

DISCUSSION ON THE NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST
DISCUSSION IS LED BY RICHARD STONE
CLASS ONE OF THREE
TRANSCRIPTION BY JIM PHILLIPS FROM A TAPE RECORDING
FOOTNOTED¹ BY JIM PHILLIPS

(Richard Stone) Now I don't know how far we'll get through this outline, but here are some of the subjects that are covered in this outline. The sacrificial death of Christ was in the form of an offering for sin; sin destroyed in the crucifixion of Christ; Christ died to effect the forgiveness of our sins; why was Christ raised from the dead; the blood of the everlasting covenant; Jesus Christ as a sin bearer; and God's righteousness declared; and diabolos, a moral term. There was one other that I wasn't able to complete before tonight, so it will be taken some other time. We probably will not get through this tonight because there will be some discussion and there will be questions.

But I'd like for us to read together this first paragraph because I think that its extremely important that we recognize what happens in the sacrifice of Christ. In dealing with the death of Christ the mistake is often made of ignoring the ritual aspect of his offering.² Unless due consideration is given to this viewpoint of his sacrifice, as well as to the divine principles exhibited therein, we shall miss entirely the full import of his death. Failure to recognize the purpose of the sin offering under the law (which

¹ In our footnotes we will quote extensively from bre. Thomas, Roberts, and Growcott. We do this for a several very specific reasons. Bro. Stone once complained to me: "Whenever I talk to some one holding Berean teachings on these matters, his only defence consists almost entirely of quotations from bre. Roberts and Thomas.

"I think you will agree with me, Jim, that our first and only line of defence in respect to the beliefs we hold as true must lie in the Scriptures themselves. When we dispute with or teach those outside of the Truth, we rely wholly on the Word of God, not on the authority of Robert Roberts or John Thomas (which authority would not carry any weight with them in any event). It is a sad thing to have to prove that one's beliefs and teachings are in line with the pioneers instead of the Bible."

In saying this, bro. Stone missed the point. We do not quote extensively from the pioneer brethren because the are authority figures, but because their **arguments are based** upon the **Scriptures**. Now, we could borrow their arguments, reword them, and claim them as our own. We do this frequently in public lectures, regardless of the subject. But by quoting directly from the pioneers we do several things. First, bre. Roberts and Thomas were powerful and clear writers. By quoting them verbatim, all of us get the advantage of their depth of understanding and ability to communicate. Secondly, it resolves an issue which is important to some Christadelphians, as to what was the original position of the Truth on this matter. I know that any one who is a true Christadelphian would quickly put away traditional Christadelphian belief, if it could be established that that belief is opposed to the Scriptures. If bre. Roberts and Thomas taught wrong, then their teachings should be discarded. We would not argue that.

But as a point of reference in determining the true from the false, it is essential to many brethren to know what is the original position upon which our system of religion is based, rather than what is the belief of any current brother. Once it is clearly established what is the foundation position, and what is the new position; then it can be determined which position is the Truth. Bro. Roberts said in his booklet, the Blood of Christ, that the Sacrifice of Christ is the "hub of the wheel", from which all the rest of our faith branches out as spokes. If Christadelphian belief on this vital doctrine changes, then many of the other tenants of our faith must change as well, as we shall see as we examine bro. Stone's talk. The nature of man, who the devil is, and to a lesser degree the resurrection all must change to accommodate bro. Stone's views.

So we are not apologetic for our extensive quotations from the pioneer brethren. Some, such as bro. Stone say they have no stomach for justifying their beliefs against the pioneers. That is fine. That is not the issue. We encourage them to forget who they are, and focus on what they said. Don't look at them as authority figures, but look at their arguments, and then judge right from wrong.

² This is a true statement, but it is the basis for later difficulties with this exposition. A ritual can be symbolical, it can be a reality, or it can be both. The failure to see the reality in Christ's sacrifice, only focusing on the symbolical aspects of the sacrifice, is the basis for the failures of this paper.

contained shadows of good things to come) will lead one to strange conclusions as to why Christ was required to suffer the kind of death he did. It will be recognized that in the purpose of God concerning the reconciliation of repentant sinners, His son was subjected to a violent, blood shedding death.³ This subject has many facets, some of which we shall attempt to cover in this lesson, as we pursue the Scriptural reasons for the death and sacrifice of Christ.

Now this is important that we understand and recognize that a sin offering is a ritual or a ceremony. It ritually exhibits what is due sin. And we are going to look at that in a little more detail here.

The first point that we want to make tonight is that the sacrificial death of Christ was in the form of an offering for sin so lets turn to Hebrews and I'd like the class to read around and we'll begin with Les over here and just follow around as we pick out these particular scriptures. Let's go to Heb. 9:26-28 if you'll read that for us Les please.

(Ellis Higham) "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

(Richard Stone) And of course in chapter 10:12; "But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God:". So I think we must admit that his offering was indeed an offering for sins. Now the purpose of his offering was to take away sins, and this means our sins can't literally be taken away, they can't literally be covered, but they can literally be forgiven.⁴ And by taken away, I mean that the means was provided in the death of Christ by which God could, without compromising any of his own principles of righteousness forgive us our sins.

Figuratively, they have been taken away: so we know John 1:29, "Behold the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Here is a lamb of God's own provision. A lamb is a sacrificial victim. It pointed to the fact that God in some way was going to take away the sin of the world through this man that was called the lamb of God.

Now look at Romans 3:25. Now we are going to look in detail at these verses in Romans but not at this point here. All we want to establish is the fact that by the offering of his son God provided a means by which our sins could be forgiven. Sandy, would you read that please.

(Sandy) Rom. 3:25. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;"

(Richard Stone) Now what he is saying is that God has set forth Christ to be a propitiation: but it

³ The curse in the garden was "dying thou shalt die". Both bro. J.J. Andrew, and this teaching altar that curse to "dying thou shalt die a violent death".

⁴ "This is the first serious error of this paper. Our sins are literally taken away, when sin nature is literally taken away. Our transgressions are also literally taken away both at baptism, and after the judgment. Jesus was the reality of the symbols under the law, not just another symbol, in a long line of symbols. Bro. Roberts posed the question this way: "If you say our sins were laid on him in the same way as they were laid on the sacrificial animals in the Mosaic system of things (which was a mere CEREMONIAL OR ARTIFICIAL IMPUTATIVENESS), *how comes it that those sacrifices could never take away sins* Heb. 10:2). And where then is the SUBSTANCE OF THE SHADOW? The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animal was the type. The REAL putting of sin on the Lamb of God IN THE BESTOWAL OF A PREPARED SIN-BODY wherein to die, is the substance. (Chdn. 1873).

requires faith on our part in his blood in which was declared the righteousness of God to effect the remission or the forgiveness of sins that are past. By this way God could be shown as being just and be the justifier of them that believe in Jesus. As I said before, we'll get back to this because this is a whole section by itself. God's Righteousness Declared.

Now lets look at the sin offering under the law. Since Christ was to be a sin offering it behooves us to understand the principles exhibited in the sin offering under the law of Moses. Because after all, they were shadows and types. All offerings under the law were actually ritual prophesies of Christ.⁵ They were a ritual or a ceremony. The word ritual merely means that it is something that you go through, you act out to demonstrate other principles as in partaking of the wine and eating the bread on Sunday morning. This is a ceremony or a ritual that we go through. But it serves to remind us that we intellectually and morally digest the teachings of Christ. We give a moral accent to the principles exhibited in his death, we remember Christ, but it is a ceremony; its a ritual.

And so is the ritual of the sin offering. The sacrifice had to be brought by the offeror before the sanctuary. He then laid his hands upon the head of the animal and he killed it himself making his confession of sin. Now lets check that out. Go to Lev. with me, Chapter 1. In almost all cases the one who brought the sin offering, the trespass offering killed it himself. Lets read Lev. 1:5 and 3:2.

(A) "And he shall kill the bullock before the Lord: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that is by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation."

(Richard Stone) And of course verse 4 it says he puts his hand upon its head of the burnt offering. Also at chapter three at verse 2 and verse 8.

(A) And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation: and Aaron's sons the priests shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about.

(Richard Stone) O.K. Beth, would you read verses 8 and 13 for us.

(Beth Higham) "And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it before the tabernacle of the congregation: and Aaron's sons shall sprinkle the blood thereof round about upon the altar. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of it, and kill it before the tabernacle of the congregation: and the sons of Aaron shall sprinkle the blood thereof upon the altar round about."

(Richard Stone) So the one who brought the sacrificial victim laid his hands upon his head and then he killed it himself and then the priest manipulated the blood in such a way as to effect his forgiveness.

Now there were certain rules governing these offerings and first of all the animal had to be a clean animal, and it had to be taken from out of the herd or flock, and we notice this in Lev. 1:2. "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, If any man of you bring an offering unto the Lord, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, even of the herd, and of the flock."

Now there were many other animals like the deer and the roe buck which were clean animals which could be eaten but they could not be offered in sacrifice. It had to be a domesticated animal, one out

⁵ This is true, but a prophesy prophesies of a reality in the future, not of another symbol.

of the herd or out of the flock. And the reason was that it stood in close relationship to the offeror. It was going to represent him.⁶ It was the closest living thing to him apart from the human being. It was one on which he had placed a great deal of care, and perhaps expense. But it was something that was close to him. And further more, the animal had to be without blemish. There was only one offering, a voluntary offering, in which the animal could be defective. Not that it could be diseased, but that it had superfluous parts of something. But in the main all the other offering required to be blemishless. Lets read Lev. 1:3.

(A) "If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord."

(Richard Stone) And also verse 10.

(A) "And if his offering be one the flocks, namely, of the sheep or of the goats for a burnt sacrifice; he shall bring it a male without blemish."

(Richard Stone) I think we are all quite familiar with this rule under the law, that it had to be absolutely without blemish. And of course this illustrates how foolish and how absurd the view is of substitution. Because the animal, if he became guilty, if God put the guilt of the sinner upon the animal then that means of course, that Christ also was guilty because the animal then would become guilty. Because this animal represented Christ. The physical perfection of the animal in these offerings prefigured the moral perfection of Christ.

Now lets read together 1 Peter chapter 1:18-19 where Peter makes this connection.

(A) "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 Stone) So the physical perfection of the animal prefigured the moral perfection of the Lord Jesus Christ. And we shall find that things physical under the law depicted things moral under Christ.⁷

Now, this was a ritual he had went through, he had made a... he had committed a sin, he had committed a trespass, he brings this animal before the sanctuary, puts his hand upon the head of the animal and makes his confession of guilt and then he kills it, and the high priest manipulates the blood in the proper way. Now the ritual of the sin offering enabled the offeror to further identify himself with the animal by putting his hand upon his head: and it also..., he gave ritual assent that sin then deserved

⁶ This is only a partially correct conclusion. The lamb represented Christ, not the individual. It was taken from the herd or flock to show that Christ was to be raised up in the condemned line of Adam, Abraham, and David. The sins were placed upon the animal, to show what was due to sin, and the man's hands were placed the head of the animal so that he could identify with the sacrifice and recognize that he was due what was to happen to the animal. But the physical perfection of the animal symbolized the moral perfection of Christ. And so the animal represented Christ who was to bear away our sins.

Bro. Roberts says: "The same routine was to be observed in the case of a sheep or goat (Lev. 1:10). It was to be a male without blemish-fit type of the man without sin." (Law of Moses, p. 223).

⁷ This is the correct interpretation, which will now be deviated from. The blemishlessness of the lamb prefigured the moral perfection of Christ, not the offeror.

death. He was indicating that what happened to the animal was something of which he himself was worthy. He had sinned. He was worthy of this violent death. But the violent death was being imposed on the animal as a ritual, and he represented the offerer.

And of course it illustrates that God was intolerant to sin. It was a dramatic way of expressing God's judgment and condemnation of sin. A violent blood shedding death. You see the sin of the person was not taken away by canceling the fact that the wages of sin are death, but the offerer had to actually vindicate God's judgment of sin through the ritual of the sin offering. He had to say God is absolutely right in demanding death of sin. And if he didn't make this ascent, then he couldn't be in a position where he could be forgiven. And of course it enabled him to confess that he was justly related to death, and also to give his expression and his desire for forgiveness.

Now go back to Leviticus again, chapter 1. And you'll see that this is implicit, in the verses we are about to read, that he sought forgiveness. Lev. 1:4.

(A) "And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him, to make atonement for him."

(Richard Stone) O.K. and chapter 4, verse 20 also.

(A) "And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a sin offering so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them."

(Richard Stone) And this is repeated many, many times in the instruction governing the offerings, that they were forgiven. So this is the ritual of the sin offering.

Now, sin is spoken of as being destroyed by God. There is many ways of speaking of this, we can have our sins removed; we can have them covered; we can have our sins forgiven, or they can be destroyed. And one way of speaking of it is to have sin destroyed in the crucifixion of Christ.

You can't destroy sin literally, because sin literally has no existence.⁸ Sin is a transgression of God's

⁸ Sin is literally destroyed because sin literally existed in the flesh of Jesus. To say that you cannot destroy sin literally, as bro. Stone does here, is to deny that sin has been destroyed at all. Jesus was made sin, in being made of sinful flesh. Then, when he destroyed the flesh which he bore on the cross, he literally destroyed sin. The following by brethren Roberts and Thomas explain how sin was literally destroyed in the death of Jesus.

(Collected by bro. Growcott.) "Made Sin"-2 Cor. 5:21

"To be 'made sin' for others (2 Cor. 5:21) is to become flesh and blood."-Eureka 1:247

"Christ was 'made sin' in being born into a sin-constitution of things: Christadelphian, 1898:390

"Was Christ 'made sin'? Brother Roberts' answer: 'Yes.'" -Resurrectional Responsibility Debate, No. 93

*"Sin' is a synonym for human nature... God made him to be sin for us...Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there."-Elpis Israel, page 127

"Christ 'made sin,' though sinless, is the doctrine of God."-brother Thomas. Christadelphian, 1873: 362

"It is testified that he was 'made sin for us' (2 Cor. 5:21). As he was not of sinful character, this could only apply to his physical nature drawn from the veins of Mary."-Christadelphian, 1869:83

"God sent forth Jesus in the nature of the condemned, that sin might be condemned in him. Hence, he was 'made sin' (2 Cor. 5:21). Christadelphian, 1873:402

"This perishing body is 'sin'... 'Sin; in its application to the body, stands for all its constituents and laws."-Eureka 1:248

"Was he not made sin in being made of a woman who was mortal because of sin, and could only impart her own sinful flesh to a son begotten of her?" -Christadelphian, 1873:463

"He (Jesus) did no sin, but he was physically 'made sin for us who knew no sin.' He was sent forth 'in the likeness of

Repeated Act

law, its an act. But you destroy it ritually. It means that a means has been provided by God by which those who are held captive by sin can be delivered. And therefore sin is spoken of as being destroyed. Now to illustrate this point, go to Hosea with me.

You see, there are many figures of speech and language used in relation to the death of Christ which we must recognize are figures of speech. So that we can properly understand and appreciate the principles that are exhibited in his death. What we are going to show is that the ritual of the sin offering was continued and converged upon the Lord Jesus Christ and repeated in his death on the cross.⁹ Hosea 13 and 14.

(John Hensley) "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes."

(Richard Stone) Of course this is quoted in the 15th chapter of 1 Cor. by the Apostle Paul (that verse 26 in the outline is a wrong verse, its later on in the chapter) where Paul quotes this and this is what is spoken of when the righteous and the faithful are resurrected and endowed with immortality. Death is destroyed. In Revelations death is said to be cast into a lake of fire and brimstone depicting the utter destruction of death, the complete abolition of death.

Sin is spoken of in much the same way. Now sin is that which has the power of death. Now lets go to Hebrews 2:14, for a moment.

(Stan Newton) "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; and deliver them who though fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

(Richard Stone) In other words the destruction of him who had the power of death, which was the devil effected the deliverance of them who though fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. That was the purpose of the destruction of sin.

Now I'm going to deal with diabolos a little later on but for the time now, just assume that diabolos here does represent sin. Now I recognize some maintain that diabolos here represents sin nature, and it does in a sense.¹⁰ But if we find out, and go to other places in the Bible we will find out that that

sinful flesh' that sin might be condemned in him."-Christadelphian, 1898:343

⁹ What is meant is that the symbolism of the Mosaic law is continued and repeated in the sacrifice of Jesus. Bro. Stone attempts to make the point that Jesus's sacrifice was another symbolical exercise, just like the Mosaic law. In saying this, he can deny that sin nature is sin, and that therefore sin was actually destroyed on the cross.

¹⁰ From the Christadelphian Instructor:

26-What is the Bible Devil?

ANSWER: The word means a slanderer and describes one who falsely accuses or betrays another. It can be used of a man, of rulers, or of a nation; and it is especially used of the impulse in our nature which slanders God and deceives men by suggesting that God does not mean what He says. Jesus overcame every impulse to sin and will at last remove all the evil effect of sin from the earth.

PROOF.--"Jesus answered them, Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve: (John 7:70-71). "The devil shall cast some of you into prison that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Rev. 2:10). "Jesus himself likewise took part of the same (flesh and blood); that through death he might destroy that which has the power of death, that is the devil" (Heb. 2:14). "He that committeth sin is of the devil: for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil" (1 John 3:8).

which has the power of death, we shall see that it is sin. For instance turn to Romans. Rom. 6:23.

(Ellis Higham) "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

(Richard Stone) Now the wages of sin are wages which we earn. The death of which he speaks here is eternal death, its the second death. And the wages of sin, if we commit sin, then the wages we are going to reap is death. Now in the seventh chapter of Romans Paul speaks of sin in the very sense in which it represents sin as having the power of death. Notice in verse 7-9.

"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 know lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: But when the commandment came, sin revived and I died."

Now sin here is personified. It speaks of something that could kill Paul. And the reason it could was because the law came and enlightened Paul. Paul realized that he was indeed a sinner. In verse 11:

"For sin, taking occasion by the commandment," (the law of God) "deceived me and by it slew me."

Sin therefore has the power of death. And from whence comes the strength of that sin? From the law. If there is no law, there is no transgression, there is no sin, that is not imputed against us. But when the law comes, we become enlightened, we're aware that we are sinners, sin therefore dominates us and slays us. Now 1 Cor. 15, Paul makes that very statement, in verse 56.

"The sting of death is sin." That's what has the power of death. "and the strength of sin is the law." Sin could only have power if the law of God is there to tell us that it is a sin. When God speaks, if you trespass of course means a sin.

Now God condemned sin in the offering of his son. Go back to Romans now and chapter 8:3.

(Sandy) "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 and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."

(Richard Stone) Now this is one of Paul's characteristic compound sentences in which you have to delve through it to find out exactly what he is saying. But he's telling us that there is something that the law could not do, and God did. And that which the law could not do was to condemn sin.¹¹ Now

You will note in the above that sin, in the sense of transgression, is not one of the definitions that the instructor uses for the Devil, yet it is the basic meaning according to bro. Stone. Also note that bro. Roberts uses Heb. 2:14 to show that the "devil" means "especially the impulse in our nature" or sin nature.

Again, this is from the Good Confession # 120. "What is meant by devil in Heb. 2:14 and 1 John 3:8? ANSWER *Sin in the flesh.*"

¹¹ Bro. Stone says that the law could not condemn sin. Yet we find that the law condemned sins of transgression, (the trespass offering), sins of omission (the sin offering), sin of the natural condition or sin nature (the burnt offering) and sin of presumption for which there was no offering available. The law condemned sin in every way, hence Paul calls it the ministration of condemnation, or the law which condemns. Bro. Roberts wrote: "The reverence for Christ

he had just illustrated in chapter 7 that the law condemned the sinner, for the law said cursed is everyone who continueth not in all things written in the law and to do them. And since everyone sinned, the law condemned the sinner. But what the law could not do was to condemn sin, but God did.

And where was sin condemned? In the flesh. And if we ask in the flesh of whom, the answer is in the flesh of Christ. And how did God do this? He did it initially by sending Christ in the likeness of sinful flesh or sin's flesh which is a much better way of expressing it. It means identicalness of human nature as Heb. 2:14 illustrates to us. He partook of the same flesh and blood. He came under the same condemnation that all of us do, the condemnation of mortality, a proneness to transgression. So God initiated the condemnation of sin by providing Christ. Here was a body prepared. One who had come to do the will of God. So God sent his son in the likeness of sin's flesh and then, for sin and here in the original and other translations will put for a sacrifice for sin¹² because that's what it means, *peri hamartia*: and it means for a sacrifice for sin, he condemned sin. God condemned sin in the ritual of the sin offering of his son. Now this illustrates again that the sin, the ritual aspect of the law was carried over and converged upon Christ. It was repeated in the experience of Christ on the cross.

Here was the sacrificial victim. The death he died was a violent death and was given to criminals. But it illustrated what was due sin, and we must never lose sight of this ritual aspect of Christ's offering. It illustrated what was due sin. Here was a sinless man made subject to the consequences of sin to illustrate for the whole world to see because he was crucified and this was a Roman way of putting to death criminals, the most vilest of criminals. He illustrated his own intolerance to sin, and what God

commands respect which leads some men to consider him immaculate in all senses and in no need to offer for himself, but it is not "according to knowledge". It is not consistent with the Divine objects in God "sending forth his son in the likeness of sinful flesh". All these objects blend together, but they are separable. One of them was to "condemn sin in the flesh", as Paul says (Rom. 8:3). The stumblings that have taken place over this expression are doubtless due to that other truth, that Christ did no sin, and in this sense was the "Lamb of God without spot". But the stumblings do not get rid of the expression as affirming a truth. Some would explain it as meaning the moral condemnation of sin by Christ during his life. This **cannot be the meaning** in view of the statement with which it is conjoined that what was done was "**what the law could not do**". **The law condemned sin so thoroughly in the moral sense that it is called "the ministration of condemnation"**. (Law of Moses, p. 173).

Earlier in the "Law of Moses" bro. Roberts had explained what it was that the Law could not do. "The law was unable to confer life because men were unable through weakness to keep it;..." (Rom. 7:10, 8:3, Gal. 3:21).

¹² "*Peri amartias*" is a Greek term that does mean sin offering, if it occurs in a sentence with the proper accommodating verbiage. "*Peri*" is a greek word meaning "concerning". "*Amartia*" is the greek word for "sin". The Greeks had no word for "sin offering", and so they combined the two words, "*peri amartias*" to be used for "sin offering". They do this in all but five places in the Septuagint, and the five places where this is not done, may not have been understood by the translators of the Septuagint to be "sin offering, but rather "sin". But the important thing to remember is that "*amartias*" by itself means sin, and not sin offering. "*Peri amartias*" means sin offering. Bro. Stone will lose sight of this fact in lecture two, so keep this in mind.

But in order for "sin offering" to be the proper translation here in Rom. 8:3, there should be certain accommodating words to set off "*peri amartias*" as a term, and not as words to be literally translated. Such verbiage is not there. As it is, if "sin offering" is the proper translation, then that portion of the verse would read, ROM 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, and sin offering, condemned sin in the flesh:". This is not a natural way of talking or writing, and therefore probably is wrong.

The Revised Version translated the disputed section, "and as an offering for sin". This translation has been applauded by the Christadelphian Magazine of 1913, and the Berean Magazine of 1979. And while this may be an acceptable transliteration, as Jesus was the offering for sin; it certainly is not a translation. The proper translation can only be, "and concerning sin", or as the King James version has it, "and for sin".

thought about sin. It was worthy of nothing but to be crucified.

So we see again that the ritual of the sin offering was repeated in the death of Christ. Now of course apart from the law of God sin would have no power to kill us, would it? Because in Romans 5:12,13:

"For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law."

Well, sin is still there of course. But it is not reckoned against a person unless there is a law, unless he's enlightened. And likewise in chapter 4:15

"Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression."

Now the wrath of the law of works is the wrath of God. And the wrath of God is going to be exhibited against sinners and against sin. For the law therefore works wrath. The law says cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things written in the law, and therefore it cursed everybody. Everybody who came under the law was cursed by that law.

Now, in the redemptive work of Christ God provided a means by which sins can be forgiven. As far as the beneficiary's of the sacrifice of Christ are concerned, sin has been destroyed.

Are there any questions on the ground we have covered so far? Now we are going to deal with diabolos later on, and we are going to deal with Rom. 3.

Now this next section, Christ died to effect the forgiveness of our sins. Now you notice that almost a whole page is taken up with verses that illustrate that he died for us. And I know not of a single scripture that says he died for himself. Now I'd be willing to look at this scripture if there is one. Christ benefited by his death on the cross. And his death was expedient to his own salvation, but I know of no place that says that he died for himself. But he died for us. Yes?

(A) Isn't that one and the same?

(Richard Stone) No.

(A) Its not?

(Richard Stone) He died for us and died for himself? How can that be one and the same. If I do something for you, its not necessarily doing something for me is it? If I pay a debt for you, that is not necessarily my debt is it? Or if I do something on you behalf, it may not be on my behalf.

But you notice in these verses here, he died for us, he delivered for us, he sacrificed for us, he gave himself for us. Lets turn to 1 Pet. 2:21...

(A-1) Dick, if you are a member of an organization and you pay dues for that organization for the whole group as the treasurer, you are paying for yourself as well as for others; so since Christ partook of sin in the flesh as we do, since he died for our sins in the flesh, would not you say then that...¹³

¹³ This is a valid point which bro. Stone ignores, because the subject is changed. Christ was our representative. What he did on the cross, he did as one of us, for all of us. This aspect of Jesus's sacrifice is argued against by bro. Stone.

(Richard Stone) There's another phrase, where does it say he died for sin in the flesh?

(A-1) I didn't mean...

(Richard Stone) Now I didn't say he paid the debt. If he paid the debt, that's substitution. But he died on our behalf, he died for us. It never says he died instead of us. But he died for us, didn't he? He died to effect our salvation. He died to effect the remission of our sins. I will deal with that in a moment.

1 Pet. 2:21-23. "For even hereunto were ye called because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: Who when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously."

So here is Christ who suffered for us. Now its true that his suffering was part of the obedience that God required of him, but I find of no place that says he died for himself, or he died for sin nature, or he died to cleanse sin nature. Now I'm quite willing to look at those verses if there are any of that nature. Yes?¹⁴

(A-2) Heb. 5:3.

(Richard Stone) All right, Heb. 5:3. What is your point there.

(A-2) The verse reads: "And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself to offer

¹⁴ Bro. Stone makes this challenge that the Scriptures never say that Christ offered for sin-in-the-flesh, or sin nature. But he can only say this, because he denies the plain writings of the apostles, as will become more apparent in Class Two. The Scriptures referred to below by bre. Roberts and Thomas are perfect examples from the Scriptures where Christ offered for sin nature. But as we shall see, bro. Stone will go to great lengths to discredit the interpretation put upon these verses by the pioneer brethren, and more importantly, by an honest, disinterested reading of the text. (Collected by bro. Growcott)

"First For His Own Sins"-Heb. 7:27

"He offered first for himself: he was the first delivered. He is 'Christ the Firstfruits. 'He obtained eternal redemption IN and FOR himself." -Christadelphian, 1875:139

"Christ's sacrifice was operative on himself first of all." -Law of Moses, chapter 11, page 90

"There is no doubt Jesus fulfilled the Aaronic type of offering for himself."-brother Roberts, Debate 290.

"As the antitypical High Priest, it was necessary he should offer for himself."-Christadelphian, 1896:341

"He did these things ('was made perfect, "was saved from death 'obtained redemption') for himself first ... for us only as we become part of him."-Law of Moses, chapter 18, page 173

"Then he offered for himself as well as for us? Brother Roberts' answer: Certainly"-Debate 716

"As a sufferer from the effects of sin, he had himself to be delivered from those effects; and as the mode of deliverance was by death on the cross, that death was for himself first." -Christadelphian, 1875:375.

"From Paul's statement (Heb. 7:27) it follows that there must be a sense in which Jesus offered for himself also, a sense which is apparent when it is recognized that he was under Adamic condemnation inherent in his Flesh."-Christadelphian, 1873:405

"The sacrificial work ... for himself, that it might be for us "-Law of Moses, chapter 18, page 177

"He offered for himself first, by reason of his participation in Adamic mortality." -Christadelphian, 1873:555

"It was 'for us' that he came to be in the position of having first to offer for himself.. 'He was made sin for us who knew no sin' and does not sin require an offering?"-Christadelphian, 1875:139

"If Christ's offering did not comprehend himself, how are we to understand the statement of Paul in Heb. 7:27?" Christadelphian, 1873:466

"Though personally sinless, he was by constitution condemned, and had therefore to offer for himself and his brethren."-Christadelphian, 1873:405

for sins."

(Richard Stone) Are you suggesting that Christ offered for his own sins there, is that what you saying?

(A-2) No, he offered for his nature.

(Richard Stone) It doesn't say that. And further more, he isn't even talking about Christ is he really?¹⁵
 V. 1. "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. And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins." So, "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron." He's not talking about Christ, he's talking about the Aaronic priesthood. "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest:". Now I have seen Hebrews 5:3 used to illustrate what Christ did. Its not talking about Christ. Its talking about those in the Aaronic priesthood.

¹⁵ Bro. Stone says this verse is not about Christ. The verse says HEB 5:3 "And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins." What was the "reason hereof"? We learn that in verse 2. HEB 5:2 "... for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity." The high priest was compassed with infirmity, and by reason hereof, he had to, himself, offer for sins. So it wasn't sin, which was the cause of the high priest offering for himself, but by reason of "infirmities". The question then, is, was Jesus compassed with our infirmities. Well, in the closing verses of the previous chapter, the apostle Paul very strongly made this point. HEB 4:15 "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." So Jesus had our infirmities. The high priest offered by reason of his infirmities. To exclude Jesus from these verses is to try to teach a theory which is not scriptural.

No doubt for the above reason, Bro. Roberts was very clear that Heb. 5:3 **DID** apply to Jesus. He writes: "Now, this is part of the Mosaic figure. There must be an antitype to it. What was it? The holy things, we know, in brief, are Christ. **He must, therefore, have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which he opened the way of sanctification for his people.** If the typical holy things contracted defilement from connection with a sinful congregation, were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things in a similar state, through derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race? **If not, how came they to need purging with his own "better sacrifice"?** (Heb. 9 : 23).

Great difficulty is experienced by various classes of thinkers in receiving this view. Needless so, it should seem. There is first the express declaration that the matter stands so; "it was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices); but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these" (Heb. 9:23). **"It was of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer" (8:3). "By reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins" (5:3).** "By his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (for us, is an addition inconsistent with the middle voice of the verb employed, which imports a thing done by one to one's own self) (9:12).

There was next the necessity that it should be so. The word "necessity", it will be perceived, occurs frequently in the course of Paul's argument. **The necessity arises from the position in which men stood as regards the law of sin and death, and the position in which the Lord stood as their redeemer from this position. The position of men was that they were under condemnation to die because of sin, and that not their own sin, in the first instance, but ancestral sin at the beginning.** The forgiveness of personal offenses is the prominent feature of the apostolic proclamation, because personal offenses are the greater barrier. Nevertheless, men are mortal because of sin, quite independently of their own transgressions. Their redemption from this position is a work of mercy and forgiveness, yet a work to be effected in harmony with the righteousness of God, that He might be just while justifying those believing in the Redeemer. (Law of Moses p. 173.)"

You will observe that bro. Stone denies that Heb. 5:3 applies to Christ, while bro. Roberts applies this verse to Jesus. And in the following paragraph, bro. Roberts emphasizes the necessity in believing this.

(Ellis Higham) Isn't he making a comparison between Christ and the Aaronical priesthood, though?

(Richard Stone) What the comparison is that Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest. But God said, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee. And of course in the 110th Psa., "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

(A-3) It wouldn't be Aaronic?

(Richard Stone) No. After the order of Melchisedec. There were similarities in the offering of Christ and those offered under the law of course. The offering of Christ was to effect the redemption of the sins of the High Priest as well as those of the people. Christ in one offering effected the forgiveness for the High Priest, as well as the people. The High Priest offered first for his own sins, then for the sins of the people, this Christ did once, when he offered himself. He effected the liberation, not only of the people but of the High Priest. His sins effected the forgiveness of sins in all branches, in all areas. Not only the people but the high priest as well. If this verse says anything that is applied to Christ, it says for himself to offer for sins. Now we were just told that he's sinless.

(John Hensley) Can I ask one thing Richard? Does the word s-i-n-s¹⁶ used in the plural, (we know that s-i-n sometimes means sin nature,) is there a place in the Scripture where undoubtedly, if the word s-i-n-s is used where it undoubtedly means sin nature? Is there a place in Scripture?

(Richard Stone) I know not of any. Where sins, plural, ever means sin nature.

(John Hensley) It says here he offered for s-i-n-s. Its difficult to think of Christ offering for his s-i-n-s. I'm just curious.

(A-1) The only way you could understand that is if you were talking about plural people. A plurality of people would have sin natures in the plural. No, I don't know of how you'd understand that.

(Richard Stone) That would kind of strain it though. It is, really in the context, it is talking about the Aaronic priesthood. We must be careful in searching for something which somebody has a theory on, to misapply Scripture.

Now surely, if Christ offered for sin nature, it would say that wouldn't it? If that's very important, it would say that in Scriptures. But I can find no place in Scripture where it says he offered for sin nature. And the very word sin nature is a term that is not found in the Bible. Its an invented term that we...I believe that there is such a thing as sin nature, don't misunderstand me, but...and sinful flesh. Course, that is a mistranslation. That expression only occurs in Romans 8:3, it should be flesh of sin. Sinful flesh means sinning flesh, its a moral term in that case. But I think there in means in the flesh. Christ came in the flesh. God sending his son in the likeness of sin's flesh.

¹⁶ This argument is not accurate. In the careful isolating and dissecting of verses that bro. Stone it may appear so, from the Common Version. But if we look at the original, we find that in Heb. 9:28, we read: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Now all agree that the sin Christ returns with out is his sin nature. But in checking the original we find that the word for sin there is "amartias" the accusative plural of "amartia". The word for word translation of the Diaglott will bear this out.

(Ellis Higham) Are you going to deal with that later or is this an appropriate time to ask you what is sin nature?

(Richard Stone) No, you can ask questions.

(Ellis Higham) I mean I don't know what you are planning on dealing with later, but I would be interested in what your explanation of what sin nature or...

(Richard Stone) Yes, I'll explain what I mean by sin nature. Remember that sin nature is not a Scriptural term. O.K? Understand that sin nature means a nature that is capable and almost invariably produces sin. Now sin nature is such that it always produces sin in everyone except the Lord Jesus Christ, by metonymy it can certainly be called sin.

(A-4) By what?

(Richard Stone) By metonymy. That's a figure of speech. And we must recognize that there are figures of speech used in the Scriptures. And if we try to make a literal application, say that sin nature is the same as sin, its like saying an automobile is the same as death because an automobile causes death. Or a gun could be stamped death, because it produces death, but it doesn't produce death, it isn't death itself, its a gun. You don't treat an accident the same way that you'd treat a car, and God does not deal with sin as he deals with human nature. Or the natural man. Or the Adamic nature. He does not deal with that the way that he deals with sins.

Sins requires a blood shedding sacrifice to atone for it. And I'll show you how he speaks of sin in a moment. How he speaks of the redemption of the body. But that my explanation of sin nature. Its a nature that invariably produces sin.

(Ellis Higham) In using that particular line of reasoning, Dick, and that's the same line of reasoning that I believe that Bro. Carter uses in his "Unity in Australia" booklet under the section of Metonymy. In going through that section carefully, I find that bro. Carter has misused that word metonymy. It happens to be a figure of speech. But there are over one hundred figures of speech in the English language. Metonymy is one of those. Now, as you know as well as I...

(Richard Stone) But it is a figure of metonymy.

(Ellis Higham) Yes, but...

(Richard Stone) What other figure is it?

(Ellis Higham) But metonymy bro. Carter has used incorrectly there and in the example that he gives in the article at that point, he, he did the same thing that you just did here.' Metonymy, particularly, is talking about terms which are closely related. Now there are other ones. You can say "The ship was a silver galleon sailing across the silver sky. That happens to be a metaphor. You can say something is like something. That is a simile. He used the expression "making mountains out of mole hills." That happens to be a hyperbole.

Now he is using all different ones and then he attempts to take those explanations and apply them to metonymy. But metonymy has to be very closely related terms, such as the power of the press meaning journalistic ability. This type of thing. And when you have very closely related terms, yes, they can

be substituted completely for...

(Richard Stone) Don't you think that which leads to sin is a very closely related matter?

(Ellis Higham) And it can be substituted, just like every other example you can think of metonymy in the English language. One word can be completely substituted for the other and make complete sense.

(Richard Stone) Only, only...It can't make sense unless you recognize the figure of speech. Sin nature, or human nature is not sin.¹⁷ Sin is a transgression of God's law. Human nature is that which causes that. You can't just substitute the one phrase for the other.

(Ellis Higham) Right, but it's not like a mountain and a mole hill.

(Richard Stone) But I'm not here to defend bro. Carter.

(Ellis Higham) No. I'm just saying that the explanation you used here...

(Richard Stone) I'm just saying that this is by metonymy, sin can be called, human nature can be called sin because it produces sin. And there we are calling the cause by the effect.

¹⁷ Bro. Ellis Higham's point is well taken. Bro. Carter, in the Unity Booklet relied on confusion, not a logical argument to make his point, and bro. Stone is trying to do the same thing here. Because a sin nature is a figure of speech (a metonym), bro. Stone is suggesting that it is not a reality. But, a metonym, different from a hyperbole, or a metaphor; is a reality. When you see "metonymy" think "another name for". Its another name for a thing. It is not as Bro. Growcott explains, a way of avoiding the reality.

METONYMY BY BRO. GROWCOTT

"METONYMY" is not an alternate to reality. It does not mean mere shadow and type. It is simply the extension of one term to include related aspect of the same entity. To say something is called something "by metonymy" doesn't brush it away as a *fact*. The dictionary definition of "metonymy" is--

"The use of the name of one thing for that of another of which it is an attribute, or with which it is associated." Sin, literally and primarily, is transgression of God's law. That is the root meaning, from which others flow. The term "sin" is *scripturally* extended by the process called "metonymy" (extending a name to include a related thing) to include the evil, corrupt, death-bringing principle in every cell and particle of human flesh - the *diabolos* - that causes all diseases and death and disharmony with God: and which normally (unless there is direct Divine interference, as in the unique case of Christ) will *inevitably* bring forth its fruits of actual transgression.

This evil principle in the flesh is both the *result* of sin, and the *cause* of sin, and therefore the Scriptures go to the root of the matter, and give the name "sin" to it (just as they call hate, "murder"; and lust, "adultery") - and they deal with all sin as an inseparable *totality*.

Actual transgression, and the evil principle that Paul calls "the law of Sin in the members," (or "Sin in the flesh," or the *diabolos*) - are inseparable parts of the total sin constitution that Christ came to destroy and abolish. Therefore the Scriptures, which deal with roots and realities, and not mere superficial appearances, gives the same name to all: SIN.

"Metonymy" is not a magic word to change a Yes to a No, or a fact into not a fact. It is simply a description of a process, illustrated in this case by the Scriptures grouping together everything to do with sin under the name Sin.

When you see "metonymy," just remember "another name" that's what it means - and in this case, a *scriptural*, God-given name.

To say it is "metonymy," doesn't change the fact that God (the Supreme and All-Wise Authority) gave the name "SIN" to the evil principle in all human flesh.

(Ellis Higham) And God could treat them the same.

(Richard Stone) He doesn't treat them the same.¹⁸ I would challenge you to show anywhere were it says that God requires a blood shedding sacrifice to redeem or to cleanse sin nature, or to forgive human nature or whichever what you want to put it.¹⁹ But I can show you 100 verses where it says our sins are forgiven in the offering.

(John Hensley) Can I add something? A sister asked a question that I believe would make this all clear. The word metonymy is a hard word, its hard to understand. When one word is used instead of another it suggests something. Now lets just forget about the word metonymy. We know that we all have in our flesh certain impulses, desires. Now not all of them are bad. For instance, the desire to eat, that not bad. Or the desire to eat, its not a bad thing. We have desires. The desire to go to meeting is not a bad thing. No, we have desires. But we have some desires or impulses in our system, it would be wrong if we followed them out. It would lead to sin. The impulses that would lead to sin if obeyed, are called by Paul in Rom. 7 the passions (and the margin says impulses) of sin in our members.

We all have those impulses, if somebody steps on our foot, we want to take our foot and kick them of do something, or commit some act of sin. Now these desires if followed could lead to sin, or transgression, are called impulses to sin. The impulses themselves couldn't be sin, or you would make Christ a sinner. He had impulses, the wrong ones, their called the impulses to sin. I think that metonymy is a hard word.

(A-4) I understand the word, I just didn't hear what he said.

(John Hensley) Does that make it clear?

(A-4) Oh yes.

(Richard Stone) The impulses to eat, self survival, propagate; these impulses are not wrong in themselves²⁰, but if you commit adultery in the way of propagating, or if you carry it out to beyond a certain bound, it becomes sin. The feeling of self preservation, if we didn't have that feeling, brothers and sisters, we wouldn't want to be saved, would we. Its a good feeling. But if we sacrifice others to achieve it, then its wrong.

These propensities have to be regulated by the law of God, and if we go beyond the boundaries, they

¹⁸ God must treat them the same, for in fact they are the same thing, as explained in bro. Growcott's explanation of metonymy. Transgression (the moral aspect of sin) arises out of the impulses (or physical aspect of sin). It is therefore impossible to isolate transgression, and sin nature. Sin could not be destroyed unless it is completely destroyed, and the source of sin is an absolute prerequisite to the ultimate destruction of sin.

¹⁹ This point has been shown by bro. Roberts, where not only does Paul teach that Christ offered for his own sins, meaning for his nature, but that the apostle Paul argued it was "necessary".

²⁰ The apostle Paul says in ROM. 7:18 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) **dwelleth no good thing**: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. Bro. Stone disagrees with this statement by the apostle, arguing that certain aspects of the flesh are not evil.

become sin. And they invariably produce sin in all the children of Adam, before they are very old, with the exception of the Lord Jesus Christ.

(Ellis Higham) No sacrifice is required for those propensities?

(Richard Stone) I don't know of any place it says that, do you?

(A-5) What about where it says that if a man even in his mind, he lusts after a woman he has already done that, he has committed the sin.

(Richard Stone) Ah. Now there is lusting after a woman. That is committing adultery with her in his heart. Now that is sin.

(A-5) That is propensity, you didn't actually carry it out.

(Richard Stone) No, no. All right. Turn with me to James 1.

(A-5) Just bear with me, I'm kind of new at this...

(Richard Stone) That's all right. I just want to explain what temptation is, and what produces sin. In James he gives it very clearly here, v. 14. "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lusts and enticed. Then," and notice, "Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin." Now sin is the child that is born when lusts conceive. Now lusts here is epithumia. And it means a strong desire or a craving for something. And I have illustrated in the lessons later on here that it can be used in a good sense. When Christ said "with desire have I desire to eat this passover with you." Paul expressed desire to see certain faithful in the truth. The same word translated lust here.

In other places it represents the inward craving or strong desire for something that promises sensual satisfaction. Now These desires²¹ in themselves are not sin. Because James says before sin can be produced, conception has to take place. He treats it as a conception. So here is lust. What has to join with lust before it gives birth to sin? Its the human will. You have to agree to it.

Now you could see a woman walking down the street, and you can see that she's beautiful and you can dismiss it from your mind. But if you dwell upon that woman and you think of committing adultery and derive a certain sensual satisfaction out of its contemplation, that is sin. You have committed adultery in your heart. But Christ on the other hand could talk about an adulteress, he could talk about adultery, he could talk about killing without ever violating or trespassing in his own mind. Because he didn't lust. He didn't derive any mental satisfaction out of this consideration. And James says that these cravings only produce sin when conception takes place. And the human will is a very powerful factor, in either doing good or bad. But when we allow ourselves to be dictated and guided by our propensities, or willing to go along with it, then we become animal like in our thinking. An animal is guided solely by his propensities, and he kills, he commits adultery, without any kind of sin against him, but he does these things by a natural inbred, what we call instinct. But he's programmed for this. God make him that way. But when we allow ourselves to be guided by the dictates of the flesh we become like animals. We become like beasts.

²¹ This is true, but the desire spoken of are not inherent in the flesh. The desires spoken of are learned. That is the difference. And to suggest that the flesh which we inherit from Adam has anything of value is to completely miss the most fundamental and basic point of the truth.

(Ellis Higham) Is this the very good state that God created Adam in, that would do those kinds of things?

(Richard Stone) Adam did it. God created Adam, but when he created Adam, he had to give Adam an independent volition, didn't he? And when you give anybody an independent volition, you make it possible to sin. He made Adam capable of sinning. Now if you say he didn't, then he made a robot. But the very fact he sinned, he gave Adam the choice, didn't he? You an independent individual, you have a volition of your own, and I have given ye life or death, choose ye life. But Adam and Eve chose another road. They had the capacity to sin. And they sinned. But the motivation came from an external source but, it also got the woman to thinking in her mind, it produced the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, the pride of life, she contemplated what could be had by this fruit, and she decided to go ahead with the words of the serpent. She agreed to do it. Put forth her hand and took of the tree and it became sin to her. Adam did too.

(Ellis Higham) Could this have happened on its own without the serpent?

(Richard Stone) I don't know. I can't tell you.²² It seems unlikely that it would have, because, what happened in Adam and Eve when they partook of the fruit of the tree? Their eyes were opened. O.K. There was something that happened within their mentality. Dr. Thomas explains it as their passions being released and inflamed. What ever it was, we have inherited it, and Christ inherited it too, and he had the same kind of temptation as we.

In this case the suggestion to do otherwise came from an external source and with us it becomes permanently visible. The first thing of when God tells us to do something is doing something else. That's natural for us.

(Ellis Higham) Well then, Dick, in clause 5 of the constitution where it talks about a law in their members, I presume then that you feel this is referring only to the law of sin and death or mortality. Your not talking about anything other than mortality becoming a law in their members.

(Richard Stone) No. A law is a rule of life. And the law of sin and death is a rule of life in which one sin will lead to death. And the law of the spirit of life when Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death. In other words it has delivered us from the consequences of our sins. And this is the condemnation that rests upon us because of our sins, and the condemnation which is no longer in those that are in Christ Jesus who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit. There is therefore no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:1)

And the reason is that Christ has provided a means by which sins can be forgiven. Under the law there was no provision. It condemned. But under Christ there was deliverance.

(Ellis Higham) Well, more particularly, I don't think I got my point across. Clause 5 speaks as though when they were expelled from the garden of Eden there was a law. It talks about the something became a law in their members at that point and I'm after what you think became a law in their members, at that point when they were expelled from the garden.

²² This is a naive answer. The answer is "of course not". If the transgression could have occurred with out the tempter while Adam and Eve were in the very good state, then God was the author of sin. This would be impossible. The fact that bro. Stone cannot be sure of his answer shows how little of our actual Adamic nature he understands.

(Richard Stone) Well there is a rule, the law speaks to me of a rule of conduct and when they were expelled from the garden, it became a physical part of their being, they had the tendency or proneness to transgress. That tendency was built in.

(Ellis Higham) Was there proneness before?

(Richard Stone) No, I don't think they had it before. No. But they had the capacity to sin before, that's what I emphasized. But when Adam and Eve had sinned of course, they had done this experience then, then of course I suppose the passions were inflamed because something happened to them mentally because they knew they were naked. They no longer had a good conscience towards God because they went and hid among the trees and they attempted to cover their nakedness. The covering was good, but it was not adequate. But, we inherit that same proneness to transgression now. As Christ did. But, I contend that God did not hold us morally responsible for this. And although this body must be changed, he deals with it a different way than he does transgression. Transgressions he deals with through the offer of sin offering.²³ And he effects the forgiveness of our sins.

When anyone is baptized, he is baptized for the remission of his sins. He is not baptized to clean his nature, because if he did, he would have clean nature afterwards, and we still don't have a clean nature if that's what you might call it. Do we? We still have a nature that's prone to sin. Nothing physically happens to us when we are baptized. God deals with that by changing this mortal into immortality.

(A-2) But we do become related to Christ when we are baptized?

(Richard Stone) Oh yes, Certainly.

(A-2) So you can't say that baptism is only for the forgiveness of sins.

(Richard Stone) I should say that its for the remission only of sins. And then of course...There are a lot of things that happen at baptism. We figuratively crucify the old man of the flesh. We make a covenant with God, we come in covenant relationship with God. We become associated with the Abrahamic covenant. We become the seed of Abraham, heirs to the promise. Lots of things happen at baptism.

But these aren't the points that are contentions among many brethren. The point of contention is what happens to us personally, in regards to our sins. They are forgiven. What about our nature? Not a thing. Because the truth of the matter is that our redemption in Christ has not one thing to do with our natural hereditary death we inherit from Adam. We inherit a dying thou shalt die death, and salvation has nothing to do with that. But were sins forgiven, if we are found faithful, we are still going to die. It doesn't avert the death, any more than it averted it in the case of Christ. And that's all death could claim. The only thing mortality could claim from Christ was death. It couldn't hold him in the grave. In fact, Peter says it was impossible that the grave could hold him. John, you want to say something.

(John Hensley) For the sake of clearness, can we say that when God created Adam and Eve, they did not have the impulses to sin, in their bodies at the beginning. They were very good. The impulses to

²³ Here bro. Stone tries to bring in the Advocate position that sin nature is a moral relationship, which of course, it is not. But bro. Stone goes farther and denies that the physical defilement is treated the same as transgression (in that it too requires a sacrifice) which shows that he is not just fighting the Advocates, but anyone who affirms that human nature requires a sacrifice.

sin came as a result of transgression. Had there been no transgression at the beginning, there wouldn't be any sin nature or the impulses to sin in our bodies. We inherit the impulses to sin in our members, there is built in along with that, mortality. The two have to go together. Or other wise...God never intended for anyone to live beyond a natural life with sin nature. Sin nature has to be changed.

In the case of Christ he had to do his own dying. In that sense he died for himself, he gained something by it. Had he refused he'd have lost his claim for salvation. But he was raised up for that purpose with God.²⁴

(Richard Stone) The kernel of all these things was built into the nature of man I would suppose. God told him to multiply and replenish the earth, and they were both naked, they were not ashamed, apparently they had no physical attraction to each other at that time. Adam didn't know his wife till the forth chapter of Genesis. And they didn't know they were naked immediately. I suppose in due course of time God would have showed them how to propagate and how to do these things, but they were suddenly released, their passions were released with the transgression. And these impulses to sin became a physical property of their bodies. And we inherit it.

(John Hensley) I have one small thing to say if you don't mind on the matter of lusts and desires. Lust is what you call inordinate, excess, beyond when you desire something, somewhere along the line you desire it too much, it becomes inordinate, it becomes covetousness or lust. Beyond that, its sin. Christ knew just when to stop and not go any farther. We don't. Undoubtedly I commit lust and sin through my desires and I may not be aware of it. I don't really know that its sin. There was a connection there in Christ, just in Christ, and Christ knew just when to stop.

Desire in itself is not wrong²⁵ if you know just when to stop and stop it. If it was, then it means Christ was wrong because he had that desire.²⁶ He was tempted in all points as we are...

(A-1) But desire is involuntary.

(John Hensley) Right. But he knew just where to stop. He's probably the only one who ever lived that never broke the commandment "Thou shalt not covet". Paul broke the commandment. There's probably not a better man in this day than Paul and he broke down.

(A-4) In going beyond that point your talking about, that is where desire becomes a lust.

²⁴ This is the way that these brethren who believe this way can say that Christ needed his own sacrifice. They believe that Jesus needed to be obedient to God, and since God required him to go up on the cross, he had to do it. Had he not, he would not have been obedient, and therefore he would not have been the perfect sacrifice. This is all true, as far as it goes, but it is not the same thing as saying that Christ was "redeemed" from sin nature as the result of his sacrificial death. The problem here, is that some brethren who themselves believe correctly, will defend ones like bro. Stone and say we do not understand. They say, bro. Stone believes that Christ benefitted from his death. That statement is true. It is the substance of the "benefit" which does not go as far as necessary to be called "the Truth".

²⁵ Here again, this time bro. Hensley, making the point that desire is not evil, in contradiction to the Apostle Paul.

²⁶ This is the point. Christ did have our nature, and the nature itself is evil. This is why bre. Stone and Hensley have so much trouble with this point. Bro. Hensley cannot imagine Christ with these desire which are wrong. But Jesus testified of his wrong desires which bro. Hensley denies. "Nevertheless not my will, but thine be done." This is clearly a testimony that the nature which he bore, had desires which went contrary to the Father. This was the "sin" from which he needed purification.

(John Hensley) That's right, an inordinate lust.

(A-1) When you dwell on it, just where does it become wrong?

(John Hensley) I don't know just where that begins, but Christ would have to know. He had to know. But I don't know, I don't have to know all that²⁷ because I can get forgiveness for my sins. There was never to be any forgiveness of Christ. Either he had to live an absolute perfect life..., He was in a different situation, really.

(Ellis Higham) Dick, I don't see another section that covers this so I think that this is probably an appropriate area to ask this question. You were talking about the offering under the law, right back near the beginning of your presentation this evening. And, I could dwell on the High Priest, but I'd rather go back and talk about the other things that the sacrifices were made for. There was a sacrifice made for the altar, there was a sacrifice made even for the mercy seat, all the things in connection with the tabernacle were referred to as the heavenly things and these were spoken of and the book of Hebrews makes mention of them as representing Christ.

How would you explain that in view of what you have presented here that it has to be a personal sin that one would make an offering. I think you recognize that I agree that Christ didn't have personal sin. What I'm getting at is that I believe that Christ had to sacrifice for sin nature which man kind, and he as a representative of mankind possess which would appear to be symbolically dealt with by the fact that even the heavenly things under the tabernacle, the most holy things, needed a sacrifice for, which represented Christ.

(Richard Stone) All right. When these things were, had to sacrifice, you know; had blood sprinkled on them and so forth they were done so because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel. God considered them to be tainted by the uncleanness of the Children of Israel. In order to emphasize His own holiness and His absolute righteousness and to show that reconciliation could only take place on the basis of pure righteousness, and therefore these things that were tainted or corrupted, you might say; by the children of Israel.

In Lev. 16 for instance, it says in v. 15: "Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, 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: And he shall make 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."

He considered them to be tainted with the uncleanness of Israel. And therefore he required this kind of an offering for it. But the uncleanness of the children of Israel constituted not only ceremonial uncleanness, but personal transgressions. They were personally transgressors. The law was given to reveal their sins. The law was added, as Paul says in the third chapter of Galatians, because of sin. That's the purpose of the law. The law was not meant for a righteous person, but for a sinner, to reveal the fact that he is a sinner.

²⁷ This is off the topic, but we would hope that everyone knows that this is not the case. We all know what sin is. We must know, in order to ask, and thereby receive forgiveness.

But to arrive at a deduction, and you know, a conclusion that because of these things being sprinkled and so forth...it showed that he had to be cleansed, that true. And if we ask when was Christ cleansed, well that word is never used of Christ as far as I know. What Christ does speak of is the fact that he was perfect, and he's quickened, and God gave him glory. What we could say of Christ in the days of his flesh is that he was imperfect physically. Well when was that remedied? When God raised him from the dead and made him perfect. I shall walk today, tomorrow, and the third, and then I shall be perfected, Christ said.

So God dealt, if you want to call it cleansing of sin nature; he did it after he raised Christ from the dead. And that's when we will be cleansed from sin nature, when God raises us from the dead. Because when we rise from the dead, we are going to have this very same nature that we had when we went into the grave. Its like those who are gathered to Christ at the judgment seat: see, they will have the same nature when they appear before the Lord at the judgment seat just as those who have been raised from the dead. That nature will have to be changed because Paul says flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither does corruption inherit incorruption. So this mortal has to put on immortality.

And here is the cleansing of the sanctuary, or the heavenly things. And that was effected when God raised Christ from the dead and endowed him with immortality. But I can't see where it was done by sacrifice on the cross, because it doesn't say that.

And if we are going to arrive at a conclusion, be certain that the conclusion is consistent with the facts. Never place an interpretation upon an ambiguous Scripture that is in violation of other places of God's word. We tell this to those who believe in heaven going and so forth, but we must practice the rule ourselves. Never place a strange interpretation upon a difficult passage. We can never prove anything this way.²⁸

²⁸ At some points, its almost as if bro. Stone is reading bro. Roberts and disagreeing with him. Here is this exact point dealt with in The Law of Moses.

"2. *The Sacrificial Blood*.--But the sacrificial blood was applied to everything as well--Aaron and his sons included (see Lev. 8:14-15; 23-24) An atonement had to be made by the shedding and the sprinkling of blood for and upon them all (Lev. 16:33). As Paul remarks, "almost all things by the law are purged with blood" (Heb. 9:22). Now all these things were declared to be "patterns of things in the heavens", which it is admitted on all hands converge upon and have their substance in Christ. There must, therefore, be a sense in which Christ (the antitypical mercy seat, the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical altar, the antitypical mercy seat, the antitypical everything) must not only have been sanctified by the action of the antitypical oil of the Holy Spirit, but purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice.

"This conclusion is supposed to be weakened by the statement of Lev. 16:16, that the atonement for the holy place, altar, etc., was to be made "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins". That is, it is argued from this, that the holy things would have had no uncleanness in themselves apart from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. This must be granted, but it must also be recognized that because the children of Israel were sinful and polluted, the holy things were reckoned as having contracted defilement in having been fabricated by them and through remaining in their midst. This cannot be denied on a full survey of the testimony. They were ceremonially unclean, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and had to be cleansed by the holy oil and the sacrificial blood before they were acceptable in the Mosaic service.

"Now, this is part of the Mosaic figure. There must be an antitype to it. What was it? The holy things, we know, in brief, are Christ. He must, therefore, have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which he opened the way of sanctification for his people. If the typical holy things contracted defilement from connection with a sinful congregation, were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things in a similar state, through derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race? If not, how came they to need purging with his own "better sacrifice"? (Heb. 9 : 23). (Law of Moses, p. 170)"

(John Hensley) Please, may I say one thing? I realize, Les, that you look at this way. But we all agree basically on this. There are two things we need in order to live forever. We need first our sins forgiven, because apart from that God wouldn't change us to a nature where we could live forever. Next, we need our physical nature changed. It wouldn't mean anything to me for God to tell me that he forgives my sins, cause I just go ahead and live this life and then die, that's all there is to it. With no physical change there wouldn't be any life. The two things are related, one moral, the other physical. The things we must have before we can live forever: we have to have our sins forgiven and we have to have our physical nature changed. Our sins are moral to our physical change. And everyone agrees and its written over and over and over; that Christ came to do what he did and he had to do exactly what he did in every particular, in every respect: in order to gain redemption or salvation in himself. He had to gain it for himself first before he could share it with us. And it so happened that God raised him up to accomplish the forgiveness of our sins.

(A-1) Where's it say that?

(John Hensley) It says that he carried away the bondage of our sins which is another way of saying what he did was the basis of the forgiveness of our sins so that God then could change us, the physical nature at the judgment seat. What God really is saying to us is, now if you do something about your sins now, cut them down to a minimum, do what I say; (we can't be perfect of course) and I'll do something about your physical nature, I'll change that;...I'll change your physical nature at the judgment and replace it with a nature controlled by righteousness.

Christ being raised up that way to die for us so we can have our sins forgiven he had to do exactly what he did. What did he have to do? He had to die the kind of death where his blood would be shed. God required it. It doesn't mean you have to understand all the wherefores and wherebys and particulars, or that you had to understand every little thing like that, you know; heaven sakes, that would be impossible for most people I'm certain. But the situation being God bringing Christ into the picture to accomplish certain things, Christ had to do exactly as God wanted him to do. So we all had to agree that Christ had to do exactly what he did, submit to the death on the cross. As for himself, he had no personal sins, no forgiveness for Christ; God never forgave Christ. Physical nature isn't something you forgive a person for, its something that will change. Sons are forgiven, that moral. Though Christ accomplished redemption, he had first for himself, and being in the situation, and us connected with him; he had to do just what he did. He couldn't enter into eternal life alone. God wouldn't permit that. So that his perfecting salvation for us, really was made the basis of his own salvation. And we're connected with it.

(Richard Stone) Look on page 3 of the outline here at the bottom of the page it says why was Christ raised from the dead? All right, he never committed a single act or transgression, did he? He was faithful to Him, and all His appointments, he was tempted in all ways as we are, yet without sin, he was absolutely obedient to his Father's will, and God satisfied him with long life, in the Psalms.

And in this connection, look at Philippians 2. Now the reason I'm doing this is I want to show you what the Scriptures say the reason for the resurrection of Christ was. Now some will say he was resurrected because he atoned for his own sin nature. But lets see what the Bible says. In Philippians

Why did the articles in the Holy Place require purging with blood? As a type of Christ, says bro. Roberts. Never put such a strange interpretation on these verses, says bro. Stone.

2, lets read v. 5-7. In fact lets read all the way through verse 9.

(Sandy) "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth:".

(Richard Stone) Now verse 8. Look at that very closely. He was obedient unto death even the death of the cross and therefore God highly exalted him. The reason given for his exaltation was his obedience.²⁹ Keep that in mind. Turn to Hebrews Chapter 1. In verse 8 of the first chapter of Hebrews: "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy Kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

Why did God anoint him with the oil of gladness? Because he hated iniquity and loved righteousness. He was obedient in every sense of the word, and therefore it was impossible that death could hold him. Death had no claim on Christ because he was raised on the basis of his obedience to God. Because as I said before, the only thing that mortality could claim from Christ was his dying thou shalt die death. That's all he inherited. It couldn't keep him in the grave. His flesh rested in hope because he trusted in God.

So he was raised because he never committed a single act of disobedience to the Father's will, and further more, he was raised because he shed his blood as a perfect sacrifice to confirm the Abrahamic covenant.³⁰ Now, Romans 15:8 speaks of him confirming the covenant made unto the fathers. In Matt. 26:28 at the institution of the breaking, "This is my blood, the new covenant in my blood, shed for the remission of sins."

Here was a covenant. His death connected with the confirmation of the covenant and forgiveness of their sins. They are all tied in together. And also he was raised from the dead to secure our salvation. Remember in Rom. 4:25, it says he was delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification.

And we are all quite familiar with those passages in the fifteenth chapter of 1 Cor. that says except Christ be raised from the dead, we would still be in our sins, our faith would be vain and so forth.

(John Hensley) That means if Christ hadn't been resurrected, regardless of his dying on the cross, we wouldn't be resurrected, would we.

(Richard Stone) No. But the basis of his righteousness is always his obedience, and the shedding of his blood to effect the remission of sins of many.

²⁹ He just read that it was not just obedience, but obedient unto death, even the death on the cross. Bro. Stone wants to isolate the sacrificial aspect of the cross out of the picture here, but it can't legitimately be done.

³⁰ His shed blood was not just to confirm the Abrahamic covenant, though this too, is an aspect involved in Jesus's sacrificial death. Also included in his obedience and the confirmation of the covenant is the redeeming aspect of his own nature which is spoken of in Hebrews 5:3, 7:27, 9:12.

(John Hensley) That's the heart of it, isn't it? That's the crowning act, wouldn't you say that's the crowning act?

(Richard Stone) He was obedient to the death, the death of the cross. He couldn't be obedient to something of which he was not commanded. But he knew right from the beginning of his ministry he had to die the death upon the cross. I lay down my life for my sheep. He never says I lay it down for my sin nature. We must be careful that we don't invent terms to propagate an idea that has been pounded into our minds.

(John Hensley) Richard, may I say one more thing. His having sin nature of the impulses of sin in his members qualifies him to die for us as a representative man upon the cross. It was an essential quality, feature he had to have. Had he not had the impulses of sin in his members, and been tempted in all points like as we are yet without sin in respect of transgression, he couldn't have qualified to die for those who have. Now that was an essential quality that he had to have. It was not the real reason that he died on the cross. The real reason that he had to die on the cross was to attain salvation for us and that's what he was raised up to do. But in doing that, he of course gained for himself as well as for you. So he benefited from it.

In that verse, if you look at the verse, that it proves Christ had to submit and do just what he did, you have it in the last chapter of Hebrews, brought again. shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant. The Mosaic law ritually pointed that to the things to come in the millennial age.

Everything in the millennial age, the blood of Christ would be the base of. It wouldn't be a millennium apart from the shedding of the blood of Christ. That's why the altar and everything else had to have the sprinkling of blood. Those things represented the age to come. Christ had to do just what he did. The Mosaic law was foreshadowing what Christ would do.

(Richard Stone) He was our representative. He died a representative death. His sin nature represented sin, just as he personally represented us. But if he himself were a sinner, he himself would require someone else to die for him and redeem him.³¹ But he was not a sinner. And he obtained salvation on the basis of his one obedience, and therefore became, having been made perfect, Paul says, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that believe.

(A-3) Would he need someone to die for him? Why couldn't his death...Why would he need a Messiah, why wouldn't his death be sufficient?

(Richard Stone) If he were a sinner? Well, in that case, then anybody can die. That only shows what is due to sin, while not doing anything to remedy it. That only illustrates what's due sin. Sin had to be condemned in one that was sinless himself, that resurrection might follow. That's only half the story. He had to be resurrected to show that not only was sin condemned but was conquered.

³¹ This is the key to the difficulty bro. Stone has. He believes that if he says that sin nature requires a redeeming sacrifice, then Christ was not a lamb without blemish. It has never made any sense to me. He readily and accurately admits that the physical perfection of the animal represented the moral perfection of Christ. Having admitted that, he should understand that the ability of Christ to be the perfect lamb lay in his moral perfection, not his physical nature. If he would carry this one step farther, he would see the truth of bro. Thomas's statement that sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus had it not existed there. Therefore, having sin nature made him constitutionally a sinner, though morally perfect. Thus he was the perfect sacrifice, sin actually, not figuratively, condemned in the body of one who did not sin.

(A-6) Well Richard, I understand what John just said was that Christ had to be bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. He had to be a descendant of Adam. No other being could truly represent us. I think that's what John means. There could no being represent the human nature that we have. It had to be bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. One who would be tempted in all points like we are tempted, and yet knew no sin. And this is great when you think about it.

Think how great Christ really is. He never sinned by omission or by commission. And we don't know, when we sin by omission, but Christ had to know. And I think this is his greatness that he knew no sin and as John laid out, was faithful even unto death, even the death on the cross.

(Richard Stone) The ritual sin offering converged upon Christ. Sin had to be condemned in the flesh of one who himself was sinless. If sin were actually there and condemned, Christ couldn't have been raised from the dead.³² So it had to be a representative, represented by sin nature. The animal under the law was not a sinner. He only represented the sinner. And God treated him as a sinner. So Christ himself was made subject to the consequences of sin to illustrate what was due sin, and we give ritual assent to this when we are baptized into his death and join with him.

We too, die, ritually speaking. We confess that we are sinners, worthy of the violent death which Christ suffered. And once we uphold and vindicate God's judgment upon sin, we are then in a position where God can forgive us.

(A-6) Personally I think this is why the genealogy of Christ was given in the Bible. It takes you clear back to Genesis, and even when Able was killed, Eve conceived, and what did she say? God has given me another son instead of Able who Cain killed. Why? Because the genealogy had to be confirmed. And was bone of our bone, and if you follow that clear through and if you follow that seed covenant, you see that Eve was promised a seed that should bruise the head of the serpent. You follow that seed covenant clear through the Scriptures, and it leads you right to Christ.

END OF CLASS ONE

³² Here is another mistake made by bro. Stone. There would be no reason at all why Christ couldn't have been raised from the dead, if sin nature requires atonement. Christ atoned for all sin, including the sin of his nature in his death. Therefore, he was purged as the result of his sacrifice, and there would be no reason at all why he could not come out of the grave. Bro. Thomas answered the question in the One Great Offering, concerning the purification of Christ from the sin-defilement this way.

"When was the Jesus Altar purified; the Jesus Mercy Seat sprinkled with sacrificial blood, and the Jesus Holies of Holies lustrated? After the Veil of his flesh was rent, and before he awoke at the early dawn of the third day.--(Mark 15:37,38; John 19:34). (Ambassador, April, 1868)

This purification was the result of his perfect sacrifice. Therefore, there could be no objection to Christ being resurrected, though he had sin nature.