

DISCUSSION ON THE NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST
DISCUSSION LED BY RICHARD STONE
TRANSCRIPTION BY JIM PHILLIPS FROM A TAPE RECORDING
FOOTNOTES BY JIM PHILLIPS
CLASS 3

(First several minutes not available. Bro. Stone said that this would be the last class, and then began laying the foundation for his explanation of 1 Peter 2:24. He begins by asking sis. Beth Higham to read Num. 18:1.)

(Beth) And the Lord said unto Aaron, Thou and thy sons and thy father's house with thee shall bear the iniquity of the sanctuary: and thou and thy sons with thee shall bear the iniquity of your priesthood. Verse 23. But the Levite shall do the service for the tabernacle of the congregation, and they shall bear their iniquity: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations, that among the children of Israel they have no inheritance.

(Richard) Alright, lets go back to Ex. 28 now, then we'll look to see why its spoken of in such a way as this. Ex. 28:38. This was in regard to Aaron going into the holy place. Why don't you read verses 36-38.

(Stan) And thou shalt make a plate of pure gold, and grave upon it, like the engravings of a signet, HOLINESS TO THE LORD. And thou shalt put it on a blue lace, that it may be upon the mitre; upon the forefront of the mitre it shall be. And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the LORD.

(Richard) Alright. And one other reference, Lev. 10:17. John, would you read that for us?

(John) Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the LORD?

(Richard) Now the Holy Things that were offered to God were considered by God to be tainted with the uncleanness of the children of Israel.¹ But they did become holy when they were consecrated to God through the offering of the high priest. And the high priest could of course, handle these things, these offerings of the children of Israel, without becoming defiled as he carried out his position as high priest and mediator. And of course through the high priest and the manipulation of the blood of the body of the sin offering and so forth, the sins of the people were forgiven. They were forgiven because of the action of the high priest. And consequently, the high priest in a figure bore away their iniquities. Look over in the Lev. 16 on the day of atonement. We'll go into this a little more thoroughly but right now, I just wanted to point out one or two things.

¹ This is an important point to remember. Here we have physical items, things which could not sin, reckoned as defiled by sin by God because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and therefore requiring a sin offering. The question that is never addressed by bro. Stone is why then, is not the unclean nature of Jesus likewise reckoned as defiled simply by its inheritance of these same infirmities, and therefore requiring a sin offering (his own sin offering) for purification from this uncleanness?

We read the question in Job, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Jesus, born in the unclean line of Adam, Abraham, and David could be nothing but unclean: and therefore required purging through his own great sacrifice.

In v. 16 he had to make an atonement for the holy place because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. Now, he could do this and he could bear their iniquity, and bear the iniquity of the things offered by the children of Israel without becoming contaminated with them himself. And consequently he's spoken of as a sin bearer. Not only because of the uncleanness of these things offered by Israel because of their uncleanness, but also because through his own manipulation, and though his own service as high priest their sins were being forgiven.²

Now, in Isa. 53 we read about the Lord, he has carried our griefs, carried our sorrows and so

² There is lot's of confusion here. It is true that the signet or the frontal piece allowed for the High Priest to manipulate the offerings without becoming defiled. But when did Jesus antitypically put on the frontal piece? There are two views on the subject. One view (the one Bro. Stone will argue for) says that the High Priest wore the robes all the time, but on the Great Day of Atonement he took off the Priestly Apparel, and wore only the white linen garments into the Holy Place. The other view, as taught by bro. Roberts, argues that the High Priest DID wear the Priestly Apparel on the Great Day of Atonement. He taught that the frontal piece was the very last item which the High Priest put on in preparation for his sacrifice.

The difference is this. If the high priest wore the frontal piece all the time, then Jesus would not have been defiled by the sickness, illness, death, etc. that he came in contact with. If it was the last item he put on prior to making the sacrifices on the Great Day of Atonement, then we can see in the type that Jesus put on the final item, the frontal piece with the words "HOLINESS TO THE LORD" as his last act in life, when he offered up himself and entered into the antitypical Holy Place, which of course is Heaven itself. That is when he could not longer be defiled; when he offered his great sacrifice and then entered into heaven by his own blood to purify us from our sins.

That bro. Stone's view is not the case is proved two ways. First, as Paul says in 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." It was necessary that Jesus had something to offer for. What was it? He had no personal sins or transgression, so the only defilement he could have had was the unclean nature which he shared in common with the children of Israel. If he had the frontal piece on, he would have nothing to offer for. Paul would be wrong. Bro. Stone would be right. But that's absurd. The second point is that Jesus was subjected to the Mosaic offerings, just as the rest of Israel. Bro. Stone has argued that we never read of Jesus going to offer sacrifices, but this is not true; again, on two points. First, at the time of his birth, Luke records in 2:22 "And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord;". By checking your Diaglott, you will see that it should read, (as in the King James Margin) "And when the days of their purification etc...". Jesus required the same sacrifices that the rest of Israel did for what bro. Stone would call "ceremonial uncleanness". The fact that we don't read about it does not discount it as happening. If he had the frontal piece on his whole lifetime, he would not have required the sacrifice required by the law at birth. The second point is that the Jews could find nothing in their law to blame him for, yet their law required certain sacrifices. Had Jesus not kept the passover; had he not kept the ritual cleansings: they would have had plenty to accuse him of. It is not remarkable that we do not read of this, as he performed them (though we do read of him keeping the passover). But it would be remarkable had he not performed them, and the Jews not publicly blamed him for it.

But here in this section, bro. Stone is confusing his own views on the issue, arguing that the frontal piece protected him from defilement on the Great Day of Atonement (the subject matter of Lev. 16 from which he quotes) when even according to his own logic, Jesus should have had on the linen garments, and not the Priestly Apparel. He can't have it both ways. In his anxiety to show that Jesus was not defiled in any way, he sets him up to be defiled (if he followed his own logic) through shedding his blood in his great sacrifice. If he had not the frontal piece on when he offered his great sacrifice for us, then unlike the Mosaic pattern, he would have been defiled by the blood of his own sacrifice, which again, would be absurd. Bro. Robert's view is the one that fits, and bro. Stone's is proved wrong by the Scriptures.

forth. Now let's turn to Mat. 8: and we'll see that the healing of the sick by Jesus Christ is spoken of as bearing our sicknesses. Mat. 8:16-17.

(Don) When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.

(Richard) Now Christ did not become, you know, involved in these sicknesses to the extent that he himself became sick. But rather because it was through him that he was done away, it speaks of him as taking our infirmities and bearing our sicknesses.³

By the same token, he bears our sins in the sense that he provides a means by which they can be forgiven. And of course sickness is very closely associated with sin. It's the direct result of sin. And Christ when he healed those who were sick, (had infirmities); was illustrating visually to them, that he also had the power to forgive sins. And we saw this illustrated in our readings either today or yesterday when he told the man on the couch, thy sins be forgiven. And they reasoned among themselves, only God can forgive sins, but which is easier to say, thy sins be forgiven, or take up thy bed and walk. And so he commanded him to take up thy bed and walk. But it was an illustration to them that he also had the power to bear their sins away as well as their sicknesses.

Now this language, of course, is based on the day of atonement and I'd like for us to go back to Lev. 16 now. And here we find that the sons of Israel were ritually born away. And very often the language used in respect of Christ's redemptive work is figurative. And because it is figurative, it lends itself to different interpretations, it's very elastic. And we must be very cautious in utilizing these terms in a hostile manner that would stultify other teachings.⁴ Because

³ Christ did not "transfer" disease, or sin, from the body of the infirmed to his own body. This is not suggested by anyone except the Churches who believe that the literal sins of mankind were all laid upon Jesus. That is not the point. But the question in 1 Pet. 2:24 is how did Christ bear our sins. Dick says here that it was not by being involved in the sickness, but Paul says that he was. HEB 4:15; 5:1,2 "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity."

Jesus was literally compassed with our infirmities. He was tempted in all points like we are, which Paul calls our infirmity. Hence, when Jesus bore our sins to the tree, what he was literally bearing was our nature, and that is the subject of Paul's verse. So how did he bear our infirmities? In a symbolical sense as suggested by bro. Stone? Clearly not. He literally took part of our weak, humiliated nature so that he could have compassion on those suffering from our nature's inherent weaknesses, manifested in illness, death, and sin.

⁴ The language is figurative because the Mosaic law was figurative. But a figure, in order for it to be a figure, must represent a reality. The Mosaic law showed us in figure, what Jesus was literally going to do. It's true that in understanding the reality behind the figure, we must be sure that we do not put an interpretation upon it which plainly contradicts what is taught elsewhere. But where is it plainly stated that Jesus did not offer a sacrifice for the physical principle of sin, called "sin in the flesh"? If that cannot be found (and it can't) how can it be said that our interpretation contradicts it?

Indeed, our interpretation agrees with the teachings of Paul, that Jesus was made to be sin, that he condemned sin in the flesh, that he of necessity had somewhat for to offer, that he was purged by the blood of his own sacrifice: all phrases which bro. Stone must spiritualize, or strain and invent terms in order to get away from their meanings.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 4

some figures of speech, if they are pressed too far, can really be unreasonable. Now here in the 16th chapter lets read verses 7-10, to begin with.

(Aud) And he shall take the two goats, and present them before the LORD at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the LORD, and the other lot for the scapegoat. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the LORD'S lot fell, and offer him for a sin offering. But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the LORD, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness.

(Richard) And verse 15 also.

(Aud) Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the vail, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat:

(Richard) This is after he had killed the bullock for his own sins, and for his household and then he offered a goat for the sins of the people. And he manipulated the blood of the goat the same as he did the blood of the bullock. Now lets read verses 20 - 22.

(Aud) And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat: And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.

(Richard) Now both of these goats represented different aspect of reconciliation, redemption. The first goat that was offered for a sin offering, explained or demonstrated to the Israelites the means of expiation involved in the shedding of blood. It was a goat for the sin offering. But the second goat, which was the scape goat which in Hebrew was "Azazel", signifying a goat of departure. That is they let him go into the wilderness. And this expressed the effect of expiation. So the one goat expressed the means by which their redemption was effected, the second, the results of that expiation which was to have their sins carried away into the wilderness.

Meanwhile, he offers us a figure, as an explanation of a figure. How ridiculous. A figure only has meaning if it types a reality. This is simple logic. Bro. Stone's logic is identical to that used by the churches to explain away the establishment of the kingdom on Earth. They make a figurative prophesy, represent a figurative kingdom; and tell us what is really meant is heaven. Bro. Stone gives us a figurative prophesy (the Mosaic law) and tells us it represents a figurative destruction of transgression; but what is really meant is that sin is really taken away. Using this method of interpretation, anything could be proved. You have no justifiable basis for any interpretation. Everything is suspect. Anything can be said to be figurative. Any interpretation is possible.

No, the Bible is to be understood literally, unless we have firm, solid reason to believe otherwise. When God said that He made Jesus to be sin; when God said that for sin, He condemned sin in the flesh of Jesus; these are literal expressions. They are not prophesies. They are not parables. They are not found in the middle of symbolical speech. They do not contradict anything told us elsewhere. There is no reason for allowing a figurative explanation of these things to stand, anymore than we should accept that the promises made to Abraham to be only figuratively applied to the Earth.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 5

And in Psa. 103:12 it says as far as the east is from the west, so far shall he remove our transgressions from us. The Israelites could visually comprehend the removal of their sins. Of course we know that sins cannot be transmitted; transgressions cannot be taken from the children of Israel and put upon a goat and carried away into the wilderness. Because transgressions are not material things. And God will never take the sin of one person and hold another person responsible for it.

So the language is figurative.⁵ It is a way of expressing the fact that through the offering of the goat, the children of Israel had their sins forgiven. They were, in the ritual figure of speech, carried away. They were born away.

And of course Christ is antitypical⁶ of both of these animals. The first goat is the sin offering, the second goat as bearing our sins away. But he bore them away, in as much as he provided a means by which they could be forgiven: because our sins were never literally laid upon the Lord Jesus Christ,⁷ any more than the sicknesses of the people were laid actually upon him. But he provided a means by which those sicknesses could be healed. Therefore, the Lord had laid upon him our sorrows, carried our sicknesses.

And the same way in respect to his sins, our sins. They are said to be carried away, because through him they are forgiven. And so again I say, that this ritualism of Mosaic law converged upon Christ. They were fulfilled.⁸

The fundamental principle of sacrifice was the shedding of blood. Its the blood upon the altar that made atonement for the children of Israel. The life was in the blood. The outpouring of the blood demonstrated the out pouring of life. Life belonged to God, and in the sacrificial victim it was demonstrated that the wages of sin is death. This is what God required, death. The one who came to God had to recognize this. He had to recognize that he himself was a sinner, and that what was happening to the animal was something that was due him.

Now under the law, we saw a couple of weeks ago in Lev. 4 and other places, that those animals brought for sacrifice had to be without blemish. They had to be perfect specimens of the flock. And these of course in shadow expressed the moral perfection of the Lamb of God. Their physical perfection represented the moral perfection of Christ. Things physical under the law foreshadowed things moral under Christ. Now we find this proven to us in 1 Pet. 1:18-19.

⁵ This is true. The Mosaic symbols are figurative of what Christ as the Antitype was literally going to do.

⁶ If he was the antitype (which he was) his actions had to be literal, not figurative, else he was simply a type of something else. An antitype by very definition, must be a reality.

⁷ Our actual literal sins were not literally laid upon Jesus, that is true. What literally was laid upon him was our weak, sin nature. As such, he could have compassion on those sick, on those dying or dead, and on those who succumbed to temptation. He himself was literally compassed with these infirmities. HEB 5:3 "And by reason hereof [by reason of the infirmities] he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins."

⁸ There is no objection to the use of the word ritual, or ceremonial. A ritual or a ceremony may be figurative or it may be a reality. The words themselves do not rule in or out either possibility. Our objection is that bro. Stone uses these terms to mean "figurative". The ritual of the sin offering, repeated in the death of Jesus was a reality, not another empty symbol in a long line of empty symbols, which could not take away sins.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 6

(Aud) Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:

(Richard) So here he compares the absolute perfection of Christ morally with the physical perfection of the animal that was under the law. The precious blood of Christ as a lamb without blemish and without spot. And of course Peter in the next chapter tells us that he did not sin, neither was guile found in his mouth and so forth. And as I have said before, physical defilement under the law always prefigured moral defilement under the new covenant.

Turn back to Hebrews 9 and see how the effects of Christ's offering are compared to the offerings under the law. Hebrews 9:13-14.

(Don) For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth 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 works to serve the living God?

(Richard) In other words, the sacrifice of Christ cleanseth our conscience. Remember in 1 Pet. 5:21? The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us. Not the washing away the filth of the flesh, but the answering of a good conscience toward God and the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. So the blood of bulls and goats, the ashes of an heifer, can cleanse to the purifying of the flesh and this is ceremonial defilement. It doesn't clean flesh. It doesn't rid us of sin nature or anything else.⁹ But it means it cleanses from ceremonial defilement. How much more shall the blood of Christ cleanse and purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

Our consciences are purged through faith and when they are purged, it means that our sins are forgiven. We stand before God as reconciled to him and justified. He pronounces us righteous on virtue of our faith, and the fact that our sins have been forgiven.

And of course Christ did not become defiled physically even though he touched a dead body, which he did, we see this in Matthew. And he also touched a leper. But he was not contaminated by these diseases. We never read of Christ going to a temple to offer an offering for purification because of some ceremonial uncleanness he had contacted. Though he often came in contact and brushed death and disease. These did not contaminate him. The physical defilement under the law, under the old covenant, typified and was superseded by the moral

⁹ Here is the mechanical relationship bro. Stone always comes back to when confronted with a Scripture which clearly teaches the purifying of the flesh. The ashes of the heifer and the running water was to purify the flesh from the uncleanness of death. This shows that death itself is defiling. Why? The wages of sin is death. The existence of death proves the presence of sin. Sin, not of guilt, not of moral transgression: but sinful flesh. Sinful flesh means flesh full of sin. It is a physical quality of the flesh responsible for illness and death, and the Mosaic law prophesied of its removal by sacrifice; in this case the sacrifice of the red heifer.

But in this lecture, bro. Stone will become very uncomfortable with the mechanical relationship he argues for here and all throughout lecture 2. Then he will go to the correct understanding of the matter, and show that the forgiveness, and the purifications under the law had no immediate effect (even though here he is suggesting one) and only have valued after Christ ratified the law.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 7

under the new.¹⁰

And I think this is not only demonstrated here in the ninth chapter of Hebrews, but also in Matt. 15. Let us read verse 17-20.

(Les) Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: These are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.

(Richard) Now under the law you could become defiled by doing certain things. By coming in contact with something that was not holy. Come in contact with your wife or anyone who had an issue. But these things were superseded by the moral cleanness of Christ, and these things involved morality. But they always typified the moral under the new. The holiness of Christ, his moral perfection; was absolutely expedient for the offering to be accepted, because it was God's plan to condemn sin in the very nature that transgressed. And yet in the person of one who had committed no trespass. One who had never sinned We find this in Rom. 8:3.

We all know what that verse says. What the law could not do in that it was weak through he flesh, God sending his own son in the likeness of sin's flesh, and for sin, that is for a sacrifice for sin condemned sin, in the flesh. [EDITOR'S NOTE: The commas are added to reflect the way bro. Stone read (or quoted) the verse.]

When Christ died upon the cross, he died as our representative, and the sin nature which he

¹⁰ We have already dealt with this to some degree, but we would add as proof that bro. Stone is wrong here, the following points. Did Jesus ever break the law of Moses? Of course not. He never sinned. The Pharisees tried to fabricate the breaking of the law in his healing on the Sabbath, but their understanding of the law was wrong. Jesus never himself, broke the law. Well then, didn't the law required certain sacrifices to be offered when coming in contact with certain diseases, such as Jesus apparently did? If Jesus actually came in contact with them, as appears from the text and as bro. Stone suggests that he did, he had to go for the special cleansing or he broke the law.

Observe the following verses: JAM 2:10 "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." GAL 5:3 "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." " GAL 3:10 "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." These three verses all explain that Jesus had to keep the whole law, and not offend in any point, or he was guilty of all. Did Jesus then, offend in any point. Of course not. Consider Jesus's words: MAT 5:17 "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."

The Law cursed Jesus in the mode of his death, but this is not the same thing as if he had intentionally failed to keep the law, as bro. Stone's interpretation would suggest. The law cursed Jesus, in spite of the fact that he had never, ever done anything wrong. Jesus kept the law perfectly.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 8

personally possessed represented us, er...represented sin, in the abstract.¹¹ Because sin nature is that which causes sin. He contained the very arena in which sin operates. It represented sin as he personally represented transgressors. But he was not a transgressor, and sin nature was not sin in itself. What is said there is representing sin, and he represented us. And he illustrated what was due sin. And therefore his death was in the form of a sin offering.

Like the animal under the law, he didn't really become a sinner. And he didn't die because he was a sinner, but he died to illustrate what was due to sin. And due actual transgressors. But the animal had to be absolutely blemishless because it prefigured and stood for the Lord Jesus Christ, who had to be morally perfect.

(Don) Are you saying then that Christ never, within himself experienced sin? Is that right?

(Richard) Yes.

(Don) He knew...there was sin all around him, but as an act, he never experienced sin.

(Richard) That's right. But he had the root cause of sin, but was holding it in complete

¹¹ Bro. Stone's interpretation of Rom. 8:3 can be likened to the interpretation by the Churches as regards heaven going. We often ask, the Churches, who try to argue that the Bible uses figures of speech to describe going to heaven, how they justify changing the literal to the figurative right in the middle of a verse. We often quote Micah 5:2 to them: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." We ask them, "Did Jesus literally come forth from Bethlehem?" "Oh yes", they answer. "Well then", we ask, "will he literally rule in Israel?" "Oh no", they answer, "that part is figurative." But what is the justification for changing the literal to the figurative right in the middle of the verse," we ask. And they cannot answer directly. They usually argue that you must determine this from other Scriptures which they say clearly teach heaven going. But of course we know that there is no Scripture which clearly teaches heaven going, and their use of literal terms as figurative terms are nothing more than excuses for them to deny the obvious.

Bro. Stone's interpretation of Rom. 8:3 is nothing more than an attempt to spiritualize the obvious. The verse starts out, "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh". Was the law literally or figuratively unable to do something (give life) because the flesh was literally unable to keep it? Of course the answer is that the law was literally weak, because the flesh is literally weak. The verse goes on, "God sending his own son". Did God literally or figuratively send His own son? Again, this is obviously literal. "In the likeness of sinful flesh" is the next stanza. Was Jesus literally or figuratively made in the likeness of sinful flesh, or sin's flesh? While the Churches may disagree, bro. Stone has said else where (and he's right) that the word likeness there, means identicalness. Jesus was literally made "sinful flesh". Continuing with Rom. 8:3: "and for sin". Now was Christ literally or figuratively an offering for sin? Again, clearly this was literally a sacrifice on account of sin. And finishing this verse, "condemned sin in the flesh". Now, being the first four to five principles of this verse (depending on how you count them) are literal, shouldn't it follow to the unbiased mind that the last point of the verse is also literal? If not, why not?

Sin could not have been condemned in the flesh of Jesus had it not existed there. This is not a moral relationship. Christ never did anything wrong. But he bore sin's flesh, personally, literally, and bearing the cause of sin; sin is said to have been condemned. And since the physical principle of sin existed there, a sacrifice was required according to God's plan, for its removal.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 9

subjection, suppressing the flesh, he never transgressed. It had to be this way otherwise his resurrection would have been out of the question.

But now lets go to 1 Pet. 2 again. Now remember the...Peter uses the language, the symbolism under the law here. And we find this constantly in the New Testament. And here he's telling us that our sin, having been forgiven for his sake, that is what had been accomplished in him; they are spoken of as having been born by him to the tree. 1PE 2:24 "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed."

Now our sins were born by him in his body. But that didn't mean that he was guilty because he was without sin, v. 22. "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." But in the ritual aspect of the sin offering, our sins are said to be laid in his body just as the sins of the people were laid upon the goat of Azazel and led into the wilderness. Not literally but ritually to express the fact that our sins are forgiven, for his sake.

Our sins are forgiven. God doesn't literally transmit our sins to another person, they are forgiven. But in the language that is used to describe these things he used a figure of speech, he bore our sins in his own body.

Now there is a similar thing done to the law. Look at Colossians chapter 2. I think this will help us to comprehend the language of First Peter 2 here. Colossians 2. For the ordinances of the law are said to be nailed to the cross. Verse 14.

(Beth) COL 2:14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;

(Richard) Now he nailed them to the cross. He also took our sins to the cross. Now keep that in mind. Lets go back to Ephesians chapter 2. Now notice what he says about these things in the law. Verse 15.

(Aud) EPH 2:15 Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace;

(Richard) Now he says he abolished in his flesh the enmity. Now what is the enmity? Even the law of commandments contained in ordinances. In what sense what the law of commandments contained in ordinances the cause of enmity? There was a cause of enmity between Jew and Gentile, wasn't it? It made the Jew feel superior, as indeed he was selected by God as his first born national son. But the law of commandments separated the Jew and Gentile. And, there was a balustrade in the temple beyond which the Gentile was forbidden to go, on threat of death.

And he says, this middle wall, he has broken down.

(Aud) Where does it say that, Dick?

(Richard) Yes. For it is our peace, who hath made both one, both Jew and Gentile. Those that were nigh, the Jews, those who were far off, the Gentiles brought nigh by the blood of Christ: has broken down the middle wall or partition between us. Because he has now abolished in his flesh the enmity. Now, what he means by abolishing in his flesh, it means that his flesh had to be crucified in order for the end of the law to come. He abolished the law. It came to an end. In Rom. 10:4 it says Christ is the end of that law to every one that believeth.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 10

Now just as he nailed these ordinances to the cross in his own body abolishing them there, even so our sins were born by him to the cross. Not literally but in the language of a figure of speech illustrating that our sins have been forgiven.¹² They've been abolished on the basis of what has been accomplished in Christ. And these sins that were taken to the cross were sins that were committed by others. But ritually born in Christ's own body. And he is the unsinning victim being treated as a transgressor.¹³

I think this would become clearer to us if we always keep in mind that the purpose of his death was that God might condemn sin, in the flesh of one who is personally innocent and holy, so as to provide a basis upon which he could forgive the sins and transgressors.

¹² In this section, bro. Stone is trying to make a comparison between the way the law was borne away, to the way our sins are born away, and his conclusions are *actually correct*, the problem lies in the manner in which he reaches his conclusions. The way that the law was literally born away, and the way our sins were literally born away were *identically* the same way. But we don't read of the way in which this was accomplished in any of the verses quoted by bro. Stone. There, we read only of side issues. Did Jesus bear away the enmity in himself (as the margin suggests)? Sure he did. How? Bro. Stone says that its all a figure of speech. But its not. The answer is in Galatians 3, a chapter incredibly ignored by bro. Stone in this section. And how this Galatians 3 could be ignored in a section dealing with the taking away of the law in the body of Jesus just passes all imagination.

In that chapter, Paul explains exactly how we are redeemed from the curse of the law. GAL 3:13 "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." In the mode of his death, Jesus was nailed to the tree. In so doing, he came under the curse of the whole, entire law, not figuratively, but **literally**. This would include the side issues raised by bro. Stone; such as the estrangement between Jews and Gentiles, along with all the rest of the ordinances (touch not, handle not, taste not). Jesus literally bore the curse of the law. All the law, the whole thing, was born away, not symbolically, but literally, by Jesus literally coming under the curse of the law in the manner of his death.

Paul had just said, GAL 3:10: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Jesus came under the curse for having literally been nailed to the cross, and in so doing, he literally, not figuratively, bore away the whole law. Nothing could be simpler.

After the same manner, Jesus literally bore our sins, in his being made of our nature. It is not just another empty symbol, such as the law was full of; it was a literal coming under the curse of the law, and it was a literal condemnation of "sin in the flesh".

¹³ Bro. Stone is always protesting the fact that we call his doctrine "substitution" but this statement shows that he does in fact believe in the doctrine of substitution. If he was treated as the sinning victim, though he was without sin, then he was a substitute. Not so, says bro. Stone. He argues that if he believed in "substitution", then he would have to believe that we don't die.

This statement is based upon logic. Bro. Roberts used this point to try to show those who believed in "Substitution" in his day, that if one truly believed that Jesus was a substitute for us and died for us, then we shouldn't have to die, which we do. But this is by no means the way that those who believe in "Substitution" see their situation. I have personally made this point with many in the world who openly confess to believing that Jesus was a substitute for us, and I have never had anyone agree with me that their position leads them to this conclusion. Logically, it does, but no one believing the illogical doctrine of "Substitution" will admit that.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 11

And Christ's death by public execution, was an exhibition of what was due sin. God was declaring, this is what is due sins, and you must recognize this.¹⁴ And when we come to the position that we recognize that we ourselves are worthy of the death that he died, we are then in a position for God to forgive us our sins. 'Cause that's the only way that we can get rid of our sins. They are not literally born by anybody. They are not literally transferred to anybody. The only way that we can get rid of our sins is by having them forgiven. But in the language of Scripture, they are said to be born by him. Because he has provided a way by which they can be forgiven.

Just as the High Priest bore the iniquity of the children of Israel, it was through him, and through his work as High Priest that their sins were forgiven.

And of course Christ had to be sinless, because resurrection had to follow. And we all know what the Scriptures say about the fact that if Christ had not been raised from the dead what would happen to us. We would perish. Rom. 4:25 says he was delivered for our transgression and raised again for our justification. Apart from his resurrection, there could have been no justification for us.

(Aud) Are you saying for the Gentiles?

(Richard) For anybody. Jew or Gentile. For God hath concluded them all under sin.

(Don) Only in Christ is there salvation.

(Richard) That's right. And only in a resurrected Christ. His death on the cross was only half the picture. There had to be resurrection. So he had to be a sinless victim, that resurrection might follow. And this, in his death he declared the righteousness of God. And Paul explains that passage so beautifully, we went over it the last couple of weeks, in Romans 3:25; when he died he shed his blood to declare the righteousness of God and that means to reveal God as being righteous.¹⁵

And Paul says, this was necessary for God in his divine forbearance had passed over sins in the

¹⁴ This is a true statement, and is the very crux of the whole matter. But how can we see what is due to sin, in the crucifixion of Jesus, if there was not sin there? Further, if sin is only there figuratively, and Jesus is crucified literally, how can we look at this and acknowledge the righteousness, and justness of God. This would be injustice.

¹⁵ Truly it is beautiful when properly understood. But understood bro. Stone's way, we see Jesus, being required by God to die a death he was in no way related to. God had said, "the wages of sin is death". Jesus didn't sin, but still God was requiring Jesus to die. And not only that, but God was requiring a sacrificial death which was required for the redemption from sin. How can this be regarded by anyone with bro. Stone's view as right and just?

Understood in the correct way, we see God requiring Jesus to die the death that he did to sacrificially put away the sin which he bore in his flesh. It was the physical principle styled sin, an inseparable portion of the constitution of sin, from which Jesus stood, as much as any of those he came to save, in need of redemption. Thus, God was both right and just in requiring Jesus to die the death which he died, for the "redemption of the body."

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 12

past. Under the law, sins weren't forgiven, really.¹⁶ They were set aside. And they would remain that way till Christ came and offered the perfect sacrifice. But God in his forbearance did not deal with those sins, until dealing with them in Christ. And so Paul says, now at this time it was necessary for Christ to declare God's righteousness. The sin offering did this. It showed that God was intolerant to sin. It illustrated the judgement and condemnation of sin, in the sin offering.

(Aud) Well under the law, to God the sins were set aside for the people, they were just make aware of their sins, is that right?

(Richard) That's right. Remember. What did the law promise? Long life, didn't it?¹⁷ The man that does them, shall even live in them. That means that he was to have long life and prosperity in the land. It never promised eternal life. The law never promised that. It did promise prosperity to those that kept the law. And freedom from their enemies. But God...most of the sins under the law you remember were ceremonial sins. Sins of contact. The law never dealt with serious sins such as murder, adultery, blasphemy, there was no forgiveness

¹⁶ This is really a curious section. Remember in Class Two, and even earlier in this class, bro. Stone used as proof that the Law had no sacrifices for sin nature, to be the fact that after offering the sacrifices, sin nature remained. This was a chemical, or mechanical reaction which bro. Stone insisted upon to discredit previous arguments, most notably bro. Roberts' arguments in "The Law Of Moses" that the "burnt offering" was for sin nature. But here, bro. Stone recognizes the fact that the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin. It was a symbol, waiting for a reality, which of course was the sacrifice of Christ (the reality of which bro. Stone "defacto" denies). His argument here is correct and well taken. Had he stuck with it throughout his exposition, he would have had less trouble seeing through the fog he creates.

¹⁷ Here is another factual error offered by bro. Stone. The law offered eternal life. We see this several times in the Scriptures. Remember when the lawyer came to Jesus, tempting him, and asked him, Good master, what shall I do to inherit *eternal* life? What did Jesus answer? LUK 10:26 He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? Here, a lawyer, that means one well versed in the law, asked Jesus how to obtain *eternal life*. And how did Jesus answer him? What is written in the law? The lawyer answered him with several references to the law, (one from Deuteronomy, one from Numbers) and Jesus told him: LUK 10:28 "And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live."

Jesus answered identically the same way when a sincere young man came to him and asked him the same question, MAT 19:16-19 "And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." All these things came from the Law of Moses. Now the young man claimed to have kept them all, and probably had kept them as well as anyone could. But no one, except Jesus, kept the law perfectly, and Jesus knew that the young man had failed. He therefore needed to be saved by faith, and not by works, as we all do, and so Jesus explained to him what further needed to be done. But the point is, the law was ordained unto eternal life. It was the weakness of the flesh, not the weakness of the law which made it impossible to obtain salvation by the law.

The apostle Paul makes the same point in Rom. 7:10. "And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." The "commandment" or the law Paul says, was ordained unto *life*. And it was. The problem was not with the Law. The problems was with the flesh, which Paul says in Rom. 8:3; was not able to keep it though its inherent weakness.

So the law promised much more than long life.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 13

of those. Anybody who did this was taken out and stoned. The law didn't provide and forgiveness for this.¹⁸

(Aud) There was only one occasion in which there was an escape, and that was in the case of the accidental murder, and the cities to which they could flee.

(Richard) Oh yes, but that was not murder. That was not premeditated murder. But for murder or blasphemy or adultery, no forgiveness; they were taken out and stoned.

The law was testifying to its own weakness.¹⁹ When the children of Israel murmured against God and he sent fiery serpents against them; you know, he wasn't told to take out a sacrifice and offer for the people. He said make a brazen serpent. Put it on a pole and lift it up above the congregation. This in itself was declaring the weakness of the law. It was demonstrating to Israel, and the discerning Israelite that real salvation was coming from a system alien to the law.

When the High Priest was about to enter into the holy of holies once a year, he stripped off his priestly garments and put on white linen.²⁰ Illustrating again that the law itself, the priesthood under the law was powerless to take away sins. It had to be done by a system that was apart from the law. The law witnessing to it. And that's precisely what Paul says in the third chapter of Romans.

He says in chapter three at verse 20: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin."

Therefore anybody who came in contact with the law was immediately condemned. But now the righteousness of God is, that is, how we can obtain the righteousness of God without the law, that is apart from the law, is manifested being witnessed by the law and by the prophets. Because all the ritual laws were ritual prophesies of what was to be accomplished by Christ. But here is the righteousness of God, exhibited and made available, apart from the law. And he says in verse 22 "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and

¹⁸ The fact that the law did not offer forgiveness for certain classes of sins, does not mean that the law didn't deal with them. The law dealt with them, in its own way, and that way was by requiring the condemnation to death of those who committed them. The law of Christ is exactly the same. Jesus said that there was not forgiveness even under his law, for blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The apostle Paul said the same thing, warning us not to tread under foot the son of God. HEB 10:26 "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins." Because there was no forgiveness for these sins, it doesn't mean that they are not dealt with. In point of fact, they are dealt with, there is just no forgiveness.

¹⁹ If the Mosaic Law was weak, because it did not offer forgiveness for certain sins, why is not the law of Christ, weak for the same reason? This is silly. Anyway, the law was Holy, righteous, and good. The law was not weak, and the Scriptures never testifies that it is. the Scriptures testify that there was something that the law could not do, in that it was weak *through the flesh*. It was our *inherent* weakness that made the law powerless. Not the Law as ordained by God.

²⁰ Again we see the inconsistencies in bro. Stone's discussion. Before he had referred to the frontal piece with "HOLINESS TO THE LORD" on when he entered into the Holy of Holies on the Great Day of Atonement. Here he says that he removed the Priestly apparel on this day. He was right the first time. All the garments are linen garments. When the law says that he put on the linen garments prior to offering the sacrifices, it is not suggesting different garments, just referring to the fact that the high Priest would put on the priestly, linen garments.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 14

upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:". He means Jew or Gentile. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

So the law was powerless to save. It couldn't forgive. It only condemned. So now he says, well we're justified freely by his grace through he redemption that is in Christ Jesus. So there is something that God did in Christ Jesus that makes redemption available for you and me. And what is it: God has set him forth to be a propitiation. Redemption only comes through Christ. He is a place where God will meet the sinner, through faith in his blood, so it requires his death. But why did it require his death? To declare His righteousness. Well, why was this necessary. For the remission of sins. Remission here is not the word that is generally translated remission. Its a different word. And it means for the passing over of sins, done aforetime, done in the past. That's why God's righteousness had to be declared now. Because God had not dealt with those sins in the past.

(Don) And this takes us clear back to the garden of Eden, doesn't it.

(Richard) Right from the very beginning. Every sin ever committed.

(Don) God provided a covering for their sins through the slaying of the animal.

(Richard) Yes, it illustrated a principle right there. The shedding of blood for the remission of sins.

(Don) Right from the foundation of the world you might say.

(Richard) So he had to die to declare God's righteousness because God in former times had passed over sins through his forbearance. Now look at verse 26. To declare I say that this time his righteousness. It had to be done now. He had waited all this time. Why? That he might be just. 'Course God is already just, but Paul is saying that he might be revealed as being a just God, He doesn't tolerate sin.²¹ Here is what he thinks of sin, in the sin offering of Christ. And the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Because there is no justification apart from those in Christ. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? The law of works? Nay but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.

Faith in what has been accomplished in Christ. And since God has provided a basis for the forgiveness of our sins, and has involved his son personally, he is our sin bearer. He's taken them away. He fulfilled the law, he took it out of the way. The law cursed an innocent man, and it converged upon Christ and was taken away, therefore by a figure he nailed the ordinance of the law to the tree and abolished them in his flesh. These are figures of speech. We must understand them as such.

(Les) Dick, without saying that Christ did all these things ritually, or it was to illustrate God's righteousness. You use that as synonymous, either ritually or to illustrate God's righteousness.

(Richard) Yes.

²¹ How did He show this if there was nothing called sin in Christ?

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 15

(Les) Without saying that, you got substitution.²²

(Richard) Well, not exactly, because substitution requires that Christ suffered the penalty that is due sinners. Christ didn't suffer the penalty.

(Les) But you take 1 Peter 2:24 without saying it's ritual there you have to end up with substitution.

(Richard) Well you could. You could isolate almost any verse and get some kind of a statement. If I said that Christ had suffered the penalty of the law which substitution requires, then he ought never to have risen from the dead. But mortality could only claim his death, it could never hold him. His righteousness required that he be resurrected from the dead. So it wasn't substitution. And it had to be ritually exhibited because if sin had actually been there, Christ would have been deserving of death. The Jews would have been right in assuming him to be smitten and afflicted of God.²³

But the thief on the cross, remember what he said, he was right that this man has done nothing. We are receiving the just rewards of our iniquities. This man has done nothing amiss. Pilot could say, I find no fault in him. And neither did the Scriptures. We never read of any fault in Christ. So he had to be absolutely sinless.

(Les) It seems to me though that what your saying is that ritually, he died the death due sinners.

(Richard) He did. If he didn't do it ritually, if he was deserving²⁴ of the death he died on that cross, the violent blood shedding death: then we would have to say well, why was he worthy of it. And if were worthy of it, how did he lay down his life for us? How are we involved in it then: It never speaks of him offering for himself in that sense. It was either ritually, or he was deserving of that violent death.

(Les) I agree. But it seems to me that ritual substitution. I don't really care for ritual substitution any more than I do for actual substitution.

(Richard) Ritual, you know, we go through rituals when we bread the bread, doesn't we? We

²² Even by saying that, you have the doctrine of substitution.

²³ I've never met a person who believes "Substitution" who would be the least bit uncomfortable with what bro. Stone teaches. He says that Christ didn't suffer the "penalty" that is due us; but at the same time he says that Christ suffered the death due to sinners (page 13). While there may be a subtle difference, it certainly does not change the overall thought that makes up substitution, which says that Christ died the death that was due us, to which he was not personally related.

²⁴ To say that Christ was "deserving" of the death, or "worthy" of the death is to give Christ a moral relationship to the death he died. This would be utterly false. But to say he was subject to the death he died, to say that his sacrificial death was a requirement to purge him from the physical condition which he inherited from Adam is not to imply anything moral whatsoever. His being made of sinful flesh was a misfortune. It was not a crime. Still, as bearing the physical principle of sin in him members, he himself required and was subject to the sacrificial death that he died. Bro. Stone says either he was deserving of the death, or his death was a ritual, by which he means figurative. This is myopic. Bro. Stone is refusing to look at the whole picture. Did he deserve it? Of course not. Was his death another figurative ritual in a long line of empty figurative rituals. Absolutely not. Was he subject to it, in fact in need of it by reason of his birth? Absolutely. This is just not that difficult.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 16

break this bread, it's Christ who performed this ritual on the night of his betrayal. This is my body which is given for you. This is the new covenant of my blood, shed for many for the remission of sins. This is all a ritual. And we are told to keep this ritual. The baptism is a ritual. Isn't it. We ritually die with Christ, we don't literally die with Christ. When Paul said in Galatians 2:20, I am crucified in Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me. He was using figures of speech. He wasn't literally crucified with Christ. But he means that he was giving his own understanding and faith and belief in all the principles exhibited in the death of Christ. And recognizing that unless he die with Christ ritually speaking, ceremonially; that he would not have life. Christ must be demonstrated in us.

(Don) Didn't all the sacrifices point to Christ some way or another? And weren't they ritually carried out, day after day, week after week, and by the High Priest once a year: and all these were ritually enacted and they were prophetic in meaning. They pointed towards certain things that were going to happen. And its just a ritual re-enactment of this same thing.

(Richard) What's the difference between Christ and those animals? Remember Paul in Romans 12:1 said, "present your bodies a living sacrifice to God which is your reasonable service." Now a reasonable service means a service of reason. The sacrificial victims under the law were unreasoning beasts. They died involuntarily. They had nothing to do with it. The only things that they had was that they were blemishless.

We come to Christ. Here is a person who is intelligent, he possessed the law of sin which the animals under the law did not possess. He possessed the law of sin. He had an independent volition. And he voluntarily allowed himself to be crucified upon the cross as an offering for our sins. To demonstrate what was due to sin. But if he had been worthy of that violent death, it would have availed nothing. He could no longer be raised from the dead any more than we could.

(Don) He was a lamb prepared right from the foundation of the world. He would have not been spotless. He would have a blemish. And he had to be without sin. Without any blemish in his body. And I think that means both physical and spiritual.

(Richard) Well, physical, I don't think it mattered.²⁵

(Don) Well, I don't think it does either.

(Richard) Because before Christ was crucified, he was scourged. His body was lacerated.

²⁵ Here a brother has just said that Christ was physically and morally without spot, and bro. Stone doesn't agree, but says it doesn't matter. How can he continue to protest our calling his view "clean flesh" when he says it doesn't matter if one believes that Jesus was physically spotless? Note he doesn't correct the brother. He just cautions him that the condition of the flesh "doesn't matter". Now bro. Stone will go on to point out that Christ's physical appearance was marred by the crown of thorns, and the other beatings to which he was subjected. How then can he say that it doesn't matter if one believes that Christ was physically spotless?

He must say that, for bro. Stone knows that in Central fellowship, there are those (really, including bro. Stone) who refer to Christ's physical nature as spotless. Now bro. Stone would say that he doesn't believe that, but by following his arguments, particularly his arguments which follow in this lecture when we get into words which describe the physical condition, we will see that he doesn't believe that the physical nature is "unclean", "in need of purging", "defiled", "sinful", or any other such term. Hence, the only possible conclusion is that he too, believes his physical nature (and in fact all physical nature) was/is spotless.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 17

Crown of thorns upon his head. He was not a perfect physical specimen at that time. But morally he was without spot and without blemish. And that is what counted. Because he had to be this way, in order for this ritual condemnation for sin to be exhibited in one that was sinless. That resurrection might follow.

(Les) Going back to Isaiah 53 which really kind of formed the basis for this section of your notes. You quoted verses 4, 6, 11, 12. It seems to me that verse three answers in what sense he bore our griefs. He bore our griefs and carried our sorrows, or had our iniquities laid upon him or he bore our iniquities or bare the sins of many in the sense of verse three. A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. He was mortal. The same nature as...sin in the flesh nature that we are, and it was in this sense that he bore all these things.

(Richard) Alright lets take a look at that very closely. Verse 3 "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not." But that's too narrow a view here. It's true that he had to have sin nature in order to be an adequate representative but you notice in verse 5, he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him and with his stripes, we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord has laid upon him the iniquity of us all. In what sense? Verse 10 "Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand." That is he could see what his own sacrifice would result in. The redemption of virtually millions. For by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many for he shall bear their iniquities.

And he bore their iniquities because God made his soul an offering for sin. Verse 12 "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." To narrow this down to just him having our nature is much too narrow I think, in view of the rest of what Isaiah says here. That he was wounded for our transgressions.²⁶

The Jews could take this attitude of verse 4, the last part, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. They thought he was deserving of the death which he suffered upon the cross. If we were standing down there at that time, depending on whether we were a disciple or one of the Jews, we would take one side or the other. I know if I were there, if I knew what I know now, that he was dying for me. That that was the death that I was worthy of. But he was illustrating what was due sin, in the ritual of the sin offering. And that for his sake, for his sake, God would forgive me. And he therefore becomes a sin bearer.

And he made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death; because he had done no wrong, neither was any deceit in his mouth. But in spite of this, it pleased the Lord to bruise

²⁶ We have never limited Christ's sacrifice to a narrow view such as suggested by bro. Stone. We have never, in fact neither have we ever heard anyone, limit Christ's sacrifice to the redemption of the body. Our point has always been that this is an important aspect, without which the removal of trespasses would be impossible. Bro. Higham's point here, is that bro. Stone ignores this aspect completely, denying it, and calling it unscriptural. Verse three explains the way in which all the other verses are made possible. Bro. Stone ignores this completely, thus taking away all meaning and turning the entire thing into another type or symbol.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 18

him²⁷. He had put him to grief when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin. Because this was in the divine purpose. This was why God brought him into the world. The lamb of God to take away the sin of the world.

(Don) You make mention of the fact that he saw what was going to happen, that's why he realized what would happen by going to the cross. And that's why we have that passage of scripture that says for the joy that was set before him he endured the cross.

(Richard) Yes. Heb. 12:12 "For the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God."

I have three more sheets that should be added to this. I'd like to hand them out to you. You can pass them around. And if we can look at these for the balance of the time. Oh. I wanted to get into diabolos, and I didn't. Well lets take a look at this first and then we'll come back to it. O.K.?

These are terms that are misused in respect to this natural earthy body. Now, many words and terms are used to lend support to the idea that the physical nature of man in the object of God's displeasure,²⁸ and as a consequence, must undergo a cleansing which is alleged to take place at either baptism or resurrection. And there are many words that are used in order to describe the condition of this present mortal body. By the use of these words, an attempt is made to support the idea that the physical nature of mankind must be cleansed by sacrifice.²⁹

But I have made a consideration of these words as they appear in Scriptures and I find that they don't countenance the theory whatsoever. We've heard the word vile, unclean, defiled body,

²⁷ Can we not see from this how absolutely essential it is to reject bro. Stone's teaching. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him". It was right and just for God to require the death of Jesus which he died. If Jesus was not himself subject to and in absolute need of that death, why would it please God to require him to die the death that he died? And how could it be just?

It pleased the Lord to bruise Jesus, because He was able to show in the death of Jesus that the cause of sin, is the flesh which we inherit from Adam; and that this nature must be utterly repudiated as the first condition of salvation. Thus, he was able to publicly destroy sin at its root, at its very source; and exhibit to the world that the destruction of "sin in the flesh" is an absolute requirement in the plan and purpose of God.

If Jesus had been a transgressor, a moral sinner; then this would not be apparent in the sacrifice. In that case, he would have been on the cross for his own guilt. This point also was not exhibited in the symbols of the law, for the animals did not have "sin in the flesh". No, only in the death of one bearing our identical sinful nature who himself did no sin; could this point be exhibited, or shown to the world.

²⁸ Again, by misusing words, bro. Stone causes the Truth to fall in a wrong light. The nature is an (not the) object of God's displeasure, but not because God is angry with the nature, and not because the nature has any moral relationship to it. The nature is the source of sin, and as such, as an indispensable part of the constitution of sin. This is why the physical nature became a part of God's displeasure.

²⁹ Note the reason why bro. Stone object to these words. It's because they are used by some, obviously by Christadelphians, to support the idea that the flesh needs cleansed by sacrifice, which of course, is taught in the Bible, but which bro. Stone denies. He is not arguing against the Advocate position of inherent moral sin. He is arguing against a basic, fundamental Christadelphian principle of Truth, that Christ was cleansed from the sin which he bore in his flesh by sacrifice.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 19

and so forth, and yet we never find these words used in relation to the natural body.

Look at that word vile for instance. It only occurs three times in the New Testament. Romans 1:26; James 2:2; and Philippians 3:21. They are all from different Greek words.

First the Romans 1:26. Lets just take a look at that very quickly. If we look at it the way it appears in the Bible it will tell us how this word is used. And lest we be tempted to use it in a wrong way. In Romans 1:26: "For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:". It goes on to describe the defiling sin which they committed. But vile here means passions of dishonor. I think there's a marginal reference, not in this one, but in the RV. And it is a moral term here. Its also translated shame in 1 Cor. 11:14, and reproach in 2 Cor. 11:21.

The second place is James 2:2. We don't need to turn to that but that's where one comes into the synagogue in vile raiment. Which merely means filthy, dirty. But the one that is generally used is Philippians 3:21.

Now Philippians 3:21 speaks of him changing our vile body and fashioning it like unto his own glorious body. Now, what does he mean by vile body here? The word in the Greek means humiliation or low estate. Vile body carries the idea of lowliness, humility. And the RV translates this as the body of our humiliation. It doesn't mean that its vile, as we understand the word vile, being a moral term. But rather, it means a body of humility. We are made lower than the angels. We have a different way of sustaining our being. We have to breath, we have to eat. And there is a process of deterioration going on in our body. It's a body of humiliation.

But, look at Luke 1:48 where the same word is translated a little different to give you an idea of how this word should be used. Luke 1:48 where Mary said, he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden and that word low there is vile, for behold from henceforth, all generations shall call me blessed. It was a term of humility so far as she was concerned. And James 1:9. Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted. It means a brother of very humble means. Modest income. Perhaps even poverty stricken in contrast of the rich in verse 10.

But this word vile is never used in relation, that is in the moral sense. Philippians 3:21, it doesn't mean that, it means humbleness or humility; low estate.³⁰

Another word that is used is unclean or uncleanness. And I've looked at every place that it occurs in the New Testament. It means ceremonial defilement; as is illustrated in these passages that I have written down here. And moral impurity. Turn to 2 Cor. 12. Now I'm not saying that's its wrong to use these terms in reference to this body if we understand that we are using them out of context with the Bible. 'Cause I've used the same terms, unclean and so forth. In

³⁰ In this section, bro. Stone is basically trying to get away from the teaching of Paul in Phil 3:21. "He shall change our vile bodies". He suggests that we should accept the RV translation of "the body of our humiliation" instead of vile. The question is, what would be the difference? Why are our bodies humiliated? "Humility" is a synonym for "modest", as suggested by bro. Stone. But humility is not the word, or rather the term used here. The term is "of our humiliation". When we say someone is "humiliated", or if we say we they are in a state of humiliation, we do not mean modest: we mean it as a synonym for "ashamed". Why are our bodies, "bodies of humiliation"? Is it not described as such for the same reason that Adam and Eve sought the coverings of fig leaves in the Garden? We are humiliated in the presence of God on account of sin. It was not modesty which led Paul to decry, ROM 7:24 "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" It was his personal acquaintance with the sin principle in his members. That is what perplexed him. That is why he described the body as vile, or filthy.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 20

2 Cor. 12:21, who read last?

(Aud) "And lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed."

(Richard) Now there it certainly involves moral impurity. You wouldn't apply those terms to one who is justified in Christ and who have not sinned. Lets go to Ephesians 4:19. Notice how it is again used.

(Aud) "Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness."

(Richard) And also verse 3 of chapter 5.

(Aud) "But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints;".

(Richard) Now this is the way this word, unclean and uncleanness is used. With a moral connotation. But also it refers to mental or physical ailments. And Christ cast out unclean devils, and unclean spirits and so forth, referring to a mental affliction or a physical affliction. But the word is never used to describe the natural, physical condition that one inherits from Adam. So, wouldn't we be wise to try to avoid that term? If its a scriptural term, try to avoid it in reference to this body because its never used that way.³¹

³¹ This entire section on words is filled with contradictory statements. It appears to have been added by bro. Stone as an after thought to his class, and that is probably why it is uncharacteristically disorganized. While there is much to be disagreed with throughout bro. Stone's exposition, he has been marvelously consistent.

First off, bro. Stone says that he checked out every place that this word occurs in the New Testament. Why only the New Testament? This is particularly strange in that our Constitution uses an Old Testament passage to support the position as regards the Edenic sentence, Clause 5: "a sentence which defiled a became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity...JOB 14:4 "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." Here our naturally born condition, a defiled condition according to our Constitution, is transmitted to all Adam's posterity. A clean thing cannot be brought out of an unclean. Adam was defiled by sin, and all who come forth from him come forth with that same defilement.

Next bro. Stone says that unclean is used in a moral sense, or in the sense of ceremonial uncleanness. But in his explanation, he recognizes that unclean is used in regards to disease, which is a manifestation of "sin in the flesh". In so saying, he unwittingly proves our point. The flesh is unclean because "sin in the flesh", that physical principle which is in the flesh on account of sin. Our weak, human nature is the cause of transgression, disease, and death. If death (ceremonial uncleanness) and disease, (physical uncleanness) and transgressions (moral uncleanness) are all styled "unclean" by the Scriptures, would not that which brings forth these things *also* be unclean? Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? No one. That which proceeds as unclean, must have come from a source which was unclean. JAM 3:11-12 "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh." Even so, the flesh cannot bring forth that which is good, or clean. Why else would Jesus have declined the title of good? When the young man came to him and addressed him as "good master", Jesus objected. What should he have objected to, if he was good? He objected because physically he was not good. Morally, he certainly was. But physically, he bore the same body as his mother, which as is pointed out in Job, could only be of the same physical quality as his mother, which would be unclean. So

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 21

And defiled. Here is a word we often here and its even in our statement of faith. But we must understand that when we use this term, we are using it out of context.³² It is not the way it is used in the Bible. The word has the meaning of making common, staining or tingeing; used often in a ceremonial sense.

Remember Christ, in the 15th of Matthew said these things defile not a man? But the things that come forth from out of the heart, they defile a man. And there it is used strictly in a moral sense. Look at John 18:28 as another illustration. John 18:28.

(Les) "Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover."

(Richard) 'Course there it simply meant ceremonial defilement. But it is used also of the unrighteous acts of mankind. We're in John here. Let's turn to the first on, 1 Cor. 3:17. Lets read verse 16-17.

(Beth) "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are."

(Richard) So if we do anything to destroy this temple, God will destroy us. This temple is to be inhabited by God. But to defile here, of course, has a very heavy moral connotation to it. Lets go to one more. Jude 8. Look at Jude 8.

(Aud) JUDE 1:8 "Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities."

(Richard) They defile the flesh by their acts of unrighteousness.

Now it is also attested that the following words are descriptive of the physical change that takes place at the resurrection of the faithful. And it is true that this body will undergo a physical cleansing when this mortal puts on immortality and this corruptible puts on incorruption. We must exercise care in the use of Scriptural terms, in an unscriptural manner. Of course, we should always be careful of this. In using phrases that occur in the Scriptures, out of context.

For instance, there is a term used by the Unamended that I objected to at the conference table and finally they got away from it. They said that when you are baptized, you are no longer in Adam, quotation marks, but your now in Christ, quotation marks. Well, in quotation marks

clearly here, the term unclean refers also to the physical body which we inherit from Adam.

³² Isn't it interesting that we as Christadelphians have come over one hundred years, only to find out that our Statement of Faith uses language which is improper, and out of context. It is not that the Statement of Faith is out of context. Bro. Stone's teaching has led him to a position where he finds the Statement of Faith uncomfortable. For that reason, he has to use what is generally called "back handed complements" to try and avoid the obvious. The same is done in other parts of the Central world as well. The Cooper/Carter addendum, which is in Australia Central's Unity Booklet, restates clauses 5 and 12. As to clause five, it removes the word "defiled" from the clause. This is removed by the Australian Shield brethren, themselves long time supporters of the Clean Flesh teaching, because like bro. Stone, they did not, and do not believe that the body itself is connected in any literal way, to sin. Hence, the body or nature does not require a sacrifice for its cleansing.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 22

means of course that its taken out of the Bible. And the term in Adam, is always used in a physical sense in the Bible. Isn't it? Because we're in Adam now, even though we're in Christ. We're in Christ morally, but we never get out of Adam physically until, this mortal puts on immortality. And Paul says, as we have born the image of the earthy, in Adam, we shall all bear the image of the heavenly. But only if you come to Christ.

So its dangerous and a little deceptive to use that term to describe a hypotheses. You have an idea, or a theory. And to use a Scriptural term to lend support to that theory, but to use it in a wrong way is deceptive. And it shows you aren't very intelligent, anyway.³³

Look at the word purge. You know this term is used some times, even by the doctor. Will purge our bodies, you know. It means to cleanse up, to make a cleansing. And the New Testament usage of this word is limited to a moral cleansing, never to a physical purging or cleansing at the resurrection. We know 1 Cor. 5:7, Christ our passover, a sacrifice for us, purge out the old leaven, and so forth. He's talking about a moral cleansing.

But look at Heb. 1:3, this is a good example of the manner in which this word is used. Purge is always used in a moral sense. Heb. 1:3.

(Stan) "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high:".

(Richard) He purged our sins. And this is the way that this term is used throughout the New Testament. Never used in relation to the body undergoing immortality or being changed.

Purified means your going to get a cleaning or remove physical defilement under the law. And to a moral cleansing through faith. Purify your hearts ye double minded, (James 4:8).

And these other Scriptures. Lets look at Heb. 9:13. We're in Hebrews anyway. And look at the way its used here. Would you read that Don?

(Don) "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth 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 works to serve the living God?"

(Richard) So the purifying of the flesh here means, purifying from ceremonial defilement under the law. And they were purified from them.³⁴

³³ Bro. Stone's point is well taken as regards the teaching of the Unamended brethren. Their idea that baptism somehow takes us "out of Adam" is a wrong view. But the tie in here, that he is trying to make is wrong, and like the Unamended teaching, a little deceptive. He uses the Unamended teaching which is clearly out of context to get agreement, and then tries to transfer that agreement over to his argument on "unclean, defiled, purge, etc." all of which are applied to the flesh, as we have shown. Now, Bro. Stone tries to explain away the occurrence of these words, but as has been pointed out, he fails to address virtually every relevant point.

³⁴ Here is another case where the most obvious verse is clearly ignored. Heb. 9:22-23 "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. 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

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 23

The word cleanse. Its used to describe the healing of lepers, and more expressively in a moral sense the healing and cleansing of the conscience by the truth. Lets look at one or two of these because I'd like to conclude this before we leave tonight. Lets take John 13:10. Hands are cleansed. John 13:10.

(Aud) Richard, doesn't Dr. Thomas use this word cleanse?

(Richard) Yes, but he doesn't use it. He accommodates the term. But at the same time, I use the same term sometimes.³⁵ But at the same time we must recognize that we are using them out of Scriptural context, and therefore we should not use them in that sense. I'm going to show you other words that are better than these to illustrate what takes place.

(Les) John 13:10. "Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all."

(Richard) And in another place he spoke of being clean for the word which ye preached to them. So, this is used mostly to describe the inward and moral cleansing of the conscience by the truth. James 4:8 again, cleanse your hands ye sinners. Purify your hearts ye double

these." The heavenly things was Christ. What did Christ need to be purified from by his own better sacrifice? Of course, he had no personal transgression. So the only purifying he needed was from his nature. And here in this verse, Paul uses the words "purge" and "purify" in this context.

³⁵ This is what is called "new-speak". It's an effort to avoid the obvious by the use of different words. Did bro. Thomas use the word "cleanse". He didn't use it, he "accommodated the term". How silly! Corporation don't lay any one off any more either. They simply "down-size". And wars don't kill civilians. They experience "collateral damage".

Bro. Thomas hardly had to accommodate a term. Bro. Thomas was a pioneer in the re-discovery of the truth. No one before had set down numerous articles which bro. Thomas was making effort to agree with. He was completely free to describe what it was that he believed, as clearly as possible. He was defining thought, not accommodating it.

Bro. Stone finds himself in the very uncomfortable position of trying to support a system, the Christadelphians, whose foundation and pioneer brethren disagree with all that he says. He then, has to find ways to accommodate terms, to define them in such a way that he can teach the opposite of what the Christadelphian movement was built upon, and still claim that he has not betrayed the movement.

At one point in our discussions, bro. Stone gave me nine quotations from bro. Roberts which he had taken out of context to try to prove his point. I answered them, placing them in their proper context, and showed that bro. Roberts was saying nothing different than what he always had said, when you understood the circumstances surrounding the quotes.

But then, rather than simply quote to him other more relevant items, which have been ignored before, I asked bro. Stone this. How can he explain the fact that he interprets all the relevant verses differently than did bro. Roberts. And I gave him examples. Bro. Roberts in the "Law of Moses" said Heb. 5:3 applied to Christ. Bro. Stone says it doesn't. Could he find any place where bro. Roberts says that it didn't apply to Christ. And I did this with several of the main verses, such as Heb. 7:27; Heb. 9:22; as well as Lev. 1:1-6 and the significance of the Burnt Offering.

If bre. Roberts and Thomas were doing as bro. Stone is doing, and "accommodating terms", wouldn't it be reasonable to see them translate the relevant verses after the same fashion? But when I asked this question, I didn't get an answer, and I won't get an answer; because these brethren NEVER used the verses as does bro. Stone. And that shows who understands the pioneer brethren, and who are accomodating their terms to try to make them fit.

minded. Both terms are used there in a moral sense.³⁶

Now let's get down to the next section. By faith, we'll be made perfect. Now we all agree that the man in his present physical state possessing a proneness to transgression is unfit for everlasting life. God would not endow us with everlasting life as long as we have this kind of a nature that is susceptible to sin and could sin. You would have an immortal sinner. But the Scriptures describe the present physical condition as earthy, natural, (1 Cor. 15); of Jesus in the second chapter of Hebrews made a little lower than the angels. Paul also speaks of us being sown in corruption, dishonor, natural weakness, at the resurrection. And so man in his natural state, aside from personal transgression, in which he experiences the impulses and propensities that lead to sin is unfit for everlasting existence.

But there is remedy. And the remedy offered by God is a transformation. A physical transformation that takes place at the resurrection. And we know that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, so before man is qualified to inherit something that is everlasting, he himself must be made everlasting. He has a change of nature from one that leads inevitably to sin, to one which is controlled by righteousness. And therefore we should exercise care in the selection of words to describe man's physical condition that he inherits from Adam. Confusion always arises when using Scriptural terms out of context.

So how does the Scriptures speak of the physical redemption of the faithful? Well, we're in John, go back to Luke 13:32. Notice what it says of Christ himself. Sandy would you read that for us please?

(Sandy) "And he said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to day and to morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected."

(Richard) Now this was a kind of elliptic reference to the fact that on the third day he's to be resurrected, perfected. Now, Heb. 2, which is of course one we are all quite familiar with. Heb. 2:10 speaking of Christ again.

(Aud) "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

(Richard) So it speaks of Christ's own redemption, physical redemption as being made perfect. Also, the word glory, glorious, and glorify are all used in reference to Christ. Heb. 2:7. "Thou maddest him a little lower than the angels; thou crowned him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands:". Christ also spoke of his own glorification. Look at 1 Peter 1:21 just to go over a few pages here. 1 Pet. 1:21.

(Don) "Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God."

(Richard) Then in Philippians 3:21 it says that he will change the bodies of our humiliation and fashion them like unto his own glorious body. So we have two words now, to be perfected, to be glorified. And quickened. 1 Pet. 3:18, right here. Les, would you read that for us?

(Les) "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:".

³⁶ The word clean is just the opposite of unclean. Our arguments on unclean do not need to be repeated here.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 25

(Richard) And in 1 Cor. 15:45 he's said to be a quickening spirit, a life giving spirit. Now, the last page of this outline, of the faithful at the coming of Jesus, perfected (Heb. 11:4) they with us should not be made perfect. 1 Peter 5:10 here. We're right there, so would you read that Sandy?

(Sandy) "But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you."

(Richard) "There is a question as to whether that perfect means nature in that spot, or perfection, but in any rate its a word that can be used. And we used the word quickened, John 5:21. The Father raised the dead, he quickened whom he will and so the son quickeneth whom he will. Rom. 4:17 it says that God quickeneth the dead. And look at Rom. 8:11.

(Aud) But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

(Richard) So again quicken is a good word to use in reference to the change that takes place at the resurrection.

Another word is changed or change. We shall all be changed, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, this mortal put on immortality. He will change the bodies of our humiliation and will fashion like unto his own glorious body. There's another work that can be used.

And the fourth one is immortality. Rom. 2:7. "To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life:".

And incorruption. This flesh shall put on incorruption.

And the word glory. We have already looked at some of those passages. He has called us unto glory. So, and then eternal everlasting life.

These are different words that can be used to describe the change that takes place. We don't have to use the words cleanse purge, purify, 'cause they really aren't used.³⁷ God changes this body, because this body is unfit for everlasting life in this condition.

So I've ended by making this statement, that words that are commonly used to describe the change from the mortal to the immortal such as cleanse, purge, and purify and so forth are not to be found in the New Testament. Are we wise to use unscriptural terms to describe this change when so many other words are utilized by the spirit to indicate physical redemption?

(Les) Aren't you really kind of aiming this section here, at the hard core unamended theory? These are what we would call in the common vernacular buzz words, they are words that mean something special to them and without understanding in depth the Andrew doctrine, they just

³⁷ Bro. Stone is confusing things that differ, mostly because he denies the difference. There are two processes here being described and they are very closely related, but they are different. First, there is the purging of the flesh from the condemnation we inherited from Adam. This is the purging or cleansing that is required. Secondly, there is the change of nature from the natural man to the perfected man. This is the glorification, perfection, or changing that bro. Stone speaks of. As we have said before, bro. Stone is half right. He has correct the part that we have to be glorified. But he denies the part that makes the glorification possible, the purging of the body from "sin in the flesh".

kind of slip right over you?

(Richard) Yes, that's true. We use them ourselves, you know. I use them myself, sometimes unwisely. You know, I say well, this body does have to be cleansed, put on a crown of righteousness, and so forth; but that's an unscriptural term. This body has to be changed, glorified, redeemed, quickened, and all those other words, but to say that it has to be cleansed is an unscriptural term and right now I would hesitate to use these words although in my own mind I know what I mean, but it might mislead others. Those words are just food for thought. And their not very good words. And without knowing the Greek and Hebrew, they're incidental.

But what I don't like is when a brother uses a term out of context. Uses a Scriptural term and gives it a different...why do this? Like alienation. The Unamended insist on using that word. They say, we don't mean it as a moral term. Then don't use it. Use some other word because alienation invariably is a moral term in the Scriptures. We are alienated from God by wicked works. But they use that term to describe man's...the fact that man has to be brought nigh, that Christ had to be brought nigh to God because of his physical nature. That we had to be brought nigh because of our physical nature. So they say we are alienated from God. We are born into a state of alienation. That means Christ was born into a state of alienation which is ridiculous. That Holy Child that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. Alienation. But this is what we're led to by the use of these terms.³⁸

(Don) What you're saying Richard, is that we won't be judged for what we were born, but for the things we do with that body, whether it's in a glorifying of God or to the satisfying the flesh.

(Richard) Yes. Right. To be crucified with Christ means to kill the impulses of the flesh, doesn't it. When Christ said, if your hand offendeth thee, cut it off. If thine eye offendeth, pluck it out. Some people have taken this quite literally and have had horrible results from it. But you know, we can go to Col. 3 and notice how Paul uses this term and here he explains exactly what is meant. Col. 3:5-6. Would you read that please, Beth.

(Beth) "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience:".

(Richard) Now when he says to mortify, the word mortify means to kill. To crucify means to kill. We mortify our members. What he really means is mortify the manner in which sin is manifested in you...in your members...but fornication, uncleanness, the manner in which sin expresses itself in our members, mortify these deeds of the body, that's what he means. That's what Christ meant.

If your feet take you somewhere where it's sin, cut them off, that is, don't go there anymore. Cut off the thing that is causing offence. If your eyes are looking upon something, looking upon a book or something that causes you to offend, pluck your eye out. That is, don't get involved in those things anymore. That's all he meant. Cut off those things in which sin manifests itself.

³⁸ Here is another case where bro. Stone makes a proper reference to a wrong doctrine by the Unamended brethren, and their improper use of the term "alienation" which is a moral term; and then *improperly* tying it in with "purge" or "unclean", which, as we have shown, do have physical meanings.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 27

(Les) Are you going to spend some time on the Diabolos?

(Richard) Yes, lets do it right now. do you want to take a little more time?

(Aud) What page now?

(Richard) Diabolos. Its on page 8 of the outline. Diabolos is from two Greek words, dia which means through and bolos, which means strike, or strike through. Its a figure of speech means, and it comes down to mean false accuser or slanderer, calumniator, or vicious slanderer. And this diabolos is a moral term in the New Testament. The word devil is always used in a bad way. In a bad sense. And when Satan appears as a synonym for the devil, it too is used morally, and as a moral term in John 13:2, lets look at it.

Devil, unlike the word Satan, Satan does not necessarily mean bad, it could mean something good, it merely means adversary. But the word devil always means false accuser, slanderer. 13:2, read that please.

(Aud) "And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him;"

(Richard) Now there, I think its used in a moral term. The devil had been now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot. Judas Iscariot had now made up his mind that he would betray the son of God. And in Luke 22:3 it uses the word Satan because Satan there is synonymous with devil. Not always, but in that case its synonymous. Look at Acts 5. Acts 5:3. This is when Ananias and Saphira came to Peter.

(Aud) "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?"

(Richard) And he asks, why have ye agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord in v. 9. 26:18. All I'm trying to prove here is that its use is in a moral sense. The devil always is used this way. Acts 26:18.

(Aud) "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."

(Richard) O.K. So it's used in a moral sense, but when it is applied to men or systems, it is always used in a bad sense. We find this in Revelations when the devil is bound for 1,000 years, so it could no longer deceive the nations. The devil here represents the system or iniquity. Not only the political systems but the ecclesiastical systems, as well. Lets turn to 1 Pet. 5:8, and look at that one.

(Aud) "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour:"

(Richard) Rev. 2:10 says the devil shall cast some of you into prison. He's the one that pursued them. This of course was the Roman government, in which sin dominates and rules.

Now you're familiar with these others, 2 Tim. 3:3 where it's translated false accusers. Titus 3:3 is translated false accuser. And other places slanderers. And again, its always used in an evil sense.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 28

Now sin nature, which leads to death is metonymically³⁹ spoken of as diabolos. Because it's a personification. We have here the language of personification. For instance, go back to Acts 13:10.

(Aud) "And said, O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?"

(Richard) He called him the child of the devil. In other words, the devil was his father. Now turn back to John 8:44 and notice how Christ addressed the Jews here.

(Aud) "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it."

(Richard) Now obviously here, the devil is personified, its a personification of something. What is it a personification of? Now he says here the children of the devil will do the lusts of the father. He says in verse 32, "ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." They answered him, "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free? Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." They were the devil's children because the devil here was a personification of sin. They become his progeny.

Just as sin is personified in the sixth chapter of Romans, "let not sin reign in your mortal bodies that ye shall bear in the lusts thereof." "The wages of sin is death." So, sin here being personified can be called a false accuser or slanderer. Because it's the basis of our own being accused before God if we obey it. Because of our own death.

Now the flesh is spoken of in two senses in the Scriptures. It's spoken of in the physical sense, purely physical; as Jesus Christ came in the flesh as John maintains that so many times, Rom. 1:3 speaks of Christ being the son of David according to the flesh. And there its strictly a term describing the physical quality.

But also flesh is used in a moral sense, isn't it.⁴⁰ Just one illustration and then we'll go on.

³⁹ Here we are back to these words which are not readily understood, and which are a source of confusion to bro. Stone. He says metonymically, but he means metaphorically. Remember bro. Growcott's explanation of metonym in the first class. When you see metonym, read it, "the same thing as". As we shall see, bro. Stone has a different understanding of metonym. Sin nature is the same thing as the diabolos. But bro. Stone doesn't believe that, and as we shall see, he will teach that it means something different than the diabolos.

⁴⁰ No, it's not. Flesh is not the operative word here, which would indicate some moral action. In the verses he quotes, the descriptive terms which affect morality are "walk", "please," and "mind". The flesh is not a moral term, but a physical term explaining where the wicked works come from. This is the same thought that Jesus had when he told us in Mat. 15:19; "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies:". These wicked things come from the heart. In Rom 8:4-5 Paul says that they come from the carnal mind, which if translated properly, would be "the thinking of the flesh". These verses show that the thought process that all of us are born with, (our physical minds) are contrary to the desires of God. The mind is physical. The obeying (walking, pleasing, minding) of the wicked thoughts is the moral. Without the thinking of the Spirit being added to our thought process, and then taking over our fleshly thoughts, we would always walk after the flesh, which means walk wickedly.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 29

Rom. 8. It's used many times in this chapter as a something that is moral, not just physical. Lets read verses 1, 4-5.

(Aud) "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit."

(Richard) And then in verse 8, "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." He doesn't mean physically. Christ came in the flesh. He always pleased the Father. We pleased God while we're in the flesh, not physically, but morally.

So flesh is spoken of in two senses, and we must bear that in mind. And sin nature. Now I use this term sin nature for flesh and blood, because the term sin nature never occurs in the Bible. It's a term that we have invented to describe flesh and blood. It's a nature that lead to sin, so we call it sin nature. It is not a term that you'll find in the Bible.

Now physically, Heb. 2:14 "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;". Flesh and blood. Its is purely physical here.

We're in Romans here, turn to 1 Cor. 15, and verse 50.

(Les) "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

(Richard) And I think that we would agree that flesh and blood there is just a term describing this physical condition. Not being good or bad.⁴¹ Purely physical. And I think its's used that way in Romans 8:3. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh". Now sinful flesh is an incorrect rending of this term. Sinful flesh implies sinning flesh.⁴² He didn't come in sinning flesh. He came in flesh of sin. Or sin's flesh. Flesh that produces sin. And here it has no moral connotation. God sent his Son in the likeness of sin's flesh.

Morally, Jesus always did the will of his Father, and had the testimony from God that "this is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased. But physically, Jesus had in him the same temptations that you and I have. These tempting thoughts are contrary to the will of God. That is why we see Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane praying to God: "And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying Oh my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not a I will, but as thou wilt." Jesus didn't want to go up on the cross. No one would want to. But it was essential in the plan of God that he did, and he was obedient to God's desires, crucifying his own. It is these thoughts which are contrary to God's will that Jesus never gave into, but which all who are born of the flesh have; and which form the enmity between God and man which Paul speaks about here.

⁴¹ While we would agree that "flesh and blood" or "sin nature" are physical terms, we would not agree that the physical is neither good nor bad. The physical nature in the Scriptures is always bad.

⁴² No, it doesn't. Sinful flesh means flesh full of sin. It doesn't mean sinning flesh, which would imply that Jesus, who never sinned, didn't have sinful flesh. It means that the flesh we have is sin. And this agrees with the other statements we have had under consideration such as "He had made him to be sin, for us who knew no sin", and "He bore our sins in his own body to the tree". God made him to be flesh full of sin, in order to condemn sin. Flesh full of sin is a physical expression. Sinning flesh would be moral.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 30

But also the flesh is used morally, isn't it? Flesh and blood. And I've given some illustrations here of how it's used morally.⁴³ Now let's ask ourselves a question. In what sense did Christ "come in the flesh?" It's in quotation marks. In what sense did he partake of flesh and blood? Morally or physically? You have to say physically. He certainly didn't partake of it morally, he partook of it physically. So there you have the meaning of it.

Now I maintain, now I understand that you all don't agree with me, but human nature, or the natural impulses within mankind are not evil in themselves. The natural desires for food, self preservation, satisfaction of the passions or anything that will fulfill the natural desires are not evil in themselves if withheld within certain boundaries. In the proper restraint. The fulfillment of these desires or lusts when confined in moral boundaries established and revealed by God are not a cause of disfavor.⁴⁴ It's when we go beyond them, beyond the boundaries, they become sin. Now I illustrated this in the sense of self preservation, in us. And if we didn't have a sense of self preservation in us, a sense of self preservation, we wouldn't seek for immortality.⁴⁵ We wouldn't want to be immortalized as a Jew. And it's not wrong. But we can seek it in a wrong way.

(Aud) Would you say like, when desire becomes lust, it becomes sinful that way?

⁴³ Please remember that he hasn't given us a single example of where the term flesh is used morally. All he has given us so far, is where the term "flesh" is used to describe the **source** of immoral acts.

⁴⁴ He's right. No true Christadelphian could agree with him, that the flesh is not of its self evil. "The heart of a man is desperately wicked" says Jeremiah. No it not, says bro. Stone. There are good things in the heart, in the physical nature. If this is the case, why did Jesus refuse the term "good"?

In his explanation, bro. Stone says that the flesh's desires or lusts when confined in moral boundaries established and revealed by God are not a cause of disfavor. Isn't this in itself an admittance that the flesh by itself is evil? Why do the desires of the flesh need to be restrained, if they are not evil? They need to be restrained because without divine guidance, they are simply evil.

Bro. Stone is so very confused on this matter. What the apostle Paul is trying to tell us in Rom. 8 is this. The flesh (the carnal mind) is evil. If an individual allows the moral boundaries established by God (the Spiritual mind) to rule in his body; then and only then can he bring forth works acceptable to God. Paul is saying this clearly enough. Bro. Stone is having so much difficulty with this because he refuses to see anything unclean in Christ, including his nature. If there was anything unclean in Christ, then Christ would require an atoning sacrifice for sin. That is clear enough. As bro. Stone cannot accept that, he has to twist these otherwise clear statements into ambiguous figures of speech.

⁴⁵ To seek for immortality in the proper way is learned, not inherent in our flesh. Everyone knows that. The natural flesh without the Scriptures knows nothing of the way of life. Our point remains, there is nothing good, but only evil **in our flesh**.

(Richard) Yes.⁴⁶

(Aud) But the desire itself is not sinful.

(Richard) No.

(Aud) There is the test between sin, and sin within me.

(Richard) I think so. Now human nature, as it is within everyman expressing itself in sinful conduct can rightfully be termed diabolos.

(Stan) How do we explain the devil if we can't use Heb. 2:14 to do it?

(Richard) All right. Lets look at this way. The word devil, diabolos, false accuser is obviously a personification of something. Isn't it. There is no such thing as the devil.

(Stan) That's not so obvious if you believe in the devil.

(Richard) But we don't believe in the devil. I'm talking about us, Christadelphians. Diabolos is obviously a personification of something.

(Stan) That's where I came from.

(Richard) O.K. I did too. I came from a world that believed in the devils too, so I had a hard time with that. But the devil is obviously a personification of something. When Paul speaks in the 6th chapter of Romans, "let not sin reign in your mortal bodies," sin is obviously personified as a king. So a king is a personification of something, isn't it? Of what is the king a personification of? Sin. The wages of sin is death, he speaks of sin as a master, so master is the personification of something. Of what is the master of personification? Of sin. Now what is the devil a personification of? Well you won't find it in Heb. 2:14. Because that verse doesn't explain itself. But what did Christ destroy on the cross. Sin. Didn't he?⁴⁷ He destroyed sin in as much as he provided a way by which sin could be forgiven. There is therefore no condemnation of those who are in Christ Jesus. Because in Christ Jesus we have forgiveness of sins. As far as we are concerned, sin has been destroyed. And the effect of the destruction of sin by his dying upon the cross as an offering for sin, sin was condemned and executed on the cross.

(Don) I think I mentioned this to you once before, Rich. Christ in his flesh, the war was taking place in his flesh in the sense that in his flesh he over came the world, he crucified the flesh, and he struck a death blow to the seed of the serpent in his flesh. He overcame it. Everything that that serpent represented, Christ conquered and overcame in his flesh. And then he goes to the cross.

⁴⁶ This is wrong. Jesus said with "desire", he desired to eat the passover prior to his crucifixion. The word desire is the same word that usually is translated "lust". So the issue is not how intense our desire is for something; but rather **what it is** that we desire in the first place. That is what determines right from wrong.

⁴⁷ This is the question that if answered, would relieve bro. Stone of his difficulties. What was destroyed on the cross? It wasn't sin, in any moral sense, since Jesus never sinned. The only thing that was destroyed (murdered, as the word destroyed should have been translated) was his "sin in the flesh" body.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 32

(Richard) It's true. He had a lifelong, or a life spent in suppressing the flesh. In displaying the poverty of human nature, by suppressing it. This qualified him for his death upon the cross.

(Don) We have in one of our hymns, hymn 171, and they just sung it last Sunday, in a full self sacrifice. It was sung at the breaking of bread.

(Les) It seems to me that you have the effect destroyed without the cause, with that explanation of the diabolos.

(Richard) Well, the cause wasn't destroyed when Christ died on the cross.⁴⁸ When he was resurrected, he was resurrected the same way that he went into the grave. He still had the impulses to sin.⁴⁹ The cause was still there. But God not only raised him from the dead but he gave him glory. God raised him from the dead and gave him glory to sit at his own right hand. In other words he glorified him. There were two steps in his immortalization, just as there will be in ours. We come forth from the grave, we come forth as natural bodies. Same propensities we have. But we have to be changed. Just as Christ was changed. That's what I'm saying.

(Stan) Would you say that the propensities to sin are the same as mortality?

(Richard) Yes.

(Les) Nothing more?

(Richard) Nothing more. Sinful nature is a term invented by us, remember that. And these propensities invariably lead to sin and by metonymy they can be called sin.

(Les) Seems to me...I'll agree with you that it's not a Biblical term, but it seems to be that the two gentlemen who invented it were bro. Roberts and Dr. Thomas and they used it a great deal.

(Richard) And there has been no end of debate over the term ever since they used it. I don't think Dr. Thomas would have used nearly the things he did, the terms he used you know, if he'd known what would have happened to those terms after he died.

(Les) In relation to what Stan said here with every body's indulgence, there is only four lines of quotes from Eureka and it has a direct bearing on what you said this brother said to you. Listen to what Dr. Thomas said in Volume 1.

He said Diabolos is a very fit and proper word by which to designate the law of sin and death or sin's flesh. What is that which has the power of death? It is the exceeding great sinner, Sin, in the sense of the law of sin and death within all the posterity of Adam without exception. This then is Paul's diabolos which he says has the power of death which power he also says is the

⁴⁸ Sure it was. The cause, or "sin in the flesh," was destroyed in Christ on the cross when his sinful nature died.

⁴⁹ There were no recorded impulses to sin after Jesus came out of the grave. How can a statement like this be justified. The parable of the ten virgins shows us that this is wrong. When the Bride-groom comes there will be no more time to buy oil, that is, to do good, or to do bad. Our fight against the flesh is over, at that point. The command is gone forth: Rev. 22:11 He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. This is the condition of the resurrected. No temptation, no righteous works. Just a waiting for the judgment.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 33

sting of death.

(Richard) And Dr. Thomas equate diabolos, if you read further, with sin.⁵⁰ Because that which has the power of death, there is only one other place where the phrase occurs, 1 Cor. 15:56. It says the strength of sin in the law. The sting of death is sin.

(Don) The wages of sin is death.

(Richard) That's right. And the seventh of Romans where Paul speaks of sin slaying him. Well, maybe we better digest what we have gone over and...

All I...when I teach somebody the Truth, or teach some body, I don't like to invent phrases. I like to go to the Scriptures and use Scriptural terms. And a lot of error in Christendom is brought in because they've invented terms.

(Beth) When Paul said that in me, that is in my flesh dwelleth no good thing, it sounds like he contradicts you when you say there is nothing wrong with the physical flesh, physical body.

(Richard) He spoke of the sin that dwelleth in me, didn't he? In the same context, Rom. 7, where he said it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

(Beth) He spoke of a law.

(Richard) Yes. It's a law because it's a fixed principle of the flesh. It invariably produces sin, therefore it's a law of sin in our members. It always produces sin.

(Beth) It's called a law of sin which is in me, and it would seem to follow that it is also in Christ, though he remained sinless, it that correct.

(Richard) He had the propensities, that's true. If you understand the law of sin to mean that, yes, I would agree with you whole heartedly. But Paul says the good that I would do, I do not, and that which I would not do, I do. It is no more I but sin that dwelleth in me. What he is saying is that he had a nature that led him to sin, and therefore by the use of metonymy, putting the effect for the cause, the effect of sin, putting it for the cause which is sinful nature, he calls it simply sin.

(Don) You almost quoted what I was going to say. Paul says when I would do good evil is present.

(Richard) He calls it evil. Sin that dwelleth in his members. He calls it the law of sin. He calls it simply sin. But I would hesitate to say that sin dwelt in Christ.

(Beth) The law of sin, if it's part of his nature, because he was exactly the same nature as we are.

(Richard) That's true. But by metonymy, the flesh produces sin. The law of sin. So since it always produces sin, it can be called sin. If you have a gun and you have a name, this is death. Why? Because it produces death. But if the gun never produces death, it would be difficult to

⁵⁰ No he doesn't. This is entirely made up.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 34

speak of it as metonymy as producing death.⁵¹

But Christ never sinned. We should hesitate to use that kind of construction in relation to a human being that has never sinned. Such as Christ. And he only. To say that sin dwelt within him...

(Beth) The law of sin.

(Richard) Well, O.K. If we understand the law of sin. We must be careful, Beth, because...

(Beth) But it's in the Bible.

(Richard) It doesn't say that the law of sin dwelt in Christ, does it?

(Beth) If Christ had the same nature, you said that yourself. That he had the same nature as we do.

(Richard) All right. Let's look at Rom. 7 for a minute.

(Beth) I'm confused, your saying that, then saying something different.⁵²

(Richard) Paul is talking about himself as a sinner, isn't he? Verse 7. "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Now, Paul is talking about himself personally. "But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead." Why? Because Paul's a sinner. And the law said, "Thou shalt not" and therefore sin became alive in Paul. Was it alive in Christ?

When the law came, did it reveal in Christ that he was a sinner? No. Well what Paul says about himself is true about every other person. He said that the commandment that was ordained to life I found to be unto death. For sin taking occasion by the commandment deceived me and by it slew me. Why? Because Paul was a sinner, that's why.⁵³

(Les) But previous to that, did in the fifth verse he talks about the motions of sin, which was in his body. Bringing forth that fruit of death. We...the fruit of death was transgression of course.

⁵¹ Here is a perfect example of how bro. Stone does not understand the things he teaches. Gun is not a metonym for death. It is a metaphor for death. A metonym must be so closely related that they cannot be separated. It must be another word for the thing you are describing. A metaphor is a symbolical expression. A metonym is an actual expression.

⁵² It is confusing until you get it figured out as to when bro. Stone is using the terms in a symbolical fashion, and when he is not. This element of confusion is what has led some well meaning but unscholarly brethren to say that we are all saying the same things, just differently. It is why we have concentrated on the one visible point, that it was necessary that Christ should offer first for his own sins, and then for the people's. The disagreement on this point shows that we are not saying the same things differently, but that the entire plan of salvation which we believe is different.

⁵³ That is not where Paul places the blame. Paul would answer bro. Stone's question this way. "For **to will** is present with me." So the question is not, did Jesus sin, and therefore have "sin in the flesh"; but rather, did Jesus have his own human **will** and therefore have "sin in the flesh"? The answer to this as we have shown, is clearly **yes!**

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 35

(Richard) The motions of sin or the passions of sin which were by the law and did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. It produces sin and always produces sin in Paul. I mean it produced sin in Paul because he was a sinner like we are. I am chief of sinners among the Gentiles. Paul recognized that he sinned. And he failed.

(Les) I'm meaning the motions of sin in his flesh is what caused it. That's what Beth is talking about, the law.

(Richard) It's called the motions of sin because it produces sin, isn't it? In Christ it didn't produce sin.

(Les) In a specially prepared body too.

(Richard) Well, he had our same nature.

(Les) Right.

(Richard) He's an example of how God looks upon a person apart from transgression. And God looked upon Christ apart from transgression as something with which he was absolutely pleased. But with you and me. We always sin. Therefore we are not separated from our sins. In Paul's experience, these impulses always made him sin. They always produced sin. He says for that which I do I allow not, that which I would, that do I not, that which I hate, that I do. It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

What sin dwelleth in him? The motions of sin. Sin is a succinct way of expressing the propensities that lead to sin. It's a simple matter of metonymy, Les. The fact that it always produces sin and in fact, by metonymy can be called sin. But unless it produces sin, it would be difficult to even call it sin by metonymy.⁵⁴

(Beth) Then you're saying that Christ was different from us.

(Richard) No, no I'm not.⁵⁵ He had the same propensities. He was different in that he didn't sin. He was certainly different there. He was different from us 'cause he never sinned. But he could have. He had the same propensities of sin.

(Les) That's where it gets us in trouble, Dick. That word propensities. None of our pioneers used that word. That's a word that has only been used by the last two generations and unfortunately it doesn't carry the same context as something that will inevitably happen.

⁵⁴ This point is well taken. If the physical body was not sin, you could not, by metonymy, call it sin. You could "metaphorically" call it sin, but that is another matter. Why are we having this discussion on metonymy. The answer is because bro. Roberts used the term, and it is a term most are not familiar with. Therefore bro. Stone can say these things and generally get away with it, claiming to be in harmony with bro. Roberts.

But bro. Roberts had no problem in saying that by metonymy, our physical nature is styled sin, even, and in fact, especially in Jesus. Yet as bro. Stone points out, if our nature does not lead to sin, (as it didn't in Jesus) you could not by metonymy call it sin. Can we not see the differences in their teaching.

⁵⁵ And truly bro. Stone is not saying that Christ was different from us. His attack against the truth is not on the issue of whether or not Christ had sinful flesh; his attack is against the Christadelphian belief that the physical flesh which we inherit from Adam is in fact sinful, defiled, unclean, etc., and therefore requires to be purged by sacrifice.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 36

Propensities can happen or they can't. And the only way that Christ was able to exist without actually sinning was because he was a specially prepared body. God made him spirit manifested in flesh.

(Richard) You're saying something that maybe you don't fully understand. If Christ had the same identical nature as we did, how could he keep from sinning. I think he did have the identical nature, I say simply just because he was the son of God, that doesn't tell us anything.

(Beth) By the grace of God.

(Richard) Oh, how did that help him not to sin?

(Beth) By his power.

(Richard) By his power? Did He fence Christ in so he wouldn't be subjected to temptation?

(Beth) Somehow, he didn't give into sin.

(Richard) O.K. But...I'm just trying to nail it down. I'm not trying to put you on the spot. Let's clarify our thinking.

(Les) Well, I've heard you and John say yourselves that you don't know how he did it, but he did it. I think I heard that a few weeks ago. We don't really know how he did it.

(Richard) All right. I maintain that he had the identical nature that we do. O.K.? But to say that he didn't sin because he was the son of God is not enough. That doesn't tell me anything. He was in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin. Now, there must have been a reason why he didn't sin and all else failed. He was a body specially prepared, absolutely true. Every molecule of his body I think was prepared of God. He was the veil of the temple, wasn't he? The veil of the temple was curiously wrought, wasn't he? It was very skillfully put together according to the pattern that God showed Moses in the mount. It indicated that that veil that represented Christ in the flesh of Christ was made exactly to the requirements of God. And Paul says in Heb. 10 that that veil was his flesh, his flesh was that veil. It means that God produced Christ exactly as he wanted him.

Now, did He make him free from sin by giving him a nature that couldn't sin? No, 'Course not. Did He hedge him in so he wouldn't be confronted with sin? No, of course not. He was in all points tempted like we are yet without sin. What did he have that we don't have?

(Les) Well, each one of us, some of us are genius and some of us are not. As you said, it depends on the molecules as to what you end up with. And he was a body that certainly was blessed with a great amount of intelligence and the ability to understand God's words, that a lot of us don't have. God could have taken care of it in any one of a number of ways. But that certainly is one way that God could have handled the situation.

(Richard) And that's probably the way He did it. He endowed him with understanding and wisdom. You and I sin before we know we are sinning. Children sin. We sin before we realize what sin is. We sin even now because we don't realize how far we can go, sometimes. But Christ had the understanding that God filled him with, wisdom, to such an extent that he could always recognize sin. He always knew what it was. And therefore he never committed sin. He dedicated himself solely to the purpose of God...which required a lot of absolute obedience. But God endowed him, and gave him that understanding, so that he would never be

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 37

confronted with a situation that he would not recognize the adversary. So Christ did live a life of absolute perfect obedience.

(Don) I think the whole thing is summed up in the phrase, he grew in favor with God and man. When we think of the greatness of Christ overcoming the flesh to hang on the cross, many people hung on the cross. But there is only one man among the millions who might save us, who over came the flesh. And it was only one of our nature who could accomplish that. He could have done it in the animal if that's all it took. It had to be somebody of our nature. It was his desire, it says the zeal of thine house has ate me up. He was consumed with the desire to please his God. He always had to please Him. I think this to me is Christ's true greatness. In that he was consummated, it says that he was faithful. Now if he was made to be faithful or just made faithful, then he didn't do anything. But it says he was faithful even to the death on the cross. To me, this is the great beauty of Christ, to me that there was one man, and one man only who could overcome the flesh.

(Stan) Did Christ over come the flesh, or over come sin?

(Richard) Well, he over came both because lust leads to sin. He provided a way by which our sins can be forgiven so he destroyed that which has the power over us. We have been liberated from sin. Not only as servants, but the consequences of sin.

(Stan) Back to Heb. 2:14. You mention that there was some difficulty or ambiguity with Heb. 2:14. Could you elaborate a little bit.

(Richard) Well, not of Heb. 2:14 but of verses that follow. What I said about Heb. 2:14 was the fact that you have to place a construction upon diabolos in order to arrive at a conclusion. Whatever the diabolos has, it has the power of death, so I go else where and find that the devil has the power of death, and I learn that Christ came to destroy the devil, he came to destroy sin. He came to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, he destroyed the devil through his death. So I put 2 + 2 together and say that the devil means sin.⁵⁶

Down here in verse 15, "and delivered them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. Verily he took not upon himself the nature of angels but took on him the seed of Abraham." You know we generally look at that and say that's Christ. He didn't take on him the nature of angels. He took on him the nature of Abraham. But that isn't what he's saying there.⁵⁷ The center column says he taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold. What is it that taketh hold of the seed of Abraham that does not take hold of angels. Well, its's the subject matter of verse 15. It's the fear of death. Death. Death takes

⁵⁶ And that really is the way that he reached his conclusion. By carefully selecting and dissecting little bits and pieces, bro. Stone has managed to come up with a conclusion which creates more questions than it answers. What has the power of death. Sin (which to bro. Stone only means transgression? No, babies die, and they don't sin. Jesus died, and he didn't sin. The nature we inherit from Adam on account of sin, has the power of death. Adam was cursed in the Garden. "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." This curse became a physical law in his being. Here is the power of death. Here is the Devil.

⁵⁷ Whether or not that is what the verse is saying, the statement is true, and bro. Stone has not called that into question. He has repeatedly stated that Jesus had the same nature as we do, and our nature is the nature of Abraham. So why the objection, unless on technical grounds? Either way you want to look at verse 15, the meaning of verse 14 would be the same. Jesus took on our flesh and blood nature, to destroy that which was killing us, which is our inherent nature, and our sins.

CLASS THREE: NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST BY RICHARD STONE PAGE 38

hold of the nature of the seed of Abraham and not angels. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, not like the angels, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. What I'm saying is that in verse 16 the "he" there should be "it" referring to death. Death takes hold of the seed of Abraham because it's in the present, not the past.

That verse there is very often misconstrued. What I said about verse 14 is that we have to determine what the devil is there. And, its described here as that which has the power of death.

**END CLASS THREE
(THE LAST CLASS IN A SERIES OF THREE CLASSES)**