

Hummingbird Debate Transcript

Held August 6, 2025 between Melissa Smith (God's Little Hummingbird), and Professor R. L. Solberg. Moderated by Scott Harwell.

[Introductions have been skipped]

[Prof Solberg]

Do you believe that we're in the new covenant now?

[Melissa]

So I believe the new covenant was instituted when Yeshua was killed and when he crucified and rose from the dead. He told his disciples, take this cup, this signifies the new covenant. Some people in our movement, in the Torah, like who comes to Torah obedience, believe we're not yet in the new covenant because they misunderstand the Hebrew idiom that says we will have no teacher.

That's not what it literally means, just like Yeshua doesn't literally mean to hate your mother and your father. We are most definitely in what we would call in Hebrew, the renewed covenant, the *berit chadasha*.

[Prof Solberg]

Okay, so *hadasha* means new, not renewed.

[Melissa]

So in Hebrew, there's a misunderstanding. So if you go to Samuel, the book of Samuel, when they said, let us renew the covenant with Saul, it actually is the word *hadash*, *hadasha*. And so in the Hebrew understanding, if you go to the Ecclesiastes, the book of Ecclesiastes, and I come from a Hebraic mindset, you're coming from a Greek mindset.

But remember, one's linear, one is more circular. We believe in Hebrew, nothing is new under the sun, nothing is new. So in technicalities, in the language to a Jewish person, there is nothing new under the sun, just like Ecclesiastes warns.

And what we say in the Hebrew tradition is what happens to Israel will happen to Mashiach, Messiah, and what happens to Mashiach will happen to Israel. We see how things are circular and prophetic. And so while we say the word new, and there

can be in the English and Greek mindset, applications of that word hadash in a new way, what we understand, like when we look at the new moon, we call it Rosh Chodesh.

Chodesh, it's a renewal every month of a 28 to 30 day process. And so simply looking at a semantic structure and saying, oh, in English, it is translated as new. That's a bit of a fallacy, because if you have to look at it from the Hebraic mindset, and I studied linguistics for years, and I taught English, from the Hebrew perspective, it's not actually new in the way that a Greek person would think of it.

[Prof Solberg]

So what was that first passage you said? I wanted to look it up and understand that.

[Melissa]

It's in the book of Samuel that we're talking about, where it says, let us renew the covenant with Saul. And so I can't remember if that's in...

[Prof Solberg]

Okay, let me look it up.

[Melissa]

Is it in 1 Samuel 11 or 22? Honestly, it's just something I didn't... Let's look at it here.

[Prof Solberg]

I'm just looking up for the word renew in...

[Melissa]

Yeah, that's fine. Actually, let me just look up. So, well, and part of the understanding of the word renew for renewed covenant is when we get to Jeremiah 31.

We understand that the new covenant, the renewed covenant is still made with the house of Israel and Judah. And there's a reason it's renewed is because Israel was divorced. And so that's something I think we need to get into with this.

But here, let me find it.

[Prof Solberg]

Yeah, I don't see the word renew, like the English translation of renew.

[Melissa]

It actually is. So it's not... Let's see here, 1 Samuel.

I'm sorry, I should have... I didn't... That's okay.

[Prof Solberg]

We're exploring this together.

[Melissa]

Right. So let me...

[Moderator]

It is 1 Samuel 11, 14.

[Melissa]

Thank you. I was just about there. Okay.

[Prof Solberg]

Oh, "renew the kingdom." That's what I have here.

[Melissa]

Okay. So, and you probably use a different, possibly use a different translation. And so what I said was...

[Prof Solberg]

I use bunches of them. Yeah. I'm looking at the ESV right now.

[Melissa]

Okay. So when you look at that Hebrew word there, it is the word *chadash*, and it is the word to renew it. And you can look at, you could click on that, and you could look at the other uses of it all through Isaiah, right here, Isaiah 40, 31.

But those who wait on Yahweh shall renew their strength. And so it's one of the understandings from the difference of a Hebraic mindset and the Greek mindset. And so if we would go over to Jeremiah 31 in this concept, in this understanding of renew, we have to look at Jeremiah 31, because Jeremiah 31 says some powerful things.

I'm just going to pull it up here on my little computer, starting in verse 31. It says, behold, the days are coming, says Yahweh. Now the sacred name, some people say Yehovah, some people say Yah, whatever.

If you want to say Lord, I'm not offended. When I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. Notice.

[Prof Solberg]

So you're reading that as renewed covenant rather than new.

[Melissa]

Right. And so why would we need a renewed covenant? Well, because we understand that the house of Israel was in fact divorced from Yah.

[Prof Solberg]

How do you account for, I'm sorry, you're explaining stuff I'm aware of. So I thought maybe we could hop along. So how do you explain the fact that it's not like the old covenant?

[Melissa]

So the renewal of it is that now it is inscribed. Well, what does it say? Let's keep reading.

"But this is a covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, not Gentiles. After those days, says Yahweh, I will put my law in their minds and write it on their hearts."

[Prof Solberg]

I think you skipped verse 32.

[Melissa]

Yeah, I was just going to the renewal part, the part that's new about it.

[Prof Solberg]

Oh, okay. Yeah. So verse 32 is the one I have the question about.

[Melissa]

Okay, sure. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant, which they broke, though I was a husband to them, says Yahweh. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says Yahweh.

Now, this is also quoted in Hebrews 8 and Hebrews 10.

[Prof Solberg]

So real quick. Okay. Because I don't want to skip past it. We will get to 33 and 34 if you want. I'm totally fine with that. But on 32, it says not.

[Melissa]

Exactly. What was that covenant like? It's symbolized by Hagar, meaning works-based, law-based.

See, if you simply have the Torah, if you have a lamp without the oil, it is no light in it. If you have the five wise virgins and the five foolish virgins, the five wise, what does the number five represent in Hebrew? Torah, five books of Moses.

So if you have a lamp with no oil, it is completely empty. So if I obey every single letter of the law perfectly, guess what? I can still go to eternal damnation.

[Prof Solberg]

Right. So in Jeremiah 31, and this is super interesting what you're saying, but I kind of want to keep us on topic. Jeremiah 31, 31 says, I will make a new covenant, a *berit chadash*, which I take to mean new as in new, as in when the Lord says, behold, I am doing a new thing, a new thing.

Right. So why? And in the following verse, he says, “**not** like the covenant I made with your fathers.”

So, you know, so the word there is *lo*. So it's a negation. So how do you equate this to a renewed covenant when God says it's **not** like the other one?

[Melissa]

Because it's a renewed marriage vow. So here's the thing. Israel sinned, broke the covenant at Sinai, was cast off by Assyria for 2,730 years. And then in the book of Hosea, we are told where they were told he would not be Yah's people, they will

against be his people. Now that happens only through a death and a resurrection. And this is the understanding of the born again nature.

See, Nicodemus struggled with this because he was a Pharisee of the Pharisees, and he understood the letter of the Torah. But what they did in living by the letter of the Torah is they added over 2,000 extra rules and made it so fenced in because they were so afraid of breaking the law that they in effect made the law negate. There was no effectiveness in the law anymore.

And so when we're saying not according, not according, so it's not saying it's not the same laws. It says not according to the covenant, not in the same way, not in the same manner. What does that mean?

We had a tutor. The law was the tutor to point us to Mashiach. Now, I'm a professor. I was. You are a professor. When our students graduated, did we expect them to throw away the information they had used? Absolutely not. So what's different about this renewal when Israel gets to come back, the scattered Gentiles like James mentions to the 12 tribes scattered abroad and Peter talks to the 12 tribes. Those are the diaspora.

What is renewed? Well, now we have the Holy Spirit doing what? Writing the Torah. That word there for law is Torah, which means teachings and instructions on the law and minds. And if we could go for a minute to Ezekiel 36. Ezekiel 36 tells us the same exact thing that's going to happen with this renewal.

In verse 26, he says, I will give you a new heart and put a new spirit within you. I will take the heart of stone. That's the difference. Out of your flesh and give you a heart of flesh. I will put my spirit within you and cause you to do what? To walk in my statutes and you will keep my judgments and do them.

So here's the father trying so hard to help us understand the meaning of the Torah, which fits exactly with what Messiah did. He said, look, you're saying not to commit adultery. I'm saying don't even lust. You're saying not to murder. I'm saying don't even hate your brother in your heart. Notice he never spoke against the Torah.

He lived it out to the very depth of the heart. He put the oil in the lamp.

[Prof Solberg]

Okay. So in Jeremiah 32, he says, **not** like. He says *lo ka*. So “like,” or “as.” I know the King James says “according” — in modern English, we would say “not like” or “as.” So that's just kind of my point.

I think that's very clear that it says I'm going to make a new covenant, a chadash. You know, chadash is new, fresh, not like the old one. So I think we have a separation there.

So, but we can disagree about that. I'm not actually sure what your position is there, but let me, here's a complimentary question to that. Do you think the Sinai covenant is still in effect?

[Melissa]

The Sinai covenant is the law that has now been applied to us in a newer, fresher way. See living by the letter of the law living. Okay.

For example, when my students are under my class before they graduate, they live by the letter of the law, but they don't understand what it truly means to have their own career and use what they've learned in the classroom. So at Sinai, Moshe went up the mountain, brought down the commandments. And by the way, Yeshua is the one who brought those commandments to Moses on the mountain.

He is the only part of the Godhead we see. He brings the commandments to Moses, speaks to him. And what happened is because it was only the Holy Spirit had not written those commandments inside of us.

It was very, very easy for the people to legalistically not understand what they were doing. They sinned over and over. They broke the commandments or they fenced in the commandments. They were not doing it in the way some were, but many were not doing it in the way that was prescribed. So then when we get the new Holy Spirit, the helper that's meant to help us, he doesn't give us a different set of laws. In fact, we just read in Ezekiel 36 and Jeremiah 31.

So what's the newness? What's the different? What's it not like?

It's not like that. We just have to look at the outward textbook. Now, like for example, I was a teacher. I graduated and I have my own classroom. So using the

tools from what I learned in school, right? Because I don't understand how to be a teacher when I'm simply reading the textbooks.

But when I have my classroom, then I was like, oh, here's what it means to wrangle monkeys. This is how I submit the monkey. So what I believe, and this is what my position is.

When we get the Holy Spirit, it enables us to walk out the commandments by the spirit of the law, not the letter. Now we have to remember Elizabeth and Zacharias were called blameless because they obeyed the commandments. So we do know there were people who were walking out obedience to the Torah in the spirit and truth.

But primarily without that infilling of the Holy Spirit, it was very hard for us. The newness of it was that indwelling of the Holy Spirit. And how was that evidenced? By the speaking of tongues of what the languages to the Gentiles who were there to hear the gospel. And what was the gospel? Well, Yeshua was preaching it, and it surely wasn't that the law went away.

It was that Israel was going to be brought back. There was redemption. Here's the salvation of Yah.

Does that make sense? Does my position seem more clear now?

[Prof Solberg]

Unfortunately, it doesn't.

[Moderator]

I have a question for Rob, if you don't mind.

[Prof Solberg]

Go for it, sir.

[Moderator]

What is your understanding of the gospel of the kingdom that Yeshua preached? And I would assume you would agree that Paul taught and preached the same exact gospel as did Yeshua. So what is your understanding of what the gospel of the kingdom is?

[Prof Solberg]

That's a fantastic question. I would love to, if you're okay with it, Mr. Moderator, put a pin in that and come right back to it once we get to the answer about whether the Sinai covenant is still in effect.

[Moderator]

Okay, so yes. Well, and the reason I'm asking the question is because until about five years ago, Mr. Rob, and just call me Scott, man.

[Prof Solberg]

Just call me Rob.

[Moderator]

Yeah. So Rob, until about five years ago, I don't know that I'd ever heard the gospel of the kingdom. And I believe that is sort of what a lot of your audience perhaps never has. And it's about this divorce of the northern house of Israel. They're out of covenant. They're a harlot.

So that's why I was asking then. So then Melissa could respond and maybe some of your audience could hear the actual gospel of the kingdom and why this divorced harlot put away wife. Now they can come back into covenant.

[Prof Solberg]

Yeah. I mean, we can explore that, but we've not finished exploring the idea of the Sinai covenant yet. Like Melissa gave a long and very fluid answer, but I apologize if you're maybe going faster than I can keep up.

But what is, in your opinion, the current state of the Sinai covenant that God made with Israel at Mount Sinai? There was a covenant cut, right?

[Melissa]

Yes, there was. There was a covenant cut, and that is what we always say. We cut a deal, basically. So with the Sinai covenant, it is eternal, right? We both read the words. This is *l'olam*, forever. And was it only for Israel? No, because Caleb was a Gentile. Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, the Kennizite, was grafted in. Ruth was grafted in.

[Prof Solberg]

Exodus. Okay, so I heard you say, and I apologize. I don't mean to rudely interrupt you, but I know when we're kind of wandering off topic. So I just want to...

[Melissa]

I'm trying to clarify how the Sinai covenant applies to both. It applies to any Jew or Gentile.

[Prof Solberg]

Okay, so my simple Greek-minded logical answer is yes, the Sinai covenant is in effect. That's your position, right?

[Melissa]

My position is that the Sinai covenant, because my God does not lie, my God does not change, the Sinai covenant in the renewed form is eternal, and it is made with any Israelite and any Gentile. That is Exodus 12:49, Numbers 15:15–16, Leviticus 17, Leviticus 19, Leviticus 24, Isaiah 56, Ezekiel 47, 1 Corinthians 7:19. It says over and over and over, whether they are native-born or Gentile, there is the same way to eternal salvation, and that is through the Messiah, and the same set of laws and rules applies to kingdom people. We are promised land people who have one set of laws.

[Prof Solberg]

Well, there wasn't one set of laws in the old covenant, under the Sinai covenant. Sojourners were under a different set of rules, and not entirely different, but they weren't allowed full citizenship. For example, Israelites could charge interest of foreigners. Foreigners could eat animals that were found dead, but Israelites couldn't. So there were slight differences in what was expected.

[Melissa]

Thank you for pointing that out, but here's the difference. If you chose to cling to the God of Israel, there was no difference. There was.

Well, wait a minute. It was sojourners who chose to live and reside among the people of Israel without conversion. If you became like Caleb, well, that's just not true.

Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, was a Kennizite, and he had the same set of laws. He inherited and became the leader of the tribe of Judah, and adhered to all the Torah. Now, foreigners, there's a difference between a foreigner.

If I move to Spain, and I become a citizen of Spain, that is different than traveling to Spain. So there are foreigners and Gentiles, and I am an Israelite. I'm from the tribe of Levi.

So if you look at the Hebrew tradition, in that language, there are people who will travel through Israel, who will reside among them, but never convert to citizenship. So if you remain as a Gentile, which Ephesians says, you are no longer to live like the Gentiles if you become a believer. Ruth said, your people shall be my people.

[Prof Solberg]

It doesn't say you're no longer to live like the Gentiles.

[Melissa]

It does. Absolutely does.

[Prof Solberg]

Paul says, remain as you were called.

[Melissa]

But he says, don't live as the Gentiles, right there in Ephesians 2.

[Prof Solberg]

Well, okay, we're kind of getting off track. Because the covenant thing is super important, because I feel like that's where a lot of our York and my theology would flow from. So, okay, here's how I read it, what I believe the Bible is saying about the covenants.

God had a covenant with Israel at Mount Sinai. It was the covenant of curses and blessings, right? Deuteronomy 28 talks about, if you do these things, so it's a conditional covenant.

If you do these things, then you will be blessed. So that's an if-then conditional statement. About halfway through the chapter, about verse 15, he says, if you disobey my law, you will break my covenant and inherit curses.

So there's blessings and there's curses, right? And so, and many times God says, do not disobey my laws. Keep my laws so that, he says, I think it's Leviticus 20, so that the land does not vomit you out, right?

So what happens is, Israel, the kingdom of Israel, certainly starting, I think, more egregiously at the end of Solomon's career and right after he died, then we have this civil war, the kingdoms were shattered. The Israelites had completely turned their back on the covenant, right? So they're worshiping other gods, they're sacrificing their children, they're breaking every, basically every commandment.

God, in his infinite mercy, gives them second and third and fourth and 50th chances, right? So when we get to Jeremiah 31 and 32, or actually up through 34, God says, look, I have been a husband to you, he says. That's the language he uses.

And of course, we know from how prophets speak, he's saying, I've been the faithful husband. Israel has been the unfaithful bride, right? They've cheated on me, we're all familiar with that.

So he says, they have, it literally says, you have broken my covenant. So Israel broke the covenant. And now God says, but in my amazing mercy, I mean, I added that part, but he says, but I'm going to promise you a new covenant for the house of Israel and the house of Judah, right?

And so this is God, metaphorically speaking, standing among the shattered ruins of the Sinai covenant. He gave them conditions, they didn't obey, the land vomited them out, right? When Jeremiah gives this prophecy, the northern kingdom of Israel had already been wiped out by Assyria.

And not too long after the prophecy, Judah will be overtaken by Babylon and taken into exile. So the land vomited them out because the covenant was broken. It was done, it was over.

Hebrews 8.13 says, when he called it a new covenant, it made the old one obsolete. So you've got this idea of a brand-new covenant. God is doing a new thing.

And the new covenant was going to be in the blood of Jesus, as you pointed out, Luke 22.20. So we have a broken covenant that's shattered, not by anything God did. It was because of what Israel did. And then God promises a new covenant.

He cuts that covenant through Jesus. So it's not a renewal of what was always there. And we can get into some of the details.

But many of the commands under the old covenant don't even make sense under a quote-unquote renewed covenant, right? The law has changed. The Scripture is not equivocal about that.

[Moderator]

I'm going to put this verse up here because you just quoted it, Rob. Every translation I've read, and I'm no Greek scholar, but every translation actually says he has made the first obsolete. Now, what is becoming obsolete and growing old? Do you know of any verse that ever completes this? In other words, it's growing old. It's ready to vanish away.

Again, I see no translation at all that says it's old, it has vanished. And I would throw that question out to you and then maybe let Melissa respond.

[Prof Solberg]

Sure. That's a great question. There's some weird stuff going on with the Greek verb tense there.

But the first thing I would point out is it is in the past tense, has made the first obsolete. Right? And so there's a couple of ways that scholars will kind of parse the Greek here because it can be interpreted a couple of different ways.

One would be, now, what is becoming obsolete? So the idea would be that the verb of having made first obsolete happened when God called a covenant new. So 600 years before Jesus, through the prophet Jeremiah, when God said, I'm going to give you a new covenant, he actually, at that time, basically sealed the deal and said, now the old one's obsolete.

God has said there's a new one coming. And so from the perspective of when God uttered those words, we could say what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away. And then the idea there would be that when the book of

Hebrews was written, which would have been before the destruction of the temple, he was sort of prophesying the final period at the end of the sentence.

But I think you're on the opening clause of that verse.

[Melissa]

So here's where you're incorrect. First of all, Hebrews is a letter. It is not verses and numbers. And Hebrews is written to Jewish believers who were finally trying to understand how Messiah Yeshua could, in fact, function as high priest because he's not from the tribe of Levi. So if you back up to chapter seven, the whole premise of this is what is being changed. Network change there is transferred, and it's making known to Jewish believers who understood that Yeshua the Messiah was from the tribe of Judah, according to the earthly Levitical law, which is a picture of what is happening in the heavens.

They go on to explain in this letter that cannot be parsed apart out of context. In the heavens, Messiah Yeshua reigns as high priest in the order of Melchizedek, which means king of righteousness. So he is saying this writer, which they don't believe it's Paul. They aren't really sure who this writer was. While the temple processes are still happening. He says, look, this is true that Messiah himself is not from the lineage of Levi.

But in the fact that this earthly premise, this earthly priesthood is a mirror, a picture of what's happening in the heavens. The one of Messiah is higher. And in fact, he this transference of a high priesthood is in fact transferred from Levi to him in the heavens.

It goes on to say in 8:13, the only thing the antecedent is referring to there is the transfer that I'm sorry, the transferring from him from the Levi to Melchizedek. That's what's obsolete is that this one being from the house of Aaron is not is not what suppresses the Messiah from being high priest. So if you read that in context, but I want to point out one thing going back to what we we kind of got off track.

Go to Hosea 9 3. Now, this is the prophecy because the northern tribe of Israel was, in fact, scattered by Assyria in approximately 730 BC. And in the book of Hosea, God says, I will cast you off, but I will bring you back.

You will be *lo ammi*, “not my people,” but you will also be my people. Now, we just clarified that Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36 says he will give us the new spirit to write the same Torah. Those words, commandments, statutes, Torah are all the same ones used for the original commandments.

It's an infilling and understanding to a deeper level like Yeshua made it harder. But in Hosea 9 3, we are told that this is what will happen to the northern tribes of Israel. It says they shall not dwell in Yahweh's land, but Ephraim shall return to Egypt and shall eat unclean things in Assyria.

Now, in that Assyria there, that's a prophetic picture of where they got scattered because with the second exodus and in Jeremiah 16 and 23, we're told that we are brought back from Assyria in the days before Messiah returns when he brings the stick of Joseph and Israel together. Now, we also know in Deuteronomy that the curses that were going to be put upon us for disobedience were not that we were going to be freed from the law, but that we would be so blind that we would break the law. So here's what we have to establish.

Was it a blessing now to be free to break the law and bring curses upon ourselves like Balaam would have us think? Or are we under Hosea 9 3 where we have in effect been scattered, which we know we have and we then now are forced to sin against God because of a blindness because he is making a difference between his rules, which are good, he says in Ezekiel, and the bad rules of the fallen world. So here we have a thing to think about.

Did God change his mind? Did God change the laws? Is there a difference in Christ's law versus a difference in the laws that he spoke to Moses on the mountain that God gave him?

So that's what I think our question is now.

[Prof Solberg]

Okay, well, yeah, I think we have a prophetic hint at the end of Jeremiah 31 passage that yes, there will be an actual change to the law.

[Melissa]

Okay, so show me where you think that.

[Prof Solberg]

So Jeremiah 31 34 says, I will forgive their sins, forgive their iniquity and remember their sins no more. Right. So under the Sinai covenant under the old covenant law, which by the way, I believe was given by God and was beautiful and wonderful.

Under that law, the sins were never forgotten. They were continually remembered year after year on Yom Kippur. So there was a continual reminder of sins going on, as Hebrews 10 tells us, that the blood of bulls and goats could never take away sins, but it just functioned as a reminder of sins.

So here we have the old system in which sin sacrifices were continual and ongoing, right? God covered the sin, right? From some of the Hebrew word kaphar, he covered it, but it wasn't actually taken care of.

So number one, we know that if there was a call for repetitive sacrifices to atone for sin, the law itself was not God's final word on sin. It couldn't be because is God just going to leave that going forever? Right.

And so in Jeremiah 34, for those who were paying attention to Jeremiah as he, as he hollered out in the gates of Jerusalem, and he says, I will, I will forgive your iniquities and remember your sins no more. Those who knew the Torah, if they remembered it at that point would have said, well, hold on a second. That, well, how is that going to work?

How is he going to remember our sins no more? Right. And so now we get to the new covenant and it starts making sense because Jesus is how he forgives our iniquities and why he remembers them no more.

Jesus is once for all sacrifice.

[Melissa]

Right. So here's the thing. Nobody in the quote old covenant thought that those sacrifices made atonement for their sin. In fact, Solomon, no, he didn't.

[Prof Solberg]

Did they not read Leviticus 17?

[Melissa]

Listen to Solomon's words. He says when this temple is destroyed and we are sinning and we have been scattered to the nations, please, when we turn to this temple, which no longer stands, please forgive us. So now how, if a Hebrew thought there was only forgiveness to sacrifices, how would they be able to cry that prayer?

They wouldn't. And here's the thing. Nehemia, Daniel, Daniel didn't have a temple to cry to. He turned three times and prayed to the Lord. Why? Because they understood that these are prophetic pictures.

Do you celebrate Christmas every year? Please don't think I'm advocating Christmas. Do you celebrate Christmas every year? Probably yes. Why? Because not that you didn't do it good enough the year before, because it reminds you of what you think is the birth of Christ.

Now, when the Hebrews did the sacrifices, they never thought they were atoning for themselves. Whether they weren't reading their own Scriptures, they were doing what they were prophesied of Messiah. Just like all the festivals when they were even says it says Moses was persecuted for his faith in Christ.

How could he be persecuted for his faith in Christ? How could anybody in the Old Testament law ever think that they were saved by how could they think they were saved by the sacrifices? They weren't.

They understood that these sacrifices were a picture of what was coming. See, when Messiah came the first time in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, everybody was looking for a Messiah. Why?

Because they understood Messiah, Mashiach, the anointed one, and they understood that his name was going to be Yeshua, the salvation of Yah. And here's what we understood is that that salvation of Yah was Yah providing him salvation in Isaiah. It says all who call on the name of Yah shall be saved.

So they already understood there was a savior coming. And when Messiah came, they were all looking for him, not because they were blindsided by a surprise savior. They knew they weren't forgiven by those animals.

They knew it was a picture of what was coming. They knew the Redeemer was coming. The gospel message had been preached from the beginning in Genesis

chapter three when the Messiah was promised to take whom and stomp on Satan's head.

And in the book of Numbers, when they looked at the stake, they looked at that stake understanding who they were looking for. That's why Moses was persecuted for his faith in Christ, it says.

[Prof Solberg]

Okay. So if they knew that these things were a picture, Leviticus 16, 34 says atonement be made for the people of Israel once in the year because of all their sins. So we were atoning through animal sacrifice for sin.

If they understood, as you mentioned, that this was a picture of what the Messiah was ultimately going to bring. Then, then you're, are you telling me that they understood that these, uh, annual atonement sacrifices were not forever?

[Melissa]

So Ezekiel 45 actually shows us when Messiah returns, what happens?

[Prof. Solberg]

It's not sin atonement sacrifices that he talks about.

[Melissa]

Zechariah 14 says all the time, Zechariah 14 says those who don't celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles will not return. We see that Paul did an atonement sacrifice when he was doing an atonement Acts 21, he doesn't make us, he doesn't make a sacrifice. That's what Ezekiel 45, Ezekiel 45.

[Prof. Solberg]

So the word in Acts 21, Paul says, I'm, he goes to the temple and gives notice of when an offering will be made, but he's, he's captured, he's arrested before that could, before it could have been made, but that doesn't even matter because Paul also says, I'm sorry, go ahead.

[Melissa]

He says, let go and pay their vow, their offerings, for their vow. Right. Which were the Nazarite vows, which had four sacrifices per, per vow.

So he had to go and pay the sacrifices, one being a sin offering. And if we go to Ezekiel 45, that's not what's going on there, Melissa.

[Prof. Solberg]

It doesn't say he paid the sacrifice.

[Melissa]

It does.

[Prof. Solberg]

The vow, and according to Numbers 6, if I'm not mistaken, the offerings made at the end of the vow, when you shave your head. It's not right.

[Melissa]

That's what he says, shave their heads and pay their expenses. It literally says pay their expenses. What are the expenses? Those are the ones from the book of numbers talking about the Nazirite vow. Please go to Ezekiel 45, a third, a future prophecy of the messianic kingdom. When Messiah returns during the millennial kingdom, nobody denies this, as far as that I know.

[Prof. Solberg]

So, well, I deny that there'll be a millennial kingdom. I think we're in it right now.

[Melissa]

This is your idea of paradise?

[Prof. Solberg]

No, no, no. This is the messianic age. I think when God comes back, when Jesus comes back, he's going to judge the world and we'll be in the new heavens and the new earth.

[Melissa]

Okay. So, okay. And that's a difference in opinion, because I believe so clear to clarify here. I believe a day is like a thousand years. I believe as we are just entering the seventh period of a thousand years, Messiah will return after the tribulation and set up the millennial kingdom for 1000 years, according to Ezekiel 39 through 48, I agree that as, as, uh, not literal, I read it as symbolic because very clearly these sacrifices and the dimensions of this temple have never been, never been in the land. And it

says, we will dwell in the land from all the way from the river, from the red, um, you know, the river to the great, um, what is it?

Mediterranean to the Euphrates. Okay. Go ahead.

[Moderator]

Let me moderate a little bit, cause that could be another discussion for another day that I would love to have with you, Rob. I think we could have fun on that issue.

[Prof. Solberg]

Eschatology. Yeah. That gets messy.

[Moderator]

Yeah, no, no, no, no. It would be a fun talk.

[Prof. Solberg]

And by the way, I'm not, I'm not super dogmatic about it, but that's just where I land, you know, you would be what I call a, uh, we're in the kingdom now.

[Moderator]

Uh, type person where, you know, it's called amillennialism. That's well-schooled in eschatology. I've been reading it, studying it since I was seven years old. I'm a fully recovered, former dispensational Calvinist.

[Prof. Solberg]

Okay.

[Moderator]

Let's get back on this topic. I would like to get back, cause I do think it's important.

If you could explain the gospel of the kingdom, what Yeshua was preaching, and teaching, cause I believe that relates to this understanding about if we're in the kingdom now. In other words, you're preaching, you know, what was the gospel of the kingdom he was preaching and therefore what commandments are applicable to us today in this kingdom? Because that's what we're really talking about is what commandments, laws, statutes, should followers, believers in Yeshua be keeping.

[Prof. Solberg]

Okay. So what your question was, what do I see as the kingdom of the gospel of the kingdom? I think that's his question.

So, all right, let's start there. Gospel, you know, the good news. That's what that word means. The gospel of the kingdom, I believe is what we might call the "already, but not yet" kingdom of God that's already broken into the world through Jesus. Right. We, we pray, you know, "Thy kingdom come that will be done." In some ways Jesus says the kingdom is "at hand." The kingdom is "among you." He says things like that, but he also makes statements about the kingdom being future facing.

So, the gospel of the kingdom, in my opinion, is—or the good news, the good news of the kingdom—is that God is breaking through into our world that Christ has come to. I think the gospel in any form can be summarized in four words: Christ in our place. That's the gospel, right? And so when we look at the kingdom aspect of it, it's the things that—it's the will of God that's being ushered in to the world through the birth and death and resurrection of Christ.

[Melissa]

Okay. So can I add to that? Here's what I see as the gospel. The word in Hebrew, of course, is basar, which you all know that it means good news. Now the gospel message began all the way in Genesis, but I'm wanting to go through some Scriptures where it specifically uses the word gospel. Let's go to Nahum chapter one, verse 15.

Behold on the mountains, the feet of him who brings good tidings, good news. Listen, listen to this, who proclaims peace. Oh, Judah, keep your appointed feasts, perform your vows for the wicked one, shall no more pass through you. He is utterly caught up. Part of this whole good news is the restoration of Israel. This one in protect for, um, in pertaining to is pertaining to Judah.

Sorry. Now, if we go to Isaiah 41, verse 20,

[Prof. Solberg]

Quick, question: When you say restoration of Israel, in what capacity are you speaking about Israel? Is it national? Ethnic? That sort of thing?

[Melissa]

So Israel by definition is anyone who wrestles with God and overcomes. That's how Jacob got his new name. We understand that Israel is the 12 tribes combined, but it

also is divided into the 10 Northern tribes of Ephraim, the Southern kingdom of Judah and any Gentiles who cling to God and make God their God, right?

If they want to make Yahweh their God. So Israel is not just blood. I can go straight to Sheol, even being a blood Jew, if I reject Messiah's work for me, if I obey all the law and I don't believe in Messiah, if I think I was good enough and justified by my works, I can go right straight to hell, so to speak.

Um, Christians, if they reject Messiah's work and they're lukewarm, greasy grace people, and they don't really commit to him, like the demons believe in tremble. They could go straight to Sheol. So a true Israelite is one who has the testimony of Yeshua and keeps the commandments of God. That's Revelation 12:14. So when we're looking at Israel, Israel is not just a people set. It is not simply the nation of Israel.

It is people who, no matter what bloodline they are, have chosen to cling to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and make covenant with him. Isaiah 56 says it pretty well to the Gentiles who want to serve me, let him keep my Sabbaths and my covenant. Okay.

So right here where it says, keep your feast. The word feast in Hebrew is moed, appointed time appointments. See, Messiah had an appointment to die at Passover rise on feast of first roots, right? Why would we still keep Passover? Was it not good enough that he did it the first time? No, it's a prophecy.

And the remembrance now of what he did at Passover, our blessed savior died for us and rose from the dead. The reason we remember this and we'll remember it in the millennial kingdom with Yeshua is because it's not that it wasn't good enough. It's not that we're constantly slaying the blood of Christ for something he didn't do.

It's a picture of what he did do. And if you understand sacrifices, most of them were animals butchered, and we had dinner with daddy. Now, continuing in the vein of the, of the gospel, let's go to Isaiah 41 verse seven or 27. So over here in Isaiah 41 verse 27, what we see is that, sorry, the first time I said to Zion, look, there they are. And I will give to Jerusalem one who brings good tidings. So notice when Messiah returns, he comes back to Jerusalem.

He doesn't go to Utah. He doesn't go to California. It's always has been about the place he put his name.

And of course, in the aerial views around Jerusalem, we see Yod-Heh-Vav-Heh. We know, well, you don't believe this, but those of us who do believe Messiah returns soon for the millennial kingdom. It says when he returns, he's put it, Zechariah 14 says he returns to the Mount of Olives, puts his feet on the mountains after the tribulation of those days, and then he begins raining.

And it says all have to go to Jerusalem every year for the Feast of Tabernacles, or they are judged with the plague of no rain. And so when I'm looking at the gospel, what I see in Isaiah 40, in Isaiah 52, in Isaiah 60, is that this covenant, this covenant with Israel, which we saw in Jeremiah 31, Hebrews 8 and Hebrews 10, this covenant with God is his relentless, endless pursuit of Israel. He said, look, you messed up.

Isaiah, or I'm sorry, Jeremiah 33 says you're going to mess up, but you can't break my covenant with Israel. Jeremiah 31 at the end says the same thing. I know they're going to mess up.

They're going to be horrible, but they're going to be saved by grace. And so by that grace, they're going to be saved when they put their faith in me. And then I'm going to continually make every effort to help them overcome their sins.

I'm going to help them become my kingdom people, and I'm going to keep my covenant with them and bless them. And they will be my people again, just like he promised in the book of Hosea. So that's what I see the good news as.

You messed up, you sinned. I send my Savior to save you and to continually help you overcome your flesh nature, and you can come back and be my people. That's what I see.

[Prof. Solberg]

So, okay. So the restoration of Israel for you is, how do you see that as being restored if there's new people being added?

[Melissa]

So that's a great question. Yeah, I do. I do actually. And Rob, that's a great question because what I see, so at the Feast of Pentecost, which is called Shavuot in Hebrew,

in Acts chapters one and two, three, right? So we have them at an appointed festival. They were still keeping the law.

They were there at the Feast of Shavuot. The Holy Spirit poured out on them and what was proclaimed in everyone's language. Those of you barking like dogs when you're speaking in tongues, knock it off.

It's a language. It was a language teaching the gospel, the good news that the Messiah is here. The Messiah was never prophesied to come and do away with the law.

In fact, Amos says, God will do nothing without revealing it to his prophets first. And in Isaiah 42 verse four, it says that when the Messiah comes, he will teach the law even to the coastlands. So Gentiles could come back.

Part of that is shown in Peter. In first Peter, we see to the pilgrims of the diaspora. That's who his letter is addressed to.

And in James's letter, we see to the 12 tribes scattered abroad. So when I'm talking about the restoration of Israel, I am saying there was a prophetic prophesied time and those people at the time of Messiah were the wheat harvest, the beginning of the wheat harvest, which is what Shavuot is. Those people were the beginning of the return of Israel.

And then in Ezekiel chapter four, Israel was prophesied to be scattered for 2,730 years, you take the 390 times seven and you get 2,730. Well, around the year 2000, there's a huge movement of Ephraimites began waking up and hearing we were Ephraim. I was one of those who just started being told by God, keep my Sabbath, you're Israel, you're scattered.

And I didn't even know my family was Jewish. My grandmother did, but I didn't. And so what we see now is we are the fullness of the wheat harvest.

We are so holt feast of tabernacles right before Messiah returns, where God is bringing all of his children back from the Gentile nations who became the fish. Genesis 48, 19, well, 48, 16 says they would multiply like the fish. And then it says in Jeremiah 16, I'm going to get sent for fishers of men.

And then Jesus says I'm sending for fishers of men. And then we see, you know what I mean? So this is where my thing is.

This restoration is bringing back the lost house of the sheep of Israel, which matches Yeshua's words. Hey, I came only for that lost sheep of the house of Israel.

[Prof. Solberg]

But that includes any Gentiles who would come to be actually he actually made a statement about he said, "I have other sheep that aren't of this fold and I'm calling them as well." So Jesus has always had Gentiles in mind and certainly he Great Commission, of course. "Go and make disciples of all nations."

And in Acts 1 he says "You will be my disciples in Jerusalem or Judea and Samaria and the ends of the earth." So, yeah, there's no question. I totally agree with you that the intention all along, going back to Genesis 12:3 with Abraham. Right. I'm going to make you a blessing to all the families of the earth, not just Abraham's family. Everybody is blessed through Christ. Right. So I agree with that much.

I guess where I disagree is this idea that that what I'm hearing you say is that there's going to be some sort of that this restoration of Israel means that when a Gentile comes to faith in Yeshua, that he now is it sounds like you're saying he's grafted into the Sinai Covenant and now bound by the laws of the Sinai Covenant. Is that what you're saying?

[Melissa]

Yes. Isaiah 56 would clarify that as well. First Corinthians 7:19 also says those don't say that at all.

No, there's another general Gentile, but keeping the commandments of God is what matters. And so Isaiah 56 says, if a Gentile would like to keep my ways, what does it say? Keep my Sabbath and my covenant.

But I mean, Isaiah 56 does say that.

[Prof. Solberg]

Right. I'm unmuted. OK, sorry, I got I got muted.

Yes. So the the Sinai Covenant ended. The Bible is extremely clear about that.

We didn't even finish going through Hebrews 8. 13. When God called the first one, God called the covenant new, He made the old obsolete.

[Melissa]

He was only talking about the Levitical priesthood there. You can't.

[Prof. Solberg]

No, he wasn't. He was talking about the covenant. This comes in a section where you've got all the way back up to Hebrews 8:6 and 7.

And then starting at verse 8, it's the entire cited version or cited prophecy from Jeremiah 31:31-34 that we've been talking about. So he's talking about covenants in verse 6, covenants in verse 7, covenant in verses 8, 9 and 10 and 11 and 12. And now all of a sudden in verse 13, he says he's talking also about covenants. Right. He's saying when God called the covenant new, he has made the first covenant obsolete.

[Moderator]

And I want to I want to reframe this back to sort of like the now what? And I'm going to pose this question to you, Rob. OK, what commandments that are in the in from, I guess it'd be from Genesis to Malachi, what commandments are you teaching those that that you instruct that look to you for guidance or in your life?

What commandments specifically are you not keeping? And I will preface it with this, that you actually could keep if you chose to, because that's going to exclude obviously all the biblical sacrifices. That's going to exclude everything.

But we're talking about maybe keeping Shabbat, what you eat, what commandments are you teaching others that they do not have to do now that they are in covenant?

[Prof. Solberg]

OK, so my point of view on the covenants and the commandments, first of all, and I think Melissa and I agree with this completely. I teach and confess and believe that obedience to God is of utmost importance. Right.

I think that's crucial. Jesus said, if you love me, you obey my commandments. You know, and I think I quoted this before, but a pastor I heard once said obedience is God's love language.

And I think that's kind of trite, but it's also quite beautiful and biblical that and it's the same thing to me. I look at it as a loving father gives you commands. And so why would if you're going to be a rebellious kid, you're only going to hurt yourself.

Right. So I view disobedience and sin as more than just legalistic rule breaking. I view it as the breaking of a relationship.

Right. The betrayal, the rebellion, you know, of a believer when we don't want to do the things God commands us to do. So I think we're in agreement on obedience when it comes to exactly what do we obey. I think that's probably where we're going to find some differences. I take my view from Scripture. Right.

And so Colossians 2:16–17, let nobody judge you on what you eat or drink or on a religious celebration or a new moon or a Sabbath. Right. Paul says those are a shadow and Christ is the reality. Hebrews 10:1 says “The law has but a shadow of the good things to come.” Right. And so I see those things as what I would call “permitted but not required.”

I see the same thing with Paul in 1 Corinthians 9 when he says, when I'm with the people that keep the law, I'll keep the law. That's fine, even though I'm not under the law, Paul says. And when I'm with people that don't keep the law, I don't keep the law, even though I am under the law of Christ, Paul says.

Right. So and why does he do that? Verse 23, “I do it all for the sake of the gospel.” So Paul took a very clear “permitted but not required” stance. He said, ‘Oh, yeah, well, you want me to keep the law? That's great. Can I talk to you about Jesus? You don't keep the law? That's fine. I won't keep the law either when I'm around you. Can I tell you about Jesus?’

I mean, that's his whole focus. And we see the same thing. This explains Acts 21. Paul's sponsoring a vow going to the temple. Whether or not he actually makes a sacrifice kind of doesn't matter because Paul is showing that he's happy to keep the law if that's what if the people around him are keeping the law. He wants to share the gospel. So that's very much not a “you have to do it.” Acts 15:1–29 is the same thing.

Gentiles must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. Well, now we're just given these four restrictions. So they're not they're not told that they have to keep Sabbath. They're not told that they have to keep the feasts, the appointed times. They're not told that they have to keep the dietary restrictions. So when I look at what that all the teaching of the early church and the things that Jesus focused on, it becomes pretty clear that we don't need to keep some of those things.

And also, when you have ceremonial or ritual things like Hebrews 10:18, "There is no longer any offering for sin." And he says that because Christ was the once and for all sacrifice for our sin. So to continue sacrificing for sin would be at best a waste of time. And at worst, it would be trampling the Son of God underfoot.

So even if there was a temple, even if there was a priesthood, which there aren't, I would say Christians do not need to keep the sin sacrifice laws, the sin atonement commands. Christians don't need to keep some of the other ones.

[Moderator]

I just want to clarify. So regarding Sabbath, regarding eating what Scripture calls abominations in Leviticus and in Deuteronomy, those would be two. As far as his appointed times, you don't believe we should try to honor those?

And this would be the standard. I mean, you're not saying that that goat should be scared whenever we run around because Yeshua didn't teach against bestiality. In other words, you would apply what most people would call the "moral law" as being applicable and not what we should obey.

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, that's fair. I like that. I know they're manmade categories, but I think the civil and ceremonial and moral law distinction makes some sense. And it's biblical.

[Moderator]

And with Sabbath going back to Genesis 1–2, though, and with Noah knowing what an unclean and a clean animal was because he brought 7 clean animals and even in Revelation 12, we see unclean birds. How would you explain that this law has changed, especially in light of do you believe Yeshua was the lawgiver?

[Prof. Solberg]

Yes.

[Moderator]

OK. And so and he was the covenant maker.

[Prof. Solberg]

Yes. And yeah, he was there before Abraham.

[Moderator]

And I want to make sure, because some people view a father, God, making the law and the son and the gracious, loving son, God comes along. And he's very different than the mean father, God, that he was to the Jews. He gave them all those bad rules and everything.

And I guess, how do you address Malachi, where it says God does not change in Jesus, God in the flesh, God incarnate, the word made flesh, where he says he's the same yesterday, today and forever. And then when we see him returning in Isaiah 66, you're probably familiar with this passage that he's not happy with those eating swine's flesh. How do you address those?

[Prof. Solberg]

Well, you kind of covered a lot of territory there. Let me see if I if I can remember. You brought up Sabbath in Genesis 1–2. It's actually not. There is no command. You're thinking of Genesis 2:2–3. There is no command for anyone in those verses. What it tells us is that God rested on the seventh day and he blessed the seventh day and made it holy. So no, no commands.

Holy means set apart: *qadosh*. So God did that. He set apart the seventh day of creation. God didn't go back to work the next day and then rest on the next seventh day.

[Moderator]

We agree.

[Prof. Solberg]

And so here's kind of what I'm getting at with that. I don't believe the weekly Sabbath command was given at creation to anyone. And the reason I don't believe that is because it's not in the Bible anywhere.

I believe that the first time God commands anyone to rest on the seventh day of the week is in Exodus 16, when Israel's being fed manna and they're wandering around the wilderness just after they crossed through the Red Sea. The reason I believe that's the first time God ever commanded anyone to keep a Sabbath is because that's what Scripture tells us. So that's my position on the Sabbath.

I don't think that it's a universal it's been around forever law. And you talk about God not changing. I think that's really important because God never changes in his moral perfection, in his holiness, in his power, in his authority, none of those things.

But the things he commands of people do change. Not because God changes, he doesn't change at all, but he knows that his people need different commands at different times.

For example, you've got you've got right after the flood. God tells Noah every living thing. We're in Genesis 9:3. "Every living thing on the earth is going to be food for you. Everything. I give you everything," he said.

So Noah could have eaten an aardvark or whatever. You know, he could have eaten pig or shellfish or whatever. Now, later, God says in Leviticus 11 to Israel, to a different set of people at a different time in history, He says, "Look, these are the foods that I am restricting from you." And it's an interesting list, too, because it doesn't make logical sense. There's no there's no consistent, you know, hygiene or nutritional value. If you look at all the all the foods that God prohibited.

For example, camel meat: modern science would say it's quite healthy red meat. So but anyway, my point is this. When God gave a list of rules—and I just think this is so beautiful—when God gave a list of rules, he said (in Leviticus 11) "Here's all the animals that I want you to avoid because these are abominations and you defile yourself if you eat them."

The reason Israel obeyed that they didn't understand, but it was because God commanded it, because the Torah said so. And I love that. It's like, OK, we don't understand God, but we're going to obey.

I think that kind of obedience is so beautiful. So you have Noah allowed to eat anything on the earth. You have the Israelites under the Sinai Covenant with a restricted diet. And then that goes on and on until the Sinai Covenant is broken. And

now under the new covenant, we're not to let anyone judge us about what we eat or drink. Paul says the kingdom of God is not a matter of food and drink—this is in Romans 14—but it's a matter of the spirit. So God's dietary laws have changed, even though God hasn't. And that's how I would account for much of what you're talking about there.

[Melissa]

OK, I'll take a turn then to kind of be about all those things. OK. First of all, in Genesis, when the father establishes the difference between the seven clean and two unclean animals, the antecedent had already been established.

And when he said you can eat every living thing that did not include his children. And so what we understand since the father had just taken the time to say, take seven clean to unclean if he had eaten one of the two unclean animals and he didn't have to repeat himself, because we understand there's thousands and millions of words that God has spoken throughout time that weren't written down since the antecedent was established. It didn't have to be repeated.

He gives up the ark. The father has just said, OK, now these seven clean and two unclean animals are coming out. Here's what I'm going to say.

Now you can eat of these things. So in the Hebrew now, remember, Paul says all things are lawful for me. When a Hebrew person says all, it doesn't always mean definitively everything.

He couldn't have eaten his humans. Go ahead.

[Prof. Solberg]

Talk with the. Oh, am I on? OK, there you are. The clean and unclean for Noah. How are you understanding those concepts of clean and unclean?

[Melissa]

It's food and not food. So when we look at a cow....

[Prof. Solberg]

And where do you get that?

[Melissa]

Well, that's what it means in Hebrew. There's just like this is your food. This is food. Oh, here, this is what you eat. And this is not what you eat. This is the things that are defined for your food. Your diet is defined in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14.

[Prof. Solberg]

That was long after Noah, though. So you can't anachronistically apply...

[Melissa]

So to answer your question, the same word for clean there is used in both instances. When we look at the word clean, it's also my I clean my face and. OK, so let's go here to Genesis. (And I'm fine, Scott. You don't have to mute him for me.)

So if we go over to Genesis and we look at the word, where is this at?

[Prof. Solberg]

We understand the Hebrew words the same. But why are you importing the same Levitical definition of clean and unclean into Genesis 7 and 8?

[Melissa]

The clean animals in Leviticus 11 have nothing to do with like a clean your face either.

[Prof. Solberg]

Right.

[Melissa]

OK, so that's why I'm pointing that. So then if we if we go over here and we look at the fact that and that those animals with Noah, when Yahweh was speaking to him, he was told very specifically which ones to take. There's a reason.

It's because those were going to be the ones that they could eat as food and consume as food. We understand dogs have diets, cats have diets. We as humans have a specific diet that would understand that.

When we go to Acts 15, we see that the new Gentile converts are told you don't have to keep the law of Moses to be saved. If you look at Acts right at the beginning of Acts 15 and the beginning of the letter of Galatians, what these Judaizers were

teaching was that you must keep the law and be circumcised to be saved. We don't have to do that to be saved.

It goes on to give them four laws from Leviticus 17 and 18. Not at the real random laws. Those four laws are known as the heart of Torah in the Hebrew tradition.

And any Jew who doesn't even know the book of Acts and doesn't read the book of Acts will tell you those four laws are required for the assembly meeting. So you don't defile it. Now let's go to Colossians 2 just for me to read about what you were saying.

Colossians 2, your premise is that Paul is saying, hey, don't let anybody judge you. But this letter is a letter. It was Paul never intended this to be a new Bible or new Scripture. He was helping people understand how to walk out the commandments of God. And so in Colossians 2, he is writing a letter to former Gentiles who were now converting to the faith, the faith that Messiah taught. And what Messiah taught was repentance from dead works.

If you look in Matthew 4, he said, repent from your dead works. Repent from what? Repent means to turn from sins in his transgression of the Torah. OK, you're saying that the definition of the Torah changed. I understand your position. I'm not saying that at all. Well, you said you said some things are no longer sin.

[Prof. Solberg] (28:22 - 28:30)

So "torah" just means instructions. And I'm saying God doesn't instruct the same exact body of commands to everybody at all times.

[Melissa]

OK, OK. Thank you for clarifying your position. So now if we go to Colossians 2, it says to new Gentile believers who had unconverted Gentiles around them. Just listen to the wordage. "So let no one judge you in food or in drink or regarding a festival or a new moon or a or Sabbaths, which are.." There's a continuation here, "which are a shadow of things to come. But the substance of Christ."

Now, wait a minute. What new moons, feasts, Sabbaths and dietary restrictions are shadows of things to come and the substance of Christ, only those found in the Torah. That's not when you look at what it literally says. These are a shadow of things to come in prophecies of things to come. And they're all about Messiah.

You can't say that about Christmas. You can't say that about swine. You can't say it in reverse order.

He is telling these new Gentile believers, don't let anyone judge you when you're keeping these new moon feasts or Sabbaths, because why? They are a shadow, a prophecy of things to come. And in fact, in the law of God, in the law of Moses, Yeshua has never yet fulfilled or met the task of feast of Yom Teruah, Feast of Trumpets, Yom Kippur, Yom HaKippurim, which is judgment day after the tribulation, Yom Teruah is the day he returns.

The only holiday at a day or hour no one knows in advance is on the first day of the seventh month at a new moon sighting. And then we have the Feast of Sukkot when he sets up in tabernacles with us for a thousand years on earth. In fact, we see there's no shadow or turning in God. The definition of sin did not change at the cross. What God hates before, He hates afterwards.

So God is not going to be loosey-goosey with you and say, you can now eat shellfish, you can eat pork. When Isaiah 66 warns that when Messiah returns the second time, He will consume those eating swine's flesh. And one of the curses put upon the scattered Israelites is that they would go to the Gentile nations and eat unclean things, Hosea 9.3. And it says all through Scripture in the New Testament, in the end times, their bellies will be their gods. Why are their bellies their gods? Because they're eating things they're not even supposed to be eating. Okay, that's my position.

[Prof. Solberg]

That was my- Okay, yeah, you tie a lot of stuff together. But Colossians 2.16–17 is talking about the shadows, shadows of what was to come, right? So a shadow of something in the future from the point at which the shadows were given. When the shadows were given, they were shadows pointing to the future. And he says the future, the reality, the body of what this is all about is Christ. So the Sabbath was a shadow. The feasts were shadows. They are shadows. I'm not saying they're bad or anything, but they were never intended as God's final plan.

[Melissa]

Listen- They're not God's final word. They are a shadow of things to come, present tense from Paul, right?

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, well, we need to get into the Greek then if you want to read that. And so what are they a shadow of? Let's go about it this way.

[Melissa]

Perfect, the shadow of things to come. The seventh day Sabbath is a prophecy- They're a shadow of Christ. A prophecy of Messiah's reign on earth for a thousand years. That's the shadow of that. The shadow, oh, sorry, you're muted again. I can't hear you.

[Prof. Solberg]

I didn't realize I was muted. Sorry. Go ahead.

[Melissa]

So, okay, so the seventh day Sabbath, the shadow to come, the prophecy of the seventh day Sabbath is when Messiah returns and institutes a Sabbath rest under his reign on earth for a thousand years. The prophecy of Yom Teruah coming up is when Messiah returns. At a day or hour, we don't know. Zechariah 14 clarifies and confirms that. And we also have then the feast of Day of Atonement.

The great judgment day has never happened. And we know that's Yom HaKippurim in Hebrew, Yom Kippur shortened. It's the day of judgments, the day that we as God's children get to go free when he took our penalty.

And then we have the Feast of Tabernacles. All of these words in Hebrew are not called feasts like in food feasts. They are called the word Moed, Moedim, appointed times.

And Christ has never, he died at Passover, rose on Feast of Firstfruits. We got the Holy Spirit of the Feast of Shavuot, Pentecost. Now he has all those fall appointed times, the word appointments to meet. And that is in his second coming. That's what it's a shadow of, his second coming.

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, you keep saying "we know," but I disagree with about 50% of the "we knows" that you keep bringing up, But that's our difference, isn't that right? Here's the point about Colossians 2.16. They were given as shadows. Colossians 2.17 says Christ is what they point to. Christ is the reality. The shadows point to the reality. Has Christ

arrived? Yes, he has. So the reality is here. The things that they foreshadowed showed up in the first century in Messiah.

[Melissa]

Okay, can we answer this question? Why do you celebrate Christmas every year?

[Prof. Solberg]

To remember the incarnation of God breaking through into this world.

[Melissa]

Okay, so why would I celebrate Feast of Trumpets every year?

[Prof. Solberg]

For the same reason, to remember the things God has done.

[Melissa]

Exactly, they're shadows of my Christ, of my Messiah. So when I do the things that God commanded me to do because they're a shadow and a picture of him, why would I fight against doing something that tells me the picture of who Christ is?

[Prof. Solberg]

When would we ever- You shouldn't fight against it. It's okay to celebrate those things.

[Melissa]

But why would you do pagan things in preference of what God actually himself says is about Christ?

[Prof. Solberg]

Oh, I don't do pagan things. Pagans don't celebrate the birth of Christ.

[Melissa]

Why would you? Okay, do you keep the Seventh-day Sabbath, which is about Christ?

[Prof. Solberg]

No, I'm not required to. I was never expected to.

[Melissa]

No, you're not required to obey. You obey him if you love him.

[Prof. Solberg]

My obedience does not include a Seventh-day Sabbath for anyone under the new covenant.

[Melissa]

So Isaiah 56, explain that to the Gentiles.

[Prof. Solberg]

We're talking about the new covenant.

[Melissa]

That is the new covenant. Look at it. That's talking about second coming.

[Prof. Solberg]

That's talking forward- I thought we were trying to avoid eschatology because I believe all of that stuff is symbolic. The law, the Torah flowing out from Jerusalem absolutely is true 100%, but it's not the Torah that was given at Sinai. And we know that because, for example, as I've mentioned several things, the Sabbath is not required.

I just read the Scripture that clearly says, don't let anyone judge you about it. Notice it doesn't say, "don't keep it." It doesn't say that at all, but it also doesn't say "you have to keep it as a condition of obedience." Same thing with Hebrews 10:18. There is no longer any offering for sin. Old covenant required an offering for sin.

[Melissa]

New covenant does not- It points to the offering for sin. The old covenant pointed to what our Messiah would do.

[Prof. Solberg]

But so if you can- The old covenant had an offering for sin. It was the bulls and the goats in Leviticus.

[Melissa]

They never covered it. Hebrews says that. They never-

[Prof. Solberg]

Of course it did. It covered it, but it couldn't bring ultimate forgiveness. The whole point of atonement is covering of sin. It's so the high priest could enter into the holy place and not be contaminated by sin.

So he had to be covered by blood because God says in Leviticus 17:11, that "the life is in the blood. And so I've given you the blood on the altar to make atonement for your life." So this is what's going on there. This is the old covenant. And it was a wonderful, beautiful way that God invented or decided it should be done under that covenant. That was how sin was taken care of. That's what, read Leviticus 16.

[Melissa]

I read it all the time. I do, I teach it.

[Prof. Solberg]

It talks all about atonement. And I think there's 11 or 12 times in the Torah where it talks about sins for atonement bring forgiveness. So we can't say that there's no connection there. The Torah says there is. And so there were- Well, let me just finish this and then I'll be done. There were offerings for sin in the Torah.

It's not debatable. Leviticus 16 and other places. Under the new covenant in Hebrews 10, there is no longer any offering for sin. He actually quotes the Jeremiah 31 prophecy when he says that. "Where there is forgiveness of these, there is no longer any offering for sin." So yeah, that's a pretty big difference. Unless you're suggesting that sin atonement offerings are still required today.

[Melissa]

Those of my Christ. The sin atonement offerings were pictures of my Messiah, what he was coming to do.

[Prof. Solberg]

And that's why- No, wait, so you're saying- Are you saying they're not efficacious?

[Melissa]

I am saying that when Messiah... Okay, for example, when Messiah returns, Ezekiel 45, it says very clearly in verse 18, that after the tribulation, Messiah cleanses the temple on Abib first. Very specific date. I don't think this could at all be symbolic. On

Abib first, it says Messiah Yeshua cleanses the temple. Messiah Yeshua cleanses the temple and reinstitutes Passover.

People all over the world still do Passover. People in churches do Passover. That was a sacrifice. That was a sacrifice that Jesus Yeshua, it was a picture of Jesus Yeshua. Just like all of the sacrifices are pictures of what Jesus Yeshua would do for us.

[Prof. Solberg]

But are they **merely** pictures?

[Melissa]

Yes.

[Prof. Solberg]

They are?

[Melissa] (7:17 - 8:14)

I firmly believe that when Messiah Jesus returns, he comes to do the sacrifices. Ezekiel 45, he functions as both king and priest, it says in the book of Zechariah. I think it's Zechariah 6.

And it says he will have both offices in the Hebrew, it says. Because the reason he can be king and high priest is because of the Melchizedek order. And when he comes back and brings us to the land of Israel, it says in Ezekiel 47, we divide the land amongst the tribes of Israel again, with Yeshua as our king.

He leads us in the offerings. And it actually says that for seven months in Ezekiel 39, again, you can't be symbolic of this. For seven months, we clean the land of dead bodies.

The dead bodies after the tribulation, where the dead bodies, the blood reaches up to the horse's bridles. Now that is figurative language. But we understand that through the tribulation, almost two thirds or billions of people are going to die.

Now, I ask you, if you can pick any day of the week to honor as the Sabbath, why would you not choose the one that your Messiah honored?

[Prof. Solberg]

So going back to Leviticus 16, or let's go back to Passover, which you mentioned. I just wanna clarify that your position is that the Passover sacrifice wasn't actually efficacious. It didn't actually do anything, but it just was a picture of what was to come.

[Melissa]

I will say this, when they were in Egypt, the blood that they put on the doorpost in the lentil was a physical application because of their faith. Their faith that that death angel was coming, this is the picture of salvation, because they understood that they would in fact be killed, the first born would be killed, they took the blood of the lamb and put it on the doorpost and lentil, which is very exactly what we do. When we believe in Jesus Yeshua and we see that we will go to hell, what do we do?

We accept his Passover sacrifice. Now, if they were saved right then, but that blood was a physical act just like Abraham's circumcision and just like Timothy's circumcision. It was a seal of the covenant of their faith.

Faith must precede the work. And because they had faith in what God was going to do and do for them in his salvation, they acted in an act of obedience. That's my premise with that.

So I'll stop there.

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, I love that part about faith. I think that's beautiful. I think we miss that too often.

But I would say that the blood actually served an efficacious real purpose, that the people who had the blood on their lentil would be passed over by God. This was the way God set it up. And I would say the same thing about Leviticus 16, that the blood shed by the high priest for the atonement of the sins of Israel did something.

It wasn't just a picture. It really did something. I mean, it was a powerful picture.

You imagine going into the most holy place, right? With the beautiful Ark of the Covenant and all the gold and all that sacredness and just sprinkling blood all over, just to show how out of place our sin is in this universe. So it's a striking picture.

But it was also the only way that priests could approach the presence of God. So they would die if they didn't come in with blood. So it has a very efficacious purpose.

[Moderator]

I've got a question for Rob here. Because again, we're in agreement as far as the application of the blood. I'll establish that you guys were in agreement on that. In other words, it is the blood of Yeshua that cleanses us from all sin. It was the blood that Israel and the mixed multitude that at the time had gotten the memo and wanted to protect their firstborn.

[Prof. Solberg]

But I'm not sure Melissa holds that position. You said to me- What I just heard seemed different. I know. It seemed like you're saying that the blood didn't actually do anything. And in the old covenant, it was a picture, a wonderful, powerful picture, but it didn't actually do anything. And if I'm, so correct me if I'm wrong, because I may be way off base, but I'm hearing you saying that the blood of Christ on the cross also wasn't God's final word, because there's gonna be more sacrifices in the future.

[Moderator]

Well, let me ask- Did I get something wrong?

[Prof. Solberg]

Let me clarify that.

[Moderator]

Go ahead and clarify. But let me get this question out. You answered that question, and this is what I wanna clarify.

What I was getting to is the Passover lamb when Israel back at the Exodus, they were in Egypt, they applied the blood of the lamb, they went through what was the symbolic baptism. Yeshua, the rock, followed them, provided the living waters. Now, Hebrews teaches, speaking of Hebrews, teaches that due to their unbelief, there were only two.

There were only two that were faithful that actually got to enter in the promised land. And I think that's really what the crux is, what now? And again, I believe you guys are on the same page from listening to you, Rob, and talking to you pre-show, and reading some of your information as far as entry into the kingdom.

I think where Melissa's heart is, and again, I align with Melissa on this issue. It's about least greatest. It's about rewards and losses. And so that's the what now, are we? But after she answers that question, I want to get back to what is it? Because they had the initial faith.

All of Israel had the initial faith to apply that blood. But then Hebrews says they did not believe, that their actions were unbelief, and only Caleb, the Kenizzite Jew, and Joshua from the tribe of Ephraim actually were able to enter the land for any man that was over the age of 20. So Melissa, go ahead and answer that question, then we'll circle back to this, and sort of what I believe is the crux of the matter.

What now are their eternal rewards and losses? Will they be least and greatest in the kingdom?

[Melissa]

So in Hebrews 10 and Hebrews 13, we see that they offer continually, present tense, whatever. He says, look, these sacrifices, it says that they're images of what's coming. They were a shadow.

For the law, having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never, with these same sacrifices, which they offer continually year by year, make those who approach perfect. They understood that these sacrifices didn't make them perfect. And this was going on for 40 years after Jesus Yeshua died and rose from the dead.

So there was no, if God had, in fact, meant all sacrifices to end at the very time Messiah died and rose from the dead, he would have stopped it. They wouldn't have gone to Passover. Paul wouldn't have tried to get to the temple of Jerusalem for the feast.

If the law had immediately changed, and they weren't to do these things at the temple anymore, and these offerings, it would have been an immediate change, and there wasn't. What we understand, that when the veil tore, that's from Isaiah, where it says that death, the veil that stood over the whole earth is death. That's what was torn, because now we could rise from the dead to the blood of Christ.

But here I see in Hebrews 10, where very much they understood, through the continual offering of these sacrifices, they could never make one perfect. Hebrews 13, 15, therefore by him, let us continually offer the sacrifice of praise. So he's going on, here we can continually offer something, but he's saying, so it's the same words, is what I'm just trying to say.

They knew there was a continual offering, something that was perpetual. And in fact, God did not lie, when he said this covenant was forever, to Leolam, to all generations. Okay, so again, so what we have to ask you, is when you look at the fact that Hosea 9, 3, says that one of the curses put upon the scattered Israel, to go to the Gentile nations, become the fullness of the Gentiles.

When it says they would return to the Gentile nations, any unclean things, and then in Hosea, it says they will last many days, without what? Ephod and King. They won't have the Urim and the King.

Remember that? Remember it says in Hosea, they will not have these for many days. So there's a prophecy for many days, they will not have the priesthood and the kingship, but then that someday they would.

And that hasn't happened. Ezekiel 36 and Ezekiel 37, talk about the restoration of the house of Israel, the dry bones coming back to life. We know that the Jews went to Babylon for 70 years, and they did come back.

That we see that in Daniel, Nehemia, Ezra, whatnot. We understand that when Messiah returns, that's the prophesied period of Ezekiel 36 and 37, where the two sticks Judah and Ephraim, are joined in his hand. Now, I have to ask you then, when one of the curses, is that they would eat unclean things, and another curse, is that they wouldn't have a Levite priesthood, or kingship for many days.

How do you understand that? How do you explain that?

[Prof. Solberg]

Well, yeah, I keep thinking that we're trying to avoid eschatology, but you keep going back to the prophecies. So I would explain that as symbolic truth. I think every prophecy in Scripture is 100% true, but not every prophecy is 100% literal.

Even prophecies like you mentioned earlier, that have numbers like 7 months. Well, 7 is a symbolic number, right? So even numbers like a reign of 1,000 years, that number isn't necessarily to be taken literally, right?

Are we to say that God owns the cattle on a thousand hills, but not on the 1,001st hill? So we don't take numbers or many things literally, where oftentimes people can get into eschatology, and over literalize many things that then end up, which is what I see happening with your theology, conflicting with what the New Testament says.

[Melissa]

So you believe for literal then, so is it literal to you that those sacrifices provide a covering? Because to me, that's symbolic. So here we're switching sides. I've seen-

[Prof. Solberg]

No, we're not switching sides. You're jumping to a different category.

[Melissa]

No, you're saying that literally those blood provided the covering, when I see that that literal blood covering was a picture to our Messiah's covering of the sins, right? I see both pictures. Now, here's the thing. If you ignore the prophets, Yeshua quoted the prophets hundreds of times. All the New Testament- Let's listen to Yeshua...

[Prof. Solberg]

Do you believe that the Torah is God's final word to his people?

[Melissa]

Final, meaning the only word he ever spoke?

[Prof. Solberg]

That it's in force forever, and he has nothing to add to it. It's everything. It's his final word.

[Melissa]

I believe that the commandments and statutes, which he gave on Sinai, the ones that began in Exodus 20, so I'm just being very literal here, what I believe. Sure. So from Exodus 20, where we have what we say, the 10 words, *asarim davarim*, and then it says, and these are the statutes and commandments.

Those things are eternal, immutably unchangeable, and forever for any Gentile believer, Israelite believer, anyone forever, and we are in a period of time out, prophesied to happen in Deuteronomy and Hosea, because we sinned, we were scattered, and lost the right to some of those offerings and sacrifices, and some of the beautiful things of his Torah, we've lost the right to that, and it will be restored to us upon his return. That's where I believe.

So do I believe that the law is unchangeable? Absolutely, and that when that new covenant was made, when Ezekiel 36 talks about the commandments and statutes, it is the same ones at Mount Sinai. That's, yes, that's what I believe.

[Prof. Solberg]

So that's a contradiction of Scripture though.

[Melissa]

No, it's not.

[Prof. Solberg]

Of course it is. We just went over several verses, Hebrews 7:12: "When there is a change in the priesthood, there's necessarily a change in the law as well."

[Melissa]

What was that one thing? You were taking a verse that's applying to the law regarding the Melchizedek order of priesthood, and the Levitical priesthood.

[Prof. Solberg]

It's related to the Levitical priesthood.

[Melissa]

It is right, the Levitical priesthood and the Melchizedek. This is one thing, the change, the transfership means, so you can't say it's all every law. Would you think bestiality is okay now?

[Prof. Solberg]

No, I'm not saying it's every law. I'm saying in Hebrews 7, there is one single instance. Actually, there's a couple in Hebrews where he says the former things were set aside because of their weakness and uselessness. In Hebrews 7, he's talking about the former commands for Levitical priests. And in Hebrews 7:12, he says, because there

is now a new priesthood—Jesus is not from the tribe of Levi. He's from the tribe of Judah—Because of that change, there's necessarily a change in the law as well. Now you can argue if you think that word means “transfer”, but a transfer is a change.

[Melissa]

Okay, yes. Okay, so let me explain. I do believe that what he's explaining to Jewish believers in Messiah is that, because they were confused. How can Yeshua function as high priest, right? Because under the Levitical priesthood, they can't. This whole issue isn't about every law. It's about one set of laws regarding the Levitical priesthood.

[Prof. Solberg]

Okay, so good. At least we agree that one set of laws has changed.

[Melissa]

No, well, it's a higher one. What he's saying is that the ones in heaven, this on earth is a shadow of what is happening in heavens, correct? What is happening on earth, this Levitical priesthood is a copy and a shadow. Because he says that.

[Prof. Solberg]

He says that about the tabernacle. But anyway, yeah.

[Melissa]

Well, the tabernacle is a picture of the heavens. The tabernacle is a picture of the heavens.

[Prof. Solberg]

I agree. No, I agree. But he says an actual Sinai law about Levitical priesthood has changed.

[Melissa]

Transferred. It's transferred.

[Prof. Solberg]

A transfer is a change, Melissa.

[Melissa]

And when Yeshua returns in Ezekiel 45, and he then is functioning as high priest in the order of Melchizedek, then it makes sense to them.

[Prof. Solberg]

When Jesus returns, he's not gonna be making sin sacrifices.

[Melissa]

Read Ezekiel 45, starting in verse 18.

[Prof. Solberg]

Read Hebrews 10:18. "There is no longer any offering for sin." This is all based on the once and for all sacrifice of Christ. And so if you think Christ is gonna come back and offer sin sacrifices later, then let me ask you this. Why did he come in the first place and die?

[Melissa]

He had an appointed time to pay the price for our sin. Do you think for 4,000 years, those people were just screwed?

[Prof. Solberg]

No, I think God in his forbearance decided not to hold them accountable, ultimately accountable. He covered the sin in his mercy and said, look, this is the way we're going to atone for this right now because it's a picture of what Christ is going to do. And when Christ comes, it's done. It's finished. It's over. The one sacrifice once and for all. He says it at least four times in the book of Hebrews. "Once and for all" sacrifice.

[Melissa]

I think you're misunderstanding that. There was already a prophesy that the Messiah was going to come at the very first day of creation, correctly, all of time. From the beginning to the end, all of the story of the earth's history was prophesied. There was a prophetic time when the Messiah was going to come. God said, I know you're going to mess up. I already have a plan in place to provide a Messiah.

He never made it seem that we would never have forgiveness for sins. Solomon understood that he got forgiveness again for sins. He said, there's no one on earth who never sins. Oh Lord, please provide forgiveness. He understood that.

[Prof. Solberg]

And God did provide forgiveness for sure in the Old Testament.

[Melissa]

If we go over to Hebrews, what was that you're talking about? Hebrews 10:18?

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, Hebrews 10:18. So my question is, what did the sacrifice of Jesus accomplish? I agree with you that it was at an appointed time. But what did it accomplish if he's going to have future sin sacrifices to make?

[Melissa]

The same thing, the reason you celebrate Christmas is because- It's not the same thing. It is, it's a lesson.

[Prof. Solberg]

So you're saying though, his future sacrifices will be some sort of like memorial?

[Melissa]

Yes, 1000%.

[Prof. Solberg] (22:28 - 22:32)

Okay, well, he already told us how to remember his sacrifice. It's called the Last Supper.

[Melissa]

No, the last supper was the dinner before Passover.

[Prof. Solberg]

He said: This blood and this bread is how you remember me. "Do this in remembrance of me," Jesus already gave us a way to memorialize his sacrifice. And now there is no longer any offering for sin. So to assume that there's going to be more actual sin offerings in the future. Now, if they're memorial offerings, then they aren't sin offerings, right?

[Melissa]

I would agree on that. Let's have a remembrance of what he did because when God returns, when Yeshua returns, there is no more sin amongst his people. In that

respect, yes. When he comes down and reigns, sin will not be found amongst his people. It's a lesson and a teaching of what he did for us. Ezekiel 45, verse 18 is a prophetic picture that has never happened before.

And we do understand that time is close. And so it is a memorial, just like when people do Passover, Christmas, whatever side of the equation they're on, it doesn't mean his birth. Okay, and I don't believe in Christmas.

Please don't get me wrong. It does not mean that his birth was not adequate enough. It means we remember what he did.

[Prof. Solberg]

I understand what you're saying about memorial sacrifices. And I think that's a decent point. But my question is sin sacrifices. I'm not talking about memorial sacrifices.

First of all, we were already given a memorial at the last supper, do this in remembrance of me. And so we've already got our way to memorialize that.

And hopefully you're keeping that because that was one of the commands of Jesus. But more than that, Christmas is a commemoration of something that happened in the past, right? And Passover is the same thing. It's a commemoration of an event of God's mighty interference or intervention in history to do mighty things. These are our commemorations and remembrances. So if Jesus is making sin sacrifices—sacrifices intended to bring forgiveness for sin in the future—it means that his sacrifice on the cross was not enough.

And that, I'm sorry, that is a false gospel.

[Melissa]

The gospel that would teach lawlessness of the antichrist is a false gospel.

[Prof. Solberg]

Well, I don't teach lawlessness. I think you should obey every command of God that applies to you.

[Moderator]

Let me ask, I want to get back to that question because again, I'm going to read Matthew 5:18–19.

“For assuredly I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no mean pass from the law, the Torah, till all is fulfilled. Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven. But whoever does and teaches them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.”

And that goes back to we're in covenant now. You, Mr. Rob, you're teaching that the fourth commandment is not applicable to you and you are teaching others that they do not need to teach it. So my question is, do you believe that the fourth commandment is less than a jot or a tittle? Or how, this is the word of the word made flesh, the law giver who is saying, do you believe that metaphorically heaven and earth passed away upon resurrection or after the temple was destroyed? Or are we living on a renewed heavens and a renewed earth already?

So this is what, this bothered me when I was a Southern Baptist Christian. I would read this and I was being taught, this doesn't apply. And I was born and raised dispensationalist, you're not. So I was taught this is for the Jews, that this is not for believers in Messiah. So how do you teach this passage to your students and to those in your ministry?

[Prof. Solberg]

I teach it as Jesus endorsing the enduring authority of God's commands. And I teach that—I would hope you guys would agree that not every command that God has ever given applies to all people at all time. Would you guys agree with that?

I mean, some only applied to men or some only applied to women, the purity laws after childbirth, some only applied to the Levitical priests, right? So not every law applies to every person in the world at all times. Some only applied for certain times.

The law to collect manna only applied for the 40 years that manna was given, right? The law to build an ark was only for Noah. The laws for how Israel was to behave in exile only applied while they were in exile.

So what I'm getting at is that I'm sure you would also agree that we're each only expected to keep the commands of God that apply to us. He doesn't expect us to

keep commands that he gave to someone else. And the example I'll often use is the idea of if I just decided that (or I guess it would have to be in the first century when the temple was around), if some average Jew in the first century said, "I'm going to go into the most holy place because that's what I want to do," he would be killed.

It would be a sin for him to obey a command that was only given to the high priest is what I'm saying. And so if he were to do that, he would not be doing that in obedience. He would be obeying a command, yes, but not a command for him. So that's disobedience.

So it's not obedience to God to keep commands that he never gave to you. That's not how we exercise our obedience or show love to God. And so the New Testament directly expresses—I've given us a number of examples—many commands that show that the old covenant commands weren't, aren't all still in effect.

Many of them are, lots of them, the majority of them are, but the ritual commands and the civil commands, we're not going to execute someone for profaning the Sabbath, right? That's not applicable under the new covenant. In fact, the actual keeping of a seventh day Sabbath has now become optional.

This is what Romans 14:5 is all about: One person considers one day sacred, the other considers them all the same. So here's kind of what I'm getting at to answer your question.

Under the new covenant, Romans 7:6 says "We serve in the new way of the spirit and not in the old way of the written code". We still serve. We still have laws to obey. We still have commands to obey, right? All the things that Jesus taught in the Sermon on the Mount and all the things that Paul expounded on. So all of these commands still apply.

And those are the things that we're expected to obey. And I think what Jesus is saying here very clearly is that obedience matters. And he's even saying, you can all get into heaven, but if you change a little bit, if you teach the least of these commands are done.

Now, when Jesus preached this, it was before his resurrection. It was under the old covenant. So certainly, yes, his immediate audience was thinking, well, the commandments, I have to keep the commandments, right? So I can be the greatest

in heaven. In my mind, under the old covenant, I'm keeping the commandments God gave at Sinai. Under the new covenant, I'm keeping the commandments of what Paul calls the law of Christ.

So yes, obedience is 100% important for us to do. It's how we express our love, but what we actually obey is not identical under the new covenant as it was under the completed old covenant.

[Moderator]

When did heaven and earth pass away?

[Prof. Solberg]

Now, so here's the thing. I would take that.

[Moderator]

Heaven and earth, he calls them as witnesses. Do you believe he's not referring back to Deuteronomy 4 and 30? When he, the lawgiver, gives to Moses and heaven and earth are called as witnesses, do you think he's just pulling these two witnesses from nowhere, or perhaps he's quoting himself as the lawgiver?

[Prof. Solberg]

Well, you know, I think neither. I think you're looking at the wrong until clause. So he says in verse 5:18, "For truly I say until heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished." That's a really weird, hard verse to parse in the English, right? Why would he say until, until? What is that about? Which one is applying?

So the way I read that is he's saying "until heaven and earth pass away" which is a Hebrew idiom saying this is going to be in place. This is unshakable, right?

And here's what's unshakable: "Not an iota or a dot will pass from the law until all is accomplished." And I would argue to you—and I've got a video about this—that when he's talking about all being accomplished, he's talking about his resurrection.

Luke 24:44–48 talks about, here's the resurrected Jesus saying—in that passage, he says, I told you that. Matter of fact, let me look it up so I can read you what it says, because he's talking, he's referring directly back to what he says here. It says,

“Then he said to them”—so this is the resurrected Jesus coming to meet with the disciples. He says, “these are my words that I spoke to you, that I spoke to you while I was still with you, that everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled.”

That's the “all” that is fulfilled, “all” that is accomplished that he's talking about there. He's saying nothing's going to change until all is accomplished. And now it says, “Then he opens their mind to understand the Scriptures and said to them, thus it is written, et cetera, et cetera....” And verse 48, he says, “You are witnesses of these things.” They are witnesses of the fact that Jesus accomplished everything that he said he was going to accomplish.

So that's how I read Matthew 5:17–20. I read him saying, “Look, as sure as heaven and earth exist, I'm going to complete my mission and nothing's going to change in the law until I've accomplished, I've fulfilled what was given to me.” And even when he accomplished it, he didn't do away with the law.

He didn't abolish the law or destroy it or any of those things. He fulfilled the purpose it was given. So I don't think that lawlessness is okay, and I'm not an antinomian. I know you like to call me that, but that's not at all my position.

I believe we need to be obedient to the laws of God that apply to us. And I also believe that, just like animal sacrifices don't apply, neither do the feasts, neither does the Sabbath, neither does the new moons, or the food laws or any of those things.

I'm not saying they were abolished and they're done away with and they're gone. I think anyone can keep them that wants to keep them. But they're no longer a requirement of obedience. So if I were to eat kosher, that wouldn't be me obeying God, unless God told me and convicted me in my heart and said, “Rob, I really want you to keep my dietary laws.” Then that would be my matter of personal holiness to obey what God's telling me to do. But as a rule, no, those things aren't required of us. Therefore, when we don't do those things, we're not being disobedient. And I reject lawlessness completely.

[Melissa]

So part of the prophecy of Messiah was that he would return the scattered tribes of Israel in Isaiah 49. So you said that he has to fulfill all that was a prophesied of him to do. And in fact, when we look at the fact that the disciples, all they had to teach the

Messiah about, all they had to teach about Messiah from was the law and the prophets.

So what we now need to go and let's look at the gospel from simply the law and the prophets. And when the Bereans were to test that which was spoken of Yeshua, whether or not it's true or not, all they had was the law and the prophets. And we see that every Sabbath, even the Gentiles in the book of Acts, we see them coming to the synagogues on the Sabbath that said, well, you come next Sabbath to teach us these same words.

So we see like 84 references to the seventh day Sabbath in the book of Acts alone. And so here's what we say, not all has been accomplished because Isaiah 49 specifically says one of the prophecies of Messiah was that he will restore the Israelites. And in Acts chapter 2, the Israelite believers said to Messiah, the disciple says, is it at this time that you will restore the kingdom to Israel?

And he said, it is not for you to know that yet. And see, the prophecy was that in Hosea, we would again be God's people in the very place from which we were scattered. And the 10 northern tribes have never returned.

They were prophesied to be gone for 2,730 years, scattered approximately starting in 722 to 730 BC, add 2,730 to that, you get 2,000. And in the year 2000, the awakening of Israel happened.

[Prof. Solberg]

But here's the thing: When Jesus said until all is accomplished, you're trying to define what "all" means. You're jumping back to the prophecies and saying it has to be *this*, it has to be *that*. I'm telling you from the words of Jesus himself, what I think he meant, "all" is accomplished. I think he meant the same accomplishment that he achieved in Luke 24.

[Moderator]

Can I ask a question? Do you believe that death has been defeated because my dad died seven years ago? In other words, do you believe that that part of the prophecy in Hosea that Paul quotes, and I'm just, I'm not even going to talk prophecy right now, Rob, but in Paul's letters where he's talking about 1 Thessalonians 4 about the resurrection and that hope, it's not about a rapture, everybody, that blessed hope is of his coming, his returning.

And I believe you agree there is a second coming.

[Prof. Solberg]

Amen. Yeah.

[Moderator]

So would you not then agree that all of the prophecies, both in the Torah, both in the writings and in the prophets, and the writings of Paul, and the writings of Peter, and in Revelation, that all has, you would have to concede that all has not been fulfilled.

[Prof. Solberg]

Oh, absolutely. Yeah. I'm not suggesting in any form or shape that God's done with everything he's ever going to do or ever promised to do. That's not my position at all.

I'm trying to show you where I see Jesus' definition of the word all very clearly defined by Jesus himself. It's like when you say, man, the whole town came out to see Jesus. It doesn't literally mean that every last human being in the town was there, right? And so Jesus is—you probably know this better than I do—he's a master of hyperbole to make points. And so when we see him say “all” is accomplished, it's irresponsible for us to say, oh, that must mean every last thing God's ever going to do.

And here's one reason we know that's not the case. Maybe a couple examples. Hebrews 10:18, I keep going back to this because it's so black and white. “There is no longer any offering for sin.” That is much more than a jot or a tittle that has changed in the law. And Hebrews 7:12, “When the priesthood has changed, the law necessarily has changed.” And Colossians 2:16, “Therefore do not let anyone judge you by these things that used to be laws,” that used to be commands.

So we see in the New Testament all kinds of laws that have changed, way, way more than a jot or a tittle. So then we have to say to ourselves, that couldn't have been the sense in which Jesus meant that. In the same way when he says, “I have not come to bring peace but a sword,” we have to say, “Well, in what sense did he mean he didn't come to bring peace?” Because isn't he the prince of peace? Same thing here. When he says “all” is accomplished, we have to ask ourselves, in what sense is he talking about? We don't want to inject it with our own. We want to let the Bible interpret

the Bible. So we could speculate all day what he might have meant, but we can look at Scripture, Luke 24, and he talks about all that's accomplished.

This is the “all” as defined by Jesus himself. So that's how I would look at that, that the law has changed more than a jot or a tittle. Of course it has. You can't read the Bible and not see that. And here's the logical question behind it. If Jesus came and sacrificed himself and not one tiny thing ever changed in anything that God commanded, then what did Jesus accomplish? Why did he come if everything's exactly the same as it was before?

We know, for example, the law is now written on our hearts, not on tablets of stone. Under the Sinai law, it was written on tablets of stone. Under the new covenant, it's not. So there are changes that we have to acknowledge.

[Melissa]

But notice that was a prophecy. So we're in Scripture. First of all, we talk about the “all.” This goes back to where you said, Noah could eat all things. No, he didn't. The antecedent had already been established.

[Prof. Solberg]

Well, that language in 9.3 is pretty universal.

[Melissa]

Right, but it doesn't mean “anything.”

[Prof. Solberg] (9:13 - 9:15)

He says “every living thing that moves.”

[Melissa] (9:15 - 9:45)

Well, then he could eat his sons. Is it your position? He could have eaten his sons because they are living things that move. So, I mean, we have to look at that. There was a hyperbole being spoken there. Not “everything.” He wouldn't say take seven clean, two unclean, and then continue on to change his mind. But what we want to look at is this. Where the Bible says in Amos, he does nothing without revealing it to his servants, the prophets first.

Now, I see prophecies that when the new covenant came, it would be the exact same set of laws written on our hearts and minds. And Ezekiel 36.

[Prof. Solberg]

Where do you see that?

[Melissa]

We just read it in Jeremiah 31.

[Prof. Solberg]

He doesn't say it's the exact same. He says it's God's Torah.

[Melissa]

It's made with not Gentiles. There's no covenant for Gentiles in the Bible, just so you know. It was made with Israel and Judah.

[Prof. Solberg]

Right, Israel and Judah. Yep, I agree. But we know from Jeremiah 31-34 that it's not the exact same commandments in the Torah written on our hearts.

[Melissa]

There's nothing in 34 that says that.

[Prof. Solberg]

Sure. It says, I will remember their sins no more. That's a big change.

[Melissa]

There's nothing in the law that said he would remember our sins forever. There's no big change there.

[Prof. Solberg]

No, but what's in the law is a repeated continuous sacrifice for sins. It's constantly, we looked at Hebrews 10. It's a reminder of sins, right?

[Melissa]

You seem like you're speaking that God messed up when he gave us the Levitical law.

[Prof. Solberg]

No, not at all. I'm saying they were temporary.

[Melissa]

Well, okay, and they weren't. He said they're eternal. His words are: these are forever.

[Prof. Solberg]

No, they're not.

[Melissa]

Well, he says it. He says right there.

[Prof. Solberg]

It means for a long unforeseeable future. It doesn't necessarily mean "forever" the way you're thinking of forever. And the reason I say that is because so many things have clearly changed in the New Testament that couldn't have been what God meant, because God doesn't lie.

[Melissa]

Well, he didn't. We already talked about. So our position on Hebrews 8 and Hebrews 10 is different. We are talking about what I see is that it's the prophecy of Melchizedek that's in the book of Genesis. See, there was a prophecy in the book of Genesis that prophesied about a high priest coming in the order of Melchizedek. There's a prophecy saying that when the new covenant comes, the Holy Spirit will write the law on our hearts.

Ezekiel 36 says that that Holy Spirit will enable us and teach us to walk up the commandments and statutes of God. That's Ezekiel 36.

[Prof. Solberg]

All the commandments that apply to us.

[Melissa]

Yep, but it doesn't say that. It doesn't say that.

[Prof. Solberg]

We already kind of went through that. Why would we obey a command that doesn't apply to us?

[Melissa]

But there's no prophecy that says any of the laws when Messiah rose from the dead would be done away with. There's no prophecy from Genesis to Malachi. There's not a prophecy that says some of these commandments will now be ineffective and no longer needed. There's just not a prophecy that says that.

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, so arguing from silence there is pretty weak.

[Melissa]

Well, not really. You just said Amos says everything must be prophesied first. I'm not arguing from silence.

[Moderator]

What about Malachi 4, the closing chapter in the older Scriptures? I hate to call them old, but in the very last... Before the prophets were shut up for approximately 400 years, you have the final witness, if you will, the final prophet. What's your understanding of Malachi 4 and why you would teach against that?

[Prof. Solberg]

Let me look up Malachi 4. Any particular verse?

[Melissa]

It's a very short chapter.

[Prof. Solberg]

Okay, Malachi 4.

[Moderator]

I can read it if you want me to.

[Prof. Solberg]

I got it. Okay, let's see. The great day of the Lord. Okay, so this is where it's both sort of a warning to the wicked, as I read this, and a promise to those who are faithful to God. Those who are obeying His commandments. So He's talking about a day when evildoers will be judged, etc. The day of the Lord, which is generally considered an eschatological event. It's the day, the coming of the Lord. You don't agree?

[Melissa]

I totally agree. Totally agree.

[Prof. Solberg]

Oh, okay. Okay. And then He calls people to remember the law of Moses. And then He promises Elijah's coming, who Jesus said was John the Baptist, and then... Okay, yeah. And so He's reconciling fathers to the children to prepare the people and avoid a curse on the land. Yeah. Okay, so it kind of sets the stage for the New Testament, right?

[Moderator]

Let me read verse 1. That did not occur at the first coming of Yeshua.

[Prof. Solberg]

No, I agree.

[Moderator]

The new covenant was made, people were allowed to come back in the covenant, but it was not judgment day yet. Do you not agree that this is a judgment day prophecy?

[Prof. Solberg]

I do, yeah. I think this is to come, and it should scare the pants off all of us.

[Moderator]

So again, now we do see, again, we do see, but to you in fear of my name, the sun of righteousness, that's S-U-N, with healing in His wings, His tzitzit, and the woman with the issue of blood reached out and grabbed the fringes, the tassels, the tzitzit of Yeshua, and she was healed.

So we see Yeshua fulfilling this, but you would agree that when, like in Luke 4, and I believe this is on a Yom Kippurim in Luke 4, when He has fasted for 40 days, He's coming in, and He stops mid-sentence in the prophecy of Isaiah, and He says, today this prophecy has been fulfilled, and He cut it short. In other words, it was not the day of wrath.

So how do you, if all has been fulfilled, but we haven't faced that judgment and wrath yet, again, are you not the least bit concerned, and I'm not using that as a pun right now, that on Judgment Day, you may lose some rewards, and you may be least

in the kingdom? Because you are actually teaching people, not only jots or tittles or lesser than, you're teaching them that His Sabbath is not applicable to them. And the reason I'm prefacing this before we talk, and I put up the question, you said that you understood that the new covenant is only made to the house of Judah and the house of Israel, and that upon us entering into faith in Yeshua, we're actually grafted into Israel.

Ephesians 2, we're no longer excluded from the commonwealth or citizenship in Israel. We're no longer without hope. We're no longer without the covenants of promise. So again, that's really what this discussion was all about. It's not about initial entry. Now what?

Are you not the least bit concerned that by teaching against what Yeshua taught, not one jot, not one tittle, until all is fulfilled, not saying that you're not going to be in the kingdom, Rob? That's not what we're talking about. But are you not concerned that there will be rewards and losses, that there will be a hierarchy in the kingdom? I mean, or do you believe everybody that applies the blood, they're all going to be, it's going to be communist kingdom? Everybody's on the same status.

[Prof. Solberg]

Well, okay, there's a lot packed in there. So I guess first of all, I would remind you that my position is an "already but not yet" kingdom. So I in no way am I suggesting that everything's been fulfilled. So that's first.

Second, I would say when Jesus says all is accomplished, I don't think he's talking about every last thing. I think he's talking about specifically his crucifixion and his resurrection, as Luke 24 tells us.

Now, what am I personally concerned about, you know, greater or lesser? I do believe there's going to be some sort of hierarchy. I think Paul talks about that, too, the things that we've done in the flesh. And so there are hints in the New Testament that would make me open to the concept of sort of different levels, different rewards based on what we've done.

But that doesn't scare me nearly as much as James 3:1, which says that teachers are going to be held to a higher standard. That's the thing that keeps me coming back to Scripture over and over again, and sort of kicking at the load-bearing walls of my faith and saying, could this be right? Could I have it wrong?

It's what has me reading all kinds of commentaries from different perspectives as scholars from all different traditions, right? I want to understand as best I can. I know for sure I'm far from perfect, and I get stuff wrong. But what I want to be able to say when I get in front of God is to at least say, Lord, I tried my best, but obviously I wasn't going to get in here on my own anyway. It's only through you that I'm getting in.

So is my conscience concerned that I might be teaching people not to keep commandments that God wants us to keep? No. Because if I discover that, I will go on public record and change my mind. But everything I've looked at, everything I've looked into, I'm not teaching Rob's theology. I'm teaching what the Bible says, what I see the Bible as teaching, and what, to be frank, what mainstream Christian thinkers, theologians, teachers for 2,000 years from every different culture, every different tradition, all agree on these things. That the old covenant law, that the Sinai covenant is done with. It's obsolete, and so therefore we have to look afresh and say, okay, Jesus, what do you have for us? How do you want me to live my life? How do I show my love for you by obeying your commandments?

And all I see everywhere in the New Testament is love is the fulfilling of the law, right? Romans 13:8–10 talks about that. All these commandments, they all add up to love. Loving your neighbor and you will fulfill the law. So I think if we focus on the things Jesus called us to. He didn't call us to keep the feasts. He never commanded us to keep the feasts. If instead we look at, okay, I'm going to love God. I'm going to love my neighbor. I'm going to serve people. I'm going to try to remain humble, right? All these things.

I'm going to pray. I'm going to read my Scriptures. All the things that we would do, not as rituals, but as ways to lean into a relationship with him so that we can be guided by the Spirit. Because Paul says in Galatians 5:18, if you're led by the Spirit, you are not under the law.

[Moderator]

And I have a question for Melissa. Melissa, how does Scripture instruct us to love Yah, to love God, to love the Father, if you would answer that?

[Melissa]

Right. And it does say, if you love me, keep my commandments. That's where Rob and I differ.

He's saying there's different commandments. And I understand his position. We just differ.

And so he is saying that when God says, "Hey, if you love me, keep my commandments," When John 1, John 2 says, "If you love him, keep his commandments," he's saying there are different commandments.

I want to point out something here. So when we have the disciples, the new believers, Yeshua himself, teaching the new believers from Genesis through Malachi, that's all they had, the law and the prophets. They were very familiar with Deuteronomy 18.

They said, I will raise up a prophet like Moses, not different than Moses, not who doesn't do different. He doesn't have different laws, like Moses. Listen to him.

In Deuteronomy 13, there's a very clear word that says, if someone comes to you and the signs and wonders come true, but those things come against and take you to serve other gods, you shall not listen to them. You shall observe the commandments that God has given you. That's in Deuteronomy 13.

They also were familiar with the verse in Isaiah 8:20. If they do not speak according to the law and the testimony, there is no light in them. So if Messiah Yeshua contradicted what he had already spoken to the prophets, because he is the part of God who speaks the word to God, they would have been like, this guy's crazy.

Now we know that Ananias was a man devout according to the law, according to Acts 22. He gave Paul his sight. Why?

There's a difference between Judaism and Torah. So Ananias was a man devout according to the law. He was helping Paul to see that the man-made regulations and rules that Yeshua taught against in Matthew 15 and Mark 7 were wrong.

So there's a difference between man-made extra rules in Judaism, and then what the father instructed us through relationship and all of the commandments of God. How do I love God? Well, if I keep his commandments, I love him.

If I love my neighbor as myself, here's the other commandments. His worship system is how he wants to be loved. And that's what he tells us.

What we see in Malachi chapter 4, he says, remember the law of Moses, not forget it, not set it aside, not change it. And he says this, I'm going to send you Elijah the prophet. Now we all, many understand.

So I'm sorry, I don't want to just blanket this. Many people understand that the two witnesses will function in the spirit of Elijah and Moses. What do Elijah and Moses represent?

The same things that Judah and Ephraim represent. Judah, Moses, Ephraim, Christians, helmet, salvation, Elijah. So here's what we have.

We have Psalm 108 saying, Judah is my lawgiver, Ephraim is my helmet. See, Christians do understand that Messiah Yeshua is in fact the salvation of God. Jews understand that Yeshua is the law giving king of Judah.

And what we see is in Isaiah 8, 14, both houses stumble over the Messiah. And most Christians can only answer me how the Jews stumbled. And they are properly correct in saying that the Jews in fact stumbled because they did not, many of them, my family was always messianic, but they did not recognize that Messiah Yeshua, Jesus, when he was on earth was the Messiah.

And how do Christians, there's two houses. So how does the other house stumble? Because they have been taught a lawless narrative.

Now, not everybody does that. But what we have to remember that is there's also in Romans and in James, not the hearers of the law are justified, but the doers. So what we see is that there was the prophecy of Isaiah, I'm sorry, of Israel being scattered to the Gentiles, becoming the Gentiles, forgetting the laws of God, going back to pagan ways.

Here we have a call right before the judgment day of God. Yes, did it happen one time a little bit when Messiah returned or came the first time? Yes.

But there's a second coming, the judgment day of the Lord. And that's when this is saying, because it's going to be burn up the wicked, right? Burn like an oven.

And it says, again, I'm going to send Elijah, the prophet again. And we know it's Moses and Elijah, spirit and truth, the lamp with the oil. And it says, remember, remember the law of Moses, my servant, not forget, not change, not do it different.

So my position would be, look, if we have these words from the law and the prophets already telling us it's a false prophet, if it takes us against the commandments of God, there's no way they would have listened to anybody writing a New Testament letter saying to now disregard any of the commandments of God.

[Prof. Solberg]

Well, as I see it, Jesus didn't teach anyone to walk after other gods and to serve them as the Deuteronomy 13 passage warns, right? I'm not saying that. I'm not saying that Jesus taught against the law in any way.

I think he elevated it and he kept it perfectly himself because as Galatians 4 says, he was born under the law. He was a Jewish man under the law. The people that Micah wrote to when they said, keep the law of Moses were Jews under the old covenant in which the law of Moses was still active, right?

[Melissa]

He tells them, listen to the Pharisees and Sadducees for they sit in the seat of Moses, but don't do as they do because they were doing Judaism, the Talmudic teachings, which were later codified a couple hundred years later in the Talmud. So he says, don't do what they say, but listen to them. Now for, you know, if he was only going to say for three years, obey the odd thing, listen to what the Pharisees say, but don't do as they do.

He also says in Luke, if, Hey, if they have Moses and the prophets, if they won't listen to them, they won't, he won't, they won't hear me either. And so this is what we have to understand that when Messiah Yeshua says he can speak no word other than that, which he has heard the father speak. He means it.

He doesn't speak new rules. And Paul, if Paul taught in any sense against the commandments of God, Paul would be an apostate person who were not to follow. But what we see is when we go to Galatians and we see that there is in fact, a Hebrew idiom, when you're under the law, this is, this is actually expressed in the Torah.

If you read it like eye under eye, hand under hand, when you're under the law, you're under the penalty for breaking the law. That is in fact, what Jesus removed from us. We are no longer under the penalty for breaking it because if we ask for forgiveness, he forgives us as long as we repent.

And so Paul was speaking against Judaism. He says, you don't have to be circumcised or become a Jew to be saved. He's speaking against that.

And we see that in the feeding of the 5,000, if I can digress one second, if we go to Matthew, what is it? 14 and 15. We see Yeshua himself give a feeding of the 5,000.

He feeds them five loaves of bread, two fish. The five loaves represent the fullness of the Torah to the five books of Moses. So the two represent the two houses of Israel, Judah and Ephraim, the fullness of the Godhead.

And I'm sorry, the fullness of God's people. And then they bring up 12 baskets. He restores all of Israel like Isaiah 49 prophecies.

We go a chapter later and we see the feeding of the 4,000. And there we have seven loaves and a few fish. And Yeshua then tells his disciples, because they're like, he says, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

And they're like, oh my gosh, it's because we didn't bring bread. He says, no, no, no. Do you not remember the feeding of these people?

Do you not remember the feedings? And they said, oh, and then it goes on to say, then they understood that he was warning them to beware of the leaven of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Now, what doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees is constructed based on the number of seven, the Noahide laws.

So they teach that Gentile converts only have to obey the seven laws of Noah. And God says, Jesus Yeshua himself says, that is leaven. You teach all of my children, all of the Torah, and you'll bring back the fullness of all my people, Jew and Gentile.

If you only teach them the seven Noahide laws, the seven loaves or seven baskets, seven in, seven out. And Yeshua says that is leaven, sin, a doctrine of man, dogma of which we're supposed to be wary. Does that make sense?

I hope I made sense on that. My point.

[Prof. Solberg]

I think I'm getting your point. Yeah, although the Noahide laws were not actually codified or defined in that way until about the third or fourth century.

[Melissa]

So they weren't codified, but they were being taught. They were in fact being taught that the Gentiles only.

[Prof. Solberg]

Okay. Well, that's, that's debatable, but I guess what I would come back to then is the reason that those particular laws were given that I believe the new Testament says are no longer in effect, right? Things like the food laws, all the laws that you and I are talking about, the dietary laws were only given to the nation of Israel, not for the whole world.

The weekly Sabbath rest was given only to Israel, not to the nations, right? The keeping of the Moedim was only for Israel and not for the nations. They were given to set Israel apart so that when you're in the ancient Near East, you're going through the desert and you come across a group of people like, well, why did they rest on the Saturday? And they don't eat... 'Oh, those are Yahweh's people. Okay.'

This was the definition of who they were set apart from the nations around them. And so when the old covenant became obsolete and the new covenant took effect, all of that changed. There was no longer, there is no Jew or Gentile. So there was no longer a need for ethnic Jews to be set apart from the nations around them based on what they ate or what day they rested. The purpose of those laws was holy, right? And it was God given, but it was always intended to be temporary.

And now that we're under the new covenant, that's why those things aren't required anymore. This is not the way we show our love for God, unless again, you feel personally called, right? And I'm not saying no one should celebrate them. I'm saying that in your celebrating of them, you're not obeying God. You're not disobeying Him either.

But if we don't acknowledge the changes that happened under the new covenant, then what we're doing is pulling our focus away from Christ and His work on the cross, and we're trying to move people back to Moses.

Because you brought up Moses and Elijah, right? I guess I disagree with what you said they represent. I see Moses representing the law. He was the mediator of the law, and Elijah represents the prophets, the law and the prophets, right? And we see them on the Mount of Transfiguration with Jesus.

So, Moses finally makes it into the Promised Land. Moses and Elijah, the law and the prophets, are sitting with Christ, and God's voice booms down, and what does He say? "Listen to Moses, who I am well pleased, follow him"? No. He says, "Listen to my son." He doesn't say, listen to the law. He doesn't say, listen to the prophets. He says, listen to my son.

Now, this doesn't mean the law and prophets were useless or should be thrown away. It means the time the appointed time for those things has come to an end, and now we are in the new covenant, the messianic age, where we are to listen to Jesus. That's our authority. The Torah is no longer our authority in terms of legal obedience. Let me qualify that. Not the *whole* Torah. The law given to Israel at Sinai is not our authority anymore.

[Moderator]

Where I'm confused, Rob, and I want Melissa to respond first, and then you, Rob, because I thought from our pre-show conversation that you understood that all people are in covenant are now Israel. We were Ephesians 2, formerly of the nations, former pagans, formerly Gentiles. We were without hope.

We were without the covenants of promise because the covenants of promise are only given to the house of Judah and the house of Israel, and kudos to you, brother, because you're one of the few Christian brothers I've talked to, and I talked to a lot of educated theologians and pastors and deacons. You're one of the few people I've ever heard admit and concede that there is no covenant with the nations, with the pagans. So, what I'm trying to understand is if you understand that you are now, there's no longer Jew or Gentile.

We are now the Israel of God, Galatians 6, grafted into the singular olive tree, those wild olive trees that were out of covenant, grafted in with the natural branches,

those of Judah that were never out of covenant in the single tree fed by the root. We all agree it's Yeshua, and I believe you understand that that olive tree from Jeremiah 11 represents Israel, both houses, because that's what Jeremiah 11, 16, and 17 says, and even talks about branches being broken off and burned up. So, where I'm having problem, and maybe you can help Melissa's audience or your audience understand, if you understand that you're Israel, why are you teaching against the commandments that Israel was commanded to keep?

[Prof. Solberg]

Is Melissa going first, I think you said?

[Melissa]

Or did you want me to answer first? You can answer him.

[Prof. Solberg]

Okay, okay. So, this is what we talked about, I can't remember if it was when we were on air or off air, but I have, rather than a replacement theology view, I coined the term in our pre-show, I have an "expansion theology," right, which says that Israel is not gone and pointless, never to be heard from again.

We have Romans 11, has God turned away His people? No way! And even later in Romans 11, Paul says that Israel will be saved in some mysterious way. When the fullness of the Gentiles come in, Israel will be saved. So, there's no way we could say that the church has replaced Israel, so there's no longer an Israel.

What we do say is that (or this is the way I view it), that the people of God—which the term we're talking about when we say Israel (Melissa mentioned it earlier), "those who wrestle with God," that term—doesn't refer to political Israel or a kingdom of Israel, it refers to the believers in God. And so, I believe God's family, (maybe that's a better way to look at it) has expanded.

Now, Jews and Gentiles are welcomed in as equal citizens in this new family, or equal family members, right? One of the other languages we see in the New Testament is "adoption." We've adopted as sons into God's family, a pre-existing family, which we see by the tree in Romans 11.

So, I do see that Christians have been adopted into the people of God, into the family of God. It's like God threw a couple new wings on His house so that He could fit more

people, because everyone's invited. It's for the nations. Now, when we're adopted into, let's call it Israel, we are not adopted into the Sinai Covenant, and we are not adopted into the old laws that no longer apply.

The family laws, the rules that govern the family of God under the new covenant are different—not entirely different, not in opposition to—but things have changed and evolved. Some of the things that God has always intended be temporary, as Paul says in Galatians 3, right, “the law was our guardian until Christ came. Now that Christ has come, we're no longer under a guardian.”

So, the law served its God-ordained purpose, and now it's done. So, when we're grafted in today, we're adopted today (whatever terminology you want to use), we are not grafted into the old covenant law. We're grafted into the New Covenant, the gospel of Christ, the kingdom of God.

[Moderator]

I have a question for Melissa. With that adoption motif, does that remind you of somebody that adopted two sons way back in Genesis 48, and there was a hand crossing in which one of those sons was promised to be the fullness of the Gentiles. Can you see prophecy being fulfilled in Romans 11, Melissa?

[Melissa]

Absolutely. In fact, what we have to remember is that in Ephesians and Romans, Paul does, in fact, quote, when he's talking about the fullness of the Gentiles. That is a direct quote from Scripture. And one of the Scriptures to which we have to refer then is Genesis 48:19, when Yaakov (Jacob) crosses his hands, he lays his right hand on the hand of Ephraim, and the left hand on Manasseh, and he says, “I know, my son, that he shall also become great, but the younger, the older shall serve the younger, and they will become a Melo Hagoyim.” That means Melo, fullness, Hagoyim, the Gentiles.

So here's a prophecy that the ten northern tribes of Israel under the rule of Ephraim, and the first leader of the tribes of Israel's king was from Ephraim. And so you can read about that in 1 Kings. And so we have the ten northern tribes scattered. They become the Melo Hagoyim.

There was a prophesied time of blindness to happen. Now, if we go to the woman at the well, the Samaritan woman, she's talking to Yeshua, and he says, “Go call your

husband,” and she says something like, or he says, he asked for water, I'm sorry, and she says, “Our father Jacob.” Hmm, a Samaritan talks to Yeshua and says, “You Jews have nothing to do with us,” but yet she calls Jacob her father.

Now, this is an indication and a remembrance that these ten northern tribes of Israel did, in fact, lose their identity as God's chosen children. And the only people in the land of Israel when Messiah came were Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, known as the Jews, because their king came from the tribe of Judah. So the Samaritan woman who said, “Hey, I know Jacob was my father. I'm a half-breed Israelite with an Assyrian. I've mixed in. You Jews no longer have anything to do with us because we were cast away as Hosea prophesied.” Then we have this whole understanding that starts coming to light, and in the book of John, where the Jews say, hey, are you going to the dispersed among the children of Israel?

When Yeshua says, I have sheep of another fold, he's literally, because then he goes to Ephraim, right after that was a prophetic moment to show them he's going to take the gospel message out to the scattered Israelites, and then we look at James. His first line in his letter is to the twelve tribes scattered abroad, not the Gentiles, and we see Peter's letter, who was written to those of the diaspora. See, there's a theme of restoration that we see happening here, because what we see is that God says in Jeremiah 16, I am going to send four fishers of men to get my people back.

They're talking about the second exodus. Now, most Christians don't even talk about the second exodus, but it says in Jeremiah 16 and Jeremiah 23, there's a second exodus coming so great from the lands of the Assyrians, so where we got scattered to Assyria, that we will no longer talk about the first exodus, and that second exodus involves these fishers of men, which is why Yeshua tells the Jews, you're going to go fish for my people amongst the Gentiles.

Now, one thing to caveat this, when we look at Exodus 12:49, Leviticus 17, 19, 24, Numbers 15, did I say that one? Isaiah 56, Ezekiel 47, it always says the same laws apply to any Israelite or Gentile believer, and there was never two set of rules for covenant people. Noah was a Gentile.

Abraham was a Gentile. In fact, in Genesis, he says that Abraham obeyed his commandments. Now, I and Rob probably differ on this, but I believe it's because the very nature of God is shown in the Torah.

We can see what he likes and what he hates, what is right and what is wrong, in the very essence of what he is. So when people could hear his voice and it wasn't written down, he would speak to them. But as sin progressively grew in the world, our sin pushed his voice away and silenced it. We know that because it says if we resist the Holy Spirit, remember, we're dead in his voice. And so there was this thing that happened where God's like, "Oh my gosh, you guys don't hear me anymore. I need to give the commandments written down."

I'm going to make you my special people, but it never excluded Gentiles, and he made provisions, like I told you, Exodus 12:49, etc. So, is any Gentile who wanted to serve God could always do that? So, the division line that we see talked about in Ephesians is something different because it has to do with the fullness of the Gentiles. And that division line was what we see in the book of Hosea, where the Israelites would become the Gentiles because of their sin.

They would go and become divorced from God. They were going to be divorced, and because they were so wicked and they would start doing pagan things in pagan lands, like Hosea 9, 3 says, they would eat unclean things. God then had to die.

Yeshua had to die, rise from the dead as a new man, and we, as God's people, have to die and rise to the to become his covenant people.

[Moderator]

Okay, I have a question for Rob. You're probably familiar with this. In Romans 9 and in 1 Peter chapter 2, we see where Paul, in writing this letter to the Roman ecclesia, the Roman church, which obviously consists of both Jews and former pagans, Gentiles, and I always use former, but so you have these two different groups that he's writing to.

When you see him quoting Hosea 1, where they're called not my people, he applies it to all the nations, and Rob, I'm sure you're familiar with this, and if you're not, that Hosea 8, 8 says that the house of Israel, Ephraim, this northern kingdom, would be swallowed up by the Gentiles, would be scattered to the four corners of the earth. Same thing in Amos 9, 9. I love the fact that they actually made it easy for me to remember.

It talks about the house of Israel again. They would be sown. They would be Jezreel, the first son of the prophet.

They would be Jezreel, scattered, sown to the nation. We see this going back to Genesis. Can you, do you see that this prophecy was in the initial infant stage of the family growing and coming back together in covenant and being realized, and how Peter and Paul got it, and Peter and Paul are explaining it to the first century audience, and they understood it, and then Marcion came along, and I've seen in the comments, Rob, I've seen a lot of the people, obviously, from your channel.

Why are we even talking about the Old Testament? It, first of all, it's not old. It's the Scriptures that Timothy read as a child.

It's the Scriptures that are all profitable for doctrine, for instruction, for correction, for rebuke, and I can tell from listening to you even tonight, you have a high respect for the Scriptures, but what I'm asking, can you see that this love story, this divorce and remarriage, and why the husband, the covenant maker, had to die to remarry his divorced harlot bride, and that's the greatest love story, the gospel of the kingdom, that I don't think most Christians, I know I've never heard it in 47 years, Rob. I had never heard that gospel and how God, the husband, would love his wife so much that, and Paul explains in Romans 7, the law of the husband, Deuteronomy 24, so do you see that in Romans 9 and in 1 Peter chapter 2, where the two apostles are getting this, and they're explaining it, as Melissa pointed out, 1 Peter is directly to those that were scattered abroad, and we see the regions there, and that's exactly where Assyria was, and where the northern tribe had been scattered, and Paul's expanding it to all the nations. He doesn't just limit it to a few Gentiles. He applies it to all the nations.

Do you see that, or what's your, I know that was a long question, but I think you see it, but why, if you see that, how can you not understand that you're the Israel of God, and he doesn't change, and what would have been good for Israel under the Scriptures, and the prophets, and the writings, why they're still not good for us today, and that we would be blessed by them for keeping them as opposed to cursed for not keeping them?

I'm not about salvation. I'm just about blessings and curses.

[Prof. Solberg]

Sure, sure. Well, so yeah, I do see—and this is actually what my PhD dissertation is on—I do see that God's call to Israel was not for the sake of Israel. It was for the sake

of saving the entire world. God promised blessings to the entire world through Abraham, not just through Abraham's descendants, and so Israel was set apart. They were a light to the nations. They were supposed to show the nations how beautiful it is to follow the God of Israel, right?

But all the way through, we have the nations praising the Lord in the Psalms, all throughout the Old Testament, the First Testament (whatever you want to call it) all throughout the Tanakh, we have a very clear picture that God's heart has always been for more than Israel. In the same way that the Levites were a set-apart group among the larger Israelites, and God loved all the Israelites, but the Levites were given a special purpose. In the same way, the nation of Israel is set apart from all the nations, but God loves all the nations. And so He says, "This nation is going to be My holy nation, set apart, and they're going to be a kingdom of priests. They're going to be My mediator to the world. I want Israel to do that."

Now, Israel failed terribly at their assignment, right? They got it right for a little while, but so I agree with your larger picture that it's always been about the Gentiles. I think where we're having a big theological distinction here is in your refusal to understand that the Old Covenant is done. It's obsolete. The things that God commanded of Israel for the reasons He commanded them under the Old Covenant, before they broke it and it became obsolete, do not necessarily—for example, you brought up, here's a specific example, the blessings and the curses, Deuteronomy 28, right?

God gave the covenant—it was a covenant of blessings and curses. We already kind of talked about this." You obey My laws, you keep the covenant, you inherit blessings. You break My laws, you break the covenant, you inherit curses." Unfortunately, Israel went with door number two: They disobeyed the law, they broke the covenant, they inherited curses.

Now, under the New Covenant, there is no such condition put on us. This is a unilateral, unconditional covenant. We can step out of covenant by not believing in Yeshua, but there's not a thing we can do to break the New Covenant. It's unbreakable. Here's why: It is based on the finished, perfect work of Christ. So it's unbreakable. There's nothing we could do. The way the Israelites could break the Old Covenant and did break the Old Covenant, they were under a different set of rules.

Now we're under the New Covenant. God never changes, but again, it's the same if you're a parent. You talk to your teenager and give them a different set of rules than

you do to your toddler. Not because you've changed, because your child has changed. So with all the revelations that God's given us, all throughout the Tanakh and through the prophets and all these things that we knew that God told us was coming, right? He promised us a Messiah. He promised us a New Covenant. When that arrives, we are now a different people than we were back then. We know so much more about God.

And also—and this is key—our focus has to be on Christ, because the focus of the Torah and the Tanakh is on Christ. Moses wrote about Jesus, right? Everyone looked forward to his day. Jesus says, “The law and the prophets and the Psalms looked forward to me.” Jesus says, “You search the Scriptures thinking that in them you have life, when you don't come to me to have life.” So we need to get our priorities straight, and Jesus has to be our highest priority.

You can't elevate the Torah above Jesus.

[Melissa]
Agreed.

[Prof. Solberg]
And Jesus is the giver of the Torah, so no one should throw away the Torah. And I'm not a fan of my... If I have fans that are talking about why are we still on the Old Testament? Look, I get your frustration. A lot of times, I think the Western church undervalues the beauty and the importance of the Old Testament. If you want to use like comic book terms, it's the “origin story” of Jesus, right? So the more we know about it, the more we know about Christ.

But I think what they're responding to—and I feel it the same way myself right now—is that every time we try to talk about stuff, you're right into the prophecies and the Old Testament, and you've said very little about the gospel and the New Testament. So I think some of my viewers, and I've noticed it as well, see that you're skewed towards the old obsolete covenant rather than fixing your eyes on Christ, the author and perfecter of your faith.

[Moderator]
I have a question on that issue for Melissa. Melissa, expand upon where you see in the gospels or in the epistles or revelation, blessings for those that obey the

commandments. Blessings, like in Revelation, those who read and hear and keep, or in like Matthew 5, before we get to 17 through 19, who were blessed.

So expand upon that, Melissa.

[Prof. Solberg]

Real quick, I sent you guys a private chat, but you haven't seen it yet. I do have to wrap up here in a few minutes.

[Moderator]

Oh, okay. Go ahead and answer that question, Melissa.

[Melissa]

Okay. So, and this is kind of where I was going. First of all, I want to start in 2 Peter 3:11. "Therefore, since all these things will be dissolved, what manner of persons ought you to be in holy conduct and godliness?" See, all through the letters, the letters were never intended by their writers to be a new Bible. They were telling the believers how to walk out properly the law and the prophets.

[Prof. Solberg]

Do you think it ended up as the Bible? I mean, you accept it as Scripture?

[Melissa]

I believe that they are Holy Spirit-inspired, and they helped me to properly walk out the spirit of the law, yes.

[Prof. Solberg]

But hold on, there's a little equivocation. And I'm sorry, I'll let you finish, but are you saying that you view the authority or the inspired nature of the New Testament differently than the Tanakh?

[Melissa]

1,000 percent! What I believe is the prophecies, see, they quote over 280 times prophecies from Genesis to Malachi. They are pointing everybody back to the Scriptures. He tells Timothy, you have had the holy Scriptures from your youth.

He wasn't talking about Galatians. He wasn't talking about Hebrews. If they were intended to study the holy Scriptures, that is the same thing we should be studying.

These letters do give value, and I think they are very important. I think they are inspired. But here we see in Peter, tells us to be holy.

It also says in the book of Hebrews, without being holy, we won't see the face of the Lord. So it's not just holiness intended with Old Testament, it is with all of it. In fact, that word in Hebrews, Old Testament, is a little bit of a misunderstanding through the Greek.

Now, what we look at is the blessing and the curses. We see all through the Beatitudes, right? Blessings. What we understand is that Ananias and Sapphira were struck dead on the spot after Jesus, Yeshua, died and rose from the dead because there was still a consequence for their actions. In fact, the curse still exists. Everybody dies.

Nobody exits without going through the grave. Therefore, if the law was in fact done away, or you're not saying it went away, if all the curses were gone away, there would be no more death. But there is in fact death, and that's not absolved until Messiah, His second coming.

And even after this is, there's anyway, we disagree on the millennial kingdom, what happens there. Now, what I want to point out is when it says that Israel was to be a light to the Gentile nations, it literally says the word Zerah, sperm. And so when we see Messiah, Yeshua, tell the disciples after fishing all night after his resurrection, and he's walking on the earth before his ascension, he says, cast out your net one more time to the right side to show mercy, right?

That's a mercy in Hebrew. What did they pull in? How many fish? Exactly 153 fish. Now, who do we first see referenced as fish in the Bible? Genesis chapter 48, verse 16, Ephraim and Manasseh, when it says they will multiply, that word there is the Hebrew word, dog, dog, fish is the root word there, dag; that's how you say "fish" in Hebrew. So when he says in Jeremiah 16, he's going to send fishers of men for his people, Israel. See, this is a continuation story.

It didn't shift at the new covenant. Yeshua literally teaches from the law and the prophets. He says, repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Peter says, tells people to repent. And so my position is the blessing and curses are still in effect. I see people with cancer right now. I see people sick. I see disease on this world. Those are

consequences of sin. I see people blessed with long life. Those are consequences of obedience. The consequences have never changed.

The payment propitiation for the sin, which is transgression of the law, has been paid. If they looked forward to it, they were forgiven. If we look back to it, we're forgiven. But here's the thing. If we break even the least of the commandments in heaven, and which I will agree, eating pork is the least of the commandments in heaven. That's one of the least important.

Faith, justice, mercy are the greatest. If we even break the lesser things, we'll be least in the kingdom of heaven. And that's shown in the tabernacle structure. So I won't go through all that tonight. So I do think, I know Rob said he has to get going. I see where we see an impasse here.

He is believing that there was a change in what is required of believers. I say it was a continuation of the promise of God to the children of Israel and those who were being called back to covenant. As we see in Romans 11, they're grafted in. I think that's our impasse. I think that's the two different eschatologies being proposed here. I mean, either way, honestly, I know he thinks I'm a false prophet.

By the definition, we're looking at people like teaching. I think both of us feel each other a danger. In the end, both of us are truth seekers. And I want he and I to just find truth. And I think he and I both have that humble heart where we just want the truth of Yah. We don't want to lead anyone astray. And we ourselves are simply truth seekers. I see a continuation of Scripture where we lose the right to eat the tree of Genesis 3 because we broke God's commandments. I see us getting to eat the tree of life again, Revelation 22, 14.

Yes, some say those who wash their robes. But still, it's a one story for one faith, one Messiah, one body of believers. And there's not two different pathways into heaven. The pathway to hell is not paved with the commandments of God. There's nothing wrong, nor is it Judaism. Judaism is what Paul taught against was the extra laws. Paul never spoke against the Torah. He says you can't be saved by being circumcised and keeping the law. He went and had Timothy circumcised.

So those are my kind of final words that I know he's got to get going. If Scott thinks it's something I need to clarify, I'll do that. I do appreciate your time.

I do appreciate this. Oh, and just to clarify, I never removed or deleted any of your comments. I literally, it must have been an AI thing. I just don't do that. I don't even see them. I know you had made in the video like, Melissa, my comments aren't there. I didn't see the comments. And that's why when I was walking down the road and the Lord said, you need to contact Solberg. I'm like, what? Three more steps. Contact Solberg. Three more steps. Contact Solberg. So I contacted you and you said, oh, I've made a few comments. And I'm like, ah, I didn't even see. So I promise I didn't.

[Prof. Solberg]

Believe me, I know how that goes. I've had stuff disappear too. And I don't know where it went.

[Melissa]

Because I didn't mean to hide your thing. I'm respectful. I don't get mad at your opinion. This is the thing. I love you. I want your soul, what I believe right with God. I think you would want the same for me. Just because we feel each other are wrong doesn't mean we have to be mad or hate each other. And I hope this is a lesson to some of you angry people in the comments.

You don't know Christ at all. You don't know God. Because we should be able to talk about this midrash and say, hey, let's come to things with respect. I love Rob. I know that I love Scott. I love his wife. This doesn't have to be mean. My whole purpose is not for me to be right, but to seek the Father's truth. And that's where you have to learn in the comments, you angry people who aren't born again yet. You probably better get some born again stuff going on.

[Prof. Solberg]

Gosh, I would never say that. It's been on both sides.

[Moderator]

I mean, I've seen some being very nasty towards Rob and I've seen some being messy.

[Melissa]

Nastiness just doesn't work. There's no place.

[Moderator]

And again, ultimately what we're talking about there, as I started out, they're both in agreement that we're saved solely by grace as a result of faith and what Yeshua did for us. Rob actually, and again, correct me if I'm wrong, Rob, you are not teaching that homosexuality is okay, that I can go cheat on my wife now or that I can steal or kill. So I like to call it the big three, Rob.

The only thing that's really changed in my understanding from my Southern Baptist upbringing, the big three would be resting on Shabbat versus Sunday worship, honoring his feasts the best I can, because again, we cannot keep those at this point in time. We cannot. Melissa and I even differ, by the way, on if and when Judah restarts up the sacrifices.

I believe they're going to be abominations from Isaiah 66.

[Melissa]

And I'm not sure if we'll do it when you're in a wait and see mode.

[Moderator]

You're in a wait and see mode. But again, that's really about it. I rest on Shabbat. Certain things I don't eat. And then from what I'm hearing you say, those would be the things that you say, hey, Scott, if you're convicted to do that, then you should obey. You're saying you don't believe it. It must be obeyed once you're in covenant. And that's really what we're talking about.

[Prof. Solberg]

There's a lot of common ground, and I think that's wonderful, and I think it's good for us to celebrate that. Yeah. There's also, I think, some significant differences. It all stems from, I guess, two things now. One I discovered early, which is that you somehow believe the Sinai covenant is still in force. And the second one, which I was shocked at, I've kind of been reeling ever since, is that you don't think the New Testament is Scripture on the same level as the Old Testament.

[Melissa]

Well, I'm not saying it's not Scripture. Okay, so Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are definitely gospels. I believe Revelation very much is a book of prophecy. Everything else was a letter to people.

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, a letter, but Peter calls Paul's letters Scripture.

[Moderator]

Divinely inspired.

[Prof. Solberg]

Okay, maybe I was wrong, and I'll admit it if I was, but I thought I heard you say there's a different level of authority or level of inspiration between the New Testament and Old Testament. And you said 1,000%. What am I missing?

[Melissa]

Okay, so what I believe is that when Paul wrote his letter to Corinth, the Corinthians, he did not intend nor think he was writing a prophetic word like Isaiah gave.

[Prof. Solberg]

And why does that matter?

[Melissa]

The authority, the position. So the Dead Sea Scrolls don't contain, what did the Dead Sea Scrolls show? That they still spoke Hebrew, that they had very accurate scroll records, that they kept...

[Prof. Solberg]

There wasn't Hebrew spoken very often at the time, but anyway.

[Melissa]

But anyway, you're saying... They literally said on Yeshua's grave, in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. I mean, come on.

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, it was used in a religious context, but day-to-day people were talking, even Jews were talking Aramaic. This is why they translated the the Hebrew Bible into Greek. But anyway, here's I think the more important thing. To get at this idea that Paul's letters are just letters, so what does that mean?

Does that mean they're not Scripture? They're not the Word of God inspired?

[Melissa]

I believe they're inspired to teach us how to walk out properly the Torah. I believe Paul's intent was to help us to know how to walk as new believers in Messiah and how to fully understand what it means to walk out Torah. I don't think he intended you or I to read his letter that he wrote to Corinthians. I think to the people in Corinth.

[Prof. Solberg]

But did *God* intend us to? That's the question.

[Melissa]

Possibly, possibly.

[Prof. Solberg]

I agree with you. They weren't written to us, but I believe they were written for us.

[Moderator]

Possibly. Let me interject so my position is, because I'm moderated here and I know I've asked questions and some of them have been misleading, but here's what I'm going to say as far as Peter affirming Paul, okay?

“And consider that the long-suffering of the Lord is salvation, of our Lord is salvation, as our beloved brother, according to the wisdom given to him, has written to you, as also in all his epistles, speaking of them these things in which some things are hard to understand, which the ignorant, the untaught, and unstable people twist to their own destruction as they do also the rest of the Scriptures.” That was your point, Rob.

[Prof. Solberg]

Right.

[Moderator]

“You therefore, beloved, since you know this beforehand, beware lest you also fall from your own steadfastness, being led away with the error of the wicked, the lawless, but grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, Yeshua Messiah.”

And I think where I'm seeing the disconnect between the two of you is Melissa would argue that Paul 100% never, ever, ever taught against the Torah, against the prophets and the writings. She would state that in Colossians, and you would not

argue that Shabbat was a Greek vain man-made tradition. I haven't heard you say that. And up above that, it talks about avoid these vain traditions of men and Greek philosophy. Avoid, down below this passage, it talks about how avoid these, you know, do not touch, do not handle.

That would be a Greek like stoicism. And so again, where y'all are talking about is she would say that letters to a bunch of former pagans, and they're being encouraged, don't let your pagans and these Greek philosophers and this stoicism and whatever, don't let them judge you because you're now keeping Shabbat. You're now only eating what is food. You're honoring the feast of Jesus he created back on day four. You're keeping this Shabbat holy, which he established on day seven, and in drink.

And Rob, you know, there's only one prohibition in Scripture about what to drink, and it's blood. That's the only prohibition. And in pagan temples, you knew that they would drink blood, they would have sex with temple prostitutes, and there's no way that we should be worshiping the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by engaging in sex with male and female prostitutes in their temple with virgins that they would purchase in order to worship God. I mean, so again, that's the disconnect.

The disconnect is Melissa is teaching that yes, Paul is affirming those Colossians to not be judged because they're keeping Shabbat, because they're honoring the feast, because they're only eating what is food versus what Scripture calls abominations. You know, in Revelation 12, I mean, in Revelation, we talk, it has unclean birds. You know, in other words, it's not something new.

Paul refers to things as unclean. So again, that's what we're really, that's what I see this discussion that I have with my Christian brothers and sisters who accused me of being Jew. Go ahead, Melissa.

[Prof. Solberg]

Hold on, hold on, guys. I gotta run. I am so sorry. I was just gonna say, Scott, that was a great wrap up, because I gotta get going.

[Moderator]

We're not going to stick around since you're leaving, because it wouldn't be fair to you. If Melissa and I want to do, I'll create a show if we want to do something post, but Rob, I would love to have a discussion with you, because again, I think I can be civil with you. I really do.

[Prof. Solberg]

Yeah, I think civility is important, because people need to understand the sides of the issue. Yeah. So I appreciate that you guys have been friendly.

[Moderator]

I cannot be civil, and I'm talking about.

[Prof. Solberg]

I hear you. I hear you. Yeah. Guys, I've, yeah, I really appreciate your civility, your friendliness. I appreciate all the time you've spent with me tonight and having me on your show. Thank you. All right. Bless you guys.

[Moderator]

All right. I'm going to end the stream now. Okay, everybody.

Thank you all for joining us. This is actually, you know, I believe it's been edifying to see a brother and a sister who don't agree, that can also be gracious with another. So I'm going to end it now. Melissa, you want to just say goodbye?

[Melissa]

Bye, everyone. Shalom.