

5695 - Carl Hagensick - The Sin Offering

On behalf of the Allentown class, we'd like to welcome each of you to our annual convention this year, and it's our prayer that all of you will receive rich fellowship and many spiritual blessings. We're pleased to have Brother Carl with us this morning, he's going to service, and the title of his discourse this morning is The Sin Offering, and we'll turn the podium over to him. Well, not actually the podium, but at least the microphone.

Well, Brother, first we're glad to bring you the love and the greetings of the Chicago Ecclesia. I'm sure Brother Joe will do the same when it's his chance to serve you. Sister Marge and the household also send special greetings.

As does Sherelle, when we talked to her last, she's still in Poland going to school there, and she sends her love and greetings. It's been very truly said that when our Christian life is over, our final judgment will not be on what we know, but on what we do with what we know. It'll be on the application of the principles of the scriptures to our daily lives.

But we should never let that saying become an excuse to de-emphasize doctrine. Doctrines, beliefs, knowledge have a very important part. We're living in a period of time that we know as the Harvest, the Harvest of the Gospel Age.

And the Harvest, by almost definition, is a period of separation. Scripturally, it's a separation of wheat from tares, of true Christians from false Christians, of those who are begotten of the seed of truth as opposed to those who are begotten not of the Heavenly Father, but who have a fake begetting of the adversary and are sown by him. The Harvest has been a separation primarily based on doctrine.

Other Christian denominations have fine characters, many times more noble than we ourselves. They have good application of scripture principles in their lives. So it's not a separation based upon one applies truth and one does not.

Separation has largely been on matters of belief and to those who've separated, beliefs that matter, beliefs that have had an importance. As we look over the history of the Harvest, there are five primary teachings that have provided ground for separation. If I were to reword these in making up this overhead, I would say, first, there is the nature of death, not a thought of hellfire or heaven, but a belief that the dead are dead awaiting the resurrection.

Second, there's the nature of life, whether man is inherently immortal or whether immortality is to be gained upon certain conditions. Those who, through patient continuance and well-doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality eternal life. Third, there is the nature of God.

The Lord our God is one, was the word that was told to the Hebrews. Christianity had

come to believe the Lord our God is three, combined somehow mystically and majestically into what? The concept of no trinity. Fourth, the nature of the present, the fact that our Lord is present, that his presence is secret, invisible, and current.

It's a current reality, not a future hope. And fifth, the nature of the future, the belief that God has life planned for man both in heaven and on earth, two salvations. And this one, in itself, has many subtopics that have become doctrines that have helped separate.

There's the concept of the ransom for all, not redemption for only the believer, but redemption for the unbeliever as well. Restitution, life restored upon the earth, not an earth that will be destroyed. The function of the church, which involves the sin offering concept, the church as part of the sin offering, the mediator, the composition of the mediator, and the covenants, the fact that there are different covenants for different ages and for different dispensations.

Each of these five areas is food for a talk in itself. We're going to deal on just one faction of the fifth area, on the concept of the sin offering. But before doing that, we're going to also mention one other question that we found very provocative.

Many years ago, in a study led by Brother Julius Bednarz, who I think many of you know well and remember, he asked the question—we broke into groups to decide the answer to this question—historically speaking, and that's the key word, historically speaking, what two scriptures are the most important scriptures in the development of the Harvest Church? Well, of course, we first came up with Acts 3, 19-21, and he said, no, that was important, that's the theme text, but that wasn't, historically speaking, an important scripture. Well, then it had to be 1 Corinthians 15, 20, and 21, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall be he alive. Again, a wrong answer.

His answer was that the two most important scriptures, historically speaking, and I got my things out of order, Matthew 24, 3, and as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the age? The discovery that the word coming, the Greek parousia, meant present, opened up the entire realm of prophecy that became so important in the development of the truths of the Harvest time. And the second scripture is Hebrews 13, 11-13, and that's our theme text today. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.

Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people of his own blood, suffer without the gate. Let us go therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach. I think many of you recall the story that is told of Brother Russell and by Brother Russell himself, how in the first book that he wrote, Tabernacle Shadows, that he spent hours, nights in prayer, trying to get a comprehension of the key to the tabernacle and the entire philosophy that it contained of the ransom and the sin offering.

And finally it opened up to him, and he sat down and in one burst wrote the book, minus the Red Heifer chapter that was added later. But the basic book was written as a one burst output, as he understood this text, the key to him, of the tabernacle. Let's look at this text now in an interpretive rendering for the bodies.

And notice, the treatment here by Paul is of the bodies. It is not of the blood, it is not of the whole, his emphasis is on the bodies. For the bodies of those beasts, and again, note the plural, we're going to talk about that later, but the body of those beasts in the plural, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary, now that limits the scope of his lesson.

He's not talking the sin offerings, and forget what you read up there, it's Leviticus 4, not Leviticus 5. He's not talking the sin offerings of Leviticus 4, the after-tomb of the sin offerings. That blood was not brought into the most holy. He's talking only the day of atonement sin offering, of Leviticus 16.

He's concentrating on that one national sin offering. The bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin are burned without the camp, wherefore Jesus, singular, the bodies of those beasts, plural, Jesus, singular, only one, the bullock of Leviticus 16, that he might sanctify, and the emphasis here is on sanctification, not redemption, not purchase, but cleansing, making holy a process, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffering. The emphasis in this text was not on his death.

The emphasis in this text was not on a legality of a life for a life. The emphasis in this text was on his suffering, the burning without the camp. He suffered without the gate.

Let us, the bodies of those beasts, plural, he's dealt with one singular, Jesus, now he's getting collected with a second group, us, the church, the goat, the second animal, the second beast that was there, go unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach. And once again, he does not say go out without the camp, yielding our blood, go without the camp, dying as redemption for man, none of that is mentioned, but bearing his reproach. The emphasis in this text is on the suffering, it's on the experiences, it's on the method, the process of death.

Now let's look a little more closely at certain aspects of this text. We noticed earlier that the treatment here is in the plural, the bodies of those beasts, bodies is in the plural. In Leviticus 16, 11, and 15, we have the sin offering, the national sin offering, the atonement day sin offering of Israel.

And there he says, take a bullock for a sin offering and a goat for a sin offering. Take a bullock and a goat for a sin offering. Notice what he does not say.

Take a bullock and goat for sin offerings. The bullock and the goat form one offering. The bodies of those beasts, plural in Hebrews, is singular in Leviticus.

It is the combination of the two animals that form the one sin offering. Neither animal by themselves, but the animals brought together, the bullock and the goat, are one sin offering. For a parallel construction, totally different subject matter, you can refer to Genesis 2, verse 23, the initial text that we use so often at wedding ceremonies.

For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and be joined unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh. The biblical concept of marriage is husband, wife, one flesh. There is a union, a bringing together, a viewing of the composite in the singular.

It's one flesh. Similarly and more appropriate to our subject, Romans 12, 5, says we, being many, Revelation says how many, 144,000, we being many are one body in Christ. The totality of Christ, the male figure in the Genesis marriage scripture, and the church, 144,000, the female scripture, figure of the Genesis scripture, are one.

Bullock and goat, one sin offering. Male and female, one marriage unit. Christ and the church, one spiritual unit.

The Christ, one body, head and body, complete by being joined, complete by being together. But now we're going to look at a scripture that seems to say the opposite of what we meant. Hebrews 9, 12 to 14.

We want to concentrate on trying to harmonize Hebrews 9, 12 to 14 with Hebrews 13 we read earlier. Hebrews 13, again, seems to differentiate between the two beasts, the two parts of the one sin offering, saying that as Christ was one, went without the camp, so the church is the other. As Jesus went without the camp, so we go unto him.

As the bullock had its body burned, so let the goat have its body burned. Let the two have the same experience. But Hebrews 9, 12 to 14, on the surface, seems to contradict.

Let's read it. Neither by the blood of goats and calves, the word is bullock, but by his own blood, he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctify it to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

Now notice what he seems to be saying. He says in the type, there was the blood of bulls and goats. In the anotype, how much more did he, singular, bulls and goats, he.

In fact, in the next verse, he complicates it. He said, bulls, goats, and the heifer. How much more shall the blood of Christ? He seems to concentrate all three with the blood of Christ.

Let's notice this comparison a little more. Verse 12 said, the blood of bulls and goats equaled his own blood. Verse 13 and 14, the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of

a heifer equals the blood of Christ.

Now, in Hebrews 13, it appears very clear that there were two beasts, one identified as the church, one identified as Christ. Hebrews 9 seemed to say, all the blood combined equals Jesus. We say, the bullock equals the church, the bullock equals Jesus, the goat equals the church, and the red heifer, which we're not really talking about much here, equals the ancient worthies.

On the surface, Paul says, bullock, goat, and heifer combined equal the blood of Jesus. Paul does not say that. That's what we assume Paul says.

Let's go back and look again at the scripture. Paul says, his own blood and the blood of Christ. We make the assumption that Jesus equals Christ.

And that's where the disharmony comes. Jesus and Christ are not totally synonymous terms. Christ means the anointed.

Jesus is a personal name of an individual. Paul says, know ye not that Christ is not one but many? That scripture in Romans, that ye are the members of the body of Christ? Jesus is Christ only in so much as Jesus is the head. And as the head controls the body, he is the controlling unit.

But the church is also the anointed. And so what Paul is really saying, definitively saying, in Hebrews 9, is that the blood of bulls and goats, and the heifer, we'll talk about that later, equals the blood of Christ, not the blood of Jesus. His emphasis is on Christ.

The second point we want to mention is his emphasis is on the blood of Christ. Hebrews 13 did not emphasize the blood. Hebrews 13 emphasized the body.

The bodies, plural, of those beasts. Hebrews 9 emphasizes the blood. Let's go back to Leviticus 16 briefly.

And notice a problem that we sometimes don't notice when we study Leviticus 16. The blood of the bullock and the blood of the goat, I'm going to talk blood now, not talking body. The blood of the bullock and the blood of the goat had the same thing happen to it.

It was sprinkled on the mercy seat, in the most holy. The mercy seat represents justice. Sprinkling of the blood upon the mercy seat represents the expiation of justice.

We say the bullock represents Jesus. The goat represents the church. In the type, the bullock was for Aaron and his house.

Without getting into discussion, I'll say the house of Levi. And Aaron represents, excuse me, and the goat was for the rest of Israel, the other 11 tribes. We seem to say that the blood of the church is 11 times more effective than the blood of Christ.

That's ridiculous. We don't say that. But that's what illogical inclusion would lead you to.

The blood of the bullock, Jesus, was applied for one tribe. The blood of the goat, the church, was applied for 11 tribes. And they're applied on justice.

And we say we don't affect justice. And therefore those who hold that Hebrews 9 says the church has no part in the sin offering, said this was their point. That only Christ affects justice.

And they're right. Only Christ does affect justice. Our blood has no effect.

But now let's go back to Leviticus 16. The bullock not only was offered first, the bullock had to be offered first. The goat was of absolutely no value without the bullock being offered.

The bullock was taken from Aaron's flocks. The bullock was given for the house of Levi. This house in its closest picture.

And I realize there's breaths here we're not going to get into. In its closest picture it represents the spiritual class. This blood was offered for the other tribes.

But that blood was of no value without the bullock cleansing that blood. To borrow an expression from our dear brother Ed Fay, it's as though the goat received a blood transfusion. It's as though the goat is carrying now the blood of Christ.

That blood has been transferred to the goat. And when that blood is applied, it's the same blood. That's why it's the mingling of the two bloods that later is sprinkled on the altar.

It is the application of that merit. So Hebrews 9, talking about the application of the merit, he emphasizes the source of the merit, which is Jesus. But he uses a term that is broad enough to include the whole church.

He uses the term Christ. Now this brings up the related question. We should mention first Hebrews 13, emphasizing the bodies, shows the distinction.

Hebrews 9, emphasizing the blood, shows the unity. The unity of Christ and his church is so much so that one is often taken for the other because they are as related in unity as the head is to a body. That is a scriptural illustration.

The related question that comes up is the question of the mediator. And it's very closely associated with this question. Whether then the mediator is a term that is limited to Jesus alone or a term that includes the church.

Let's go back to a very basic scripture. 1 Timothy 2, 5 and 6. For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom

for all to be testified in due time. That is a text that is loaded with questions.

As you read that text, is he saying that the mediator is a man? So there is one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all. Is he saying that Christ, as the mediator, died? There is one mediator, the man who died. Is he saying that to be a mediator, one must first have been a ransom? That the ransom qualifies the mediator? Does this text elucidate or exclude the church from being a part of the mediator? And with that question, we must note the fact.

And it's a scriptural fact. The word mediator, the word mediator, is never in the New Testament used of the church. The word itself.

Now, does this scripture dictate that? Our answer is no. It does not dictate that. But that is the assumptions that can be drawn, and they are logical assumptions.

Let's go back and translate this scripture the way that theologians would like to have it. There is one mediator between God and man, the spirit being. The Christ, head and body.

That would be nice, wouldn't it? Let's just take the spirit being part. Now let's read the whole text. There is one mediator between God and man, the spirit being Christ, who gave himself a ransom for all.

He didn't. The spirit being didn't give himself a ransom for all. So spirit being we can't use.

We're using two different phases of existence. We're using one phase relating to ransom, and that's his human phase. We're using another phase relating to his mediation, and that's his spiritual phase.

And so when you tie the two together, you've got to use a word that's going to be based on one or the other. What he is emphasizing here is that the one who is to become the mediator in this text is the one who initially died at the ransom. There is the emphasis of Jesus.

The emphasis is on Jesus and not on the church. There is no question that in Timothy he is not talking of the church as being part of the mediator. Does that mean that the church is not? No.

There are two ways scripturally to look at this question. The first way, if we can find a scripture, any scripture, New or Old Testament, that uses the word mediator and applies it to the church, frankly, I can't find one. I've looked.

I've looked every text I can find. I can't find one that exists. Secondly, if we can find the concept of mediator, type and antitype, apply it to the church.

Now we only have one scriptural type that is obviously a mediator, and that's Moses. That's definite. That's scriptural.

There's no question about it. Moses was a mediator. He's referred to as such frequently in the Bible.

Do we have scriptures that apply Moses to the church? Well, the first one we like to think of often, I forgot a text I wanted to come to. I'll come to it later. Okay.

That is the one in Acts 3, 22 and 23. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you from your brethren like unto me. Notice he identifies that prophet with himself.

Him shall you hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass that every soul that will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people. Here's a text that obviously speaks of Moses as a type, but, unfortunately, does not obviously include the church in the antitype.

We may assume that, and I think we are correct, but this scripture does not prove that. This scripture only says that Moses is truly, as a mediator, like unto me, a picture of this greater prophet. So all this text can prove is that the antitype of Moses, whatever that antitype is, includes the thought of being like unto Moses, which was the office of mediation.

We need a different text to identify Moses with the church. If we have a different text, then this fits beautifully. Then we can see beautifully how this text does fit in with the whole.

But this text by itself does not prove either way. It does not prove that it includes the church. It does not prove that it excludes the church.

This merely proves another point of the time of the Moses antitype. So let's look at 2 Corinthians 3, 6 to 8. The scripture of the able ministers of the new covenant, who also have made us, the church, able ministers of the New Testament covenant, not of the letter, but of the Spirit. For the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.

For if the ministration of death, written in the graven and stones, was glorious, so the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his covenant, which glory was to be done away, how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? Now let's concentrate on this text for a little while. Let's notice exactly what the scripture is saying. The scripture does not state that the church should be made able mediators of the New Testament.

It uses the term ministers. So that phrase by itself does not prove anything, either side. Certainly a mediator was a minister, but so were others, those who carried the blood.

These are all ministered to the old covenant in one form or another. So this in itself just says the church is made a minister. They then have the ministration of the new covenant.

Now he then compares the ministration of the new covenant with the ministration of the old covenant, the old law. And now he draws his point that as Moses had a ministry that was glorious, so this ministry is more glorious. He's identified what that minister was.

He's identified as Moses, not as the elders who went up on the mount, not as the priests, not as other roles, but the minister he's talking about was Moses. So shall the ministration, the term that he used back in verse 6, able ministers, be more glorious. I submit that this text links Moses and the church.

Not only links Moses and the church, but it links them in their relationship to the ministration of the covenant. That as Moses was the minister of the old, so Christ is the minister of the new. That as Moses was the minister of the old, so in the ministration of the new it includes us, the church, for able ministers.

As Moses in his ministry of the old was the mediator, so the us in the new includes the work of mediation. This I think is the primary text to identify the church as a part of this role in the ministration of this covenant. Now we're going to deviate a second here to bring in the missing scripture that I missed earlier, then I'll come back to my main thread.

Remember back in Timothy, it says that the mediator was the man, Christ Jesus. And we notice how we noted that the obvious, definitive, interpretive meaning of that text was the man who died as a ransom, the perfect man for the perfect man. But I want to look briefly at an extended view, not a conflicting view, but an extended view of the term the man, Christ Jesus.

To do that I want to go to Ephesians, the fourth chapter, the thirteenth verse, where it says of the church, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. He's talking here about the completion of the church. He's talking beyond the veil.

He's talking about the ministries that we have through pastors, teachers, helpers of various sorts, helping us arrive at a unity that will eventually be realized when we come into the stature of a perfect man. But we're not going to be perfect men. The scriptures are clear.

We'll be perfect spiritual beings. He's talking man here, not as an element of nature, but as an element of totality, head and body, until we come and form the total, the whole, the complete. And it's the whole, the complete, the total, that is the mediator.

Let's go back to this term now, able ministers of the new covenant. We're going to

another scripture in 2 Corinthians that breaks this ministry into two parts, one future, one past. 2 Corinthians 5, 18 and 19.

Verse 18 speaks of the future ministry of the new covenant. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us, this time he does not say the ministry of the new covenant, but the ministry of reconciliation. I would submit that because they're both in 2 Corinthians in the same discussion, that he is like linking the two.

That the ministry of the new covenant is a ministry of reconciliation. The object of the new covenant is to reconcile man to God. That's what it's all about.

It's to take away the heart of stone. It's to give him a heart of flesh. And in that object, in the realization of that object, he said, you have a ministry that's committed to you, this ministry of reconciliation.

But now in verse 19, he tells you what you've got already, this side's availed. To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespass unto them, and hath committed to us the word of reconciliation. Future is the work of reconciliation.

Present is the word of reconciliation. Already we can be peacemakers. Already we can preach the word of the ransom and the sin offering and its effects and its atoning features.

We can talk about God's love for all mankind and all that are in the graves that come forth, those that have done good and those that have done evil. Let's concentrate for a second, though, on the current work. As being currently able ministers of the new covenant, currently ministers of the word of reconciliation, how do we today, this side of the veil, participate in the word of reconciliation? On reprint 4496, it suggests there are three specific activities that we are engaged in that are part of the reconciling work.

Number one is gathering the members of the body of the great mediator. And I like that expression. Members of the body of the great mediator.

The head is Christ. He is the mediatorial head. The body is what needs to be gathered.

And until the mediator is complete, until we come in the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, until that man that perfect man, that perfect entity, then we must still work with the word of reconciliation, bringing together the members of the body. Second, the learning and the teaching others the lessons necessary to qualify for that position. An expression that is often used in our tabernacle studies, and I think it's a very good one.

The purpose of the sin offering is to qualify the mediator. There is a direct relationship

between the two. To do the one, one must learn the other.

We must learn now what it means to be of the human race. What their trials are, what their experiences are, what they go through. That qualifies us for that future work of reconciling man to God, of being able to apply those lessons practically in the overseeing work that the Church has.

In Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, under the word mediator, much of which is wrong, by the way, in that definition, there's a statement that says, yes, Jesus was uniquely qualified to be a mediator because he understood both the needs of God, excuse me, both the demands of God and the needs of man. That's precisely what we're learning. We're learning through our scripture study of principles, the demands of God.

We're learning through the pulls of the flesh, the needs of man, and how these two interreact. And to the extent that we learn how to apply the one to conquer the other, we have what we like to term a sin offering experience. And third, it's preparing the blood with which it is to be sealed, his blood, Jesus' blood, not our blood.

But while we are in the flesh, his blood is not available to reconcile the world. It is used to guarantee our consecrations. And so that blood is finally prepared by our becoming faithful, releasing the mortgage on it, making it available for its use to mankind.

Let's start getting to the conclusion of the matter. Before we've got a ways to go yet in concluding. The sin offering and the ransom are to be kept separate and distinct.

There's no question that the ransom is an offering for sin. But it is not the sin offering of Abacus 16. There is no question that there are other sin offerings, including the red heifer.

Number is 19.9, on the red heifer, which concludes with the words, it is a purification for sin. The Hebrew word translated purification for sin, the word hata, is the identical word used in Leviticus 16, a bullock and a goat for a sin offering. But it's eight offering for sin.

The function of that, we mentioned, we touched that briefly. Why does Paul say the sin offering, the red heifer, is a part of the blood of Christ? Really, directly, if it is the ancient worthies, it's not. And we think there is so much in support of being the ancient worthies, we have to say it is.

But why does he include it as part of the blood of Christ? Because of 1 Corinthians 10. They drank of that rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ. They participated anticipatory in the blood of Christ.

They will be part of the sin clearance project. We have today slum clearance projects. Their kingdom is one big sin clearance project.

And that sin clearance project, these ministers in heaven and on earth. And so as a result, the blood of Christ cleansing them makes efficacious not their bodies, but their ashes. Makes efficacious not the church's ashes, but their bodies.

These are used for the purification. The remembrance of their experiences brought on a one-to-one basis with man will be very helpful in the cleansing of sin. But these in offering is limited to the bullock and the goat.

To that scripture so well defined, Hebrews 13, the bodies of which are Christ and the church, the two elements. All legal value is supplied by Jesus' ransom sacrifice. The church adds nothing.

It took one perfect man for one perfect man to redeem mankind. There is not one iota of intrinsic merit that our imperfect flesh offers. Now it doesn't say there's no value to our lives.

There's tremendous value. But there's no legal value. There's no legal merit.

There's no purchasing price. What there is is the value, the uncalculable value of experience. A practical value.

A value that's there in learning from our experiences to assist. But this is of no legal merit. The legal merit, the blood, is always the blood of Christ.

It's never the blood of the church. Our blood is not where the value lies. Paul's emphasis on the sin offering in Hebrews 13, and that's when he mentions sin offering, is not on the blood because really the application of the blood is a part of the process.

But the blood is not the sin offering. The blood is the ransom blood, ransom merit. It shows how it's applied, the method of application.

And that's why sometimes we oversimplify with the statement the sin offering is the application of the ransom. That's true. But it's not the whole truth.

That covers a part of the truth. It's a very valuable truth. But the whole truth is it's also providing the work of mediation that's there.

So Paul, when he speaks about the sin offering, does not emphasize that but emphasizes the sufferings. The sufferings that teach the identification with man and his experience. The sin offering qualifies the mediator in two ways.

One, by giving those tests that show the faithfulness of the mediator. But much more important, by the sympathetic understanding that is gained with the similar experiences to mankind. And I refer you to 1 Corinthians 10, 13 which says there is no experience that we suffer that is not common to man.

Our experiences are identical with man so that we can learn the lesson. And then to Hebrews 2, 17 and 18 and Hebrews 4, 15 and 16 which directly link our ability to approach Jesus now with the fact that he suffered as we suffer. And mankind's ability to approach the church is the same principle.

We suffer as mankind suffers and that identification of experience. Why was Jesus' part in the sin offering necessary? Now we're going to look only at Jesus' part. Let me use two books to illustrate my point.

Each of these books has one thing in common. They got a cover and they got pages. Let the cover of this book represent Adam.

Let the pages represent the human race that came forth between that cover. Adam sinned. Historic fact.

Adam died. Historic fact. God provided redemption by providing another identical book.

By providing Jesus not just the cover but the potential for a race in his loins. Jesus came to give his life so that Adam and his race might live. Beautiful.

Simple. One major problem. Jesus is dead.

The ransom cannot give life to Jesus. Justice demanded that somewhere the life be given for Adam. If Jesus gave his life for Adam that's fine.

Adam can live but he cannot. Always that simple. He won't live as a human being.

He'll live as a spirit being. That doesn't answer the question. It's almost irrelevant.

When Jesus exchanged his spiritual life for the human life how much change did he get left over? None. A life equals a life. When he exchanged his spiritual for the human he gave up the spiritual.

He took the human. He didn't have the spiritual later to fall back on. That was given.

So when he died he can't say, oh take the spiritual now. He gave that to get the human. How does Jesus live? The answer is simple.

Jesus did not come at age 33 consecrate and die. He came, he entered into a contractual relationship with God. A covenant.

This contractual relationship was said don't die. Now, die in the manner I prescribe. Die daily.

Learn the experiences of man. Identify with him. If you do that, for that contract I will give you a spiritual life.

That contract we call Jesus' part in the sin offering. What's the necessity for the church's part in the sin offering? Go back to the ransom. The ransom was very simple.

A perfect human life for a perfect human life. Finish the formula. A perfect human life for a perfect human life will give a perfect human life.

Is that what you expect? Do you expect a perfect human life? I don't. Do you expect a spiritual life? You won't get another ransom. The ransom does not say a perfect human life for a perfect human life gives divine nature.

Now you're getting an unequals instead of equals. You're not comparing the same elements. In order to get the divine nature, you need to take this perfect human life which you are given only in prospect through justification.

You're being treated as though you had it and say, I'm willing to give that up. Double or nothing. I'm willing to give that up.

I'm willing to surrender that. Under the same contract that Jesus surrendered his. I would die the way he died.

Die daily. Identify with man. So that as a reward for that contract, I can have spiritual life.

And that's what our theme text on almost every pulpit says. Revelation 2.10. Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee the crown of life that's beautiful. The crowning life.

The divine life. That divine life is the process of faithfully continuing this covenant that David calls in Psalm 50 verse 5 a covenant by sacrifice. That covenant by sacrifice is the church's part in the sin offering.

Let's come to our concluding text. 1 Peter 1.2 A scripture that says it all. A scripture that encompasses the entire calling plan of God in one short verse.

It says, Brethren, you are elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through the sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and strengthening of the blood of Jesus Christ. Here you've got the principle of our election. The foreknowledge of God our Father.

What does he mean by that? That God knew ahead of time that he would need a church. To redeem mankind? No. He doesn't need a church to redeem mankind.

Jesus but alone does that. To perfect redeemed mankind. To take the redeemed mankind and educate them.

Again, I'd like to use an illustration of our brother Fay. The person has appendicitis. He

goes into the hospital.

He's operated on for appendicitis and sent home. Dies three weeks later of infection. You don't send him home.

You keep him in the hospital to recover from the operation. The ransom is the surgery. It removes the sin.

The sin offering is the recuperation period in the hospital. To remove from the side effects of that sin. When my wife went in for cancer, they said, we have a treatment that would treat cancer, but it won't work unless you first have the tumor removed.

Because that's going to manufacture more cancer. So there's two steps. We've got to remove the tumor.

We've got to kill the cancer cells. So you have a two step process. That's what God does.

The ransom removes the tumor. The sin offering gets rid of the cells. Gets rid of all the side effects.

That's the purpose of the highway of holiness. That's why a mediator is needed. That is the foreknowledge of God.

He doesn't select a bride for Christ and say, oh, I've got a bride and I've got to give her some work to do. Let me get a job. And find busy work.

But like any good corporate executive, he's got a job and he finds the people to fill the job. And the job that he's got is this bringing of a mankind. We fill up that which is, and yes, the guy I've got is right, lacking.

Of the afflictions, not of Christ alone, Jesus alone, but of the Christ. Of the whole body. Colossians 1.24 The method of our election is through sanctification of the Spirit.

Through the process of becoming made holy. Through the process of learning through our experiences. And here it's worthwhile to mention that those sin offering experiences that we have have no relationship to how we get into an experience.

We can get into an experience through our own stupidity. We can get into an experience through our own willfulness. If we learn how to overcome, that experience is valuable.

That failure is great. That's a part of the store of knowledge we'll need. On the other hand, we can get into an experience purely suffering for Christ.

We didn't ask for it. We were persecuted. We come out of it and say, boy was I good.

I got persecuted for Christ. That's of no value at all. We haven't learned a thing through it.

It's not what got us into the experience. It's what we got out of the experience that makes the experience valuable. That's what makes it part of this sanctification process.

I haven't got time to go into it but read carefully John 17, 17-20. And notice how the sanctification of Jesus was so he could sanctify the church. And the sanctification of the church is so they could sanctify the world.

Each one has a step, just like a sin offering process. The purpose of our election is twofold. Primarily, in effect, it's obedience.

First, becoming obedient ourselves. Subduing the flesh. But for the function of helping mankind become obedient.

Of obtaining total obedience. It's not only our own obedience, that's primary. But it's the eventual obedience for all.

And second, the sprinkling of the blood. The privilege of being with Christ in the raising of the human race. In the application of that merit.

It's his merit. We share with him the privilege of application. And in the application of that merit, just as the vessels in Exodus 24, is it? Are used to carry the blood, sprinkle the people.

So we, in our cracked pots, our broken vessels, can go forth and carry his blood and help others. So in summary, we're saying that when we look at the doctrines of separation of the harvest, and we look more carefully at the doctrine of the two salvations, we find within that doctrine, the nugget of the philosophy of the ransom and its distinction from the sin offering. We find the jewel of the church's part in sharing with Christ in that sin offering.

There's only one redeemer. But Obadiah 21 puts it well. Saviors, plural, should come up Mount Zion.

There are many saviors. There are many who will assist in the salvation work. There's much to be done by the church.

That this privilege is ours if, and only if, one, we're faithful, but two, we take our individual experiences, don't use them to judge others, but to sympathize with others. And above all, learn to conquer. For the advantage is in conquering sin, not in giving in.

We may give in for a time. A just man may fall seven times, but he must rise. If he doesn't rise, he can't fall the second time.

He's got to get up before he can fall again and again, and eventually he has to end up on his feet. So too, he must end up on our feet if we would be a part of this blessed experience, which I consider one of the most beautiful, personally applicable doctrines of

the scriptures. It gives so much meaning to our experiences.

To know they're not just for today. These experiences are for eternity. May the Lord bless you.

We'd like to thank Brother Carl for that very detailed study on the sin offering, and how beautiful it is when we realize in detail how we fit into that program and the sin offering, and if we're faithful, we'll be part of that mediator. So, let's use our experience as well, as Brother Carl said. If we can learn the lessons, then we will be part of it.

So, before we close with Brother Carl's selection of Hymn 208, we have a couple of announcements. At 1115, we have a children's program for ages 4 through 8, and I believe that's going to be in the Bethlehem room. Our Heavenly Father, we bow our heads before Thy throne to thank Thee for the privilege, the inestimable privilege of sharing in the high calling and being called to the glorious work of helping in that grand salvation of mankind.

Help us, Father, to comprehend it more, to comprehend our current realities of our experiences more, to apply them more deeply, to love Thee more dearly. In Jesus' name.