LET’S GET BIBLICAL – PLEASE!
Response to Rabbi Tovia Singer’s Lecture
“Sin and Atonement”

by Rev. Randy Oliver

Rabbi Singer’s presentation was interesting, to say the least. His fast clipped, New York accent was a bit nostalgic for me, since I was born in Brooklyn. He strives to keep the interest of his listeners, and in this aspect his presentation was successful.

However, it seems that Rabbi Singer is guilty of the same hermeneutical errors of which he accuses Christians. His ideas with regard to sin and atonement, rather than being biblical, are in fact “sub-biblical.”

The Rabbi dismisses the idea that blood atonement is necessary for the removal of sin. In fact, he considers sacrifice to be the least important means of atonement in the mind of God, as it only atones for unintentional sins. Unlike the Christian who is, according to Singer, “preoccupied” with blood atonement, God prefers repentance and charity to sacrifice for the removal of sin.

In light of Singer’s views on blood atonement, I’ve selected two passages in the book of Ezekiel that concern themselves (at least, in Singer’s presentation) with this subject. What I discovered is that not only are Singer’s statements regarding the “Christian perspective” alternately gross exaggerations or fallacious characterizations, but he is surprisingly inconsistent concerning his own Jewish beliefs.

Rabbi Singer states that Christians believe that Ezekiel 18 addresses the issue of vicarious atonement. He also states that this idea of the “innocent” father dying for the “wicked” son was around long before Christianity: there had been a “murmuring” among the Jews that such an idea was possible. Singer goes on to insist that Ezekiel literally looses his temper in response to this murmuring: “Who is saying such a thing? – ‘The father eats sour grapes … the son’s teeth are set on edge’?”

While researching this paper, I came across the web site of Outreach Judaism.1 There I found a question with regard to Ezekiel 18, and Rabbi Singer’s response. Though the quotes are lengthy, I believe them to be illustrative of the presuppositions behind Singer’s interpretation of Ezekiel 18 and his overall hermeneutic:

1 http://www.outreachjudaism.org/
The question:

“I am also confused with the use of Ezekiel 18:1-4,19-23 as proof against the ability of one to atone for another’s sins. This text was not intended to be extrapolated to this point. It was simply as intended: a correction of those in that day which were propagating the idea that the sin of a father will rest upon his children. Ezekiel was dealing with those who teach that the sins of the father rest upon the children because the fall of Adam and Eve caused suffering on their children. It is clearly this false doctrine Ezekiel was trying to destroy.”

Singer’s response:

“In the 18th chapter of Ezekiel, the prophet was teaching his people a fundamental biblical principle: a righteous person cannot die vicariously for the sins of the wicked. This notion was identified as thoroughly pagan and was to be avoided by the Jewish people at all costs, and is taught emphatically throughout the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel. In verses 20-23 the prophet declares that repentance alone provides full forgiveness of sin. Never are blood-sacrifices or the veneration of a crucified messiah mentioned throughout Ezekiel’s thorough and inspiring discourse on sin and atonement…

“Ezekiel’s teaching was not new. The Jewish people were warned throughout the Torah never to offer human sacrifices. When Moses offered to have his name removed from the Torah in exchange for the sin that the Jewish people had committed with the golden calf, the Almighty abruptly refused Moses’ offer. Moses, who was righteous with regard to the golden calf, could not suffer vicariously for the sin of the nation. Rather, only the soul that sinned would endure judgment

“With regard to your comment on the sin in the Garden of Eden, the consequences of the fall of Adam and Eve are not to be appended to Ezekiel’s 18th chapter. Nowhere in this chapter is the sin in the Garden of Eden ever mentioned. In fact, Ezekiel outlines many of the sins that the wicked one may have committed, and yet not one of them is eating from the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. On the contrary, all of the sins outlined are those that were never committed in the Garden of Eden. As mentioned above, this chapter is a prophetic teaching on sin and atonement in general, and a

2 http://www.outreachjudaism.org/sin.html
vigorously condemning the thoroughly pagan belief in vicarious atonement.

... “This comment surprises me because this is a foundational Christian doctrine. Christianity teaches that the Original Sin has infected all of mankind to the point that man has become incapable of achieving ‘salvation’ through his own initiative. Man is ‘totally depraved’ and therefore his only hope of salvation is through the cross. Paul makes a very big deal about this in his epistles, especially in the Book of Romans. So I do agree with you that this belief in the doctrine of Original Sin is contrary to the teachings of the prophets, although this is not what Ezekiel was specifically addressing in the 18th chapter. However, if we take Ezekiel’s teaching to its complete spiritual conclusion, the prophet has condemned the church’s doctrine on Original Sin and Total Depravity as well.”

I find it interesting that Singer, an ethnic Jew, seems ignorant of the place of Ezekiel in the history of his people. The book of Ezekiel contains Ezekiel’s response to a controversy and crisis in the lives of the southern kingdom. Ezekiel himself was one of the exiles taken into Babylon in 597 B.C. – an exile which took place because of the continued unfaithfulness of God’s covenant people. There was a dispute between those who were taken to Babylon and those who remained in the Promised Land. Those who remained in the Land (mostly commoners and Levites) believed that the exile was a sign that only those who were taken were being punished, while those who remained in the Land were God’s “remnant.” The exiles themselves held out hope that they would compose the remnant that God had promised to return to the Land as his people.

It is in the light of judgment, restoration, and reconstruction that the book of Ezekiel is to be understood. There were some who questioned their own culpability in this matter. They had not sinned, so they said – it was their parents, their forefathers had transgressed God’s law. They believed themselves to be suffering for their forefathers’ errors. However, in chapter 18 Ezekiel instructed the Judahites that “God does not unfairly punish the descendants for parents’ sins; the present generation must repent.” The chapter clearly teaches that rather than suffering unfairly for sins he has not committed, “every man bears the guilt and punishment over his own sins.”

---

3 http://www.outreachjudaism.org/sin.html
Chapter 18 seems to take the form of a complex disputation speech. When discussing their lot, the Judahites were quoting the proverb, “The fathers eat the sour grapes, but the children's teeth are set on edge.” The Harper Bible Commentary states, “The meaning of the proverb is clear. One generation is suffering the consequences of a prior generation's actions. In the context of Ezekiel’s historical situation, just after the first deportation, the use of the proverb implies that the exiles are being punished for the sins of their ancestors.” But “instead of theologizing about Yahweh's (mis)administration of justice, they need to repent of their rebellious ways and to reorder their lives according to tôrâ. The same tôrâ that determines the principles of divine judgment offers the only hope of escape and points the way to the future.”

The Lord invalidates the “sour grapes” proverb not to destroy Jewish notions of vicarious atonement, but to correct the fatalistic viewpoint of the exile: “Ezekiel was not at this time dealing with the problems of the suffering of the innocent, vicarious suffering or corporate suffering ... he had to bring home to them an individual sense of sin. The subject of justification by faith should not be pressed into this chapter; it is not under discussion.”

Many saw repentance as superfluous, as they did not consider themselves accountable for their situation, but rather blamed their forefathers for the sins that brought them into exile. But Ezekiel said to them, “No – it is of your sins, not the sins of your fathers, for which Yahweh is chastising you and for which he calls upon you to repent.” In light of this pervasive sinfulness, it is strange that Rabbi Singer would state, “The prophet has condemned the church's doctrine on Original Sin and Total Depravity as well.” In contrast, Lamar Eugene Cooper, Sr., writes:

“Ezekiel eloquently made the case that everyone was equally accountable before God for the stewardship of life and the opportunity to avoid God’s anger. Judgment was coming, and the people were accountable directly to God. The unrepentant were responsible for hearing the word of God and turning from sin by repentance.”

Singer is simply mistaken in the characterization of Ezekiel's purposes in chapter 18:

---

9 Block, 554.
“In the 18th chapter of Ezekiel, the prophet was teaching his people a fundamental biblical principle: a righteous person cannot die vicariously for the sins of the wicked. This notion was identified as thoroughly pagan and was to be avoided by the Jewish people at all costs, and is taught emphatically throughout the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel. In verses 20-23 the prophet declares that repentance alone provides full forgiveness of sin. Never are blood-sacrifices or the veneration of a crucified messiah mentioned throughout Ezekiel's thorough and inspiring discourse on sin and atonement.”

Please note Singer’s inconsistency here: 1) Ezekiel does not mention the concept of “blood sacrifices” here; yet 2) Ezekiel is teaching a “fundamental principle” with regard to the superfluous nature of blood sacrifices. Singer argues that Ezekiel is teaching something about a subject that he does not even mention!

It is in dealing with Ezekiel 40:38-43 that Singer reveals not only that his knowledge of Christian doctrinal positions is somewhat deficient, but also that his own brand of “Judaism” is one somewhat akin to Christian Dispensationalism. What makes this doubly ironic is that Dispensationalists hold to the very interpretation of this passage which Singer emphatically states that “no Christians” holds.

It is instructive to note that, for Singer, the Bible is “a crystal ball of the future.” Singer describes it as akin to Captain Kangaroo’s “magic” television set, where the Captain would observe something that would happen in the future, which would somehow occur (e.g. the television would show the Captain with a lampshade on his head, and the Captain, chuckling at the impossibility of such an event, would go to his closet where a lampshade would promptly fall on his head!).

Singer accedes little, if any, historical or redemptive-historical significance to the passage in question. Ezekiel, in a fashion, looks into God’s crystal ball and observes Israel ensconced in the eschatological kingdom – a future that includes animal sacrifices in its ideal temple! I find it interesting that although Singer posits that blood sacrifice is God’s least-preferred method for atonement, and that belief in such an atonement is “thoroughly pagan,” he exults in knowing that there will be sacrifices in this eschatological Temple.

What is baffling, however, is that he states emphatically,

“When you are looking at the Jewish Scripture, and they are telling us ‘I want you to know, at the end of days there are going to be sacrifices again,’ there’s a serious problem, because according to Christians, there shouldn’t be a sacrifice anymore … any of you, walk out of here, go to any fundamentalist Christian you know, and ask them, ‘Tell me, is there going to be a sacrificial system again, they will say, ‘No – no

---
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need for it – Jesus died once and for all.' Now, not only will there be sacrifices, there will also be sin sacrifices. One of the most detailed descriptions of the Messianic age ... takes place in the book of Ezekiel chapters 40-48 ... it is a description of what the third temple will be like ... this great eternal temple ... guess what else is going to be there? There’s gonna be sacrifices. You know what kind of sacrifices? Sin sacrifices ... Sin offerings at the end of days – why, if Jesus died for our sins? ... When you are looking at the Messianic age as described by the prophet, and they tell us that there’s gonna be sin offerings again, they tell us that there’s gonna be a regular sacrificial system again, clearly, Hebrews just simply doesn’t hold up.”14

What is puzzling is, as “Dispensational” as Singer’s views sound here, he seems to ignore the Dispensational wing of “fundamentalist Christendom” who tend to affirm that sacrifices will take place in a rebuilt, ideal temple in the eschatological kingdom.

Walvoord and Zuck note in their Bible Knowledge Commentary:

“At Christ’s second coming, Israel will again assume her place of prominence in God’s kingdom program (cf. Rom. 11:25-27). The Lord’s Supper will be eliminated, because Christ will have returned. It will be replaced by animal sacrifices, which will be memorials or object lessons of the supreme sacrifice made by the Lamb of God. The slaughtering of these animals will be vivid reminders of the Messiah’s suffering and death.”15

Cooper, in his commentary, states:

“Since the church will be taken out of the world, or raptured, prior to the tribulation (Rev. 4:1), the tribulation will be the era of conversion for Israel (Rev. 7:1ff.), and the millennium will afford them the opportunity to reinstate their covenant to celebrate and commemorate the redemptive work of Jesus the Messiah. The existence of the millennial temple and the reinstatement of the sacrificial system is not only understandable but predictable.”16

In light of this, why would Singer assert that no Christian would affirm that blood sacrifices would take place in the eschatological kingdom? It is interesting that he holds to an almost “Dispensational” view of the prophets, sharing their “crystal ball” conception of prophecy, yet is seemingly ignorant of Dispensational Christians who make up the vast majority of fundamentalists and affirm his contention for blood sacrifices at the end of days.

15 Walvoord, John F, and Zuck, Roy B. The Bible Knowledge Commentary (from Logos CD)
16 Cooper, 379
In any event, both Singer and Dispensationalists ignore the historical impetus of this passage. Ezekiel was preparing his hearers for their eventual return to the Land, and for the restoration of the pattern of covenant life in which worship and sacrifice were central. Ezekiel’s message in this portion of the book was “God gave us a reconstruction program that has the temple at its center. Full restoration will come only through compliance with this Zadokite vision.”

Unfortunately, this ideal was altered by the one great “intervening historical contingency:” the sin of God’s covenant people. We find, however, that though the details of God’s pronouncements may be altered, his decrees and promises are sure, as “these restoration hopes are fulfilled in inauguration, continuation, and consummation of Christ’s kingdom.”

Even noted dispensational Bible teacher H.A. Ironside affirmed the historical nature of this section of Ezekiel:

“By consulting 1 Sam. 2:33; 2 Sam.15:24; 1 Kings 2:27-35 we will understand what is said here of the sons of Zadok. These alone are given a true priestly place in this temple. All others of the sons of Levi are given positions of authority and service, but it is not theirs to present the offerings of the people on the altar. The priesthood failed almost from the beginning, and God set the other sons of Aaron aside in favor of the descendants of Zadok who was faithful in a day of declension and apostasy.”

Vern’s Poythress’ comments are germane to correcting the typical “Dispensational” mindset, whether that “Dispensationalism” be Christian or Jewish (á la Singer):

“Some Dispensationalists, of course, think on the basis of Ezekiel 44-46 that bloody sacrifices will be renewed in the Millennium... The point is this: for almost any prophetic passage touching on the ‘latter days,’ one can claim that it has a perfectly straight-line, obvious kind of fulfillment in the Millennium. Though such interpretation is possible, is it necessarily a genuine implication of the passage in every case? Was the Old Testament hearer obliged to say that the passage must be fulfilled in the most obvious way?”

In conclusion, I cannot help but state that Rabbi Singer’s presentation, rather than being “biblical” as he contends, is “sub-biblical” at best. He offers not only

---
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contradictory testimony of Christian interpretation of the passage he cites, but contradictory testimony of his own religious tradition.

The website for Jews for Jesus\(^{21}\) contains reflections on Singer’s lecture series by Dr. Arthur F. Glasser, Dean Emeritus and Professor Emeritus of Theology and East Asian Studies as well as Faculty Coordinator of Judaic Studies at Fuller Theological Seminary, School of World Mission. In a paper given at the 1997 meeting of the Lausanne Consultation on Jewish Evangelism in North America, Glasser commented:

Rabbi Singer does not feel constrained to give his hearers anything approximating an Orthodox portrayal of the Messiah. Again and again he states that a particular passage or cluster of chapters in the Tanakh is Messianic, and refers to the future. Occasionally he intimates that a certain detail or specific event is yet to take place, but without establishing any basic framework or eschatological sequence that might be helpful to his people in their understanding of its relevance. Many religious people are concerned about the future and its biblical certainties. I think his silence on the sequence of prophetic utterances is unfortunate.”\(^{22}\)

Appendix: Outline of Rabbi Tovia Singer’s Lecture “Sin and Atonement”

Introduction: “Tonight’s lecture is the most significant of all – Sin and Atonement”

I. Discussing with a Christian regarding sin
   A. All people sin.
   B. How do you get atonement for your sin?
      1. Old Testament times – sacrificial system
      2. No sacrifice/blood atonement now.
      3. Didn’t Jesus give his life for the sins of the world, and 40 years later the temple was destroyed – what a coincidence!
      4. Sacrificial system no longer necessarily
      5. Synagogue attendance, then, is waste of time – the only way to atone for sin is through the shedding of blood.
   C. Leviticus 17:10-11 – part of the basic argument of Christians
      1. Verse 10 was skipped (though in the worksheet).
      2. Because of the lack of blood atonement, Christians refer to modern Judaism as “rabbinic Judaism.”
         a) “That’s like referring to Jerusalem as “occupied territories” – offensive
         b) Does God indeed provide only one method for atoning for sin, blood atonement?

\(^{21}\) [http://www.jews-for-jesus.org/]
\(^{22}\) [http://www.jews-for-jesus.org/CASE/BIBLICAL/Glasser/glasser1.html]
D. No.

E. Three primary methods for atoning for sin
   1. Repentance, confessing sins to God
   2. Charity
   3. Blood Atonement

F. How do you select which method you use. Are they all equal?
   1. Charity and repentance are the most desirable methods of atonement, what God prefers
   2. Blood atonement is the weakest, and least significant method of atonement
      a) Christians would consider blood atonement to the “strongest” method.
      b) You must be able to demonstrate the primacy of charity and repentance, through the Scriptures, when encountering Christians.

II. Does the Blood atonement atone for every kind of sin?
   A. No.
   B. It only atones for unintentional sins.
      1. Sin offering – Leviticus 4 – only for sins done by accident.
      2. Excursus – most Christians think offerings only have to do with sin – they ignore thank offerings.
      3. Read Leviticus 4:1-2
      4. The chapter continues by giving four versions of the sin offering – all for unintentional sins.
         a) High Priest
         b) King
         c) Commoner
         d) Whole nation of Israel

III. If you commit a sin intentionally, there is no sin offering.
   A. Exodus 22 – if someone steals, he pays double – there’s no sin offering.
   B. If he murders, he is put to death
   C. If you kill unintentionally, you go to the city of refuge, remaining there until the high priest dies (a “model” of the sin offering).
   D. For intentional sins, there is no form of indirect punishment – it is always a direct punishment.
   E. The sin offering, by definition is done for the “most inadequate, most insignificant form of sin.”

IV. In Christian Bibles, Leviticus 17:11 often has a reference to Hebrews 9:22
   A. The author of Hebrews 9.22 quotes Leviticus 17.11
   B. However, the author of Hebrews changes the wording “without the shedding of blood, there is no atonement.”
      1. The context of Leviticus 17: the prohibition against the eating of blood.
2. It has nothing to do with the laws of sin and atonement, how to get atonement for sin.
3. It’s very rare that a Christian will know this.
4. In Leviticus 17, God does something rare: He gives a reason for a commandment.
   a) Blood is set aside for atoning in the sin offering ("not the knuckles, not the cuticles, not the eyebrows")
   b) Yet, this is not the only method of atonement.
      (1) If the priest “messes up” the sacrifice during the “service of the blood” (preparing the animal for sacrifice), it had to be redone.
      (2) If the priest “messes up” during the roasting of the sacrifice, the sacrifice is fine
   c) He (Singer) had them skip Leviticus 17:10 earlier in order to “direct your eyes in a way a Christian might direct your eyes.”
      (1) This is not malicious on the part of Christian. This is how their books are quoting.

C. Singer reads Leviticus 17:10
   1. Singer is sometimes asked the question regarding sacrifice by Jews:
      a) He describes “taking Elsie to Jerusalem” to sacrifice for one’s sin.
      b) Judaism is supposed be a religion of love and justice, but sacrifice seems barbaric.
   2. But if the sacrifice is only done for sins done unknowingly, “things begin to fall in place”

V. The Bible clearly states that God doesn’t even like the sin offering, but much prefers repentance and “opening your ears to the almighty word.”
   A. Psalms 40.7 (verse 6 in the Christian Bible)
      1. This verse has been “an enormous source of pain” to the church for a long time.
      2. This is not the kind of verse a Christian will quote to you, because it goes against everything they were taught.
      3. God does not desire sacrifices
      4. The Jewish people were inclined to focus on the sacrificial system, but the prophets spoke of the same concept
         a) The prophets are not saying that “when you bring a sacrifice, I also want you to have repentance in your heart.”
         b) What it does say: “rather than the sacrifice, God would rather have something else.”
   B. This verse has been so troubling to Christians, even the earliest Christians ripped, mutilated Psalm 40:7
      1. References will point you to Hebrews 10:5
a) “A body you have prepared for me” rather than “my ears you have opened for me”

b) Changed the wording because of the difficulty for his theology, creating an entirely new theology.

c) It is for this reason that Christians would state that the sacrificial system never worked.
   (1) Hebrew 10.4 – the purpose of the animal sacrifices were only to point to Jesus

d) The Jew says, “How dare you touch my Scriptures!”

C. There is a consistent Pattern in the Scriptures regarding that “the sacrificial system was not #1 on God’s list”

1. “There is not one other commandment in the Bible that is denigrated by the prophets except for the sacrificial system.”
   a) Nowhere in Scripture do the prophets denigrate Sabbath, for example.
   b) The prophets had the insight to know that one day people would place too much emphasis on the sacrificial system.
   c) 2 Samuel 15.22 – “to obey is better than a priest offering”
   d) 1 Kings 15.5: The Bible considers King David to be “right and straight in the eyes of God” turning from this only once in his life
      (1) Singer then relates the story of David, Bathsheba, and Uriah the Hittite
      (2) “There’s more to this story…but I don’t want to get into it”
      (3) He then tells Nathan’s parable (2 Samuel 12), and David’s reaction.
      (4) David “throws himself on the floor…says ‘I have sinned.’” (“one of the most powerful scenes in the Scriptures”)
      (5) Nathan says – “the Lord has already forgiven you’ – no sin sacrifice, no atonement” (2 Samuel 12:12-13) – “that’s love, that’s mercy”
      (6) Singer then refers to Psalms 51
         (a) (Verses 16-19) God does not desire offerings, but “a broken spirit.”
   e) Hosea 14:2-3 speaks about the replacement of sacrifice today
      (1) “Take with you words…”
      (2) “Let us render for bulls the offerings of our lips” (“the bulls of our lips”)
         (a) “I don’t want to say the NIV is sleazy…but it’s not the most…honest” (someone on the tape calls out that he did call it sleazy)
(i) The NIV changes the verse: “let us render the *fruit* of our lips” – bulls are removed

(ii) It is in a footnote – but who reads footnotes? “Leave the word of God alone.”

(iii) The NIV does this again and again

**f)** Micah 6:6-8

1. “Shall I come before him with burnt offerings…give my first born.”
2. “He has told you what is good, and what the Lord demands of you….do justice, lovingkindness, and to walk discretely with your God.”
3. Christians, innocently, always ask the question about how sins are atoned for, but this verse addresses this.

**g)** 1 Kings 8:46-50—spoken by Solomon at the inauguration of the magnificent first temple

1. Solomon prophesies eventual exile because of your sins.
2. What do you do? (“Jesus died for your sins – no!”)
   a) Turn your face toward this building
   b) Confess all your sins
   c) God will hear your prayers in heaven, and forgive you for all your transgressions.
   d) Why didn’t he mention Jesus?
3. “Hello and good night!…There’s no way out of this” This is why Jews turn toward Jerusalem (east) as they pray
4. 2 Chronicles 6 mirrors this text

**h)** Ezekiel 18 addresses the issue of vicarious atonement

1. This idea of the “innocent” father dying for the “wicked” son was along long before Christianity was. It was a “murmuring” among the Jews that such an idea is possible
2. Ezekiel literally looses his temper “who is saying such a thing? -- the father eats sour grapes…the son’s teeth are set on edge?”
3. Is there a way out for the wicked person to become righteous again?
   a) Ezekiel 18.21 – if the wicked man turns away from his sins, God literally forgets them.
   b) God’s hands are not bound by sin.
D. Charity
1. Can Charity take away sin? Yes!
   a) Proverbs 10.2
   b) Proverbs 11.4
   c) Proverbs 16.6
   d) By Giving charity God forgives sin.
2. Is Charity Superior to Sacrifice? Yes!
   a) Proverbs 21.3
   b) Hosea 6.6
   c) Daniel 4.27
   d) Jeremiah 7:1-7, 21-24
      (1) "Jeremiah loses it"—God is looking for mitzvahs, not sacrifices. When did God demand sacrifices when you left Egypt?

VI. Other Claims by Christians for the Essentially of Atonement
A. Mentions fear that Jews have in speaking to Christians, so he wants to prepare his hearers.
B. Genesis 3.21 – After the sin of Adam and Eve, God shed blood for Adam and Eve – but not for sin, but to provide something to wear!
C. Genesis 22:6-13 – Abraham and the "Sacrifice" of Isaac pointed to Jesus – but God does not allow Isaac to be sacrificed. If God wants a sacrifice, it will only be an animal sacrifice.
D. Passover
   1. The Pascal lamb is never described as a sin offering.
   2. They Jews had to put the blood on the doorpost, not because the angel of death didn’t know who the Jews were, but the lamb was a god in Egypt!
   3. The Almighty wanted to see if we were truly worthy of being redeemed from Egypt.
   4. If the Egyptians catch you killing a lamb, you’re dead – but put the blood on the door.

VII. The Bible as “The Crystal Ball of the Future” – Two Models
A. The one tool we always have available to us, which most people never look at.
B. If I asked the Christian, “At the end of days, will there be a sacrificial system again?” The Christian would say “no” – New Testament clearly states that Jesus was the final sacrifice.
   1. Romans 6.10
   3. Hebrews 10.10
   4. Hebrews 10.18
C. If I asked a Jew if there will be sacrifices when the Messiah arrives, the Jew would say “yes.” Jesus is not the Messiah – he didn’t die for our sins, but died only for his own.
   1. Isaiah 56.7
2. Jeremiah 33:17-18
3. Zechariah 14:21
D. There will also be *sin* sacrifices at the end of days
   1. Ezekiel 40-48: description of the third temple
   2. Ezekiel 43:22-27 – there will be sin sacrifices

VIII. Questions