know what the

---

<sup>22</sup> Of course this is not an alien thought. But as for why, please refer to footnote #45.

Bible teaches. And if there is anything you can recall in the writings of the pioneers that says "thus saith the Lord", then I'm willing to listen to it. I'll accept that. But we must have a "thus saith the Lord".

Lets not introduce something, that is the idea of somebody to accommodate an idea. Sometimes terms have been used, expressions have been made that have been very injurious to the truth; because those who made them never had a ghost of an idea that they would be interpreted the way they are interpreted two or three generations later.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> In so saying bro. Stone argues that it is simply "terins" which bre. Roberts and Thomas used, which is confusing us. But the reality is that bro. Stone must disagree with the entire translation of verses like Heb. 7:27, or whole subjects like the Burnt Offering, in order to defend his theory. This is how bro. Roberts interprets Heb. 7:27 and compare that with how bro. Stone just interpreted it.

"The statement of Paul (Heb. 7:27) is that Christ did "once" in his death what the high priest under the Law did daily, namely, offered "*first for his own sins*, and then for the people's." But there is a difference between the two cases that there always is between shadow and substance. Christ's "own sins" were not like the sins of the priests: they were not of his own committing. He was without sin, so far as his own actions were concerned.

"Yet as the bearer of the sins of his people--whether "in Adam" or otherwise--he stood in the position of having these as "his own," from the effects of which he had himself first to be delivered. Consequently, HE OFFERED FIRST FOR HIMSELF. He was the first delivered. He is "Christ the *firstfruits*." He obtained eternal redemption in and *for himself*, as the middle voice of the Greek verb *euramenos* (Heb. 9:12) implies. The "for us" is not in the original: R.V. omits it. He was--"Brought again from the dead *through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant*" (Heb. 13:20).

But this offering *for himself* was also the offering for his people. The two aspects of the double typical offering were combined in one act. He had not twice to offer for himself--"By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14).

Yet, though combined, the two relations of the act are visibly separate. Christ was the first saved from death (Heb. 5:9)--"Afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming" (1 Cor. 15:23). In this way the Mosaic type has its counterpart.

There is no inconsistency whatever between these facts and the constant declaration that Christ "died for us". ALL that Christ was and did was "for us". It was "for us" he was born; "for us" he bore sin; "for us" he came under the curse of the law; "for us" he died. And the fact that personally he was without sin where all were transgressors, gives all the more point to the declaration.

It is "for us" that he came to be in the position of *having first to offer FOR HIMSELF*. The "for us" does not deny that what he submitted to "for us" was our own position--"He was MADE SIN for us who knew no sin" (2 Cor. 5:21)--and doesn't sin require an offering?--Chdn. 1875 p. 139.

Bro. Roberts does not have the same interpretation as did bro. Stone. He has no problem in saying that Heb. 7:27 means that since Christ was made to be sin, he therefore himself, required a sin offering. The High Priest offered for his personal transgressions, that true. Bro. Stone then reasons that if Jesus offered for sin, it would have to be his own transgressions, of which he had none. But to bro. Roberts the shadow and the substance in this, mirror as close as is required. So no matter what we think as to the fact of the matter, it must be clear that bro. Roberts would not agree with bro. Stone's interpretation.

And in another place, taking issue with bro. Stone's interpretation that Jesus did not, as the High Priest offer first for himself dealt with the question this way. In "Diary of a Voyage" Sept. 1886, bro. Roberts found himself dealing with one who denied that Jesus was himself involved in his own sacrifice. These brethren were the forerunners of the Shield group, which was received into Central on the basis of the Cooper-Carter Addendum (an addendum to the BASF which is used to nullified clauses 5 and 12) in 1957.

That as the anti-typical High Priest, it was necessary that he should OFFER FOR HIMSELF, as well as for those whom he represented?

(Ellis Higham) Let me express it right from the Scriptures then. Rom. 3:25-26 gives us an indication that it is a first principle that we believe in the blood of Christ for salvation.

(Richard Stone) Absolutely.

(Ellis Higham) O.K. If that's established, then we are talking about a first principle subject, Right? Now...

**(EDITOR'S SPECIAL NOTE)** At this point Richard Stone is called out of the room for a phone call.

(A-1) While we have a minute, Dick is probably aware of this, I wasn't till right now. My wife handed me a Revised Version of Heb. 7:27 and it reads a little different. Verse 27 says, He (speaking of Christ) He hath no need as those high priests to offer sacrifices daily, first for himself and then for the people.

(John Hensley) Well, he didn't make two sacrifices, Christ didn't.

(A-1) But that makes one.

(John Hensley) He did everything in one.

(A-2) So what your saying is that the High Priest made two sacrifices, the first one for himself, and the other for the people, Christ only did it once which would mean help the people and not for himself.

(Ellis Higham) Well, Christ died only once. That's all that indicates.

(A-2) Right. But he only had to do it once, for the people. Because the first one, the High Priest had to do for himself, he didn't have to do.

(Ellis Higham) I don't think that that indicates that Christ wasn't involved in his own sacrifice.

(John Hensley) He met all the requirements of God in one death.

(A-2) Combined the two of them into one.

(John Hensley) The High Priest had to make two sacrifices to meet the requirements of God. Christ only had to make one sacrifice to meet all the requirements of God. Which all through Hebrews and right in Hebrews he's showing how much greater Christ is than all this other. He's greater than angels. Greater than the High Priest. There is a contrast there.

(A-2) Your making both of them, both the sacrifices that the High Priest did, Christ did both of them, but he did them in one fell swoop.

---

HEB 5:3 And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.

HEB 8:3 For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.

HEB 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

HEB 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.

HEB 9:23 It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.

It must be clear from this that the way bro. Roberts interpreted verses, not just phrases, differ greatly from bro. Stone's.

(John Hensley) He did everything that God required in one sacrifice.

(A-2) Well, he didn't exactly though, because then he would have had to sacrifice for his own sins.

(John Hensley) Well, I said everything that God required of him was in that one sacrifice. It wasn't for the High Priest. He had to make first one for himself, then he had to make another. But Christ did everything that God required of him in one sacrifice. He didn't have to make two.

(A-2) I think mainly what he's dealing with in this verse is that he didn't have to do it daily.

(John Hensley) You have to be careful what we say. Christ first offered for himself. Now what the pioneers really said, I don't know or want to make a point or anything, but what they really said of this verse so many times is as there was a first, the High Priest first, offered for himself and went into the Most Holy Place. Then that indicates that Christ would have offered and be where he is now a long time before we would be where he is now. He had first, like the High Priest to go into the Most Holy Place, so Christ had first to obtain redemption for himself first then he comes back, like the High Priest comes out of the Most Holy Place under the law, and then, sacrificed, blessed the people, and then he comes back and then he changes our nature. And had the High Priest made one offering both for himself and the people, it would have indicated that at the same time that the High Priest would have accomplished something, the people would too. It would mean that at the time of Christ gained immortality, we would at the same time. But there wasn't, there was a first for him. Look 2000 years for us. Then later for us. There's your type. The High Priest first went into the Holy Place, then come back. Then he went in for the people.

(A-2) This verse is really meaning its just a sacrifice of the people. It doesn't mean he has to come back again and again and again...?

(John Hensley) That's right. He doesn't have to make another one.

(A-2) I think that's clear. We could milk these verses dry. I think this is pretty simple.

(John Hensley) We never deny that Christ was involved and he benefited by it. That he obtained eternal redemption. That he gained salvation through this. Had he refused the death on the cross he couldn't be saved. I don't know how more emphatic we could be. But, you do have to leave room for his sacrifice. If you say he died in the absolute complete full and same sense that he died for us, how did he sacrifice his life for that matter, for us. We have to leave room open for him doing something above and beyond what might have been required for him. Because he sacrificed.

**(EDITOR'S SPECIAL NOTE) Richard Stone returns.**

(Ellis Higham) Going back to where we were before you were called out, we had established that Romans 3:25-26, that we believe in the blood of Christ or in the death of Christ is essential. So its essential that we understand, so what he is saying then, is that its essential that we understand what his death is all about. Otherwise we're not in the body and then we're not amenable to resurrection.

Going from there to the 8th chapter of Romans verse 3: now, you dealt with it a little bit, I had never heard the construction that you placed on verse three. What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, it true, the law could not condemn sin in the flesh<sup>24</sup>. The law of Moses could deal with the problem, with the people committing sin. You can throw people in

---

<sup>24</sup> Unfortunately, bro. Ellis Higham makes a mistake here. As explained in class one, the law condemned sin so thoroughly that it is called the "ministration of condemnation". What the law could not do was give life.

prison for committing sin, but it doesn't mean that they're not going to walk out the day they're released and just do it all over again, and that's the problem with laws. They can only deal with the situation as it occurs. They can't cure the source of the problem. And that's what Heb. 3 is talking about.

God, realizing that the law could not solve the source of the problem which was sin in our flesh, sent his son to die for the sin in the flesh which is the basic root of the problem, the diabolos, which is within us.

(Aud 2) He doesn't say that. He says he condemned sin in the flesh.

(Ellis Higham) That's what the law couldn't do, and that's what Christ could do.

(Richard Stone) Well, we must be careful when we read that, that we don't read that as a hyphenated phrase. He's not saying there is such a thing as sin-in-the-flesh.<sup>25</sup> Its the only place in the Bible that this phrase is found. He says he condemned sin. If we ask where, he says its in the flesh. If we ask in the flesh of whom, its the flesh of his son. He condemned sin, in the flesh, of his son, as an offering for sin.

(Ellis Higham) Well, he explains, this is Paul's terms, right? This is Paul's term. And he explains what he is talking about in the context of the seventh chapter. Previously he explains the term where he says, "For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. That's what he is talking about. Sin in the flesh right there. Verse 18 if of the previous chapter. Its Paul's phrase and he explains it.

(Richard Stone) That's part of it, yes. Are we going to talk about this now?

(Ellis Higham) Well I was, I..."

(Richard Stone) 'Cause I have, you have a page on that which I'd like to go through. Its in the lesson here. And, we can go to that or we can talk about the rest of these quotations here.

(Ellis Higham) I'm sorry. I didn't mean to get ahead of you, Dick.

(Richard Stone) That's all right. Do you want to go on to discuss the rest of these here? Like Heb. 9:12-14. Here in the ninth chapter of Hebrews. First of all "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption. For the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifying to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead

---

<sup>25</sup> Doctrine to be Rejected # 27: "That there is no sin in the flesh." Bro. Stone denies that there is such a thing as sin in the flesh. He believes it is merely a figurative description. Note the way he objects to considering sin in the flesh to be a phrase. Note the way he breaks up the term, to give it a moral, instead of a physical relationship. And note the contrast with the truth as outlined by bro. Roberts below.

Bro. Roberts deals with the subject this way in his Magazine. "Question: 'What do you mean by 'sin in the flesh'". Answer: David by the Spirit says (Psa. 51:5), 'I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me'...'Sin in the flesh,' which is Paul's phrase, refers to the same thing. It is what Paul also calls '*sin that dwelleth in me*' (Rom. 7:17), adding, 'I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing.' Now, what is this element called 'uncleanness,' 'sin,' 'iniquity,' etc?...There is a principle, element or peculiarity in our constitution which leads to the decay of the strongest and healthiest. Its implantation came by sin, for death came by sin; and the infliction of death and the implantation of this peculiarity are synonymous things. Because the invisible, constitutional, physical inworking of death in us came by sin, that inworking is termed 'sin.' It is a principle of weakness and uncleanness and corruption. For this reason, it is morally operative; for whatever affects the physical affects the moral. If no counterforce were brought into play, its presence would subject us to the uncontrolled dominion of disobedience, through the constitutional weakness and impulse to sin.. The body of the Lord Jesus was this same unclean nature in the hand of the Father."



works to serve the living God. And for this cause he is a mediator of the new covenant that by means of death for the redemption of transgression that were under the first covenant, they which were called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

And have you noticed that in these verses, that Paul says the benefits of his death, and the benefits of his offering, were for others.<sup>26</sup> How much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works. He is the mediator of the new covenant that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were made under the first covenant.

Now it is true Christ obtained eternal redemption. The "for us" is in italics which means it isn't in the original. He did indeed obtain eternal redemption. And he did it through his own blood. Now that could be understood in a variety of different ways. It can mean that his own blood in some way cleansed him as John says, like a detergent. Or it can say that there were principles involved that involved the shedding of his blood.

When we speak of ourselves as being washed in the blood of Christ, we mean that there are certain principles that are set forth in the plan of salvation which require the death of Christ and involves our participation in Christ. The blood of Christ cleanseth us from all unrighteousness. Jesus entered the Holy Place by his own blood. It means it required his own blood shedding. It was part of the obedience that God required of him before he could have eternal redemption. The blood shedding, as Paul says here, was for the purifying and purging of your conscience, and for the redemption of the transgressions made under the first covenant.

It doesn't say that Christ had anything purified by it. Or that Christ was morally benefitted from it. But rather that it was because of his obedience which required the shedding of his blood that he entered into the Holy Place and obtained eternal redemption.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Bro. Stone wants to emphasize the aspect that his sacrifice was for others, to which we do not object. What we object to is that he completely ignores the fact that the atoning sacrifice itself, was also for himself. The verse is quoted to him, because all Christadelphians (even bro. Stone as we shall see) understand how this verse should be translated. When Paul speaks of Jesus "having obtained eternal redemption", the King James translators added "for us" to the end. This is *italicized* indicating that it is added by the translators. But it is more than just added. It is an incorrect translation. The actual translation should be "having obtained eternal redemption to himself."

The Greek word is the verb "euramenos". It is in the "middle voice" which we do not have in English. We have the active voice, where you do something, and the passive voice, where something is done to you. But Greek has a middle voice where someone does something to oneself. The is the state of this verb in Heb. 9:12. So the redemption obtained in his blood, is obtained in and for himself. Bro. Roberts makes this argument in "The Blood of Christ", and recommends this as the correct translation: "Having obtained *in himself* eternal redemption." So yes, the sacrifice was for us. But this verse is also describing with great force, that it was for and to himself, as well.

<sup>27</sup> Bro. Stone's argument in the previous three paragraphs is both naive and absolutely wrong. The verse says he obtained redemption through his blood. Bro. Stone says we can't know what the expression "by his blood" means. That it could mean several things. We perhaps if Paul was speaking with no supporting context, this would be true. But for nine chapters so far, and also for the rest of the book, Paul is only talking about one subject: how the law of Moses was a type of Christ. So when Paul says that he obtained eternal redemption through his blood, the expression is understood in harmony with the Mosaic law. If we say that something was redeemed by blood under the Mosaic law, what do we mean? There is no ambiguity there. We understand that to mean atonement. That is what blood shedding under the Mosaic Law was for. As Lev. 17:11 says: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul."

In this same chapter of Hebrews, Paul takes from the 19th verse to the 23rd verse to explain that by the law, almost all things were purged with blood. Now he wasn't talking about the obedience of the High Priest in making the sacrifice. He was talking about the principles of redemption which were involved in the blood shedding sacrifice for sin. In the 23rd verse, he equates all this to Christ. HEB 9:23 "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens

If we look, and I got a whole list of them here. The reason why Christ died, was raised from the dead invariably is because he was obedient to death, even the death on the cross. And that involved the shedding of his blood. It isn't because he atoned for sin nature. If anything, it says he atoned for our sins, and for this reason God raised him from the dead. I lay down my life for my sheep. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again. Romans 10. The reason he had power to take it up again, is because God promised him long life.<sup>28</sup>

Is there some other comment? What construction do you place on this verse? It is kind of ambiguous, isn't it? It can be understood in two or three different ways. By his blood. And therefore we should interpret it in a way that is in harmony with what is plainly revealed elsewhere.<sup>29</sup> We know he had to shed his blood before he could please God, before he could raise him from the dead. But the shedding of his blood invariably is spoken of on our behalf.

(John Hensley) Apart from us, there wouldn't have been a Christ. There would have been no need for him if there had been no transgression. If we didn't need any forgiveness for transgressions or for sins, why would he have needed to die on the cross.

(Ellis Higham) It seems to me that he explains it, in terms of what you already owed to, in that he died for us. It should be able to be explained within itself. It says he entered in, by his own blood, he entered in once. So obviously there was something that involved himself.

(Richard Stone) But the terms surrounding his blood, Les, are used in many different ways and its a succinct expression.<sup>30</sup> As the flesh is often related to the impulses of the flesh, and the Spirit, the guidance of the Spirit. And blood is often spoken of because it encompasses more than just blood. It encompasses everything that was required of Christ and all the divine principles that were exhibited in the outpouring of his blood which was accomplished. But the blood of the covenant indicates to us that blood was required, shedding his blood was required in

---

should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." The heavenly things themselves, was that which the patterns were a type of. The heavenly things were Christ. The pattern was purged in symbol, with the blood of bulls and goats, which could not take away sin. But the Heavens themselves, were purged with the better sacrifice, the blood of Christ.

So to say that we can't know what Paul's expression really means, and therefore we are at liberty to put some idea pulled out of the air on this, is to completely ignore context. The aspect of obedience was of fundamental importance. And of course Jesus had no moral iniquity to be redeemed from. But in order to say that this verse does not teach that Christ himself was redeemed by virtue of his own blood shedding sacrifice, which was an atonement for sin; is to ignore the verse, the words, and the context.

<sup>28</sup> No one denies the aspect which bro. Stone emphasizes. He just leaves out all the verses which prove that Christ did atone for all sin, including sin nature, when he offered his one great sacrifice.

<sup>29</sup> It is not ambiguous. Ambiguous means that you cannot tell the correct way to interpret it. It would be open to more than one interpretation. But the context here in this chapter defines the interpretation. The context is the comparison between the Mosaic patterns, and the heavenly Christ, who is the substance of those patterns. Under the law, when things are said to be redeemed or purged with blood, there is no ambiguity. We all know what that means. It means that the principles of the pouring out of blood, symbolic of the pouring out of life are recognized, and then the item is recognized as "purged" from the uncleanness of sin and death. With this being the context, anyone who cannot see the same thing in Christ redeemed by his blood is simply trying to introduce ambiguity where none exists to avoid the reasonable conclusion.

<sup>30</sup> "Succinct" means compact, or abbreviated. And the blood of Christ is a succinct expression. There are many aspects to it, some of which Bro. Stone affirms. The blood of the covenant, which he mentions is another aspect, one which will be dealt with shortly in this class. But none of these meanings eliminate the meaning that it was an atonement for sin nature, as bro. Stone suggests.

confirming the covenant. It was a covenant of life.

And here he entered by his own blood and we interpret it either God required it of him, because he was to die for others<sup>31</sup>, or it was required of him because his sin nature required a cleansing. But we can test those two theories. We know he died for us, but we can't find a place where it says he died for sin nature, and if that's the way we are going to interpret it, we place a strange interpretation upon it.

(Ellis Higham) You have mentioned that challenge a number of times Dick, that you can't find any place in Scripture that mentions this, and I have one statement to make about that challenge. Its been made before, and the way its been answered is this. The Bible doesn't say anywhere a number of things that we hold to be first principle, such as baptism. The Bible doesn't say that baptism isn't infant sprinkling. The Bible doesn't say that the dead will not suffer eternal torment, the Bible doesn't say that the devil isn't a personal being. But it doesn't mean that these things aren't so, and you throw that challenge out, but there are a number of Scriptures that would lead one to believe these things.

(John Hensley) We all agree that Christ's sacrifice on the cross on our behalf is a first principle. But that doesn't mean that every little detail connected with it would be. The fact that God exists, and is up in heaven and so on...is a first principle, but there are certain things related to him that we don't know and can never know until we are immortalized. There are things about Christ's sacrifice, his offering and so on, that I don't think are in the realm of first principle.<sup>32</sup>

If a person believes, I think that Christ offered himself as a sacrifice on behalf, and that in doing so he himself obtained redemption as a forerunner, that's a word that we need to use. Christ was a forerunner. He was first. Like a big boat. First a little boat goes to land and then in a big boat he comes back and takes the others. Christ as a fore-runner first obtained eternal redemption for himself then we get into...

If you realize that and in believing in that: that God has offered us salvation on the basis of that, I don't think you have to know all these little ins and out and details, and hypotheses and this and that.

In this verse, by his own blood he entered in once for all. Real stuff. It was once for all<sup>33</sup>,

---

<sup>31</sup> Bro. Stone misses the point. The verse specifically says he redeemed himself. It is not talking about others. There is no possibility of it referring to others. "He obtained in himself eternal redemption. So to suggest that this refers to others is to get back to the churches definition that the King James translators tried to get us to believe in the first place. The whole point here is that he redeemed himself.

<sup>32</sup> This aspect must be a first principle for it alters the entire plan of salvation. Consider just in what we have gone over so far, that bro. Stone teaches that the devil is sin, in the sense of transgression. We believe that the devil is human nature. Bro. Stone teaches that the flesh, by itself is not an evil thing. We teach that in the flesh dwells no good thing. Bro. Stone teaches that sin is only symbolically condemned in the sacrifice of Christ. We teach that it is actually condemned. Bro. Stone teaches that when we see God exhibited as right and just in requiring Christ to go up on the cross, we are seeing a symbol. We say, that if Christ was not actually made sin for us, in being made sin nature; then what we would see on the cross was an innocent man, one not subject to the death he died, (for the wages of sin is death, if there was no sin in Christ, his death was wrong) being required to do so by God. This would be an exhibition of injustice, not justice. Paul says that this exhibition is the basis for the forgiveness of our sins. This must therefore be not only a first principle, but the first principle upon which all others hinge. Hence bro. Roberts called it the hub of the wheel.

<sup>33</sup> Here again we have a translation out of air. The expression "for all" does not mean for all people, as bro. Hensley suggests. It means once for all time. The Greek expression is "apax" meaning "once, or once only" (Liddle and Scott) and "epi" a particle used to strengthen the meaning of a word. "Apax epi" then means only one time,

including himself. But now, if you take him apart from us and say oh, well he'd have had to do the same thing just for himself alone; now I don't think that's a first principle. Your getting into territory in which you might call hypothetical. And I don't think its necessary to know all those little ins and outs. Now if it was, you'd have almost nobody to be saved.

You know, what is a first principle? A first principle, the main thing about it. But the little odds and ends, or details surrounding a ..., there's lots of little details that may not be first principle. But every little thing...

Now whether Christ would have had to do the same thing in relation to himself personally as an individual, that he has had to do in dying for us, in connecting us with him. Whether he would have had to do the same thing I don't think its a first principle. I don't think it matters. I don't care about it. And I'm not going to agree to any statement that definitely makes that a test of fellowship, because I don't think it should be.

(Aud 2) Why was it made one? In the constitution, now I tend to agree with what you are saying. You can strain something too far. And this issue is one of those issues. But why was it made a first principle in the constitution, the Christadelphian constitution?

(John Hensley) Well, I don't think it is.

(Aud 2) Read clause 8. Its pretty definite in clause 8. Read it. Its pretty definite.

(Ellis Higham) And by dying abrogated the law of condemnation for himself and all those who believe and obey him. I think that's very clear.

(John Hensley) I agree with that.<sup>34</sup>

(Richard Stone) Why certainly. I agree with that.

(John Hensley) I agree with that. There was a law of mortality and so he was mortal. Now the law of condemnation that he inherited was not a legal condemnation, it was a physical one. He inherited death, he inherited...if you go ahead and read the whole thing it says in there that he inherited the death that passed upon all men.

(Aud 2) In wearing their condemned nature.

(John Hensley) All right, that's difficult. That's difficult<sup>35</sup>. I agree with that completely, and now he inherited mortality, all right. How was mortality...

(Ellis Higham) Only? we already talked last week you remember, about clause 5 which we agreed that the physical law in his being was more than mortality. We agree to that last week.

---

emphasizing that Christ's one sacrifice was the great sacrifice, and all others, past and future only have value as they have their root in this one great sacrifice. It would be more equivalent to our common saying of "once and for all". That means only once, as related to time, not as related to a multitude of people.

<sup>34</sup> Bre. Stone and Hensley say that they agree with this but watch the difficulty they will have. They have been disagreeing all through this that the law of condemnation had any relationship to his sacrificial death. They will say, later in this class, that the law of condemnation is changed when Jesus was immortalized. They say they agree, then they go out of their way to cut up this clause to change the meaning of the clause. Could they accept the clause the way it is written? Clearly not. But most importantly, you will see that the clause will be brushed aside, and how the difficulties their views have with this clause will not be addressed.

<sup>35</sup> -Its difficult to bro. Hensley, because he doesn't believe that the nature is the subject of condemnation. He believes that it is mortal. He believes that we must die. But they cannot view the nature having any relationship to sin, so the term "condemn nature" is a problem to him which he must explain away, so that he can agree with the clause.

(John Hensley) More than mortality? Why, he didn't inherit anything legal or moral surely? Well, if he didn't inherit a legal or moral condemnation, all that's left is mortality, with the impulses to sin in his members. They called it, the physical attribute, his flesh. I don't know what...

(Many voices talking over each other)

(John Hensley)<sup>36</sup> May I say one thing here that might just clear everything up. You know, we talk a lot about the penalty of sin nature. You know the penalty of sin nature is built right into our physical beings. Dying, thou shalt die. When Adam transgressed, he was sentenced to mortality when he invoked the physical attribute of the flesh. He had put on what we call sin nature and with that sin nature, death, the wages of sin are death, which is where we inherit it from.

Now, we inherit sin nature, and we inherit the penalty for it, goes right along with it. If we ask, what is the penalty for it, go to a funeral. There is the person, there is the penalty. Or go to a hospital. A person is in pain...or a person just got into an accident. All those things of life, that's the penalty. Its built in physically in the body. And there is a difference between the penalty of sin nature, which we inherit and when we commit transgressions which we might have deserved, you know... Even criminals when they commit certain crimes receive the death penalty by law.

There is a difference between the penalty of sin nature, the sin nature we inherit, the penalty we inherit and that which we become guilty of in relation to transgression. There's a difference. Now we commit transgression. We inherit the penalty of sin, sin nature, in that we grow old and die.

Now everyone then right on down the line from Adam and Eve, right on down to Christ lives a little while and dies...Abraham and all.

The law of condemnation called sin or sin nature put them all right in the grave. There they go. Christ broke this law of condemnation when he was resurrected.<sup>37</sup> That's where he is.

---

<sup>36</sup> Note how the topic gets changed here. Clause 8 is particularly difficult for clean flesh teachers to get around, for it teaches that through the death of Christ, the law of condemnation was abrogated. Since the only thing they think happens to this "law of condemnation" is a change in nature which occurs at immortalization, they cannot understand it being described as the result of his death.

Now, bro. Thomas is very clear that the law of condemnation is canceled at death. In his work, "The One Great Offering" bro. Thomas dealt with the question this way: "*When was the Jesus Altar purified; the Jesus Mercy Seat sprinkled with sacrificial blood, and the Jesus Holies of Holies lustrated?* After the Veil of his flesh was rent, and before he awoke at the early dawn of the third day.--(Mark 15:37,38; John 19:34). Since the only thing that the Jesus Heavlies needed purification from was the sin which God had made him to be (2 Cor. 5:21); the purification bro. Thomas is speaking of is his purification from sin nature. This occurred, after his flesh was torn, and before he rose to life. Hence, the law of condemnation was abrogated by dying.

Some brethren have viewed this clause slightly different. They have said that the expression "by dying" is a succinct (to borrow from bro. Stone) expression which includes his perfect obedient life, his sacrificial death, his resurrection to life, and his glorification. Therefore the effects of Adamic Condemnation, as being anything meaningful, were canceled at death; but the actual removal of Adamic Condemnation was not accomplished until resurrection. There is no objection to this. It matters little when Adamic Condemnation is actually changed, providing it is recognized that the change is in virtue of the sacrificial death of Christ, as clause 8 says.

<sup>37</sup> Here is the changing of the phrase to which I referred to earlier. He broke the law of condemnation when he was resurrected (really he believes its when he was immortalized, as will become apparent later. But the clause says "by dying" he abrogated the law of condemnation. His sacrificial death was responsible for his redemption from sin nature.

He's up in heaven. The law of condemnation couldn't have been anything moral. It would have ruined Christ. It had to be physical. What you inherit is mortality, is mortality with the impulses to sin.

(Aud 2) Nobody...we believe that when he conquered death he conquered sin nature, but what your saying, he conquered the reward of sin nature?

(John Hensley) Well the law of condemnation then would be mortality with the impulses to sin.

(Richard Stone) He abrogated this when he was raised from the dead, of course.

(Aud 2) Can I have a definition of the word abrogated?

(Richard Stone) Disannulled, made of none effect.

(John Hensley) If a law was made and its set aside and rendered null and void, it has been abrogated. Its been disannulled, canceled.

(Aud 1) Would you say it was an incorrect statement to say that the wages of sin nature is death?

(John Hensley) Well I think Paul was meaning much more than that. There he is talking about the committing of sins. Death at the judgement seat would be the judgement of sins.

(Aud 1) Merely having sin nature wouldn't hold you in the grave?

(Richard Stone) No, no. Mortality can only claim your death, that's why it couldn't hold Christ in the grave.

(John Hensley) I could give, this is not the time and I'm not allowed to do it but when the time comes I'm going to give you a statement by Robert Roberts that will say exactly what we say, that it couldn't hold you by itself, you had to have transgression.

(Richard Stone) Well lets get off dead center on this passage here, shall we? By his own blood. We can interpret that one or two ways but we must be sure we place a construction on it that harmonizes with the rest of Scripture.

You got Heb. 13:20 so lets go to page 4 shall we that's where I got the blood of the everlasting covenant. Heb. 13:20. "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, make you perfect in every good work" and so forth.

Now it mentions the bringing of Christ from out of the grave through the blood of the everlasting covenant. And what does this mean. Well first of all, we know that blood shedding was required to confirm a covenant. Look at Heb. 6:16. It was man's way of making a thing sure. "For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for the confirmation is to them an end to all strife." And in Gal. 3:15 also.<sup>38</sup>

But the reason that God makes a covenant is because of man's weakness. In the first case, in Genesis. Go back to Gen. 15 here where we find the confirmation of the covenant made with

---

That is what clause 8 says, and bre. Stone and Hensley could not accept that, so they will change it just enough that they can say the do accept it.

<sup>38</sup> This is confusing. Many if not all oaths made between men were not made with blood. Only covenants which God made, which were made with oaths were confirmed with blood. And it wasn't the oath God made which required blood shedding, but the covenant, for reasons to be dealt with later.

Abraham. Abraham asked in Gen. 15:8, "Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it? God had just told him that he would bring him out of the land and so forth and his seed should be as numerable as the stars of heaven. And so God, in the ensuing verses makes a covenant with him and he confirms the covenant. And in verse 15: "thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age."

So by this Abraham was given assurity that God would bring to pass his covenant. But it was a condescension to Abraham's weakness of faith that God made this covenant with him. Because the truth of the matter is that God's word is immutable. If he promises something, he doesn't have to have a covenant in order to bring the promise to pass. In Num. 23:19 it says, "God is not a man that he should lie, or the son of man" and so forth.

Look at Isa. 55, and notice what it says concerning God's word there in a verse very well known to us. Yes, would you read that v. 11 for us please. You might read all the way down to eleven.

(Aud 3) "For as the heavens are higher than the earth so are my ways higher than you ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

(Richard Stone) So God's word would never fail. When it came to Abraham, go up to the sixth chapter of Hebrews now, in regard to Abraham, God made promises to Abraham and confirmed it by an oath. Now why? Does God have to confirm something by an oath in order to make it binding? When he speaks, is it not going to be done? Look what he says here, v. 13.

"For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater he swear by himself, Saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath."

Its because of the weakness of human nature that God entered into an oath, and entered into the confirmation of the covenant. "That by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us:".

So God has stooped to meet the weakness of man on the account of sin. Look at the ninth chapter of Hebrews. The covenant remember, was made for the benefit of transgressors. When God made the covenant of Abraham, it was made for the benefit of transgressors. In v. 20 saying, "this is the blood of the testament" or covenant, "which God hath enjoined upon you."

And you remember that Christ connected the covenant, the confirmation of the covenant and the shedding of his blood and the remission of sins, in Matt. 26:28. He ties it together here. "This is the covenant of my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins".

Because the promise and the covenant were made for sinners. They were made for men who under no other circumstances could gain life eternal. And so God built into the everlasting covenant a means by which our sins could be forgiven, and so Christ said this is my blood of the everlasting covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins. So he died to confirm the covenant which is the everlasting covenant and it was part again of his obedience. And so if sinners were going to participate in the covenant, provisions had to be made by God in this

covenant for this forgiveness and therefore blood shedding was involved.<sup>39</sup> And the blood shedding was the blood of Christ. But as he said, it is a covenant in my blood which is given for the remission of sins of many. For others.

Now Christ of course benefited from his death. He was brought from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant inasmuch as that was required of him. Listen, he had to shed his blood to confirm the covenant. But it was shed, as he indicates here, for many. For others. Not on behalf of his own self except in a secondary sense that God required it of him. And if he hadn't shed his blood to confirm the covenant and made way for the forgiveness of men's sins his resurrection would have been out of the question.<sup>40</sup>

Now we can have comment on Heb. 13:20, if you don't agree with that explanation. Or you want to add something to it.

(Ellis Higham) Do I understand you correctly to say in chapter 9:20 the blood of the testament is the Abrahamic covenant that he's talking about here?

(Richard Stone) No, no. But a covenant does require blood. And there was the shedding of blood for the first covenant.

(Ellis Higham) That's not the one your talking about here.

(Richard Stone) No, this is talking about the Mosaic. But it was an illustration, and the new covenant also had to be confirmed by the shedding of blood. He is a mediator of the new covenant that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. They could only gain that inheritance by having a provision made, built into that covenant for the forgiveness of sins. And so it was built in by the shedding of his blood.

(John Hensley) That's why he had to come under the curse of the Mosaic Law. Through an action, not born to, but an action, voluntary action so that he had suffered the curse so he could save those who believe and obey Christ. He suffered it under the law.

(Richard Stone) So if he, what I said is of course true, is it not? You would have to agree with it, that there had to be built into the covenant the means for forgiveness, for the transgressions made under the first covenant. And this involved the shedding of his blood. That's why he said this is the new covenant in my blood, shed for many for the remission of sins.

So when you read Heb. 13:20 now, "Now the God of peace who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great shepherd of the sheep through the blood of the everlasting covenant," If he hadn't shed his blood for the everlasting covenant and provided a means for forgiveness of transgressions, he wouldn't have been raised from the dead.

But this does not say what people think it says, that he offered for sin nature. Or blood was required for his sin nature. We have to think this, we're begging the question when we come to a verse like this and say this proves.

You know, christendom makes the mistake of attempting to prove false doctrine by taking an ambiguous verse and placing a plausible explanation upon it that harmonizes with their theory and proves their theory true, which is nonsense. You don't prove your theory by taking a

---

<sup>39</sup> This is correct that sin made blood shedding necessary in the confirmation of the covenant. If bro. Stone had built his argument upon this, he would not eliminate Christ from the work his blood shedding sacrifice accomplished. Paul did not. That is why Paul says that what happened to Christ, happened through the blood of the everlasting covenant.

<sup>40</sup> We have already commented many time on the "secondary" way in which bro. Stone believes Christ benefitted from his death. Not that it was atonement, but that it was simply an act of obedience.



difficult passage and giving it a plausible explanation in harmony with it. That doesn't prove anything. You must first of all prove the first principle, then you can interpret difficult passages in harmony with it. But you can't put the cart before the horse.

(John Hensley) The everlasting covenant that was given to Abraham, was contrasted with the Mosaic, isn't that right?

(Richard Stone) Right. But you know Gal. 3:15 says that even a man's covenant is annulled, cannot be disannulled. It's man's way of making sure of his word. But God didn't have to do this. God doesn't lie.

And as John said, he goes on to say that this covenant was 430 years before the giving of the law, certainly superseded the law. The law couldn't disannul it, it couldn't take it out of the way. It was a temporary measure added because of transgressions. Then it was taken out of the way, with that first covenant still existing. So it exists till the present day.

(Ellis Higham) Would you say a shepherd is kind of like another chapter of Hebrews describes, as a forerunner, the low man in a ship, the little dingy that goes in with the anchor into the harbor and then the ship is pulled in afterwards? Wouldn't a shepherd fulfill the same kind of a function?

(John Hensley) A forerunner is.

(Ellis Higham) To me its still proven then. If a forerunner, he must have done it for himself too. We would still follow.

(Richard Stone) Well lets look at it this way. He must have had sins to forgive then, else he couldn't have been our forerunner. That's what you are saying.

(Ellis Higham) No. Your coming from a different premise that he didn't offer for sin nature, I'm saying that he did.

(Richard Stone) But the premise must be built upon fact, not upon conjecture. But the thing is that if he's going to be exactly like us, then he had to have sins that had to be forgiven so that he too, could benefit from the everlasting covenant just as we do. But that's nonsense. He didn't have any sins. So obviously he benefited but in a different way.

(John Hensley) I've said time and time again that the sin nature of Christ needed corrected. He had sin nature, the impulses to sin in his members, it was corrected. We call that sin nature, that settles it. I've said time and time again that the sin nature of Christ qualified him to die as our representative, sin bearer, but was not the reason why he was condemned to die on the cross. It qualified him because he was raised up for that purpose. Had he been just brought into the world as an individual apart from the covenant made with Abraham and apart from us, I don't know what God would require? But in this case since he was brought in to do something so that the Abrahamic covenant could be brought to the force which involved the forgiveness of sins and that was...he had to be qualified to die for us.

Animals couldn't really, they couldn't. His sin nature qualified him.

(Aud 2) Was there nothing evil or nothing wrong, I'm not saying Christ was evil, or sin or anything like that; was there nothing wrong with even the impulse itself, that required blood: was there nothing evil in the impulse? Even though he did not go beyond that point that you talk about, was there nothing evil about the actual impulse itself that needed to atone?

(Richard Stone) No.<sup>41</sup>

(John Hensley) Look at this. God made Christ the way he wanted him. Exactly the way he wanted him. Now we're the seedlings of Adam. We just happen along the way in the voyage. This wasn't true of him. He was begotten of the Holy Spirit specifically. God wouldn't make him anything evil or sinful.

(Many voices talking over each other)

(John Hensley) Now here is the thing. He had impulses to sin in his members. He had to have those impulses.

(Aud 2) Are the impulses to sin, sin?

(John Hensley) No, the impulses are not of sin in themselves, if held in check. They become a sin when unchecked and they go too far.<sup>42</sup> Just how far that is he knew, but I don't always know. I'm too blind. I probably do things when I don't even know it. He didn't. He kept everything in check all the time. It was essential. He had to have our human nature in order to qualify and die for us. And then he was taught, he knew sometime before he was baptized, he found out that God has appointed a certain kind of death for him to die.

Now Christ inherited the same dying thou shalt die or the natural death that we all inherit. The same thing. Left to himself, he would have grown and died, but that wouldn't have accomplished us one thing. He had to die the certain kind of a death that God had in mind, that death on the cross. And that was typified when he submitted to baptism. When he submitted to his baptism he accepted that kind of a death, everything that God had appointed for him. And that's the reason why when he came up out of the water, God said, this is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased.

He had just accepted it publicly. He exhibited it publicly out for everybody, he submitted to that kind of a death. So whenever he came forth God anointed him with the Holy Spirit without measure, and from that point on until he submitted to the death on the cross, he was a full representation of God in character.

Now how could it be sinful for him to have the nature if it was sinful. Now how could it be if God made him exactly that way and said this is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased. Now God never intended for him to keep that nature. Just wear it long enough till he redeemed himself from it. That ought to stow any charge or accusation of clean flesh. He was to keep that nature until he had redeemed himself from it and us along with him. Don't forget that

---

<sup>41</sup> This is a direct attack on the nature of man by bro. Stone. To deny that man is essentially evil, is to disagree with the Apostle Paul who lamented, "Oh wretched man that I am". Paul's perception of the matter was sharper than bro. Stone's. He wrote: "ROM 7:18 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.

Paul recognized in his flesh a will which was contrary to God. It is this will, or sin nature which is evil, and causes us to do "that which we would not". Jesus, had this same will, common to all men. In the garden prior to his crucifixion, he lamented "not my will, but thine be done," an admission that he like Paul had a will which was contrary to the will of God. Being contrary to God's will, our own will, which exists "in me, that is, in my flesh" can be nothing but evil.

<sup>42</sup> The impulses are not sin, in the sense of something moral, or legal. They are not of themselves transgressions, nor do they alienate us from God in any moral sense. But they are the source of sin, called in the scriptures "sin in the flesh". Sin had to be in the flesh of Jesus, in order for it to be condemned there. Therefore, the impulses themselves had to be sin, in the physical sense. Bre. Stone and Hensley deny this aspect of sin. The apostle Paul says "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom 14:23) The impulses are of the flesh, not of faith. The impulses therefore, are sin, though they are not transgressions, and they are not held against us in any meaningful way. But as sin, they required the perfect sacrifice for atonement, and also as the key to demonstrating what is due to sin.

we're along with him.<sup>43</sup>

When he died to obtain redemption we go along with him so that, it was his dying for us that necessitated the kind of death that he had to die. And God made his dying for us the basis of his own salvation. Two tied in together, they both, like the head and the body. Christ and the saints together. Now how can you see any difficulty at all in this.

(Aud 1) Could you explain that so a ten year old can understand that for me?

(John Hensley) Well, there are probably many 40 and 50 year olds who don't understand that.

(Richard Stone) Can we go on to another station here? Les mentioned Rom. 3:25 and I'd like you to turn to page 6 of the outline and talk about this passage of Scripture step by step. And see what you think of this explanation. Stan, would you read that little prologue, that little explanation for us? God's righteousness declared. The quotation is the Revised Version. Note that very carefully 'cause its a little different from the AV.

(Aud 1) In the divine arrangement for the salvation of mankind, the declaration of the righteousness of God had to be publicly exhibited. The Father, in order that repentant sinners might be saved, must be revealed as consistent with His own holiness and righteousness; mercy could not be blind to righteousness. Since the offering under the law could not and were not intended to truly remove sins, being only shadows and types, the time would come when God would have to deal directly with sin. This He did when He offered up His own Son. The verses in the third chapter of Romans, quoted below clearly and succinctly reveal the reason why Christ was required to shed his blood on the cross. They show to us that the ritual of the sin offering was continued and fulfilled in the death of Christ.

(Richard Stone) Why don't you read that. This is a little different form, this, but its a better translation.

(Aud 1) But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to shew his righteousness because of the passing over of sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the shewing, I say, of his righteousness, at this present season; that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.

(Richard Stone) Now Stan, I'd like to go down and consider each point of this, then throw it open for discussion, and then bring our class to a conclusion.

But first of all, justification of repentant sinners is first of all freely. And that means to us that its wholly unmerited by any acts that we might do. Justification is definitely on the basis of faith. And there are a number of Scriptures to indicate this.

But I'd like to go on to B there. Jesus was the propitiatory place. And the word translated propitiation means a propitiatory place. It is translated mercy seat in Heb. 9:5. Now the mercy

---

<sup>43</sup> It certainly would end the charge of "clean flesh" if bro. Hensley used the word "redeem" the way that the Mosaic Law used the word redeemed, that is, atonement through blood shed for the uncleanness of sin. But he limits these terms to mean only that his nature was changed, not that it was purged from the sin God made him to be (2 Cor. 5:21). Therefore, we continue to affirm that the teaching of bre. Stone and Hensley is "clean flesh". It is agreed that they differ some from the 1873 version of "Clean Flesh", but only so much as that in 1873 they taught that Christ had an undefiled nature, while the rest of man kind had "sin nature" from which they needed redemption. Bre. Stone and Hensley teaches that no one needs purging from sin nature. In both cases, they deny that the nature needs cleansed, and it must therefore be clean, by their own definitions.

seat was a lid of the ark. And there were two Cherubic symbols above this, made of gold. And God chose to appear to Moses to speak to the children of Israel from between the Cherubim above the mercy seat. And we find this in Ex. 22; Psa. 80. It speaks of God shining forth before the, between the Cherubim or above the mercy seat.

But this is the way that God usually communed with Israel, through the mercy seat. But now, only through the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the propitiatory place. It is only in Christ that you and I can be reconciled to God. He communicates with us through the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the way, the truth, and the light.

So we can agree, at least down through B-2, that God meets with us now through Jesus Christ. He is our mercy seat, he is our touch stone. God meets the repentant sinner of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now then, we must have faith through his blood. Now the declaration of God's righteousness could only be accomplished on the basis of his shed blood. It required the violent death that Christ suffered upon the cross. Now Paul says that this is so because of the passing over of sins done aforetime. And our translation says for the remission of sins. But the word remission there means let by, implying that God would not at that time deal with them. For 4,000 years God had past over sins that were past. He had not dealt with them directly. He dealt with them in shadows and types.

But now the time came for God to absolutely declare his righteousness, by declaring I mean to reveal it, and Heb. 9:15 tells us that he sheds his blood for the remission of sins committed under the first covenant. And, God would forebear those sins that were past, he past over them for 4,000 years. But the death of Christ and the shedding of his blood was necessary now to show that God was not tolerant to sins. That he would not condone iniquity. So he did this, he shed his blood to show his righteousness at this present season, that he, himself might be just.

Now, of course God is already just. But the death of Christ was to indicate and declare for the whole world to see that he was a just God, that he was a righteous God, that he was not tolerant to sin. Remember that I said, that the ritualism of the law converged and was repeated in the death of Christ. His death upon the cross was an offering for sin that declared God's judgement upon sin. Here is how God would deal with sin. So now God was dealing with sin at this present time, and he had passed over sin aforetime, in view of this present declaration of his righteousness in the death of his son.

So this had to be done before God could be revealed as righteous, but also he could then be the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Only when God's judgement on sin was vindicated by the repentant sinner, that is recognized and upheld, could God then justify repentant sinners, the justifier of them that believe in Jesus. And according to Paul, apart from this declaration God could not righteously condemn sins.

God could not just side step the offering for sin, the Lord Jesus Christ...said I'll forgive you, because his righteousness could not permit him to do this. He had to first of all declare and display to the world that He was a righteous God, and that he was not tolerant to sin, and therefore he demonstrated this in the sin offering. And Rom. 3:25-26 is telling us, is that the death of Christ was for the purpose of revealing God as a righteous God in no way tolerant to sin, that God might be revealed as righteous, and that he might be the justifier of them that believeth in Jesus.

The death of Christ provided a basis upon which God could uncompromisingly forgive us our sins. There was no compromise of any of the principles of God's righteousness in the

forgiveness of our sins, if we come to it on the basis of Jesus Christ crucified.<sup>44</sup> Not because sin nature required it. But it was an offering for sins. It demonstrated in the ritual and ceremony of the sin offering what was due sin. And this ritually and ceremonially attested to, when you and I are baptized into Christ. We join with him in death. We declare that what he suffered physically upon the cross was that of which we are worthy. Actually, morally because we are sinners.

So we say to God that God is just in demanding death of us, a violent death and then God will forgive us. So we join with Christ and God forgives us for his sake. Because of what has been accomplished in him.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> To this point, bro. Stone's explanation is perfect. If he would only seriously consider the things he said, he could then understand why sin nature must be included. He has also correctly stated that to this point, God has only dealt with sin in types and shadow. This appears to be different from his earlier statements, that when sacrifices were offered, the sins were actually forgiven, the chemical reaction he previously taught. But perhaps there is a way that his statements can be harmonized.

<sup>45</sup> We now come to the single most important point of this discussion. Its a shame that the time for the class ran out before these points could have been brought up to bro. Stone. But this will show why it is that we cannot fellowship the view that bro. Stone has.

God said through Paul that the wages of sin is death. (Rom 6:23) Yet God required Christ, who did no sin, to die the death that he died. And while some in the past with views similar to bro. Stone have disputed this, it is clear that God did require Jesus to die the death that he died. It is clear from Rom. 8:32 (He that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all) and from Jesus's own testimony in John 10:18 "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." God commanded Jesus to go up on the cross and die the death which he did. And remember, death is the wages of sin.

Now then, when we see Jesus upon the cross, when we see this exhibited to the world, and that is what the word "declare" in the King James version really means, it means exhibited; when we see Jesus on the cross, required to be there by God; we must see God as righteous and just in requiring this *or we have no basis for the forgiveness of our sins.*

If bro. Stone is correct, and Jesus did not need to die the blood shedding sacrifice for sin nature which he died; then how could God be right and just for requiring it of him? Jesus didn't sin personally, so there is no possibility of God requiring his sacrificial death for the redemption of personal transgressions. Yet God required him to die the death that he died. And not only so, but we must recognize that what God did was right and just. But if there was no sin in Jesus, then it simply was not right or just for him to be on the cross.

Lets put it another way. The state of Texas condemns murder. And so it takes murderers, and executes them, showing what is due to murderers. And most people in this state look at the actions of the state, and say yes, the state is right and just in the way it deals with murderers.

What if the state looked for a volunteer, a man who did no murder, and sent him up to be executed in a public manner. And the state issued a decree that said, "Now everyone direct your attention to this exhibition. The State of Texas condemns murder. And to show all you folks that the State of Texas condemns murder, we will take this man, who has volunteered to represent murder; and figuratively lay all the murders that have ever been committed on him: and we will through this ceremony, execute him. And all you good people of the state of Texas will look on this exhibition this day, and say yes, the state is right and just in its condemnation of murder, as exhibited to us this day."

What would the people of Texas, or any other state, say? Wouldn't there be an outcry such as never was heard before about the injustice and the unrighteousness of the state in executing, (whether he had volunteered or not,) a man who had not committed a murder. It would be a sham, and everyone would know it. There would be no justice, no righteousness in such an act.

And yet this is precisely the case with bro. Stone's explanation of our sins figuratively laid upon Jesus. If sin was not

And of course Rom. 6 declares this in the chapter we often read at baptism. We are buried by Christ into his death. By revealing God a God of righteousness who would not tolerate sin and demonstrating what was due sin. And rightly due us. Now let's have some comments on this.

(Ellis Higham) What you said here, Dick brings up a point that not only myself but two other people who were at the class last week, but are not at the class this week without any discussion among ourselves, all had the same question but we didn't get to ask it last week directly on this issue, so perhaps it's better to ask that question now. If in fact the sacrifice of Christ only did something ritually, then we are still under types and shadows.<sup>46</sup>

For 4,000 years it was ritual in that it was a type and shadow pointing forward to the fact that something was going to be literally done. And if in fact sin's flesh was not actually condemned, if it wasn't really done somehow then we are still living under types and shadows. It had to really be done otherwise the law of Moses is still pointing forward.

(Richard Stone) Well how are sins remitted at the cross? If Christ had no sins, how are they forgiven? How did he deal with them?

---

literally, and actually there in the body of Jesus, then it was wrong for God to have required his death on the cross. It wouldn't be right or just to require a sinless man to die a sinner's death.

Now the rightness and the justness of God's actions in this case, is the only basis that the Scriptures gives us for the forgiveness of sins. By bro. Stone's definition, there could be nothing right or just in God requiring Jesus to die and therefore his interpretation of the matter has no power to forgive sins. This cannot and must not, be tolerated in fellowship. It is absolutely destructive to the only basis of hope we have, the forgiveness of our sins.

The following is by bro. John Carter in 1940, written at the time when he was trying to get the Bereans to unite with Central fellowship. Bro. A.D. Strickler had just died. And bro. Carter was laying the foundation for what eventually became the division of 1952. We do not quote bro. Carter as an authority. He was, in my opinion, the one ultimately responsible for the Clean Flesh teaching of bro. Strickler reaching such prominence in Central. But before he had begun to teach or at least support "Clean Flesh" himself, and while trying to appeal to the Berean brethren he wrote this. This was in response to an article in the "Fraternal Visitor", a Suffolk Street fellowship publication. (Suffolk Street was brought into Central on a majority vote basis in 1956.) The "Fraternal Visitor" argued that "Christ was not 'made sin' until he hung upon the cross." Bro. Carter wrote: "The Truth is only maintained by faithful contention, and however much we dislike contention, earnest men do not hesitate to contend for the Faith...It has been sound Christadelphian teaching from the days of Dr. Thomas that *Jesus was 'made sin' by being born a member of the human family*...Jesus by birth was 'made sin'...If he was not *related to sin*, either in NATURE or character, then a grave injustice was done when he was allowed to suffer on the cross, and there was no declaration of God's righteousness...The publishing of such teaching reveals against the absence of that unity between the two sections without which *union is not possible*." (Chdn. 1940:40).

Bro. Carter says that if Jesus was not sin, either in nature or character, then it was wrong for him to be on the cross. As he clearly was not of a sinful character, he must have been literally made sin for the sacrifice to exhibit God's righteousness. Note also that bro. Carter says that there can be no fellowship with those who do not believe this. Bro. Carter changed, and brought not only the Suffolk Street groups into Central fellowship, but also the Shield groups one year later. In so doing he brought many, many brethren into fellowship, all who deny this point.

<sup>46</sup> Bro. Ellis Higham's point is right on target. If sin was only figuratively condemned, and this is what bre. Stone and Hensley mean when they say ritually and ceremonially condemned, then sin still has never actually been condemned by God. It was just another figurative example in 4000 years of figurative examples.

Though I quoted this from bro. Roberts in the first class, it bears repeating here. "If you say our sins were laid on him in the same way as they were laid on the sacrificial animals in the Mosaic system of things (which was a mere CEREMONIAL OR ARTIFICIAL IMPUTATIVENESS), *how comes it that those sacrifices* could never take away sins Heb. 10:2). And where then is the SUBSTANCE OF THE SHADOW? The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animal was the type. The REAL putting of sin on the Lamb of God IN THE BESTOWAL OF A PREPARED SIN-BODY wherein to die, is the substance. (Chdn. 1873).

(Ellis Higham) In the fact that he had the seeds of sin in his body. That's how it was publicly...

(Richard Stone) Exactly, he had sin nature. His sin nature represented sin, just as he represented us. But that which represented sin was not literally sin. If it were, then his resurrection would have been impossible.<sup>47</sup> He had to be absolutely righteous. Nothing could stand in the way of his resurrection.

(Ellis Higham) He was absolutely righteous. We're talking about the seeds of sin in his body being publicly condemned. The fact is that body was thinking flesh... Thinking flesh apart from the Spirit brings forth nothing but evil.

(Richard Stone) That made him qualify as our representative, the fact that he had sin's flesh.

(Ellis Higham) OK. And that's what was publicly, literally condemned to death on the cross, and if it wasn't really done there, then we're still living under types and shadows, like I say, two others wondered the same thing. If it were just a ritual, then we are still under types and shadows.

(Richard Stone) Christ exhibited physically on the cross, what was due sin. It was a physical demonstration of the way that God looked at sin and sinners. He died a transgressor's death. Now, if it weren't a ceremony or a ritual he would have to be a transgressor. But he wasn't. He represented transgressors. And therefore was ritually set forth. John, you want to say something?

(John Hensley) Yes, what's meant by ritual, that's a word that the most respected of all writers used, and the word, ceremonial, is the same. But sin, not sin nature, sin. If it just condemned sin nature alone, what about transgression? It's the following of sin that, in Rom. 6, "Henceforth we should not serve sin". That must mean, but what I was going to say, the reason why the word ritual and ceremonial is used with that is because sin isn't something that you could literally take out of a person and literally nail up to a cross, you can't do it. What you had to do was take a body and nail that body up on the cross and have it represent sin. First to do that, it had to have the sin nature, that's right. That's why sin nature qualified for it.

Now if you say it factually literally, absolutely was done, then you have to have sin itself, as something an element of, something that you would nail literally to the cross, you can't do that literally because you can't separate sin. It isn't an element, sin isn't.

(Richard Stone) It's an act. It's not something tangible.

(John Hensley) It's an impulse in the body. It exists really only in the body. Apart from a body of a person, sin wouldn't exist.

(Aud 2) Doesn't that take away from his being a propitiation and make it almost expiatory? Makes him an expiation for sin then, right?

(Richard Stone) Well, it is. It is an expiation. Making a satisfaction for sin. It makes satisfaction for sin. You know Christ was a sin bearer. And the sin that he bore were our sins. And he bore them to the cross. He could only bear them, since sin is not something you can touch, sins are the violation of God's law, therefore they have no material existence, so they could only be ritually exhibited on the cross in the nature that transgresses. And that nature that Christ bore represented sins, as he represents us. And therefore the flesh was nailed to the

---

<sup>47</sup> This makes no sense at all. If Jesus was made sin in his nature, and then he atoned for that nature in his death; and his death was that which could take away sin like the sacrifices of the law could not: what could hold him in the grave? It was his transgressions, because he didn't have any. It was sin nature, for that was covered in his perfect sacrifice. There was nothing therefore to keep him in the grave, and to say so is simply confusion.

cross, crucified, because we must crucify the flesh because from the flesh stems all transgression; but it had to be done in one who's absolutely sinless, that resurrection might follow. You can't take a literal sin and nail it to a cross.

END CLASS TWO