

# Hebrews 1

Last time we went through the first three verses of Hebrews. And in those verses Paul lays out a summary of what he's going to be discussing in the book. And he begins that by talking about the ministry of the word of God, how God has spoken to mankind. And he does that to emphasize the importance of what he's about to say, to encourage his hearers to pay attention. And so he begins by pointing out the contrast between the way that God spoke to the fathers in the OT, by the prophets, and the way that he has now been speaking to them, by his Son. And so we talked about the contrast between the ministry of the prophets and the ministry of the Son. How the prophets spoke at sundry times, it was a varied ministry, that God used at various times. It had no finality to it, it was continuing, it was progressive. But in contrast to that, God has now spoken by his Son. And so the ministry of the prophets is over. God no longer needs to speak through them. Because now the Son has spoken. Now he's given the last word. Now he's filled in the things that the prophets couldn't declare, because they couldn't see the glory of God. But the Son can, because he is the brightness of God's glory.

And Paul also pointed out that the Son who has now spoken to them is the one who has been appointed the heir of all things. And so we talked about that, how God gave the kingdom of heaven, gave the dominion over the earth, to man. And so God the Son could be heir of everything else, but that was given to man. And so to become the heir of all things, he had to become a son of Man, a son of David, a son of Abraham. And it is through that, through becoming a man, and making atonement, that he bought the world, and the treasure that was in it, the kingdom of Israel.

And so Paul also talked about that atonement, talked about the Son as a priest. And there again he showed the contrast, between the Son, and the OT priests. The OT priests, like the OT prophets, had a continuing ministry. But the Son has ended his ministry of sacrifice as a priest, and has now sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. In the position that declares him to be absolutely holy, to have made complete atonement, and to have been appointed the second ruler in the kingdom, the heir of all things.

## Verse 4

**Hebrews 1:1** God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

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

4 Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

So verse 4 concludes Paul's summary of what he is going to tell us in this book, and it introduces the subject that he's going to start off with here in chapter 1. And that subject is, the angels.

In this summary Paul has declared some things about the Son that exposed some contrasts between him and other people that God has ministered through. It exposed some contrasts

between the Son and the OT prophets. And some contrasts between the Son and the OT priests. But the first contrast that Paul is actually going to expound for us, that he is going to treat in depth, is the contrast between the Son, and the angels.

Now, to the NT mind, that seems kind of odd. That doesn't really strike us as being that significant. You could grasp the contrast between the Son and the prophets. But the contrast between the Son and the angels? Why is that even important? Why should that be the first thing that Paul deals with here? We don't really understand that.

And the reason that we don't understand that, is because angels don't really play a role in the NT, in the new covenant. It is all about Christ and the church.

But you see, in the OT, the angels did play a role. They played a role in the old covenant. And so to the OT-minded person, the first-century Hebrew, the angels are significant, in regard to the covenants. They have to ask, "OK, but what about the angels, what part do they play in the NT?" And so Paul has to deal with that.

He's briefly mentioned how the Son fulfills the role of the OT prophets, and the role of the OT priests. He's dealt with two groups that were vital to the OT ministry. But he hasn't mentioned this other group that is also important. And that is the angels. And so that is what he is now going to deal with in depth.

As we mentioned last time, here in this summary, Paul took us back to the beginning with the Son, and now he's brought us back to the end, back to the inheritance. And so now he's got to deal with something in relation to the inheritance, and in relation to the angels.

And so he points out here the Son as "being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they."

And so he declares here that the Son is better than the angels, and that how he is better is that he has a more excellent name.

So the focus here is the name. The name of the Son versus the name of the angels.

And we get an idea of what he means by "name", when he relates that to the inheritance. He says that the Son *obtained* that more excellent name by his inheritance.

And we talked last time about how he was appointed heir of all things. How the Son is not the heir of all things by being the God the Son. He could have been the heir of some things, God could have given some things to him, but not all. He couldn't be the heir of the earth as the God the Son, because God had given the earth to man. And so to become the heir of that the Son of God had to become the Son of Man. To become an heir of the promised land he had to become a Son of Abraham. To become and heir of the throne of Israel he had to become a Son of David. And so it is only through that that he could be appointed heir of all things, of earth also, and not just heaven.

And so it says here again that he obtained a more excellent name through his inheritance. He obtained that inheritance, and through that, he obtained a name. A name that was better than the angels'.

Now, this is once again strange to us NT-minded people. We think to ourselves, why did the Son need to obtain a more excellent name than the angels? I mean, isn't the name "Son of God" more excellent than the name of any angel already?

And the answer is actually yes. We're right on that one. You can mark down one point for the home team.

But you see, the problem comes when we just gloss over that little detail of Jesus Christ, the *man*, having that name "Son of God." And that is why this is so profound.

Because listen, God did not give the name of Son, the title of Son, to a person of the Godhead. It was not exclusively reserved for God the Son, as we know that concept today.

You see the Son of God, is not by necessity... and this is going to be a little scary at first, but bear with me. The Son of God, is not by necessity, a member of the Godhead. The Son of God does not have to be God. The Son of God is just whoever God appoints to be his heir.

Remember what we are talking about. We are talking about the inheritance. And so what we're going to see in these OT passages that Paul is about to quote, is that the Son, in the OT, was the name that God would give to his heir. It was the title that would go along with the inheritance. It was a name that God was going to give out, and it had not been given yet.

Now, we'll let that simmer for a minute. Because we need to step back and get the angels back in here. We have to understand how this relates to the angels. How does the name relate to the angels? And the answer is, how does the *inheritance* relate to the angels?

You see, as we said, angels were important in the OT, under the old covenant. They were sometimes God's messengers, who would carry his word to his people. And they were given power to administer justice, to administer judgment, the judgement of God. To administer the consequences of the law, the consequences for sin. They had the power, to in the name of God, go out and cause a pestilence to slay the people of Israel. To destroy them out of their inheritance. Or, on the flip side of the coin, to go out and destroy their enemies, and *preserve* them in their inheritance.

God himself was not constantly there administering the covenant. The angels were sent on his behalf, in his name, to administer justice. To administer the inheritance.

And so even more powerful than the prophets, even more powerful than the priests, were the angels. The prophets could just declare God's word. The priests could only attempt to intercede, they had only limited ability to actually administer justice. But the angels were often tasked with actually administering God's judgement, with actually miraculously carrying out God's edicts in regard to who got to be in the inheritance and who didn't.

And so in the OT system, the angels are to be most feared of all. Of all the different people under God who participated in the OT ministry, in the administration of the old covenant.

And there's obviously a lot more depth that we could go into on that. We could go through passage after OT passage. But the point is, that to a Hebrew, angels are very important. He has a reverence for angels. They are God's most holy, most mighty ministers.

And that fact that the angels are holy, is the key. That demands immense respect from the Hebrew. He understands that God is a holy God. That sin cannot approach to him, and so man cannot approach to him. As we said last time, even the prophets could not see his glory. Even the priests, even the high priest, the holiest man on earth, the holiest man in their entire religious system, could only come before the model mercy seat of God, once in a year, with the blood of animals. And so man is unholy, man is unable to approach to God.

But angels, aren't. Angels *are* holy. Angels *are* able to approach to God. They are able to come into his presence. They are even holy enough to carry out his righteous judgments, to fulfill his righteous anger. That's a fearful thing. That's a big contrast. There is a contrast between angels and man. The OT-minded Hebrew understood that.

And so do you realize how that same set of contrasts that we went over last time, between men and the Son, those very same contrasts exist between men and the angels.

The angels are not unholy like us. They are not fallen like us. They are not unworthy to be God's heirs. So much so that they are referred to as the sons of God in the OT. Meaning that in some essence they must be God's heirs.

But now, we're saying that the Son is the heir of all things. A man, the Son of man, is the heir of all things. God only gave the promised land to Abraham, he only gave the throne to David, but now, a son of them, is going to get it all? He's going to get everything? What about the angels? I thought they were the sons of God? Did he just kick them out? Don't they get something? They were administering the OT, they were administering the inheritance, and now, man get's everything, and they get nothing? How does that happen?

And so do you see how from the OT perspective this is kind of shocking, this statement that a man has become the heir of all things, that he has a better name than the angels?

Do you see how the angels are the other potential heirs, how Paul has to show that the Son is better than them? That's the thing to beat.

And so Paul has to deal with the angels right up front. He can't go on and talk about the priesthood and the other topics that he needs to cover, until he's dealt with this. He can't talk about those things while his reader is constantly having this thought, "what about the angels?", nagging in the back of their mind. He has to show how the Son is better than the angels, or else his premise, that the Son is going to inherit all things, falls apart, and his entire message is undermined.

And so he has to demonstrate the Son as "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they."

He has to show that the Son has been exalted above the angels. Despite the fact that he's a man, that he's been made better than the angels. That despite the fact that the angels have a good name, a good inheritance, that they are the sons of God, that this *man* still has an even better name, and an even better inheritance, than they do. That despite that, he is still going to be the heir of all things.

And do you understand the implication here? The angels do have an inheritance, they do have an excellent name. If they didn't there'd be no issue here. But they do. This man just has a more excellent name.

But the implication is, that if they have an inheritance, and he, a man, is going to inherit everything, then that means, that even the angels themselves only get their inheritance through him.

Everything we said last time, about the Hebrews being promised an inheritance, but only being able to get it through the Son, because he's the heir of all things: — All of that also applies to the angels. They can only get their inheritance through a man, through the Son, because he is the heir of all things.

And that's a 180° reversal to the OT mind. They used to get their inheritance only through the ministry of the angels. But now the angels are only going to get their inheritance through a man. Things are kind of flipped around there, and the OT mind has got to get used to it.

But it is not a concept totally foreign to the OT, which is what Paul is about to demonstrate. All of this was prophesied before.

## Verse 5

**Hebrews 1:5** For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?

So he quotes two OT passages right there.

And what he is doing here, is showing them the name that the Son has been given.

What name is that?

Son.

That's the name.

That's the name that he obtained, that's more excellent than the angels'.

And this brings us back to that issue of God the Son, a person of the triune Godhead, obtaining the name of Son.

And the only way to understand that, is to look at these verses, and understand what they say. Because that is exactly what they say.

In essence, they are about a *man* obtaining the name "Son of God", not about the Son of God becoming a man. It's backwards to the way that we think about it.

But you see, this is one of the mysteries of the OT that Paul is about to expound to them here.

One of the mysteries of the OT is that the name "Son of God", was reserved for a man. It was a title to be given to a man.

The first passage that Paul quotes here is Psalm 2. And he quotes just one piece of verse 7, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." And we won't go through the whole of Psalm 2, but I do want to you see the surrounding context for that phrase, because a Hebrew might have it memorized, he'd be familiar with it. So when Paul quoted just that one phrase, there would be more that would be coming to their mind, they'd understand the context that that phrase was being pulled from.

**Psalms 2:6** Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.

So this title of the Son is associated with the kingship over Israel. Zion is the city of David, and so it is talking about the throne of David, the throne of Israel that God gave to the sons of David.

7 I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.

So this is a decree from the king upon the throne of David, declaring that the LORD has called him his son. And so this is a title that would be given to a son of David, who would sit on the throne of David.

And so does that bring back some things that we talked about last week? Remember how the Son of God had to become the son of David before he could be appointed heir of all things? Because the throne of David was given to the sons of David by God, that was their inheritance. And so he had to become one of them, in order to be a potential heir of it.

Well, now we actually see that it goes one step further than that. Not only did the brightness of God's glory have to become a son of David to become heir of all things, but he had to become a son of David to obtain the name Son of God.

Because the name "Son" was reserved for a son of David. Just as God had given them the throne, he had reserved the name of Son for a son of David as well.

Now, I know that may not jive with your theology very well. But we're not here to study theology. We're here to study the Bible. And the theologians can say whatever they want, I'm going to stick with what the Bible says.

Because you see, what it says here, is that there was a particular day when this man obtained this name. "Thou art my Son; *this day* have I begotten thee." And so there was a particular day when the Son of God would be begotten.

And that really shouldn't be a difficult to grasp concept. But it seems that some theologians never learned the birds and the bees. They must not have grown up on a farm. But if you did grow up on a farm then you know that every single thing that has ever been begotten has been begotten on a particular day. That's just the way that it works.

And so the Son was begotten on a particular day. That isn't the mysterious part of this. The part of it that was a mystery to the OT Hebrew, was that it said that God had begotten him. That there would be a son of David who would declare that God had begotten him. How was that going to work?

Well, Mary, a daughter of David, found out how it was going to work, when as a virgin the Spirit of God came upon her and she conceived in her womb.

And so the mystery was that this name, Son of God, was reserved for a man. A physical man, who had been begotten on a particular day, just as every man is. But that this man would not just be arbitrarily granted the name Son of God, but would actually be, in literal terms, the Son of God, begotten by God.

And that's more familiar territory for many of us, coming from the NT. But we miss some of it. God the Son, the brightness of God's glory, did not obtain the name Son of God for himself, he did not become the begotten Son of God, until that day that he was begotten, and became a man.

And so, ironically, the brightness of God's glory did not fully become the Son of God, until that very same moment that he became a son of man. Just as it was at that moment that he became a potential heir of all things.

"I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee."

8 Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.

And so as the Son of God, he would be able to ask God to give him the heathen for his inheritance, and the whole earth to be his possession. As a member of the Godhead he couldn't do that, that had been promised to man, it had been promised to Abraham, it had been promised to the son of David who would be the Son of God. And so he had to become that son of David, and Son of God, in order to be able to ask that.

And so how does this relate to the angels? Well, remember what the issue was, with the angels. Here were these angels that are holy, that are righteous. They are as righteous as God. They are sinless. They can approach the throne of God itself. They were participants in administering the OT. And they were given an excellent name, they were given a name that implied they were God's heirs, they were given the name of sons of God.

And what Paul has to show here is that Jesus has obtained a more excellent name than the angels, that he has been made better than them.

And that would seem strange to the Hebrews at first, that this man would be the exclusive heir of all things, and the angels would get nothing outside of him.

But you see, what Paul is demonstrating here, is that this is one of the OT mysteries, that was declared by the prophets, but they that couldn't fully comprehend. It was declared that a man, a son of David, would be given the name of Son of God. That that more excellent name was in fact reserved for man. Not just, *a* son of God, but *the* Son of God, singular, there's only one like him, who has actually been begotten by God himself.

And so it was prophesied in the OT that a man would obtain that most excellent name, a name more excellent than that given to the angels. And so he's setting out to prove that this man can indeed be the heir of all things.

And there in Psalm 2 we saw that he would inherit the kingdom of Israel, and he could also ask for the rest of the earth, and God would give that to him as well. And so through that inheritance, this man would obtain that title, of the Son of God, and be made better than the angels.

And this is not a one-off prophecy. Paul gave us two OT quotes just in this verse, and he's got a lot more he's going to go over here.

And that second bit that Paul quotes is from 2 Samuel chapter 7. "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son." And God said that to David, when David was contemplating building the temple, that God would be a father to one of David's sons. And so David would not build the house of God, but that son would.

So let's look at that context of this quote, in 2 Samuel chapter 7. God sent Nathan the prophet to deliver that message to David. And here is how it began:

**2 Samuel 7:8** Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel:

9 And I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have *made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth.*

So there is something interesting. David himself obtained a great name that God gave him. That's what we've been talking about here in regard to Christ. But God did something similar for David.

But what God is about to tell David is that he is going to have a son, and that son is going to have an even greater name.

10 Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime,

11 And as since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel, and have caused thee to rest from all thine enemies. Also the LORD telleth thee that he will make thee an house.

And so note here that it is talking about the kingdom. He's mentioned the throne, the dominion, the promise to Israel, the kingdom's domain. And he's said that they are going to receive that

inheritance, that promise, and they're no longer going to be hindered from enjoying it by the wicked.

12 And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom.

13 He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever.

So David is going to beget a son, who is going to be the heir of that kingdom, and God will establish that throne for the sons of David forever.

14 I will be his father, and he shall be my son. ...

And so God told David that yes, he had given him a great name, and a great kingdom. But his son was going to be given an even greater name, and an even greater kingdom. And it was he that would build the house of God, and through him David's throne would be established for ever.

And so who is that? Who is the son that it is talking about? Well, which one of David's sons sat on his throne after him? Which one of them built the temple? Solomon did. That's who it is talking about. It is talking about Solomon.

14 I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men:

15 But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee.

And so it is talking about a man, a son of David, who could commit iniquity, and have to be chastened. And that is in fact exactly what happened to Solomon. He did commit iniquity, and was chastened by the heathen.

And so do you know that there was a man that was the son of God before Jesus was? Solomon was the son of God, the son of David, before Jesus was. The difference is that he was the begotten son of David, adopted of God. Whereas Jesus is the begotten Son of God, adopted of Joseph the son of David.

You see, part of Paul's point in quoting this, is to show that there is an OT precedent for a man receiving a name more excellent than the angels. Solomon, as a foreshadowing of Jesus, obtained a more excellent name than they. Solomon obtained the name son of God. Not just one of the sons of God, not just a son of God, but in a special way the son of God. In a special way, because God was going to give him this inheritance, of the kingdom of Israel, of the kingdom of David.

You see, there is a reason why Paul quotes these two verses together. From Psalm 2 and 2 Samuel 7. Because both of these passages are actually about Solomon. Yes, they are prophetic. But they are both prophecies first of Solomon. And it is true that Solomon would be only a foreshadowing of Christ. And that is Paul's point. That there was an OT precedent for this, that was set through Solomon, but that now it has been more perfectly fulfilled in Jesus. And so Solomon was a man, and he obtained that excellent name. How much more can Christ now obtain that more excellent name, as the ultimate fulfillment of those OT prophecies?



That was a name that was reserved for one of the sons of David. And God temporarily gave it to Solomon, during his reign. But now he has given it to Jesus, who will reign forever. Who will inherit all things. He's been given that name that is more excellent than the angels.

## Verse 6

**Hebrews 1:6** And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.

### FIRSTBEGOTTEN

And so Paul calls Jesus the first-begotten here. He is the first Son to ever be begotten of God. Solomon was not God's begotten son. But Jesus is.

So he's emphasizing that, coming off of those last passages, as he moves on to the next one. That this next passage is talking about that same person, the begotten Son of God, his heir.

And I would note also, that the fact that Jesus is the first-begotten contradicts the teachings of Catholicism and Islam. Both of those religions teach the immaculate conception of Mary. But Mary can't have been begotten of God, because Jesus is the first-begotten. Nobody was begotten of God, before him. So that he is called the *only* begotten Son of God.

So that's just a side note. But all you Marians, you'll notice here that Hebrews is going to be talking all about the Son, that he is the sole and only one, that he is the whole show. And it is never even going to mention Mary. Never going to mention any saints. It leaves no place for them here. The Son is the sole priest and the sole mediator and the sole heir of all things.

### AND LET ALL THE ANGELS OF GOD WORSHIP HIM

And so all of them will worship him. As it says, "And let all the angels of God worship him."

Now, that quote there, if you look for that quote exactly in the OT, you aren't going to find it. Paul has embellished it slightly to make his point. Because remember, Paul is just pulling out little bits from the OT to draw the reader's mind to these OT passages, these OT concepts.

And so as near as anyone can figure he is quoting from Psalm 97.

Remember, the point of Christ and the apostles when they are quoting the OT, is not to translate word for word what the OT says. They are making a point, and they are referencing a passage from the OT. And because they didn't have chapters and verses, they would do that by quoting a short snippet. And in the process they'd sometimes condense things, or modify them slightly, in the context of the point that they were trying to make. They aren't necessarily trying to reproduce exactly an entire OT passage in what they are saying, they are just trying to draw the reader's attention to a particular passage, by saying something from that passage. And so there are times when it isn't exactly word for word. But that doesn't mean that it isn't pretty clear which passage they were referring to.

And in this case it is pretty clear. There is only one possible passage that it could be referring to. And that is Psalm 97.

Now, if you look at what the commentators have to say on this verse, they will likely try to tell you that Paul is quoting from the Septuagint.

Now, for those of you that don't know, the Septuagint is a Greek translation of the OT. The OT of course was originally written in Hebrew and Aramaic. But it was translated into Greek

eventually, and the Septuagint is one of those translations. However, it isn't a very good translation, it isn't faithful to what the Hebrew says. It adds extra stuff in many locations, that you won't find in the Masoretic Hebrew text, that was so carefully curated by the Hebrew copyists. So everybody has to admit that the Septuagint is not a faithful translation, that it modifies the text, and that those modifications weren't inspired. That's not in dispute.

However, despite that, many people have been taught that the Septuagint is the text of the OT that was used by Christ and the apostles. And they give various examples where quotes of scripture in the NT match what it says in the Septuagint. And they say that this right here is a quote from the Septuagint, from Deuteronomy 32:43.

The problem is, that there is a much better, alternative explanation. Instead of believing that Paul, the Pharisee, the Hebrew of the Hebrews, brought up and trained at the feet of Gamaliel the great doctor of the law, that the apostle Paul, when writing to the Hebrews, would try to make a point by quoting from a translation that he knew to be corrupt:— You can't get much more ridiculous than that. Instead of believing that, you could believe that he is just paraphrasing a quote from the Hebrew OT.

You see, the fact is, there is absolutely no reason for Paul to reference a flawed translation here. There is no reason for him to reference a translation at all. He spoke Hebrew.

**Acts 21:40** And when he had given him licence, Paul stood on the stairs, and beckoned with the hand unto the people. And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them *in the Hebrew tongue*, saying,

22:1 Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you.

2 (And when they heard that he spake *in the Hebrew tongue* to them, *they kept the more silence*: and he saith,)

3 I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the *perfect manner* of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day.

So Paul could speak Hebrew. He was taught according the perfect manner of the law, not some corrupted version. And when speaking to a Jewish audience, they were impressed by him speaking Hebrew to them, that made them more willing to listen to what he had to say. So he could speak it, and they could understand it, and he wouldn't be helping himself out here by writing the Hebrews and making an argument from essentially apocryphal content of a Greek translation.

So it is pretty ridiculous to think that Paul would have quoted the Septuagint here, or in any of his other epistles, even if he could have.

And that is the real kicker. After considering the evidence we have to conclude that he couldn't have. He couldn't have quoted the Septuagint here, because at the time it likely didn't even exist.

You see, people are taught, and accept unquestioningly, that the apostles and Christ quoted the Septuagint. But there's a problem with that theory. When Paul supposedly quoted six verses from the Septuagint in Romans chapter 3—that's one of the main quotes that it all hinges on. When he was supposedly quoting the Septuagint in Romans 3, he actually wasn't. All of the different phrases that he throws together there, they can all be found in the Hebrew OT. They just aren't all in one location. But Paul has a habit of doing that. He was familiar with the Hebrew scriptures. So when he wanted to make a point he could quote at will many different bits of

different passages that were relevant. Much as he is doing here. And so that is what Paul did in Romans 3.

And that is where we get to the real crux of the matter. If Paul was actually not quoting from the Septuagint, but he was quoting from different places in the Hebrew OT, then how did his quote get into the Septuagint? How could the exact same thing end up in the Septuagint?

And the answer is pretty simple, but too many people have been indoctrinated differently, they have staked too much on that, to acknowledge it. But the reason that the Septuagint says the same thing as Paul did, is not because *he* was quoting *it*, but because *it* was quoting him. It was quoting Paul.

And the proof of that, is this. When Paul started off that series of quotes in Romans 3, he started off with a phrase from Psalm 14. And so people say that he got the whole thing from Psalm 14, because in the Septuagint that entire quote that Paul said there in Romans 3 is found in Psalm 14. The problem is, that quote doesn't belong in that Psalm, and actually *isn't* in that Psalm, even in the Septuagint itself.

You see, God foresaw this deception that Satan was going to attempt to fool people with. And he made sure that his word would be robust against the attack. And so he provided a way for us to check what Psalm 14 is supposed to say. So that you can actually prove that that version of Psalm 14 is wrong, using the Septuagint itself.

Because you see, God didn't include Psalm 14 just once in the Bible. He actually included it twice. He had the same Psalm be included twice, two similar versions of it, to prevent it from being tampered with. Some ignorant person tried to tamper with it, and all these ignorant scholars were fooled by it. But they can't fool the Bible student. Because the Bible student realizes that they forgot something. They only changed the Psalm in one place. They changed it in Psalm 14, but they didn't change it in Psalm 53. You look at Psalm 53 in the Septuagint. It has virtually the same content as Psalm 14, except for some reason it doesn't have those verses that quote the apostle Paul from Romans 3.

Oops.

Somebody made a mistake there didn't they? And fooled so many of the world's textual critics. Because they are just ignorant of scripture. They don't study it carefully.

But they couldn't fool us. And so we can be sure, we have conclusive proof, that the apostles didn't quote the Septuagint, the Septuagint quoted the apostles.

It is one of those chicken and egg problems. Which came first the chicken or the egg? Well, the chicken did, and now they have egg all over their faces.

Now, there likely was a translation of the OT into Greek that existed before Christ. Probably even several of them. But the text did not match what the Septuagint says until after these epistles were written.

When you go online, and look for facts about the Septuagint, you'll find lots of storytelling, and even ancient storytelling, about where it came from, and when it originated. And the scholars believe that it originated in the 3rd century BC. 300 years before Christ. And so I tried to search for a list of ancient sources that quote the Septuagint. I mean, if you actually had ancient manuscripts of the Septuagint, if you had ancient sources that were quoting the Septuagint, then you'd have something, right? But they don't. They do have a few BC sources that reference the existence of a Greek OT. But they don't have any substantial manuscripts from before Christ that actually contain a Greek OT text that matches the Septuagint. There were some from the first or second century BC that were found with the dead sea scrolls. But when it came to a place where the Septuagint should differ from the Masoretic text, guess what? It

matched the Masoretic text. And so they are forced to claim that a scribe must have corrected it to match the Masoretic text.

Because folks, too many people, hundreds and thousands of people, have staked their careers, staked their livelihoods, staked their reputation on this. They will fiercely deny what I'm telling you. If it was true, too many very respected scholars would look like fools.

But we're not worried about the foolishness of man, we're interested in the wisdom of God, revealed to us, in his preserved word.

And so is Paul quoting from a corrupt Greek translation of the OT scriptures here in Hebrews? Are you out of your mind?? No he's not. But it might be quoting him.

And quite frankly, the passage that they say he is quoting, in Deuteronomy 32:43, doesn't even make sense anyway.

Remember how he prefixed what he said here: "And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him."

And in Deuteronomy 32:43, and the surrounding verses, it doesn't matter whether you look at the OT or the Septuagint, it doesn't say anything about anybody being brought into the world. The context doesn't really fit, it doesn't really make any sense.

And so instead of pretending that Paul was taking the Septuagint out of context, let's look at the OT verse that he was actually pulling from a relevant context here, that does talk about somebody coming into the world.

And that is Psalm 97.

Now, when we see "when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world," we immediately think of Christ's birth. At least I do. Especially since it says firstbegotten there. Because we associate Christ being begotten with his birth. Although being begotten and being born aren't exactly the same thing.

But, in reality, God the Father didn't bring Christ into the world, in a literal, physical sense. Yes, Jesus came into the world, but he was sent from the Father. That's the phrase that is used in the gospels. The first time Christ came, the Father sent him. But the second time he comes, the Father will bring him into the world.

Now I know that we look at this phrase, "brought into the world", and think, "Isn't that term used in the Bible to describe somebody being born?" Well, that's what I thought. But I actually looked it up in scripture, and it turns out that the Bible never uses the phrase "brought into the world" like that anywhere. It doesn't ever use that to talk about somebody being born. So, we may get that idea when we read this verse, but it actually isn't a pattern from other scriptural passages, it is just us misunderstanding.

Now, it was kind of funny, because the commentator I looked at who was talking about the Septuagint, said that it was manifest that what it was referring to here was Christ's resurrection. And actually, I can see where he gets that, he got that from John 16:21. But it is kind of ironic, because Deuteronomy 32 has almost nothing at all to do with the resurrection of Christ. So if that was true, Paul would have not only been quoting a corrupt translation, he would have been taking it totally out of context as well. And that is not a good way to make an effective argument to the Hebrews who are familiar with the OT scriptures. That's a way to make yourself look like a fool.

So no, this isn't a reference to Christ's birth, nor to his resurrection. But to the time when he is ultimately brought into the world, by the Father, at his second coming. When all of that is culminated.

So look at what it says in Psalm 97. Because it fits with all of the stuff that Paul has been talking about here, with the angels, and the Son of God, it fits all of that perfectly.

**Psalms 97:1** The LORD reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof.

So this Psalm is about a time when the LORD will reign over the earth. Currently he does not, but one day he will. And it calls on the earth to rejoice when he does.

2 Clouds and darkness are round about him: righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne.

And so it describes his throne. So again, it is talking about the kingdom, and LORD sitting upon his throne as the one who is reigning over it.

3 A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about.

And this is what we know is going to happen when Christ returns. From many other passages that describe the second-coming. Prophecies throughout scripture.

4 His lightnings enlightened the world: the earth saw, and trembled.

5 The hills melted like wax at the presence of the LORD, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth.

And so the LORD is coming to the earth.

And remember what Paul prefixed his quote with. He was talking about the first-begotten being brought into the world. And that is what is happening here, the LORD is coming into the world.

6 The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory.

7 Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols: **worship him, all ye gods.**

And that quote there is what Paul paraphrases here. When all of the lowercase-"g" gods are told to worship the One who has come to reign over the earth.

And so why does Paul refer to them as angels when it actually just says "gods" there? Well, remember what he is talking about. Paul is expounding on the fact that Christ has a more excellent name than the angels do. The angels have obtained an excellent name, and the Son has obtained an excellent name. And his name is more excellent than their's.

So what is one of the names that the angels have obtained? Well, we already pointed out that they obtained the name of sons of God. But Paul is pointing out another way of saying that, another name that they have obtained. The angels have also obtained the name of "gods". Lowercase "g". They are sometimes called that in the OT. As in Psalm 97. Which is why he quotes it this way. He is making a point about angels, and the name that they have been given, and so he quotes a passage that uses that name, but he calls them angels when he paraphrases it, to point out to his readers that it is the angels that are being called that. They are included there, in that OT use of the word "gods".

And that is certainly an excellent name. To be called “gods”. That’s a pretty good name. But Jesus has a better one. The Son, has a better one.

What name does the Son have? Well, we’ve already pointed out that he is called the Son of God, the only begotten. And so that is an excellent name. But he’s got an even greater name than that.

Look at what it said in Psalm 97 verse 5. “The hills melted like wax at the presence of the LORD [all-caps, that’s JEHOVAH], at the presence of the Lord [just first letter capitalized, meaning ruler or master] of the whole earth.” So it is talking about the Lord, the Ruler or Master of the whole earth. It is talking about him coming to earth.

And who is that? Who is the ruler of the earth?

Who has been given the kingdom? Who has been appointed heir of all things? A man. Not just any man, the Son, the Son of God.

But what does it call him here? It calls him the Lord of the earth, yes, but it also calls him by another name. A more excellent name. A more excellent name than the angels. A more excellent name than anybody has, because no more excellent name than it can exist. It calls him by the most excellent name in the universe, not just the Lord of the whole earth, but the name of the LORD God Almighty. It calls the Lord of the whole earth by the name of LORD, all-caps, by the name of JEHOVAH.

And so do you see why Paul chose this passage? It demonstrates how much more of an excellent name Christ has than the angels. Even though he is just a man. He has the very name of the Father himself. It calls him that name, as being one with the Father, when he is brought by the Father into the world, to be the Lord of the whole earth.

And think about it. This is pretty shocking to the Hebrew mind. Here we are saying that a man, a mere man, has obtained the name of God himself. That’s a part of what it means to be the Son of God, to be his heir, his name is bestowed on you.

Do you understand why the Jewish leaders were so taken aback when Jesus claimed that God was his Father? Why they were so angered by the apparent blasphemy of a man claiming to be one with God? That was just totally contrary to everything that they thought they knew from the OT about the holiness of God and the uncleanness of man.

But here Paul is challenging the Hebrews who are following Christ to embrace the fact that he, as a man, has indeed been given the name of God. That Christ, as a man, has yet obtained a more excellent name than the angels.

And as a side note here, last time we were talking about prophets, and we could see how that related to Islam or Mormonism, or any religion that claims to have heard from some prophet after the Son had spoken.

And now we’re talking about angels. And they relate to the same religions. Islam, Mormonism, and so on. Those religions don’t just claim to have the words of a prophet, but they claim that that prophet was spoken to by an angel sent from God.

And so you see why it is important for Paul to address angels as well. Because if you question the legitimacy of one of those prophets, the reply of their followers would be that they weren’t just any prophet, but that an angel of God spoke to them.

But you see, just as the prophets didn’t control the kingdom, just because they said something didn’t make it so:— They didn’t have some kind of authority beside what God himself told them to say. And so there could be false prophets. —The same is also true of angels. They do not

control the kingdom. Just because they say something doesn't make it so. There can be false angels. And the Bible specifically warns against them.

**Galatians 1:8** But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

The Son has spoken, and any angel that contradicts that, they have no control. Jesus is the heir of all things, and even the angels themselves get nothing outside of Christ, outside of the Son.

And so when Christ is brought into world to receive the kingdom, all of the angels of God will worship him.

## Verse 7

**Hebrews 1:7** And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.

So Paul quotes again from Psalms, from Psalm 104 verse 4.

And so here is what God makes his angels to be. Here is the designation that he has given them, the ministry that he has given them.

His angels are his ministers. And he makes them to become spirits, or a flame of fire, to carry out that ministry that God has for them.

So that is their calling.

What God calls his angels to be, what he causes them to become, is not kings or rulers over the earth. Not the heirs of the world. That's not the ministry, the calling that they have been given.

For the ministry that they've been given God makes them spirits and flames of fire.

And so Paul is pointing out that God has declared the ministry, the calling of the angels, and it isn't that they would be the ultimate heirs of the world. Rather than being his heirs, they are his ministers, and he transforms them as needed into spirits and flames, to fulfill that purpose.

But he contrasts that with the calling God has given the Son:

## Verse 8

**Hebrews 1:8** But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

So here is the calling the Son. Unlike the angels who are called to be ministers, he's called to be the heir, the ruler of the kingdom, to sit upon the throne. And what? Upon the throne of God himself. So much so that there it actually calls him "O God." And so once again, the Son has obtained a more excellent name than the angels. Not minister. Not a flame of fire, a ministering spirit. But the name of God himself.

**Psalms 45:1** To the chief Musician upon Shoshannim, for the sons of Korah, Maschil, A Song of loves. My heart is inditing a good matter: I speak of the things which I have made touching the king: my tongue is the pen of a ready writer.

2 Thou art fairer than the children of men: grace is poured into thy lips: therefore God hath blessed thee for ever.

So it is talking about one of the children of men, who would be king, as in king over Israel. Ruler of the kingdom of heaven. But he would be fairer than the children of men, and his lips would speak grace, and he would be blessed for ever.

3 Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, with thy glory and thy *majesty*.

And there is that word *majesty* that it used back in verse 3 of Hebrews, how the Son sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

And here it says that he would gird on his sword and his glory and *majesty*.

4 *And in thy majesty* ride prosperously because of truth and meekness and righteousness; and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things.

5 Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies; whereby the people fall under thee.

6 Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre.

And so that there is the verse that he quotes here, Psalm 45 verse 6, where the one on the throne is declared to be God, who will reign forever, in righteousness.

So that is that more excellent name that he has obtained.

And Paul continues, quoting the next verse also, in Hebrews 1:9:

## Verse 9

**Hebrews 1:9** Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

And so once again this is confirmation that the one on the throne, that it just called “God”, is a man. He is a man, to whom God is his God, but yet he has been anointed above his fellows. And so it is a man who has obtained a more excellent name, by being given the throne, the inheritance of the kingdom.

And so the angels were called to be ministers, but this man was called to be king. They were called “gods”, but he is called “God”, and “the LORD”, the very name of God himself. And so he has obtained a more excellent name than the angels, because although he is a man, he has obtained a more excellent position, a more excellent inheritance. He’s been made the heir of all things. The one to whom God would give his own name and his own throne. And though he is just a man, and they are angels, they are just ministers, but he is the Son.

## Verse 10

**Hebrews 1:10** And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:

And so Paul quotes another passage on this, from Psalm 102. He quotes parts of verses 12, 25, 26, and 27. So he’s condensed things, and he’s paraphrasing a little bit again at the start of this quote. But it is obvious what he’s quoting.



You'll notice how all of these different quotes are from Psalms, they're all about the kingdom of heaven, and the throne of David, that Christ is inheriting. Well, all except that one pulled out of context from Deuteronomy 32, of course.

So let's look a little bit at Psalm 102 and get the context of that.

The title of the Psalm says, "A Prayer of the afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the LORD." So this Psalm is a prayer for the afflicted Hebrew. And it is prophet of Christ. It is prophetic of things that Christ could pray, in his affliction; and it is also prophetic of things that the Hebrews could pray, in their time of trouble.

Now, it's fairly long, so we're not going to hit every verse, but I'm going to point a few highlights out to you.

**Psalms 102:1** Hear my prayer, O LORD, and let my cry come unto thee.

2 Hide not thy face from me in the day when I am in trouble; incline thine ear unto me: in the day when I call answer me speedily.

8 Mine enemies reproach me all the day; and they that are mad against me are sworn against me.

11 My days are like a shadow that declineth; and I am withered like grass.

12 But thou, O LORD, shalt endure for ever; and thy remembrance unto all generations.

13 Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion: for the time to favour her, yea, the set time, is come.

14 For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof.

15 So the heathen shall fear the name of the LORD, and all the kings of the earth thy glory.

16 When the LORD shall build up Zion, he shall appear in his glory.

17 He will regard the prayer of the destitute, and not despise their prayer.

18 This shall be written for the generation to come: and the people which shall be created shall praise the LORD.

19 For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the LORD behold the earth;

20 To hear the groaning of the prisoner; to loose those that are appointed to death;

21 To declare the name of the LORD in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem;

22 When the people are gathered together, and the kingdoms, to serve the LORD.

23 He weakened my strength in the way; he shortened my days.

24 I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations.

25 Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands.

26 They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed:

27 But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.

28 The children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before thee.

So it is talking about the redemption of Israel, and the lifting up of the kingdom in Zion. The kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of David. The kingdom of the Son.

And who did it say would do that? It said the LORD would. It said that at that time the heathen would fear the name of the LORD. Who is it talking about? Who has been given that excellent name? Who is it that will rule that kingdom? The Son.

And it declares that the one who will rule that kingdom, the one who it calls the LORD, is the one who has done this:

**Psalms 102:25** Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands.

The one who will rule, is the one who did that.

Do you see the contrast between the Son and the angels.

We mentioned something similar last time, in reference to the prophets. In Hebrews 1 verse 2 it pointed out how the Son had now spoken, by whom also God made the worlds. The one who was the brightness of God's glory, who understood all the work of God, because he was the one who did it. Whereas the prophets couldn't understand all things.

Well, Paul is pointing out the exact same contrast between the Son and the angels. The angels are just ministers sent by God, who he makes to become this or that, for the purpose that he has for them. But do you know who this man, the Son, the heir of the kingdom is? He is the One from eternity, who made all things. Who made the angels. Who makes them ministering spirits and flames of fire. The Son, the heir, is also the Creator.

And so yes, his name is more excellent than the angels. Son of God, the LORD, the Creator, Maker of heaven and earth.

## Verse 11

**Hebrews 1:11** They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment;

And so the Son, the one who will be the ruler, the one who is the heir, yes, he's a man. But he is also God. And he's greater than the angels. He not only made the worlds, that he will inherit, but he has been here from eternity, he is not created, and he will also last for ever. He will reign forever, even though the heavens and earth shall perish.

And not only that:

## Verse 12

**Hebrews 1:12** And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.

Not only is he from eternity, and will last to eternity, not only is he the one who made the worlds, and not only will he outlast them, but he himself, the Son, the heir of all things, has also the power to destroy them. *And one day he will.*

And so that demonstrates, beyond any shadow of a doubt, that he is the heir of all things. They are his, not only did he make them, but God has made him the heir of them, so that he can discard them at his pleasure. And that is exactly what he is going to do.

And so an angel can't give you an eternal inheritance. Nobody can give you an eternal inheritance. Because everything that exists is going to be destroyed by the Son, after he gets it. An angel can tell you that you are the heir to a piece of land, or to a planet, sorry, it's not true, one day the Son is going to burn that up. There is nothing here that you can be given, that will last.

And you see, that is why you have to go through the Son. Nobody get's anything but through him, because he is the Creator. He's the one who made heaven and earth. And he's the only one that can create something for you to inherit.

And whatever you are going to inherit, is going to have to be something that he creates, in the future. Because everything that exists now, it's going to be given to him, and he's a pyromaniac and he's just going to burn it all up. All but that one piece of treasure that he has purchased to himself. And so you've got to go through him if you want to get something. Because none of this is going to exist, he's going to destroy everything that's here. So even if *an angel of God* is promising you something that is here, they're lying to you. And if they are promising you something that is not here, then you better ask them, "What, are you the Creator?" How can they promise you something that hasn't been created yet, when God is the sole Creator? When the Son, the Heir of all things, is the sole Creator? If you're going to get something, he's going to have to create it. And so you absolutely have to go through him. He's the only way to get an eternal inheritance.

The angels are just ministers, and God makes them into one thing or other. They aren't creators, the Son is, and he transforms them at will. They are under his command, under his control. Yes, Jesus, Christ, the son of Man, the son of David, the son of Abraham, the Son of God, is the LORD God, the Creator, he has a name more excellent than the angels, so that they will worship him and acknowledge him as the heir of all things.

## Verse 13

**Hebrews 1:13** But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?

So Paul quotes again from Psalms, from Psalm 110.

It's strange how there are all these Psalms in here with that one Deuteronomy passage, isn't it? And it is a Psalm of David, too. Paul's just too consistent here isn't he?

And he's going to be quoting more from this Psalm later on in Hebrews.

**Psalms 110:1** The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

And that is what he quotes right here. And just like in Deuter... in Psalm 97, it talks about both the LORD, all-caps, and the Lord, the ruler or master of the earth. And he would sit at God's right hand, until all his enemies were made his footstool.

So this relates to that right hand of God, that we mentioned last time. In verse three of Hebrews 1 Paul said that the Son had sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. And that's when he first says then how that the Son has been made so much better than the angels, because he's obtained a more excellent name than they.

And so we looked at a couple of passages from the OT last time, that talked about the one who would sit on the right hand of God. And the implication of them was that he was given all power by the Father, that he was the heir of all things.

And so here Paul is highlighting another OT passage that is saying the same thing. That it is the Son who was told to sit on God's right hand, until the Father subdued his enemies under him.

So once again, unlike the angels, he has been given this calling of ruling over the kingdom of heaven, of ruling over all things. That's what God has told him he would do. The angels are called to be ministers, the Son is called to be the LORD, the Lord of the whole earth.

2 The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.

So again, it is talking about the kingdom of David, the kingdom of Israel, the kingdom of heaven. That's what this man will rule.

3 Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth.

And he is indeed a man, who will rule over *his people*.

And this language here about the morning and the dew, that is a reference to the end times, to the end of the tribulation and the beginning of the millennium. So it is talking about how Israel will one day be willing, when one of themselves, a son of David, will be made their Lord, and given their kingdom by the LORD God.

4 The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

And Paul is going to quote that later on, and expound that.

And so this Psalm relates not only to the kingdom, but to the priesthood as well. And in fact, last time we pointed out how sitting on the right hand of God did transect both of those things. It related to the Son being the heir, but also to him being a priest. A priest who had finished his ministry of making atonement, and had sat down at the right hand of the Majesty. A priest so holy that he could sit at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

And so those two things do indeed relate to him sitting on God's right hand. This Psalm connects them. It makes him the sovereign Lord and the holiest priest.

5 The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath.

And so now it describes in more detail the work given to that Lord that sits at God's right hand. What is his calling. And the first thing is, that he shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath.

6 He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the places with the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries.

7 He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head.

And so that is the calling of the Son, a son of David: to reign from Zion, and be Lord over the earth.

To which of the angels has God ever given that calling, Paul asks? To which of them has he ever said this? When did he make one of them a lord over the earth? Or over anything?

## Verse 14

**Hebrews 1:14** Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?

So no. The angels have never been given that kind of calling that has been given to his man, to the Son. He may be just a man, and they might be angels, but it is him that God has called Lord,

has called Son of God, has called the LORD. *They* are just sons of God, small-g “gods”, who will all worship *him*. They are just ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation.

And think about that. Look closely at what Paul said there. Think about the implications of that. Paul has just said “the *heirs* of salvation,” plural. Not just is Christ the heir of all things, but there are others who will be made heirs of salvation. That salvation that was promised to the Hebrews, that it talked about in some of those passages that Paul quoted, that the Son would bring.

And so there are those who shall be made heirs of salvation, who will get to partake in Christ’s inheritance. And that first and foremost is the Hebrews, to whom God gave that promise of inheritance.

And what Paul has just pointed out, is that the angels, in regard to this, are not rulers over the inheritance. They aren’t heirs that God has given a promise of being lords of the kingdom. They are just ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to *those who will* receive that inheritance. Those that *have* been given that calling.

The angels aren’t the lords of man. God has given a man, his Son, the name of Lord, and the angels are his servants. They are man’s servants. The servants of them who through Christ will be made the heirs of salvation.

And so in eternity, the angels will be our ministers. That is the calling that God has given them. He’s never given them a calling to be rulers. As Paul wrote to the Corinthians:

**1 Corinthians 6:3** Know ye not that we shall judge angels? ...

And so they can’t come to you and give you a promise of the kingdom. They can’t come to you and tell you that you’re the king of the kingdom of heaven, by their word. They can’t dispense the kingdom. They won’t control the kingdom. We will. Man will, through God’s Son.

And so Paul is going to continue to talk about these same things in chapter 2. He’s going to continue to talk about angels and man, and how we relate to the eternal inheritance.

And so we’re going to stop here, and pick up in chapter 2 next time.

And we see again, just like last time, that the topic of the book of Hebrews is the end times. And how we need to relate the the inheritance if we want to receive a part in it when the Son is brought into the world to take it.

And so we’ll continue to see that as we go through Hebrews, and as I said there will be places where we’ll be able to point out particular things that are especially relevant to the tribulation Hebrews, in a special way.