

How does Hebrews 6:6 teach Eternal Security

There is a difficult passage I have heard referred to and used in teaching to say, "...look here, you see: you can lose your salvation." Hebrews 6 reads in part: "...those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit...then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh..." Others, I have heard say that this is about those who never really were saved in the first place. Both opinions admit some confusion and difficulty in the words, and so do I. On further study of the text and research of scholarly opinions, I believe the same as I have long felt that God doesn't back out even if we do: that in this passage the writer of Hebrews is illustrating the fallen believer still has a sure salvation. So, let's start in the immediate context of verse 4 and then branch out to see where the writer is going with his letter. Hebrews 6:4 says, "For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit." Now if this were found anywhere else in Scripture and we were plainly honest, we could not help but interpret this to be talking of things which make us saved, i.e., partakers of the Holy Spirit which is never spoken of the wicked. The fact is that the word partaker meaning "one having with" coupled with another word-form "made to become" together speak plainly of that which was given to us to save us, i.e. grace. Ephesians 3 confirms it: "...the Gentiles are fellow heirs and fellow members of the body, and fellow partakers of the promise in Messiah Yeshua through the gospel," and so on this, there is no question. Hebrews 6:5 continues, "and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come." These who have tasted of the word and power of God, too, one may look to refer to the unbeliever in Scripture, but not find at least by me. Tasting as in "Psalm 34:8, "Oh taste and see that the LORD is good," says in a plain sense that one tasting of God brings sight that He is good, only possible by faith, again which is possible only of the indwelling Holy Spirit in the saved.

Now, here lay the rub. In verse 6, speaking of these believers it says, "then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Now, evidence to a salvation once and for all eternity is confirmed from a sampling of Scripture that the believer is "sealed for the day of redemption" of Ephesians 4, "has passed out of death into life" of John 5, and as one grasps a pencil that it not fall, "no one shall snatch them out of My hand...and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand" of John 10. So, why do we fret over those passages that are not so clear as if God is looking for some way to finagle out of saving us. God doesn't lie, finagle, or is purposely self-contradictory to His faithful. So, we must be missing something, here. And the fact that it is talking of the believer who "fell away" cannot mean of all who have fallen away for the example of Peter comes to mind when after he promised in Mark 14, "though all may fall away, yet I will not," then denied the Lord. In fact, Yeshua said, "You will all fall away because of Me this night." Then the Lord goes out of His way to bring about the repentance of Peter who confesses in John 21, " Lord, You know all things; You know that I love You." If you say now reading this that this is special case, then I say before the Lord that I believe we are all special cases as His precious sheep.

Let's branch out to get the overall context of Hebrews before entering Chapter 6 again, we know the original readers of this letter were Hebrew believers in Yeshua living in the Land of Israel, in fact, the first Messianic Jewish believers. The writer begins the book warning in Chapter 2, "We must pay more careful attention, therefore, to what we have heard, so that we do not drift away." And the greatest of what they have heard is that: "in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son...", Yeshua, Who "by the grace of God...might taste death for everyone." Chapter 7 adds, "Yeshua has become the guarantee of a better covenant," that is, better than the old Mosaic covenant. And why? Chapter 10 answers, "...it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats

should take away sins. Wherefore when He comes into the world, He says, 'Sacrifice and offering You did not desire, but a body You did prepare for Me. In whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin, You have no pleasure,' that is, the sacrifices of the old covenant. It continues, "then He has said, 'Lo, I am come to do Your will.' He takes away the first that He may establish the second. By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Yeshua Messiah once for all." It is impossible that the old covenant sacrifices actually take sin away, so we need the new covenant by which Yeshua's blood sanctifies us. It continues, "For by one offering He had perfected forever them that are sanctified," that is, separate to God. Chapter 8 confirms, "When He said, 'A new covenant,' He has made the first obsolete...." so, the question from the beginning that the writer proposes in Chapter 2 to believers in Jerusalem remains, "how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation?" Look at the choice they must make, here. The writer is asking should they choose the salvation they already have in Yeshua, or choose to neglect it, the consequences of which there is no escape. Yeshua has already warned of the hopelessness of this choice in Luke 19: "your enemies will throw up a bank before you, and surround you, and hem you in on every side, and will level you to the ground and your children within you..." And why? "...you did not recognize the time of your visitation." It would be a terrible choice putting them into the coming judgment upon their city and temple within a few short years. It is a shame because these readers of the this letter had already recognized the time of Yeshua's visitation to Israel. They had once accepted His sacrifice as all sufficient. So with the threat of judgment, how can we now know it is not an eternal judgment? In God eyes, how can we now know He is trying to warn His own of a terrible judgment in this life alone? It will help to understand how the writer, therefore, God views forgiveness. Now, before we return to Chapter 6, what is forgiveness in Chap 9. It says, "...without shedding of blood there is no forgiveness...", and Chapter 10 adds, "Now where there is forgiveness of these things, there is no longer any offering for sin," this speaking of "sins and lawless deeds" which the writer quotes of God: "I will remember no more." So, "no longer an offering for sin" doesn't mean a time of salvation has forever past them by because forgiveness remains, and where it is, eternal life remains. It must mean that chronologically after Yeshua died circa 30 A.D., there are no other offerings for salvation past this event in time. Now, if you keep reading in Chapter 10 to verse 26, I believe we find the kernel to help us with our problem in Chapter 6 which again says, "...it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance, ...seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh..." Verse 26 reads, "For while we go on sinning intentionally after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins." Yes, believers are known by God to intentionally sin "after receiving the knowledge of the truth," for that is our nature even with a regenerate soul. And in light of verse 18, it is plain when the writer says "there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins," it is saying our sins for salvation are forgiven, but we must still heed "the knowledge of the truth." Here, it is that Yeshua's sacrifice remains sufficient. It negates any need for remaining levitical sacrifices. And, when we don't heed the knowledge of the truth, what happens? Verse 27 continues, "but a certain terrifying expectation of judgment, and the fury of a fire which will consume the adversaries." This is, until contextual evidence proves otherwise, a fire in this life, i.e., the 70 AD fiery judgment of the Romans. This is a warning from the truth that these believers must heed, or die. The adversaries are at least those who oppose salvation at any time in Yeshua alone. It looks, too though, like believers could throw in their lot with them, and pay the same consequences.

Making a comparison between those who had set aside the Law and those who insult the grace of God, the writer says, "Anyone who has set aside the Law of Moses dies without mercy on the testimony of two or three witnesses. How much severer punishment do you think he will deserve who has trampled under-foot the Son of God..." Nothing changes in the context. This trampling

under-foot the Son of God is by the believer who has returned to the Temple sacrifices. It is the rejection of the Son of God's sufficient sacrifice for all things in life. It continues of the believer facing the wrong direction, "...and has regarded as unclean the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified, and has insulted the Spirit of grace?" What does it say...plainly in the context, no other information given, but that this one "*regards the blood of the covenant as unclean or common or profane...and has insulted the Spirit of grace,*" that is Yeshua's blood given by grace in our stead, is the same one, "...*who was sanctified,*" or made holy-separate to God forever. This is what the text of the context says when we interpret the judgment of v. 27 and that of v. 30 as the coming fiery judgment of 70 A. D. at the hands of the Romans. This does not call into question our eternal security sealed by the Holy Spirit. Some have taken this as the eternal judgment of the Lake of Fire, and necessarily must change the subject of the aorist indicative, "was sanctified" to be the covenant instead of the falling believer, i.e., "*and has regarded the blood of the covenant unclean by which it [the covenant] was sanctified*", but this argues against the context for the following reasons: every phrase of verse 27 is about the falling believer; the context exhorts those already saved to not return and identified with the Jewish leadership condemned to the 70 A.D. judgment, and v. 30 is written to the Jewish nation per *The Lord will judge His people.*

Any translation not handling the Word well by saying, "which made us holy" is adding to the Scripture. One substitutes the personal pronoun, "we" in place of the plain object for which it was intended, this believer trampling the Son of God under-foot. This trampling is figurative for no one can do that, but it is similar to "If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar" in 1 John 1. God can never lie, but says all men lie. So, saying otherwise is as if we are calling Him or making Him seem to lie. And then the writer confirms God is talking about the believer when he continues, "For we know Him who said, "Vengeance is Mine, I will repay." And again, "The Lord will judge His people. It is a terrifying thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Yes, the Lord loves us and will judge His people who have His name called upon them. Now, as we move in to Chapter 6, just think if it can be removed from the list of passages used by naysayers to sow doubt in your secure salvation. They infer God is telling us to watch out, or I will rip the life from your spirit, rip the Holy Spirit out of you, and remove my declaration that you are righteous.

Verse 6 of Hebrews 6 says of the believer, "and then have fallen away, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance while they again crucify for themselves the Son of God, and make an example of Him." Returning to the Temple ritual in God eyes was falling aside from the true way of Yeshua's all sufficiency for life. If they are, and while they are engaging with their Jewish brothers in the Temple ritual, for these believers, it would be impossible to turn them back to standing in the truth of Yeshua alone. Why the mechanics is impossible of changing their mind in the middle of offering their goat, lamb, or dove as a sacrifice, I don't know. I think it is as the Lord Yeshua said in Matthew 6: "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will hold to one and despise the other." If they are in the Temple and a part of it, in mind and body they must believe Yeshua's sacrifice insufficient. And while they do, they also are sharing in the Temple's coming judgment at the hand of the Romans. But more than that, in God eyes, Who already crucified Messiah once and for all, they openly make again His Only Begotten an example accursed by our sin. These believers, in open defiance of Yeshua's efficacious sacrifice, in essence, crucify Him again, all for themselves to work and sacrifice in the Temple. However, on the other hand practically speaking, if at synagogue hearing this letter then at home meditating and repenting never going back, then they have

turned to look Yeshua in His glorious face. If they leave Jerusalem in 70 A.D. with the remnant of believers in the middle of the siege as history records, then, they are saved physically from that fire and judgment as well.

Now, concluding in Hebrews 6:7-8, "For ground that drinks the rain which often falls upon it and brings forth vegetation useful to those for whose sake it is also tilled, receives a blessing from God." This is the believer who heeds the truth. And if they don't, this same ground "...yields thorns and thistles, it is worthless and close to being cursed, and it ends up being burned." This same ground is burned as was the custom to purify for planting, again. After all the writer has said for eternal security, would he slide an inference in under the cuff that the believer is after all doomed to eternal fire. Again, the ground is not consumed, nor does God consume the believer, though He is a consuming fire.

To God Be All Glory

Amen