

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 196

Hebrews 10

December 30, 2017

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Hebrews 10 wraps up the author's discourse on the superiority of the high priesthood of Jesus—a theme begun in chapter five. The chapter revisits how the Torah's system of sacrifices could not take away sin as it was a shadow of things to come. The author references earlier high points of how Jesus is superior to Torah dealt with earlier. The entire second half of the chapter, though, focuses once more on the chief concern of the author—the reason he keeps telling his audience about the superiority of Jesus to the Mosaic Law—the need to keep believing the gospel so as to not “shrink back” to dependence on their obedience to law (merit-based performance) for salvation.

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 196: Hebrews chapter 10. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike! How are you doing?

MH: Pretty good, pretty good. And I think you know why!

TS: Yeah, because you..... had a good Christmas?

MH: Yeah, yeah. That's part of it.

TS: Uhhh..... You had a happy New Year?

MH: Yep, yep. Keep going.

TS: Uhhh..... Maybe because you got lucky and won Fantasy Football?

MH: [laughing] It's not luck when you're guided by the Lombardi of Fantasy Football—my pug, Mori.

TS: I saw that trophy you posted on Facebook. Now, where was my trophy when I won last year? Where'd you get that trophy? That was a good-looking trophy.

MH: I just got it because I thought... This was the first year I got smart enough to make Mori my general manager, and he deserved a trophy. I couldn't find one made of dog biscuits, so I figured that was good enough.

TS: Yeah, that's a good-looking trophy. Well, I guess...

MH: I also won my Logos Fantasy League and I'm in the Superbowl for one of my brother's leagues, so I'm having a good year.

TS: Logos. Do they even know what football is in that league? I figured they'd be too busy studying.

MH: They're into things like soccer and rock-climbing. Whatever.

TS: [laughs]

MH: They could tell you who won the Tour de France or climbed X, Y, Z mountain, but they can't tell you much about football. But there are a few people in the company that are not hopeless and they are part of the league.

TS: Mike, one thing you will never see me do is rock-climb. [laughter]

MH: Yeah, well, ditto. [laughter] I won't even watch it. I don't really want to watch people die, you know?

TS: Well, there you go. So all right, Mike. I take it you didn't bow down to your Christmas tree last week. So you had a good Christmas?

MH: I did not [bow down]. We gave it scant attention.

TS: You didn't worship it by giving it presents and then...

MH: [laughs] Right, with all of our presents, we had *it* in mind!

TS: And New Year's? Are y'all doing anything fun for the new year?

MH: We went over to a friend's house. We usually don't do anything, but we got invited this year, so why not?

TS: Any New Year's resolutions? Quit smoking? Anything like that?

MH: Nope. I don't make resolutions.

TS: Boom.

MH: [laughing] I just don't.

TS: There you go. All right, Mike. Hebrews 10—Christ's sacrifice once and for all. What have we got?

MH: Yeah, for those who have been listening for a while, we've been on the theme off and on (mostly on) since Hebrews chapter 5 of Christ's high priesthood and his sacrifice. I mentioned way back then, "Hey, this is going to run all the way through chapter 10." And so here we are. We're still in that content, in terms of its theme and the emphasis, but this will be the last chapter for that. We'll transition to some other things beyond chapter 10. But we're still here. Believe it or not, there are still actually a few things that are interesting to think about. There's going to be one item in here that is going to be... I'll just be honest: It's hard for us to understand why the writer of Hebrews would do what he does with a particular Old Testament passage. So there's going to be something new here that's difficult to understand. Other than that, there are places where previous ideas get punctuated here once again. The good news for that is not that it's just redundant and repetitious, but it shows us once again what the most important things are in the mind of the writer. That's why he keeps returning to them.

Let's just jump into Hebrews 10. I'll read the first four verses to get started. Reading from the ESV, it says:

5:00

For since the law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities, it can never, by the same sacrifices that are continually offered every year, make perfect those who draw near. ² Otherwise, would they not have ceased to be offered, since the worshipers, having once been cleansed, would no longer have any consciousness of sins? ³ But in these sacrifices there is a reminder of sins every year. ⁴ For it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins.

That's the first four verses. This is pretty pointed language about the insufficiency of Torah—the insufficiency of the law. If you just follow the logic here, the law is just a shadow of the good things to come, instead of the true form of these realities. "These realities" are the stuff he has talked about up to this point about the high priesthood of Christ, about Christ's sacrifice, about Christ being seated at the right hand of majesty, so on and so forth—the superiority of what Jesus did on the cross, the cross event to the Torah and to its sacrifices and whatnot. Not only could the sacrifices not remove sin (they didn't take care of the sin problem, in terms of human fallibility, obviously)... Humans are going to sin, so even the cross event of Jesus is no guarantee that Christians aren't going to sin. Scripture teaches the opposite of that (1 John: "When we say we have no sin we make God a liar, we deceive ourselves"...). But what he's talking about here is the inadequacy of the sacrifices to actually absolve a person of moral guilt.

For those who listened to the Leviticus series that we did, that is not an unfamiliar idea—that the sacrificial laws and the sacrificial system were not about absolving people of moral guilt. It was really about decontaminating sacred space. It was about insulating mere mortals who might be unclean or had become unclean... It was about taking care of an uncleanness problem, in terms of them being allowed to approach sacred space—they being allowed to participate in the system by which their relationship to both the community (people of Israel, people of God, the family of God itself) and God could be restored or remedied or sort of just whatever the contamination was—that's removed and taken care of. So if you were an Israelite and you went through the sacrificial system, the rituals, you did things as they were prescribed to be done, God would look at you and say, "We're okay now. You're not going to pollute my presence. Let's try it again. You're not unclean. You're not contaminated." You never get this notion that "I look at you now as though you never sinned." That is not an Israelite Old Testament idea as it relates to the sacrificial system. There are broader perspectives about sin and relationship with God that sort of transcend the sacrificial system, but what we're talking about here (what the writer of Hebrews is talking about) is specifically what the Torah describes to do for certain types of violation.

Again, from the Leviticus series, if you committed a serious crime—you committed adultery or you did X, Y Z—there wasn't a sacrifice for that. You either had the death penalty or you had to pay restitution—you had to make things right with the person you offended or there were some sins that there just wasn't a sacrifice for. The sacrificial system itself was about sacred space and decontamination of it—protecting it from contamination and making the participants "clean," i.e., not morally guiltless now, but able in a contaminative sense to participate in the system. That's what it was about.

The writer of Hebrews is saying, "Look, that is just inferior to what we have in Jesus. It's because of the sacrifice of Jesus that we are allowed to enter his presence. And beyond that, we do have the forgiveness of sins. We have been cleansed. We are new creations." He uses all this New Testament sort of language. And not only that, but even better—still better—it's permanent. We don't have to keep doing these things. We don't have to sacrifice the son of God anew. In fact, that's an abominable idea—sort of casting what happened at the cross, or filtering what happened at the cross through the filter of the Old Testament ritualistic, repetitive system. To the writer of Hebrews, that's an abominable thing.

10:00

So no matter what angle you look at it, he's saying that what we have is so much better in every way. And the law, again, was the shadow. "Shadow" is kind of an interesting term here (*skia* in Greek). It's clear that sacrifices (from what we read) were both temporary and, in terms of the actual removal of moral guilt, they were ineffective. Now, few would argue that. For instance, the Hebrew Roots people (the more extreme versions of that)... Maybe I'm wrong, maybe some of them do

argue that we should go back to animal sacrifices. I don't know, but I would think at least that much would be obvious. So I don't think they're arguing for bringing back animal sacrifices, but what else? It's kind of interesting to ask this question, because you could have somebody that's sort of on the periphery here with the Hebrew Roots Movement saying, "We don't argue that we should have sacrifices come back. We still believe in Jesus" and all that, but then they want to cling to other elements of the law. So it's interesting to ask the question, "What else does the New Testament describe with the same word—"shadow," *skia*?" What else does the New Testament put in that kind of same category or cast the same way? The term is not used very often. In Colossians 2:17 we get it. The verse itself says:

¹⁷ These are a shadow of the things to come, but the substance belongs to Christ.

So what are these things? If we actually go look at Colossians 2, the previous verse says this:

¹⁶ Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink, or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath. ¹⁷ These are a shadow of the things to come, but the substance belongs to Christ.

Then he goes off in verse 18 and he sort of hits the pagans with the worship of angels and all that kind of stuff. But here in 16 and 17, what's the shadow there? It's food and drink laws, it's the Sabbath, "new moon" (that's the lunar calendar and the Israelite calendar—the Torah calendar), and festivals. Those things are a shadow of the good things to come. So why are we preferring the shadow, the precursor, the warm-up, the ineffectual things of lesser value to God than Christ? Why are we preferring the inferior instead of the superior? It doesn't make any sense. In Hebrews 8:5, you also get this *skia* terminology—the shadow. It says:

⁵ They serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly things. For when Moses was about to erect the tent, he was instructed by God, saying, "See that you make everything according to the pattern that was shown you on the mountain."

That's the verse proper. Now, if we go actually to the context and move back a few verses to verse 1, we read this:

Now the point in what we are saying is this: we have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, ²a minister in the holy places, in the true tent that the Lord set up, not man.

Remember our episode on this. The tabernacle was made by virtue of human agency. Yes, God commanded it be built, but people built it. So that's what's

behind this reference to human involvement. But the true tent is one that's created only by the Lord. We talked about how that becomes sort of an analogous way of thinking about the gospel—the work of Christ that God accepts (the propitiation for sins and all those kinds of things—everything that's involved with that). That was God's doing because Christ is the God-man. God the Father (we're going to get this in Hebrews 10) and God the Son were the ones who conceived of this plan in eternity past. It's God through and through from start to finish. It has nothing to do with people. This comment about the true tent and the Torah tent (the tabernacle) becomes an analogous way of thinking about things that are really all of God and things that are in some way involving human effort. It's a contrast for the gospel. It's either grace through faith and that's it—end of story—or we have some sort of works (merit-based kind of thinking). So the writer of Hebrews uses this as an analogy to talk about salvation being exclusively by faith through grace, or grace through faith (whichever way you want to say it)—some system that has human involvement, i.e., the law. Back to Hebrews 8:

³For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices; thus it is necessary for this priest also to have something to offer. ⁴Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, since there are priests who offer gifts according to the law. ⁵They serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly things.

So there's this idea again, not just of the sacrificial system... Here's the point: We're not just talking about the insufficiency of the sacrificial system. The writer of Hebrews is talking about the insufficiency of any system—including Torah/the law—whereby people could presume or actually teach more overtly that salvation was about human merit and performance. The point being, salvation has nothing to do with human perfectibility—human performance/works. It has everything to do with what happened on the cross. His fundamental question is not to belittle the things associated with the law, but to elevate the high priestly ministry and sacrifice of Jesus. It's not that he's cutting down one. What he's doing is he's putting things in their proper place. He's putting things in proper perspective. He's not saying that the law was bad: "Bad law, sinister law, icky law." He's not doing that. He's just saying, "This was one thing, and it's inferior to this other thing. One was a shadow of the other. One was a precursor to the other. And the other is what happened on the cross with Jesus. That is superior." So he's trying to elevate that above Torah-, not say Torah was bad. I think that's important for us to keep in perspective, as well. Paul had a very high view of the law. He had a positive view of the law (Romans 7). He had a love for the law because he uses that kind of language in Romans, especially, and in a few other places. Paul had a high view of the law, but he had a higher view of Jesus. That's how we need to look at these things. We don't need to denigrate one for the other, we just need to keep things in proper perspective.

So Hebrews 10:5-7... let's continue. The writer says:

**⁵ Consequently, when Christ came into the world, he said,
 “Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired,
 but a body have you prepared for me;
⁶ in burnt offerings and sin offerings
 you have taken no pleasure.
⁷ Then I said, ‘Behold, I have come to do your will, O God,
 as it is written of me in the scroll of the book.’”**

This is kind of an interesting passage because what's here is sort of cast as a conversation between the first and second members of the Trinity—between God the Son and God the Father—Christ and God (however you want to say it—those two members of the Trinity). This is like a conversation. It's linked to the incarnation because of the phrase, "when Christ came into the world." That would be the point of incarnation. The author of Hebrews appropriates some Old Testament stuff to make this point. At this juncture, Guthrie says this... just a little excerpt from Guthrie's comments in Beale's commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament. He writes:

The author appropriates the psalm as being explicitly fulfilled by Christ “when he comes into the world” (10:5). This language is distinct from that used as an introductory formula in [Hebrews] 1:6, where the author employs *oikoumenē* (“world”), which can be interpreted as a reference to the heavenly realm. [But *here*] the use of *kosmos* (“world”), along with the context, suggests here that the incarnation is in mind.

He has something in mind of what's happening on Earth, not specifically when Christ came into the world of the heavens. That's not his point, Guthrie is saying. Specifically, what this conversation between the two members of the Trinity has in view is the incarnation. So it's kind of an interesting way to sort of see that comparing Hebrews 1:6, when it uses *oikoumenē* (which can be talking about heavenly realms) and here you have *kosmos*. So it's a way to look at this and say, "What he has in mind here is the incarnation." That's kind of obvious from the context because of verse 5 (the second half): "a body you have prepared for me." It kind of makes the incarnation sort of obvious.

20:00

Another thing to mention in passing here: These three verses (Hebrews 10:5-7)... I'll just read them again:

**⁵ Consequently, when Christ came into the world, he said,
 “Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired,
 but a body have you prepared for me...**

Think about what that says. It really cuts against adoptionist Christology in a pretty clear way. Now, adoptionist Christology is the idea that Jesus of Nazareth (the man) became the son of God. He was adopted by God, like at his baptism at some point. People typically put it at the baptism. That kind of undermines... I shouldn't say it that way. It's *used* by some people to undermine things like the virgin birth and incarnation—God actually being man and that sort of thing. In other words, God picks a guy (Jesus of Nazareth) and says, "You're going to be my son. You're going to be the tool now for salvation." The Gnostic version of this kind of thinking is that the Christos came and inhabited this guy at this point. That is not what's in view here. What's in view here (very clearly) in Hebrews 10:5 is that prior to the incarnation, God the Son and God the Father had a conversation. They had a plan that involved the second member of the Trinity having a body. "A body you have prepared for me." This really undercuts adoptionist Christology, in my mind, in a significant way.

Now let's talk about these three verses. Here's the difficulty that I mentioned as we started the episode. There's something here that really, honestly, might sound troubling to some. It's a little bit hard for us to understand. I'm going to prep it this way: We're used to thinking about the letters of the New Testament getting written, and then they get copied and passed around and then they're copied a lot, and then everybody has a Bible. Everybody's going to be *reading* this. Most people in antiquity did not have Bibles. Most people in antiquity lived and died without ever seeing one. They might have seen a portion of something. If they were Jewish, they could walk into a synagogue and they might have a Torah scroll there—a whole one. They'd see it pulled out and then a portion read. People don't have Bibles. This is still largely an oral and aural culture. People would go to synagogue, they would go to church, and hear things read out loud. That's just the way it was done. Just think about the composition of the early Church. You get a lot of slaves, Gentiles, Jews, and there's a lot of underground stuff going on. You obviously have the use of the Septuagint. If anybody has something written, it's typically going to be the Septuagint. But you've got various levels of literacy and various levels of access to any of this material. Everything has to be done by hand. There's no printing press. We have to remember these things. Chances are, when you met as a community—as a church, a family or group of believers—somebody would have something and you would read it out loud. Or you would talk about maybe something you had heard before. Nobody shows up there with their Bible in tow, and they're all sitting there with a Bible open on their laps. It's just not the way it happened, not the way it was done. And that matters for this particular issue. There's a reason why I gave that little set-up.

What we have going on here in Hebrews 10:5-7 is a quotation of the Septuagint of Psalm 40:6-8, but there is a significant difference in the wording of the Septuagint as compared to the Hebrew text of Psalm 40:6-8 in the Masoretic Text. There's a really significant difference here. Let me read you what we have

in Hebrews 10:5-7 once more. This comes from the Septuagint. It's not completely quoted in its entirety from the Septuagint, but it largely follows the Septuagint. The writer says:

⁵ **Consequently, when Christ came into the world, he said,**

Now here's the beginning of the quotation:

"Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired,

but a body have you prepared for me;

⁶ **in burnt offerings and sin offerings**

you have taken no pleasure.

25:00

⁷ **Then I said, 'Behold, I have come to do your will, O God,**

as it is written of me in the scroll of the book.'"

Now if you go to Psalm 40, here's what you read. Here's the Masoretic Text (the Hebrew text)—not the Septuagint, but the Masoretic Text. Here's what it says, pretty literally here:

In sacrifice and offering you have not delighted,

but you have given me an open ear.

Burnt offering and sin offering

you have not required.

Where the Masoretic Text has "open ear," the Septuagint has "body." It's quite different. Let me just read what Hagner says here. He writes:

Here, the Septuagint appears to be an interpretation of the Hebrew, which reads literally, **"ears you have dug for me."**[instead of "body" from the LXX] Most translations (including KJV, NASB, RSV) of this line of Hebrew in Psalm 40:6 take the words in the sense of the NRSV's "you have given me an open ear"—that is, able to hear and thus obey. The Septuagint translators, however, took the words as an allusion to the creation of Adam's body, which, being fashioned by God out of clay, would have required the digging out of the ears, as in the making of a sculpture. The words were highly appropriate when put into the mouth of the incarnate Christ: "a body you prepared for me." Christ could not have fulfilled the will of God—explicitly, he could not have died—without a body.

You read that and you go, "What in the world is going on?" It just seems like the Septuagint translator (whoever that was) was just *on* something. Why in the world would you look at the Hebrew text and see this idea of carving or digging

out or making ears... Why would your mind go from that and go, "It's like Adam. When Adam was made from the dust of the ground—that dirt—God had to fashion his body, and boy, when you're fashioning a body, you've got to make the ears so the human can hear you and obey you. And so I'm going to translate this part 'a body you've prepared for me?'" That seems like fairly convoluted thinking, but it is actually what the writer of Hebrews quotes instead of the Masoretic Text. You've got to wonder... It just feels like there's some sort of deliberate misquotation going on here, or some sort of arcane self-styled imaginative theologizing going on.

Here's the issue: It *is* sort of a deliberate misquotation. It's deliberate in terms of the choice of the Septuagint translator. In other words, both the translator and the writer of Hebrews are not inept. They are doing something here. There's a reason why the writer of Hebrews prefers this for his audience. It's actually for the purposes of drawing attention to something in particular to *hearers* of the text instead of readers.

There's an article on this, and I'm going to post this on the episode page. Honestly, you probably have to have a little Greek, maybe even a little bit of English literature or literary panache to really follow this thinking in this article, but I'm going to put it up anyway. It's by Karen Jobes, who is a Septuagint specialist. The article is entitled, "The Function of Paranomasia in Hebrews 10:7." I'm going to put it on the episode page. This is Webster now:

[Latin, from Greek, from *paronomazein* to call with a slight change of name, from *para-* + *onoma* name—more at NAME] 1577: a play on words: PUN

30:00

In other words, this is a fancy literary term for a play on words: a pun. What Jobes is going to argue—what she shows in this article—is that the writer of Hebrews picks the Septuagint because it creates word play with other parts of the content of Hebrews 10. In other words, it's a deliberate choice on the part of whoever composed Hebrews 10—that he sees in the Greek text of the Septuagint (the Greek translation of this particular Psalm) a convenient way to create word plays in his own material with his own material, in his own argument. The thing that he wants people to zero in on (which, in the context of Hebrews 10 is the person and work of Christ, the high priest)... He sees things in that Psalm in the Septuagint version that will make that task easier for him. It's an issue of convenience. He's a writer, and he picks that translation particularly because it affords him the opportunity to create word play. Why would he do that? Because he knows that most of the people who are going to get his content are going to hear it, not read it. It's a deliberate choice on the writer's part because "if we use these wordings and I can create these word plays, people listening carefully... their attention will be drawn specifically to ideas that I want them to walk away with."

For me, personally, this is kind of interesting when writers will do this sort of thing. It's complicated. Again, I'm putting the Jobes article up there. It doesn't translate well to a podcast episode. You more or less have to see it, and you probably at least have to know the Greek alphabet to see what's going on. But this is the kind of thing (actually, there's a lot of these kinds of things) that really defy ideas like "all prophecy is interpreted literally." I'm sorry, but that's just not true. The biblical writers don't always take a prophecy literally. They don't always take the Old Testament literally. They do things like this because they are literary artists. They are skilled communicators. God allows them to use their skills to produce the stuff that we call scripture. He is not whispering the content into their ear. He is not dictating stuff. This goes back (as many things that we have discussed on this podcast before) to a flawed view—a flawed way that we are taught—about inspiration. When you muck around in the text, like New Testament scholars have to do, like Old Testament scholars have to do... Systematic theologians—people who do English Bible work—never see this kind of stuff. They never get into it. It's not on the radar because that's just not their scholarly field. They do different things to earn their degrees and do what they do. But the people who are the text geeks—the people who have to look at the text—run into these things a lot. Not just word play issues like this, but other things that are happening in the text. Honestly, the best word that I can think of for it is that that they *defy* what we are taught about inspiration—the way we are taught about biblical interpretation. There is a spectrum of ways that scripture gets interpreted by other scripture writers. This notion of this one-to-one literalism kind of thing just doesn't work in a number of places.

Here you actually have a situation where the writer prefers a translation of the Hebrew text that is very... Let's be honest. The Septuagint translation of this ("getting a body" instead of "ears you've carved out for me") is highly interpretive here. But the writer of Hebrews likes it because it allows him to create memorable word play in his own material. He finds that useful to helping hearers zero in on specific items that he wants them to walk away with. What happens in the production of scripture... We are taught to intentionally minimize the human activity. I've said it before and I'll say it again: When you minimize the humanity of scripture, you undermine inspiration. You undermine it. You make it vulnerable to criticism. Anybody who's listening to this and has some of these traditional-yet-flawed views of inspiration... If I were an enemy of scripture, if I were an enemy of the gospel, if I were an enemy of Christ or the faith, I could destroy the idea of inspiration. It would go up in flames right in front of your eyes. But that would be illegitimate. That would be cheating on my part as a critic, because I would be then dishonest because I'm using a caricature of inspiration to undermine the whole idea. That's where critics of scripture (your hate-mongers among the atheist community or whatever) do. They're guilty of caricature. But a lot of Christians are taught caricature positions on things like prophecy and inspiration, and they are made vulnerable to unscrupulous critics—people who hate the faith. They are made vulnerable to those people and the kinds of arguments they

35:00

make—the kinds of things they will show you in your own Bible. If you only have one way to process these things, then you're in trouble.

So what we try to do on this podcast is to get people just to think better about how we got this thing called the Bible and what biblical writers are doing under divine influence. Inspiration is a process, it's not an event. It's not a series of paranormal events. God prepared the writers from the moment they were born all the way up to the moment they were confronted with the task of writing whatever they were going to write to be included in this thing we call the Bible. God is in that process. Some writers providentially (because of Providence), they were very skilled literary artists. If you go all the way back to the introduction to Hebrews, the Greek of Hebrews is rivaled only by the Greek of Luke, in terms of its difficulty and its elegance. Whoever wrote the book of Hebrews was a highly skilled writer and communicator. He was a rhetorician of high status. It's stuff like this that actually shows that. That all happened under the Providence of God—this person's training, their ability, their proclivities to do certain things in writing that they did. And in this case, he specifically has in mind how this would play (pun intended) to an aural audience using word play. That's just what they did to make it memorable.

Let's go to verse 8 now:

⁸When he said above, “You have neither desired nor taken pleasure in sacrifices and offerings and burnt offerings and sin offerings” (these are offered according to the law), ⁹then he added, “Behold, I have come to do your will.”

This is still part of the conversation between the two members of the Trinity (the Father and the Son). When that conversation happened:

He does away with the first in order to establish the second. ¹⁰And by that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

In a nutshell, the writer of Hebrews is saying, "Hey, because they had this conversation and they decided it was the will of God to set aside the shadow in favor of preparing a body for the second person of the Trinity to come to earth and accomplish salvation... Because that was the will of God, he has done away with the first stuff. He's done away with the precursor in order to establish the second. And by his will, we all are the beneficiaries. We've been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." I ask again: If Jesus did away with the shadow things (the temporary things), why do we want them

back? Shadow things (Colossians 2:17) are food and drink laws, Sabbath, new moon, festivals, Hebrews 8:5—the stuff that the high priest did.

40:00

We just did an episode on Christmas and I did a blog post on it and I said, "Look, if you want to do these things, these are issues of conscience." If it genuinely helps foster an appreciation in your heart for the Bible, for the Old Testament, for what Jesus has done, for your walk with the Lord, by all means do them. Do the Jewish calendar, observe the Sabbath. Those things aren't bad. It's just that Jesus is better. So don't take the old things (the shadow things, the precursor things) and elevate them to the level of Jesus. Don't do that. Because they're not. They don't bring you to a saving relationship with God. They don't make God happier with you. "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." God loved us all before we had any thought of doing anything God liked! We're sinners. We were aliens from God—all these New Testament ideas. We were estranged, alien, haters of God, all this stuff. God loved us even then. By adding the Torah to Jesus, if we think "that's going to make God's happiness level with me rise a little bit," that's just flawed thinking. But on the other hand, if you want to do these things—if they mean something to you personally—and you don't displace Jesus with them, you don't bring Jesus down to the level of the shadow things, then fine. You have to evaluate what you're thinking theologically. You have to judge what you're thinking theologically by what scripture says here in Hebrews and other places.

Again, you go through the book of Hebrews and, like I said, I don't know how some of the more extreme Torah folks can even tolerate Hebrews, because everywhere you look at it, it's not saying that the Torah and this stuff is bad, it's saying it's *lesser*. It's inferior to what Jesus did. Verse 11:

¹¹ And every priest stands daily at his service, offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. ¹² But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God, ¹³ waiting from that time until his enemies should be made a footstool for his feet. ¹⁴ For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are being sanctified.

That's Hebrews 10:11-14. Just some thoughts... Sitting at the right hand signifies completion. Why? Well, In Hebrews 1:3 (if we go back there again—a long time ago in our episode series here), you have this statement about Jesus being...

³ He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature, and he upholds the universe by the word of his power. After making purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high...

So he did what he needed to do and then he sat down. He was restored to that ruling—seated at the right hand—his own throne and position in heaven. So he doesn't have to get up again and go do something else. It's done; it's finished. So after making purification for sins, he sits down at the right hand of God. Mission accomplished. He prepared for him a body, he did the job, and now he's back in the true tent (the heavenly tent) next to God. Mission accomplished.

The thing to notice here in verse 14 [chapter 10]:

¹⁴ For by a single offering [the offering of Jesus] he has perfected for all time those who are being sanctified.

Our sanctification... Not just our salvation, but our sanctification—our status with God (we could put it that way, too)—is linked here to the sacrifice of Christ, which is superior to the Old Testament system of sacrifices. Our sanctification is in no sense linked to the shadow things—the things that have been replaced. So again, if you want to do those things, I'm not objecting. If I could be so bold, I don't think the writer of Hebrews would be so bold as to say, "That's bad! Don't do that! That's dangerous!" No. What he would be concerned about is that you're not trading the superior for the inferior. You're not going back to a different gospel—some sort of works-based performance or performance-based notion that a relationship with God is achieved or merited by doing the works of the law. That's what he'd be worried about. If you're clear on that and you want to have a Passover meal, you want to do the Sabbath, you want to observe the Feast of Booths or Tabernacles... whatever. Go and do that and enjoy it. But keep it in its proper perspective. Know what it is and what it isn't. Go back to verse 15:

¹⁵ And the Holy Spirit also bears witness to us; for after saying, [he's quoting from the Old Testament]

¹⁶ "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, declares the Lord:

**I will put my laws on their hearts,
and write them on their minds,"**

¹⁷ then he adds,

"I will remember their sins and their lawless deeds no more."

¹⁸ Where there is forgiveness of these, there is no longer any offering for sin.

That is really kind of a punch in the nose statement [laughs] for the writer of the Hebrews to make to a large portion of his audience, which is going to be these Jewish converts to the faith. "Where there is forgiveness of these..." And he quoted the New Covenant passages. He quoted Jeremiah 31 here. We had a whole episode on the New Covenant and how Christ is not only the Sabbath, but he's the New Covenant.

¹⁸Where there is forgiveness of these, there is no longer any offering for sin.

45:00

This points again to the fact that Old Testament sacrifices were about purgation, protection, decontamination of sacred space. They were not about forgiveness of moral evils and sins. If the sacrifices had been about that stuff, then the statement here would apply to them. But it doesn't. If you were really forgiven of sin in a moral sense back in the Old Testament—if that's what the sacrifices were for—then there'd be no need to repeat them. But they did repeat them! Why were they always repetitive? Because sacred space was always in danger of pollution. *You* (the person who could participate in some level, either as a member of the community, or the priest, or the high priest—there were different levels of participation and different places you could occupy or not in the tabernacle system)... You were always in danger of pollution, as well. This is why you had to have this system of repeated offerings and sacrifices. It was a large element of the logic, because you were always in danger of polluting yourself or sacred space. *But with Jesus, you're not!* And—bonus time—you also receive the forgiveness for moral sin, as well. You get two for the price of one. Two permanent [applications of forgiveness] for what happened on the cross. It's superior in every sense.

So he uses all that and he transitions in verse 9. If you're using the ESV (and other Bibles probably have something similar), it has this section marked "The Full Assurance of Faith." What he's going to do is he's wrapping up the high priestly ministry of Christ and he's going to go back to the main issue—*the main issue*—which is, "Are you understanding, are you comprehending, and are you embracing the real gospel, or are you stuck in a merit-based mentality?" That's the real issue here. So in verse 19, he says:

¹⁹Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the holy places by the blood of Jesus, ²⁰by the new and living way that he opened for us through the curtain, that is, through his flesh, ²¹and since we have a great priest over the house of God, ²²let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. ²³Let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering, for he who promised is faithful.

That last verse: "Let's keep believing." It doesn't say, "Let's work even harder. Let's be even more careful. Let's make sure we do X, Y, Z, and abstain from the things that we shouldn't do. Let's just pull ourselves up by the bootstraps and do a better job." He doesn't say any of that!

²³ Let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering, for he who promised is faithful.

Don't stop believing. This "holding fast the confession of our hope"... We've seen that language before, earlier in the book of Hebrews. We'll also see it a little bit later. He's been here before. This whole thing about "keep embracing, keep holding onto the profession of your faith—the confession—the thing that you confessed to believe (the work of Jesus)"... That is the issue. The sacrifice of Jesus, our high priest, not only allows us to enter sacred space... Back to verse 19:

¹⁹ Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the holy places by the blood of Jesus...

The sacrifice of Christ not only allows you to enter sacred space... He was the sacrifice and he presides over the house of God (verse 21):

²¹ and since we have a great priest over the house of God...

The sacrifice and the priesthood—we have all that. So that not only allows us to enter sacred space, but his work on the cross means that we have new hearts. You get this imagery of cleansing right after quoting the New Covenant passages about having a clean heart. You actually have moral forgiveness. So back to the point I made a few minutes ago: we have been made fit for sacred space, but the bonus is that we're also forgiven in the sense of moral guilt. Frankly, as this little section of the chapter says, that's all you need. And it doesn't need any repetition. How good is that? That's his point. How good is that? Verse 24:

²⁴ And let us consider how to stir up one another to love and good works,

In light of all this, yeah—we need to love each other. We need to live right.

²⁵ not neglecting to meet together, as is the habit of some, but encouraging one another, and all the more as you see the Day drawing near.

50:00

I realize that this verse is often used to... When I was growing up in my first Christian context... I'll just be honest with you. I still reap more benefits from it than liabilities, so I'm not going to be overly critical of it. But this verse was used basically to justify that whenever anything is happening in church—whenever the doors are open—you need to be there. And if you weren't, there was something wrong. Maybe your relationship with God wasn't right or something. It was an abuse—it was a misuse—of the passage. The word *ecclesia* (the word that gets translated "church") is not present in this passage. It is present twice in the book, in Hebrews 2:12 and Hebrews 12:23. We've already see Hebrews 2:12. When

we get to chapter 12:23, we'll see it again. The *ecclesia* (the congregation there) is really a reference to the Divine Council and glorified humans—exalted humanity being made members of the Council. It's not about earthly church gatherings in those two verses. But *ecclesia* does not occur here in verse 25 when he says "don't neglect to meet together, as is the habit of some."

The point here in this passage (Hebrews 10:25)... The writer is afraid for those who habitually refuse community. It is a present active participle. "Neglecting" there is present active in Greek. The reference is to some activity that is ongoing and that is probably even habitual. Why is he worried about that? Is he worried that believers won't get the correct number of hours in a week to keep God happy? No. He's worried about that because the community can help encourage them to keep believing. They're under persecution. Life is hard. It has nothing to do with meeting a quota of hours per week to keep God happy. Honestly, that is a wicked legalizing of something that's really important, that just far and away transcends that kind of thinking, especially if you appreciate the context here. This was a big deal. Because as people would drift away and they would doubt and think, "Should I go back to Judaism?"... This is the whole focus of the book—the superiority of Christ! It would be spiritual insanity to want to go back to this. And if you turn away from the gospel of grace and you go back to the works system that you were basically enlightened at one point to go away from that, seeing that God had intended that this thing we call the cross and Jesus and all this stuff... You're in a perilous situation. How are you ever going to come back to the truth?

So he wants them to be together. He wants the ones who are struggling to be encouraged by the ones who really see the importance of all this and are going to suffer with those people. It's really about "don't stop believing," not a quota of hours and activities. It's faith, it's not activity. Verse 26:

²⁶ For if we go on sinning deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins, ²⁷ but a fearful expectation of judgment, and a fury of fire that will consume the adversaries. ²⁸ Anyone who has set aside the law of Moses dies without mercy on the evidence of two or three witnesses. ²⁹ How much worse punishment, do you think, will be deserved by the one who has trampled underfoot the Son of God, and has profaned the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified, and has outraged the Spirit of grace? ³⁰ For we know him who said, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay." And again, "The Lord will judge his people." ³¹ It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

Let's go back to verse 26:

²⁶ For if we go on sinning deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins...

55:00 People could jump on that without the context of everything in the book of Hebrews up to this point and say, "See, see? If I commit this particular sin or I have this bad habit and I can't break it, I'm going to lose my salvation!" That is not what the passage is saying a) because of everything that has preceded (your relationship with God is not based on works, it is based upon believing the gospel—it's been consistently about faith) and b) because of what he says in this passage! It's not about moral perfection. We'll say it again: *That which you couldn't achieve through moral perfection* (i.e., salvation—you can't work your way to heaven), *cannot be lost by moral imperfection*. That's an axiomatic thing. It's not what he's talking about here. He's not talking about stopping sinning deliberately so that you can be morally good enough. That's not what he's saying. Let's just go to verse 26 and read the whole thing again.

²⁶ For if we go on sinning deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth...

We're violating something that we've learned! We came to a particular thing of knowledge. I wonder what that would be.

²⁶ For if we go on sinning deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins...

It seems like if we reject this point of knowledge, there's really no other way to be saved. Verse 27:

²⁷ but a fearful expectation of judgment...

That's what we can look forward to. In other words, if we reject this thing we've learned (this knowledge of truth), then we can expect judgment.

...and a fury of fire that will consume the adversaries.²⁸ Anyone who has set aside the law of Moses [for instance] dies without mercy on the evidence of two or three witnesses [using an Old Testament analogy].²⁹ How much worse punishment, do you think, will be deserved by the one who has trampled underfoot the Son of God...

Now, that language takes us back to Hebrews 6:6 and the line about "crucifying once again the Son of God to their own harm and holding him up to contempt." "Trampling underfoot the Son of God" and "crucifying once again the Son of God"... both of those are bad things in the book of Hebrews. It means rejecting the work of the cross. If you do that, yeah—there is no other way to be saved, so there is no more sacrifice for sins. And if that's where you're at, you're going to be judged. He's talking about the same thing: maintaining your belief in the gospel and not abandoning it—not choosing to no longer believe. It's the same thing he was talking about in chapter 6.

²⁹How much worse punishment, do you think, will be deserved by the one who has trampled underfoot the Son of God, and has profaned the blood of the covenant...

What covenant has he been talking about? The New Covenant, which is linked to the gospel—the sacrifice of Jesus. Jesus' blood was the testimony of the New Covenant. He has just quoted the New Covenant in this passage, and a couple chapters ago we had the whole episode about the New Covenant—how that is linked to the work of Jesus on the cross. So he's saying, "Look, how much worse punishment if you profane what Jesus did? If you just reject it? This is the means we're sanctified by, and how much worse is it going to be for anyone who has 'outraged the spirit of grace?'" It should be evident by this point that he's juxtaposing the gospel of grace with a merit-based system. If you reject the knowledge of the gospel, that's what he's talking about when he talks about sinning intentionally/deliberately in verse 26. Again, doubts (questions) are not the same as intentional rejection. The emphasis here is on a deliberate choice to no longer believe. That's what the writer of Hebrews has been afraid of the entire letter. That's the thing that's on his radar. That's the thing that concerns him—choosing to no longer believe.

Since we did the episode on Hebrews 6, I've gotten a handful of emails about, "I disagree. You're teaching you can lose your salvation!" No, if you heard me correctly back then (and now), there is no sin that you can commit that will result in the loss of your salvation. That which cannot be obtained by moral perfection cannot be lost by moral imperfection. But you can choose to reject the gospel.

Here's the alternative, really, in stark contrast. My view is that everyone who's in heaven *believed* and *believes*—they kept believing. They were *believers*. When you get to heaven someday, everyone you meet will have been a believer. The other view says there are going to be people in heaven who chose not to believe. Does that make any sense? I would suggest it doesn't. The Old Testament equivalent of that is, "The Israelites were elect." Well, yeah, a lot of them worshiped Baal. That's why we had the exile—Baal and Ashtoreth and Asherah—all this crap, this stuff they did in the Old Testament that brought on

the exile. "But they were still Israelites. At one time they worshiped Yahweh, so they're going to be there too!" Really? We've got Baal worshipers in heaven now? It just doesn't make any sense.

1:00:00

So there's nothing you can do sin-wise (moral violation-wise) that could cause you to lose your salvation, because salvation isn't based on any of that anyway. It's based upon the simple question: Do you believe the gospel or not? Do you believe? If you say, "No, I don't"... You have to believe to have eternal life. It's John 3:16! *You have to believe to have eternal life.* But we have turned the gospel into an incantation. "I prayed a prayer (didn't really understand it, or maybe didn't understand parts of it) back when I was 8 or 10 or 50... I prayed that prayer and I felt like I meant it. I was sorry for my sin. But today, if you ask me, I don't believe any of this stuff." You don't believe. You are not a believer. You're either a believer or you're not. Like I said, what we have done is we have treated that person's prayer like it's a magic incantation, and that is not the way the gospel is presented in the New Testament. The way the gospel is presented in the New Testament is, "Do you believe or not?" It doesn't mean you never doubt, it doesn't mean you never struggle. Do you intentionally embrace this, even if you don't understand everything, even if you're suffering and life is frustrating and you've got all sorts of problems? At the end of day, do you believe this, or at the end of the day do you say, "It's nonsense and garbage. I just reject it. I don't believe it." That's the only question that matters. It's the only one that matters.

He's back to the same kind of content here in Hebrews 10, and he's concerned. I think we need to read Hebrews 10 in concert with Hebrews 6 (that should be obvious at this point). If you reject the gospel of grace, well, no kidding—you're in trouble. If you reject the gospel of grace, you're going to be trampling underfoot the Son of God and you're going to be profaning the blood of the New Covenant— profaning the work of Christ on the cross. You're going to outrage the Spirit of Grace, and God's wrath is going to be upon you. Like, no kidding. You can't be saved apart from the grace of God shown through Christ on the cross. There is no other way of salvation. That's the point.

All that negativity aside, there is a little glimmer of hope here that I think goes back to chapter 6, as well. Chapter 6 was the language of impossibility: "If you reject it and go from works to grace and you go back to works, it's impossible to come back"—this impossibility language we talked about in Hebrews 6, which I suggested then really isn't a categorical impossibility. Here you have this phrase in verse 26:

²⁶ **For if we go on sinning deliberately...**

That language ("go on sinning") *suggests* that you might not keep on doing that. In other words, you might still turn around. In other words, you have to persist in unbelief. You have to persist in it. At the end of the day, if that's the core issue

(that you persist in it), the language suggests that maybe some won't persist, and so that's why the writer of Hebrews is warning them. He's warning them because he still sees a little bit of hope for those people in this boat, and that's why he says things the way he does. Verse 32:

³² But recall the former days when, after you were enlightened, you endured a hard struggle with sufferings,

Look, life is tough.

³³ sometimes being publicly exposed to reproach and affliction, and sometimes being partners with those so treated. ³⁴ For you had compassion on those in prison, and you joyfully accepted the plundering of your property, since you knew that you yourselves had a better possession and an abiding one. ³⁵ Therefore do not throw away your confidence, which has a great reward.

Don't turn over to unbelief. Keep believing.

³⁶ For you have need of endurance, so that when you have done the will of God you may receive what is promised.

This word "confidence" in "Therefore, don't throw away your confidence" is the same word used in Hebrews 3:6.

⁶ but Christ is faithful over God's house as a son. And we are his house, if indeed we hold fast our confidence and our boasting in our hope.

Not our confidence in our works, not our confidence in our moral performance, not our confidence in not doing the things we know we shouldn't do. No, our confidence and our boasting is in our hope. What's our hope? The hope is the gospel—the hope that it was done for us. Because Christ is faithful, and he's the one that's over God's house! It's also used in Hebrews 4:16.

¹⁶ Let us then with confidence draw near to the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need.

Find *grace* to help in time of need. Earlier in this chapter:

1:05:00

¹⁹ Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the holy places by the blood of Jesus...

In other words, the messaging here ("don't throw away your confidence") is "Don't throw away your faith. Don't turn from the gospel." Verse 37:

³⁷ **For,**
 "Yet a little while,
 and the coming one will come and will not delay;
³⁸ **but my righteous one shall live by faith,**

There's "by faith" again! In other words, you're enduring not by your merit-based performance. "You guys need to endure more. You need to do more works! You need to keep it up. Good job! You need to just add a little bit of this and a little bit of that to your profile—to your resume." It's just so far from what he's talking about.

³⁸ **but my righteous one shall live by faith,**
 and if he shrinks back,
 my soul has no pleasure in him."

"But wait a minute! I prayed a prayer when I was 14. I can't remember an exact date. I know I prayed it a while ago. And yep, I think all of this is nutty now. But I prayed that prayer, so I'm in!"

...and if he shrinks back,
 my soul has no pleasure in him."

[laughs] I just don't know how much clearer it could be. You have to believe. You must believe. Verse 39:

³⁹ **But we are not of those who shrink back and are destroyed, but of those who have faith and preserve their souls.**

It doesn't say "those who have moral perfection" or "those who have a good report card with God." No, it says, "those who have faith and preserve their souls." See, faith is what preserves you, in terms of eternal life. Not works.

³⁹ **But we are not of those who shrink back and are destroyed, but of those who have faith and preserve their souls.**

That's the last verse of Hebrews 10. Now, he goes through all of that, and then what do you think he does? Hebrews 11—it's the Hall of Faith! I've got news for

you: There are some real screw-ups in the Hall of Faith! There really are. We're going to meet them. We're going to jump into Hebrews 11 in the next episode. But I'll tell you what you won't find there: you won't find people who didn't believe at the end of the day. That's what you won't find there. There's a reason it's called the Hall of Faith and the line "by faith" is repeated over and over and over and over again in the chapter. It's not called "The Hall of Goodness" or "The Hall of Doing Things Right" or "because we did more right than wrong" or "because we were consistent in our behavior." No, it says "by faith" this person did this, that, and the other thing. There's a reason for all of that. Hebrews 11 is back-dropped by this whole discussion. It is what it is because of this whole framing of the issue. So the writer next time is going to start going through for his audience example after example after example, and they're not all of the same character quality. [laughs] If you've read Hebrews 11, you know that. They're not all shining examples of people who never had an issue, never had a problem, always had the perfect behavioral track record. That's not what you're going to find. What you will find is people who, at the end of the day, they believed. They didn't give up on their belief.

TS: Mike, can we go back to verse 26 and break it down for me a little bit? Verse 26 says:

²⁶ **For if we go on sinning deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins...**

Can you break that down in mindset of believer versus unbeliever? Because can't the believer still believe in the one true God but yet consciously choose to keep on sinning?

MH: Well, the issue I do think with the sinning is maintaining their faith in Christ. That, I think, is where we camped on in the episode. In that sense, if we go on sinning deliberately... In other words, if we go on sinning deliberately after receiving the knowledge of truth... What I think he's getting at there is, I think, whether we are persisting in not believing this anymore.

1:10:00

To your question, let's say you have a person who struggles with sin. That isn't erased by Hebrews 10. It's just not what Hebrews 10:26 is about. I don't know if that helps, but yes—Christians struggle with sin. Every Christian struggles with sin. Paul says, "Who can deliver me from this wretched body of death?" *Paul* struggled with sin. But that isn't what's in his crosshairs in Hebrews 10:26-31.

We have to take his language as a unit. I think we also need to interpret it in light of Hebrews 6, which he borrows from a couple times in here. We also need to interpret it in light of verse 35 about throwing away the confidence. We also need to interpret in light of verse 38 about "the righteous shall live by faith." And if you don't have faith (if you shrink back) then "I have no pleasure in you."

So what I'm saying about Hebrews 10:26 and onward is not a denial that Christians will struggle with sin. It is a denial that the focus of what the writer was trying to get at is losing salvation by virtue of sinning. That is not what he's arguing for. The sinning that he has in mind (that is the issue in his head) is turning away from faith—it's trampling underfoot the Son of God. It's profaning the work on the cross. It's outraging the Spirit of Grace. That's what he has in view. That's the sinning he's talking about.

So I don't think Hebrews 10:26 and onward is talking about the Christian who is just struggling with some particular sin. That happens, obviously. When it does happen... In my own life and somebody else's life, we need to realize, why are we struggling with this? Why should we even care? We're not caring because, "Oh, if I quit this, God's going to love me now, and then I get to go to heaven." If you're thinking that way, you fundamentally misunderstand the gospel. The reason you should deal with that sin in your life is because it could harm other people, depending on what it is. It might have a direct impact on someone else's life. That's bad. But you should try to be holy. You should try to live a holy life—a godly life—because you appreciate what the Lord has done for you. You want to show by your life where your loyalty and your faith lies. It lies in Christ. "I'm doing this or not doing this because I'm a believer—I'm a disciple of Jesus, and I want the world to know that. I want to be grateful. I want to be usable to the Lord. If I don't get this thing out of my life, then it's going to impede what I can do for the Lord."

There's all sorts of motivations that scripture presents to us on why we should try to live a certain way, but none of them are so that "if I do this behavior, God's going to love me now, and then I get to go to heaven." And that's where I think a lot of people are trapped. They get misdirected away from the motivations that we should have when we struggle with sin—to be useful to the Lord, to bless the Lord (if we can say it that way), to show our gratitude, to avoid harming other people, to avoid being a bad testimony, to avoid keeping people from embracing the gospel. There are all sorts of reasons why we should try to live a certain way. But people sort of get trapped into thinking that God's love for them is somehow linked to this behavioral issue. Again, before you ever even had a thought, before you ever had a care in the world about what God thought about you, Christ died for you. It happened 2,000 years ago. It was planned for in the mind of God in eternity past. God loved you *then*. You're not going to boost his disposition or give him a loving disposition if you do or don't do a certain act today. He loved you from the beginning. It has nothing to do with merit-based thinking—a merit-based approach to salvation. But we tend to be trapped in that, both because of religious tradition we've been taught before (maybe growing up) and because we feel guilty when we do something we know God would disapprove of, and we process that guilt in terms of God loving or not loving us anymore. We turn it into a salvation situation that depends in part on us. And that's not actually the gospel.

1:15:00

TS: All right. That sounds good. Mike, I also want to mention that we're going to have a call for questions specifically about Hebrews at the end of it. We're nearing the end of the book of Hebrews, so we would like to ask for our listeners to email me (treysticklin@gmail.com) with your questions specifically about the book of Hebrews. If we get enough and we feel like we have some added value to that, we'll do an episode strictly on Hebrews Q&A. Then after that episode, we plan on doing one or two more regular Q&A episodes. We're going to try to finish wrapping up the book of Hebrews in the first part of 2018, Mike. We appreciate everyone's support in the year 2017, and we think 2018 is going to be much bigger moving forward. We have big plans for that.

MH: Yes, we do. [laughs]

TS: We appreciate everybody who has left us reviews and rated us wherever you consume us. That helps new people discover us. We hope to grow and we need your help, so we appreciate everybody that's with us and everybody that's going to help us try to get this done.

MH: These are not... They feel trivial—reviews. Give us a little, give us that star. But it actually does matter. So it might sound like kind of a trivial thing, but it's not.

TS: All right, Mike. We look forward to chapter 11 next week and we look forward to the new year. I appreciate everybody out there in the Nekked Nation. We want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God bless.