

MATTHEW NOLAN AND DAVID PERRY'S MELCHIZEDEK DOCTRINE: SUBTRACTING FROM TORAH

SHOULD WE KEEP ONLY THE COMMANDS CONTAINED IN
THE "BOOK OF THE COVENANT" AND NOT THE ONES
CONTAINED IN THE "BOOK OF THE LAW"?

Reading Key:

Black text: author original.

Purple text: Matthew Nolan, Torah to the Tribes

Dr. David Perry Th.d, Torah Without Rabbinic's

First Published on: <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/project/matthew-nolan-and-david-perrys-melchizedek-doctrine-subtracting-from-torah/>

There are two individuals in the Torah-keeping movement who teach what I consider to be errors concerning a supposed distinction within the Torah. One of these individuals has written two books on the topic while the other is actively teaching their ideas at conferences and congregations around the United States. Normally I tend to keep to myself and let people believe what they want. I rarely feel the desire to publicly address other people's teachings, but I've received quite a few questions about the information brought forth by these two individuals. After privately trying to reason with both of these teachers over e-mail, I've decided that I should go ahead and write this public response.

To open with I'd like to establish a foundation of truth going forward, our author states: *"Normally I tend to keep to myself and let people believe what they want. I rarely feel the desire to publicly address other people's teachings."*

First, to those of you who care to investigate further on the author's FB page you'll find this statement is patently false.

Our author has a prolific and quite vitriolic history of attacking teachers publicly on Social Media if they disagree with his theology.

Secondly, take note our author states, *"After privately trying to reason with both of these teachers over e-mail, I've decided that I should go ahead and write this public response"*.

Neither I or Dr. David Perry have ever been contacted over email by our author as he states above. This is a patently untrue statement.

How are we to trust any subsequent statements made by the author when public false statements are made like this?

Right from the outset this title is a dead give away – It presupposes that the “Book of the Covenant” and the “Book of the Law” are the same – They are Not! It also presupposes that the content of these two are the same – They are Not! Melchizedek values and issues (including “Book of the Covenant” Exodus 19:5-24:8) are peppered throughout the “Book of the Law” (Exodus 24:12 thru Deuteronomy 31:26) but still stand in their respective original Melchizedek place (Genesis 1:1 thru Exodus 24:8-11).

If the book of the covenant and the book of the law are one and the same as our author assumes, then what ‘Torah’ sanctioned change of law does our author actually recognize? Throughout this article the author takes the position of a ‘NO change of law’ which is a contradiction to the written Word of both the Old Testament & New Testament (Genesis 49:10 & Hebrews 7:12).

Adding ‘Jesus’ to Judaism is not the answer and is rejected by both Christianity and Judaism itself.

The authors position is one of propagating the status quo ‘one book theory’ accepted by both Christianity and Judaism for the past 2000 years which denies the ‘Torah’ and ‘New Testament’ sanctioned “*a change also of the law;*” which leads both religions to draw opposite but equally erroneous conclusions about the redemptive work of Messiah.

Torah to the Tribes position, in contrast, is one of viewing Torah as applicable in its New Covenant administration under Melchizedek Yahusha recognizing “*a change also of the law*” which is uniquely distinct from both Judaism and Christianity. Torah to the Tribes believes this position should be at least studied with merit before being dismissed offhand. ***Hebrews 7:12 For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.***

A. Either the law has changed with Yahusha

<OR>

B. The law was not changed.

** If B) is true (which our author believes) then we’re left with one of two choices:

1. To be lawless (the law in its entirety is done away with, Christianities position - a status quo position)
2. To be Judaized (the law is unchanged and we’re to keep it in its entirety, including animal sacrifices - The Judaizing of ‘Jesus’ - a status quo position)

I offer a final and third option; *but* it is countingnt on accepting the truth of A):

3. The New Testament has been given as Melchizedek Book of the Covenant-Torah based upon the better promises given to Abraham (Hebrews 8:6 Gk: ‘*nomotheteō*’, Ephesians 2:12, Galatians 3:16).

Torah to the Tribes believes A) and 3.

We find B), 1. & 2. to be unacceptable, against the written testimony of The Word; either lawless pagan syncretism or Judaizing.

We have chosen the narrow way a) (3): The law has changed, the New Testament has been given as Melchizedek Book of the Covenant-Torah based upon the better promises given to Abraham (Hebrews 7:12, 8:6, Ephesians 2:12, Galatians 3:16).

Hebrews 8:6 But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was given as torah based upon better promises.

Torah to the Tribes believe the bible demands us to thoroughly investigate its language and context; especially in the light of the High Priesthood of Yahusha before we dismiss offhandedly a distinction between the Book of the Covenant and the Book of the law - a distinction in law.

The Exodus 24:7: **Book of the Covenant:** Hebrew: **Sepher ספר Brit ברית** - proposed, accepted, blood ratified, and meal confirmed brit given as torah (Hebrews 8:6,10 Greek: *diathēkē*)

Deuteronomy 28:6: **Book of the Law:** Hebrew: **Sepher ספר torah תורה** - torah void of a proposal, acceptance, blood ratification and covenant confirming meal (NT Greek: *nomos*)

Linguistically, textually we have unconnected and disparate words in the Masoretic Text, Septuagint and New Testament - three textual witnesses to these *Sepherim*/books not being one and the same.

Both are torah: one is Melchizedek covenant; the other is the “added” and “imposed” “school master” - law.

Deuteronomy 31:36 Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of YHWH your Elohim, that it may be there for a witness against thee.

Hebrews 7:11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,)

But the Book of the Covenant law/torah was given at Sinai in Exodus 19-24 before there was ever a Levitical priesthood. So another; separate and distinct law (the book of the law) was given as a result of the Levitical Priesthood; which was a result of the Golden Calf breach.

Hebrews 7:12 *For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.*

Galatians 3:10 *For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.*

Galatians 3:12 *And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them.*

But in Exodus 19:8 & Exodus 24:3 the children of Israel answered; "all that יהוה has spoken we will do." and they accepted the Book of the Covenant law IN FAITH, so Galatians 3:12 CANNOT be referring to Book of the Covenant but a SEPARATE law that was NOT OF FAITH.

The Book of the law wasn't added by faith, but for transgression:

Galatians 3:19 *Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions.*

A clear distinction in books. A clear distinction in law!

One accepted in faith - the book of the covenant.

One imposed for transgressions at the Golden Calf and the added Levitical priesthood - the book of the law, No longer a nation of priests but denigrated to a nation WITH A priest.

Galatians 3:24 *Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Messiah, that we might be justified by faith. 25 But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.*

Romans 3:21 *But now the righteousness of Elohim (Malki-Tzadik) without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.*

Romans 3:31 *Do we then make void the law through faith? Elohim forbid: yea, we establish the law. (We establish the Book of the Covenant - law)*

Hebrews 10:8 *Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law. 9 Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O Elohim. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.*

'First' - 'Second!' Another clear separation and distinction.

The authors claim to have spoken – to me or David Perry is patently false and utterly baseless – Neither I or Dr. Perry have been contacted by the author for an open scholarly discussion our positions or work on this subject to date. The author assumes to assert comment on Dr. David Perry's Books on Doctrinal dissertation that he has not read!

This article is based on my research of Matthew Nolan and David Perry's public teachings on this topic in addition to my e-mail conversations with them.

As stated above neither I or Dr. David Perry have ever had scholarly, investigatory discussion with the author over this subject.

I focus specifically on their belief that the commands contained in what they define as "the book of the law" are no longer for believers today.

This statement is patently false. Because the author has not contacted either of Dr. Perry or myself he does not understand the polemic and goes about trying to establish a false premise, or a straw man that he can then blow over; leading the reader to a false conclusion. Torah to the Tribes has produced a teaching called "the book of the law" that contradicts the authors statement.

<https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2018/01/20/book-law-part-1/>

You can find out more about their teachings on their websites. David Perry wrote a response to this article, which you can read here:

<https://torahwithoutrabbinics.wordpress.com/2014/11/10/melkizedeq-priesthood-attack-ii/>

The Application of Torah

For those who are unfamiliar with my views concerning the role of Torah in the life of Believers, I'll give a quick summary: I am a Torah-pursuant Christian.

The above statement is a contradiction in terms. The definition of a Christian is not someone who pursues the torah, the author is giving the Christians definition for a Judaizer. Our author has identified himself as a Judaizer.

That means that I follow Messiah Yeshua (Jesus) and I believe that the Bible teaches me to obey the commandments and principles outlined in the Torah (often translated into English as "law") given through the Prophet Moses. Stated more negatively, I *deny* the belief that the Torah is, at best, no longer relevant to Christians, or at worst, a burdensome yoke that was abolished and taken out of the way by Yeshua's death and resurrection.

Our author denies a change and distinction in law. Genesis 49:10 states there will be a change in the law: ***The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.*** Until means impending change, 'a change of law.' that our author denies, which Christianity rightly gives as the definition of a Judaizer or Judaizing.

Hebrews 7:11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be called after the order of Aaron? 12 For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.

According to Yeshua, nothing from the Torah will pass away until heaven and earth passes away (Matthew 5:17-19). Heaven and earth do not pass away until there is no more crying, mourning, pain, nor death (Revelation 21:1-4). We still have crying, mourning, pain, and death; therefore, it follows logically that nothing from the Torah has passed away.

Many aspects of the Torah cannot be kept today due to the fact that the elements required to Biblically observe them do not exist right now. For instance, we cannot observe the commandments concerning sacrifices because there is no Temple in Jerusalem at which to make sacrifices. However, there are many aspects of Torah that we should keep today, such as: the Sabbath, dietary instructions, wearing tzitziyot, and not lying, stealing, coveting, etc. Also, although there are some aspects of the feasts that cannot be observed right now (e.g. sacrifices at the Temple), we keep the memory of the Feasts to the best of our ability while we're not in the land. This would include keeping the annual Sabbaths and rituals associated with the Feast days (such as ridding our homes of leaven during the Feast of Unleavened Bread and fasting during Yom Kippur).

I say all that to make my point that when it comes to figuring out which parts of Torah are applicable for today, it is not a matter of "picking and choosing." It's a matter of whether some things are even possible.

"Not one Jot and Tittle" except that which is inconvenient or impractical today. Here the truth comes out; the 'Hebrew Roots Movement' are not *"Torah observant"* at all, in reality, 'Hebrew Roots Movement' is selective in which parts of the Law they do obey. Are there not parts of the Law that require a parapet on your roof, a High Priest and a Temple? What about animal sacrifice? Did YAHWEH become flesh and spill His blood simply to spare people the inconvenience of sacrificing animals?

What about penalties for those who violate the parts of the law for which the punishment is death? Who will take on the "responsibility" of making sure that appropriate punishment is administered according to the Law? The apostate Ashkenazi "Jews" who hate Yahusha and want to kill His followers? You'll find no justice administered justly there!

The above statement is hypocrisy and picking and choosing no different from the traditional church. Do not Deuteronomy 27:26 and Galatians 3:10 say that ***“cursed is everyone who does not continue to do EVERYTHING written in the Book of the Law?”*** (Caps mine.)

How is it, in this selective view, that grace exempts one from observing/performing the parts of the Law that one finds inconvenient or impractical today (*animal sacrifices, courts of justice, Niddah after childbirth 40/80 days-Leviticus 12*) but does not exempt one from observing/performing the more palatable parts of the Law (*tzitzit, beards*).

I really wonder how those who lay claim to being “Torah observant” can reconcile these obvious problems with consistency in obedience to the whole Law doctrine.. If you do go ahead and decide to perform sacrifices or build a parapet on your new home to be consistent, then of what use is the Cross?

Have you not left the Cross, rejected the redemptive work of the Blood that was shed there for you by the Lamb of YAHWEH? Yes; you’ve left the Cross and rejected the redemptive work of the Blood , you’ve chosen the wrong altar, the wrong sacrifice and the wrong High Priest. And herein lies the great deception: Judaizing!

Hebrews 13:9-14

9 Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines. For it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace; not with meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein. 10 We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. 11 For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. 12 Wherefore Yahusha also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. 13 Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach. 14 For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come.

Following the authors theology to its logical conclusion leads you to animal sacrifices under a Levitical High Priest, on a altar of apostate Ashkenazi “Jews” who hate Yahusha and deny His High Priesthood.

A believer who ends up here is no longer a believer and has ‘*no right to eat of Yahshua's body and blood*’ (John 6). Looking to a carnal Jerusalem and carnal temple and carnal priesthood demonstrates one is still following ‘*the law of a carnal commandment*’ and rejecting ‘*Yahshua's power of an endless life.*’

Hebrews 7:15-18

15 And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, 16 Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. 17 For he testifieth, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. 18 For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.

A "Jew" living in Israel on a good day could only fulfill about 240 of the so called 613 commandments established by the rabbis. That's because there is no Temple, no Priesthood, and other various excuses. If you do the math on that, it means that a person living in Missouri could probably only fulfill 40 +/- percent of the Law on a very, very good day:

James 2:8-10

If you truly fulfill the royal Law according to the Scripture, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself," you do well. But if you have partiality you work sin, being reproved by the Law as transgressors. For whoever shall keep all the Law, but stumbles in one, he has become guilty of all.

To believe that you are keeping the whole torah (which one is clearly, by the authors own testimony not capable of) and then conveniently switching to grace when someone points that out, is a terrible witness for the price that Yahusha paid (in my personal opinion).

Hebrews 7:11-12

Truly, then, if perfection was through the Levitical priestly office (for the people had been given Law under it), why yet was there need for another priest to arise according to the order of Melchizedek and not to be called according to the order of Aaron? For the priestly office having been changed, of necessity a change of law also occurs.

Hebrews 7:18-22

For, indeed, an annulment of the preceding command comes about because of its weakness and unprofitableness. For the Law perfected nothing, but a bringing in of a better hope, through which we draw near to Elohim. And by how much it was not without oath-taking; for they truly becoming priests are without oath-taking, but He with oath-taking, through the One saying to Him, The Lord swore, and will not care to change, "You are a priest to the age according to the order of Melchizedek;" by so much Yahusha has become Surety of a better covenant.

The whole Judaizing 'one book' torah doctrine is agenda driven. Those who teach this are alluding to the fact that we are still under the Old, imposed law - the book of the law, with no change (not recognizing the "until the time of reformation" clause of Genesis 49:10 & Hebrews 9;10). Since the book of Hebrews proves unequivocally that to be incorrect, many of the Hebrew Roots teachers are now saying that the book of Hebrews is not authentic, and should be removed from the canon. What's next Galatians and Ephesians, Yahusha and the entire N/T? Sadly for thousands this has become their testimony and many in the Hebrew Roots Movement will be held accountable for leading them down that road to destruction.

Hebrews 9:8-14

8 Animal sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; 10 Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. 11 But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; 12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. 13 For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: 14 How much more shall the blood of Messiah, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to Elohim, purge your conscience from dead works.

The book of the law was not an agreed to covenant but an imposed law for breaking the book of the covenant at the Golden Calf.

We DO have a legitimate mandate for change from Torah (Genesis 49:10, Exodus 32, Numbers 3:12, Numbers 8:15-17, Joshua 5:5 – and Hebrews 7:11-12 evidences it) a change our author denies – on the reverse side Jews (Rabbinic to Anti-Missionaries) deny a 'change' (like our author) yet act on a change they have NO legitimate Torah mandate for.

The point to understand is Genesis 49:10 – It is not a 'change' OF Torah; to enact the 'change' IN Torah; that has always been right there IN Torah.

The truth of the matter becomes; to refuse the change that has always been there in Torah as prophecy is to 'diminish ought' (jot and/or tittle) from Torah (Matthew 5:17-18; Luke 16:17; Deuteronomy 4:2 & 12:32)! What irony!

To give an analogy, in Missouri there are speed limit laws that apply to certain roads. If a road is under construction and blocked off to traffic, then the speed limit law of that road becomes inapplicable. You can't accuse a law-abiding citizen of Missouri of ignoring the speed limit of that road if they physically can't apply it. In the same way, many of the laws

in Torah require certain specific elements in order to be properly observed. As stated above, many of those elements do not exist today (e.g. a physical Temple in Jerusalem). Therefore, those particular laws become inapplicable until the road is no longer under construction, so-to-speak. Furthermore, many laws in Torah apply only to specific people. To continue with this analogy, if you don't have a driver's license, then none of Missouri's driving laws apply to you. They apply only to drivers. Much in the same way, Torah gives specific laws to specific people (Priests, Levities, Judges, farmers, women, poor people, rich people, etc.). Therefore, if you are not a Priest or Levite operating within a physical Temple in Jerusalem, or a judge over theocratic Israel appointed by God Himself, then the specific laws given to those groups of people don't apply to you.

One day Yeshua will return and reestablish the Temple in Jerusalem. Israel will be a theocratic government with the Torah as its constitution again. Much of the Torah will apply again at that time, but in the meantime, we can only do the best we can with where we are.

Our author states *"Much of the Torah will apply again ..."* Our author admits to a change just not one based upon Genesis 49:10 and Hebrews 7:12. Our authors change is not based upon a torah sanctioned passage or a New Testament passage whatsoever, but a convenient side step because he is aware of the gaping hole in this theology. What change of law will that be based on if not Melchizedek? Even more interesting What law will the omissions be based on if not Levitical?

A New Revelation of Torah?

A New Revelation of Torah?

What is stated above has been my view for the past eight years. I'm used to having to defend my views against "mainstream Christians" who claim that the Torah is fulfilled in Christ, which according to them means that we don't have to keep commands like a literal Sabbath anymore. However, recently the validity of the Torah is being questioned from a different angle. There are two individuals who now are teaching that Torah-pursuant Christians and Messianics, such as myself, are clinging to the "status quo" by holding to our current Messianic theology. It is said that until we accept their new revelation we are rejecting our full inheritance as "Melchizedek priests."

So, what exactly is their "new revelation"?

Correct our author is "clinging to the "status quo" by holding to (your) current Christian – Messianic theology" – All the groups by-and-large take their cue from Yahshua denying Jews (Rabbis to Anti-Missionaries) and bring along a variety of Torah denying / Covenant denying Church baggage.

Our author asks "A New Revelation of Torah?" The point our authors has yet to understand is to remember Torah also states 'that in the witness of two or three the matter is established' (Deuteronomy 19:15/2 Corinthians 13:1). This then is the awareness we must realize – It is not a change 'of' Torah to enact the change 'in'

Torah; that has in fact always been right there in the pages of Torah i.e. the first five books of Moses. (Genesis 49:10, Galatians 3:19, Hebrews 9:10). The truth of the matter becomes; to refuse the change that has always been there in Torah as prophesy is to 'diminish ought' (jot and/or tittle) from Torah (Matthew 5:17-18; Luke 16:17; Deuteronomy 4:2 & 12:32).

It goes like this: God's original plan was that His people were all supposed to be priests and follow only the commands that are found in "the Book of the Covenant" (apparently in addition to a few other random commands given earlier in Genesis and Exodus for reasons I don't understand). Exodus 19:5-6 are the opening lines of this covenant and it ends when the Covenant is ratified at Exodus 24:8.

The author actually got that one pretty much right except Genesis 1:1 thru Exodus 24:8 has many more issues that are not found in "the Book of the Covenant" yet are still Melchizedek.

Then he took the Book of the Covenant and read it in the hearing of the people. And they said, "All that the Lord has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient." And Moses took the blood and threw it on the people and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant that the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words. - Exodus 24:7-8

Correct!

Israel broke this Covenant when they made the golden calf (Exodus 32). Since Israel was unfaithful, God was going to wipe them out. However, Moses pleaded for them and God decided not to kill them. Instead, God made a "plan B." The plan B was to establish the Levitical Priesthood. Moreover, God decided to add "the Book of the Law" to the Covenant, which apparently includes all of God's commands contained in Exodus 24:12 – Deuteronomy 31:26.

When Messiah Yeshua died and was resurrected, the Melchizedek priesthood took the place of the Levitical priesthood, and therefore the Book of the Law was removed and taken out of the way. This means that the only commands followers of Yeshua need to keep today are found in the Book of the Covenant. Why? Because that was the original Covenant to which God's people were called as Melchizedek priests (before they forfeited this calling and God made the Levites priests instead and added the Book of the Law). God's commandments that are found in the Book of the Law, plus the entire Levitical priesthood, were apparently only temporary until Yeshua came and replaced the Levitical priesthood with the Melchizedek priesthood.

The authors statement of, '*followers of Yeshua today only need to keep the commands found in the Book of the Covenant*', – This again is not correct – Genesis 1:1 thru Exodus 24:8 has many more issues that are not found in "the Book of the Covenant" (Exodus 19:5 – 24:8) yet are still Melchizedek.

Yahusha has not 'replaced the Levitical priesthood with the Melchizedek priesthood' BUT Reinstated the Melchizedek priesthood to its original place.

From what I can tell, the above hypothesis is simply their attempt at reconciling the difficult passages in the New Testament that seem to speak negatively about the law (Torah). Basically, their view is that any time the New Testament *seems* to say that the law is done away with or burdensome or temporary, it's actually talking about the "Book of the Law" (the commands contained in Exodus 24:12 – Deuteronomy 31:26). Again, according to their view, the Book of the Law was added because of transgression (Galatians 3:19) -- specifically the transgression of the golden calf. The Book of the Law was not part of the original covenant. Moreover, it was placed on the side of the ark (Deuteronomy 31:26), it's "against us," it's not any good, and it is now removed and taken out of the way because Yeshua established the Melchizedek priesthood. Therefore, if anyone keeps and teaches the commands contained in the Book of the Law (e.g. wearing tzitziyot or fasting on Yom Kippur), they are living in legalistic bondage and promulgating the religious status quo!

There is much more to be understood concerning Priesthood and Covenant to truly gain an even handed fully-accounted-for assessment – The thing to understand is there are 20 categories of law in the New Testament – which one or ones is Paul talking about?

Here are 10 reasons why you should reject this theory

1) The Bible never makes a clear distinction between the Book of the Covenant and the Book of the Law. In fact, sometimes the two titles are used synonymously.

For example: 2 Chronicles 34 tells us that the "Book of the Law" was found by Hilkiyah the priest and brought to King Josiah (vs. 14-21). This same book is called the "Book of the Covenant" when King Josiah reads it to the elders of Judah and Jerusalem (vs. 29-30). The same story is told in 2 Kings 22 & 23 -- the Book of the Law is found (2 Kings 22:8), and the same book is then later called the Book of the Covenant (2 Kings 23:2).

When I brought this point up to the two individuals promoting this theory, they responded by saying that if Hilkiyah had found the Book of the Law then he would have also found the Book of the Covenant since they were right next to each other (Deuteronomy 31:26).

Hilkiyah the High Priest found the Book of the Law and thereby the Book of the Covenant. Why? Because the Book of the Law was in a pocket outside the ark as a witness against them Deut 31:26. If you found one you found the other! This does not prove a synonymous relationship. Hilkiyah gave it to Shaphan the sofer who showed it to Melech Josiah. Josiah took a stand for the covenant and reinstated the Book of the Law Levitical ordinances and Passover sacrifices thereby removing any traces of the Malki-Tzedik Book of the Covenant rites. In his zeal for a return he had to deem anything non Levitical impure.

Our author is reading his ideas into the text with Eisegesis. ***Deuteronomy 31:26 Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the YHWH your Elohim, that it may be there for a witness against thee.***

It's not called the ark of the law because it contains the tablets and the scroll of the covenant and outside is the book of the law. One will be found with the other.

To make that assumption based on a singular usage when referencing two singular books is asinine and an attempt to lead the readers in a thought unsupported by the text alone. The text uses two different Hebrew words, not one! To say that two is one is using Eisegesis.

Quick side note: They also believe that all the commands throughout the entire Book of the Covenant (Exodus 24:12-24:8) were written on the stone tablets, not just the Ten Commandments. This will be addressed later.

The problem with their response is that they are assuming that there were, in fact, two books found. However, there is nothing from the text indicating that there were two books found. The plain reading of the text is that only one book is being referred to.

They cited Ezekiel 20:25 as their proof text to support their view that there is a dichotomy between the Book of the Law and the Book of the Covenant:

“because they had not executed My judgments, but had despised My statutes, profaned My Sabbaths, and their eyes were fixed on their fathers idols. 25 Therefore I also gave them up to statutes that were not good, and judgments by which they could not live; 26 and I pronounced them unclean because of their ritual gifts, in that they caused all their firstborn to pass through the fire, that I might make them desolate and that they might know that I am the Lord.” -Ezekiel 20:24-26

These “not good” statutes, they say, are referring to the "Book of the Law." However, there are several flaws with this interpretation. First of all, if Ezekiel was speaking against keeping certain commandments in Torah, then he would be a false prophet according to Deuteronomy 13. Moreover, Deuteronomy 30 states that the laws were given for a blessing, not for harm or punishment. And verse 14 of chapter 30 specifically says that we can do the Book of the Law. Therefore, the “statutes that were not good, and judgments by which they could not live” in Ezekiel 20:25 cannot possibly be referring to any of God’s commandments.

Our author states “If Ezekiel was speaking against keeping certain commandments in Torah, then he would be a false prophet” this is a leading supposition to your own conclusion – Ezekiel merely stated the fact; he did not make a recommendation or assessment either way besides Yahshua had not come at that point there would be no choice but to keep doing as mandated – All the while knowing that these were in Yah’s Words ‘not good’ because of disobedience – Like adding salt to the wound.

A reasonable alternative interpretation is that these “not good” statutes and judgments were those adopted from the heathens. It seems more plausible that the text is saying "because you have broken *my* commandments (vs 24), I am going to give you over to these pagan ways that I pronounce unclean because they pass their firstborn through the fires of Molech".

This is similar to what is said in Isaiah 63:17.

"O LORD, **why do you make us wander from your ways** and harden our heart, so that we fear you not?"

Also consider Acts 7:42.

"But God turned away from them **and gave them over to worship the host of heaven.**"

Finally, Romans 1:21-28 says that God gave the heathens "up to uncleanness," "unto vile affections," "to a reprobate mind." There are many other examples like this. Ezekiel's point was that the consequences of disobedience and rebellion against God's commands leads the sinner on to even greater sin. The Israelites rebelled against God. Therefore, the natural consequence of their disobedience was that they fell under the influence of the heathens.

The author is trying to wrench a position from the text, one cannot use the confusion of the nation finding what they had not been keeping for scores of decades to reinterpret Torah to another conclusion. This is not honest scholarship.

Also, the author decides to flagrantly deviate from the text;

Ezekiel 20:24 Because they had not executed my (Melchizedek) judgments, but had despised my (Melchizedek) statutes, and had polluted my (Melchizedek) sabbaths, and their eyes were after their fathers' (Pagan) idols.

Ezekiel 20:25 Wherefore *I* (Yahweh) gave them also (Levitical) statutes that were not good, and (Levitical) judgments whereby they should not live;

Now how much sense would it be that Yah 'gave (pagan?) statutes that were not good, and (pagan?) judgments' after lamenting that 'their eyes were after their fathers' (Pagan) idols'?

Yah is Not the author of confusion!

It makes much more sense to realize and accept that both the Melchizedek and the Levitical are both Torah given by Yah. The Melchizedek is the perfect will; the Levitical is the permissive fix.

The authors use of Eisegesis leads us away from the text. The text does not state 'statues of their enemies' - what our author incorrectly states above. It actually says: V. 25 ***Therefore ** I ** [YHWH] also gave them up to statutes that were not good, and judgments by which they could not live - Therefore ** I **.***

This is before the Genesis 49:10/Hebrews 7:12 change. Ezekiel is teaching the people like all the other prophets that wayward Israel is to turn back to the Book of the Law which they are under. He's not teaching against keeping the Book of the Law.

Ezekiel is simply recounting history. That after their rebellion that culminated at the Golden Calf, ***“Therefore I also gave them up to statutes that were not good, and judgments by which they could not live.”***

“Therefore I also” seems pretty clear that YAHWEH gave them up to (Levitical) Statutes that were not good after the Book of the Covenant breach!

The alternative to the imposed Book of the Law was YHWH instituting genocide on Israel, so yes, the Book of the Law is both a blessing (*you're not dead*) and a curse (*you're not in the Book of the Covenant blessings and now have to live under multiple curses and some blessings depending on your works*).

Deuteronomy 30:1 And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither YHWH thy Elohim hath driven thee.

Deuteronomy 29:21 And YHWH shall separate him unto evil out of all the tribes of Israel, according to all the curses of the covenant (Book of the Law is Levitical covenant not a Melchizedek Book of the Covenant of promise) ***that are written in this book of the law:***

Curses plural are not good! There are no curses, plural in the Book of the Covenant, only ONE, SINGULAR limited family curse (5th commandment) so here is ANOTHER SCRIPTURE PROOF of distinction between books!

Every single time the phrase ‘*commandments*’ is used in the Torah (63 times in the KJV) it always refers to YAHWEH's commandments NOT statues of enemies or pagan nations, EVER!

We have to be careful of reading one's own beliefs into the text – 1st off Ezekiel is speaking a fact not against keeping certain commandments in Torah (at that time – before Yahshua – before the Genesis 49:10 advent, before the change of the Law Hebrews 7:12), he is not a false prophet – our author is jumbling concepts that have to be sorted out with respect to time instead of injecting his own suppositions that were not stated.

There is a difference between giving them over – and giving 'them also' – both are true – to overlook that is not honest. The point is they broke the 'good' Melchizedek Book of the Covenant – they were also given the 'not good' Levitical Book of the Law which they also did not keep – YHWH then gave them over to the heathens.

2) The Priesthood was given to Aaron and his sons before the golden calf incident.

Then bring near to you Aaron your brother, and his sons with him, from among the people of Israel, to serve me as priests—Aaron and Aaron's sons, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar. –Exodus 28:1

If God established the priesthood and added the Book of the Law as a result of the golden calf, then why does it appear that it was His intention to give the Priesthood to Aaron before the golden calf incident ever happened?

Yes you can say that but you have to understand – The setting of the Exodus Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19:5-24:8) was the last time Moses ever saw a Melchizedek Israel keeping the Melchizedek Covenant. For after promising to keep the Covenant – Moses goes up the Mountain – 40 days later Israel makes the Golden Calf (Exodus 32); breaks the Covenant, defiles themselves and is no longer eligible to be that Melchizedek Priesthood (including Aaron and his sons). So – Moses started up with a Melchizedek intent -but- came down to a Levitical reality (Numbers 3:12). This ineligibility reigned for the next 15 centuries in the form of the Levitical Priesthood till Yahshua's death and resurrection, – releasing Him (Romans 7:1/Galatians 4:4) from the law (the category of Levitical Law Hebrews 7:11-15) to be – the Melchizedek High Priest (Hebrews 2:17; 3:1; 4:14-15; 5:5; 5:10; 6:20; 7:26; 8:1; 9:11; 10:21).

What would really bring clarity to this article and the book of the law/book of the covenant polemic is understanding Torah isn't chronological it's **achronological** (*not relating to, arranged in, or determined according to the order of time : not chronological*). Hebrews 7:11 testifies to this truth stating that the Book of the Law was given under Levitical priesthood which was determined at the Golden Calf breach.

The Church taught that Torah progresses according to the chronological order in which the events in the 5 books of Moses took place, whereas in yearly study of Torah it becomes apparent that Torah is achronological , this interpretation allows for thematic considerations in the Torah to place certain Parsha's together, even though each Parsha may have been given at different times.

When preparing for the weeks Parsha I always have to differentiate between 'narrative' and 'mitzvot.'

To me, it's logical to assume that the ongoing narrative of Torah follows chronological order, (e.g. the story of Issac will obviously follow the story of his father Avraham). But, we may find instances when a certain narrative concludes with details that took place many years later. Even the renowned Jewish Rabbi, Rashi himself believed the torah was composed this way believing the reason for the break in of the narrative at Exodus 25 with the Tabernacle was for the Golden Calf breach.

An example is the story of the manna in Parsha B'shalach concludes with YHWH's commandment to Moshe to place a sample of the manna next to the Aaron in the Ark of the Testimony (Exodus 16:33) . This commandment could only have been given **after** the Ark of the Testimony was completed, an event that doesn't occur until many months and chapters later (Ch 25). But, because that narrative deals with the manna (which first fell before the giving of Torah), a related event, even though it takes place at a later date, it can be included in the same Parsha.

The story of Judah and Tamar in Genesis is another classic example of achronology, since Tamar waited for Shelah to grow up, the second part of that story must have taken place at least thirteen years later, and hence **after** Yosef becomes viceroy in Egypt! Recall that he was sold at age 17 and solved Pharaoh's dream at age 30.

What about the 'mitzvot' in the Torah? In what order are they presented? Do they follow the chronological order by which they were first given?

Because the mitzvot are embedded within the narrative of Torah and are not presented in one unbroken unit (as explained above), the answer is popularly known as "*ein mukdam u'm'uchar ba'Torah*" (there is no chronological order in the Torah). Rashi, together with many other commentators (and numerous Midrashim), consistently hold that "*ein mukdam u'm'uchar.*" The Torah isn't written chronologically! The episode of The Golden Calf preceded the command to build the Tabernacle (as is maintained by Rashi in his commentary to Exodus 31:18). The Tabernacle was never YHWH's original intention but rather a requirement which resulted from the Sin of The Golden Calf. Again, the order of the Parsha's in the Torah is determined by thematic connections and not necessarily by the sequence of events.

By Exodus 20 we know that Moshe is receiving instructions from YHWH that get written down later, or he gives a discourse to the people that are summarized briefly at the time and the details come later [like sprinkling procedures reflected in the differing accounts of Exodus 24:6 and Hebrews 9:18-22. The procedure used by Moshe when he came down from the Mount in Exodus 24 is written down and described much later in Leviticus 14:5. Additionally, the Golden Altar of Incense is skipped in Exodus 25 and written down much later in Exodus 30]. This is not linear storytelling as we are used to it in the modern sense. It's achronological instead. The Torah isn't modern western

literature. You have to fight a bit to get the details together. They won't all be in the same convenient place!

Another example is in Parsha Lech Lecha, the death of Terach (Avraham's father) is mentioned at the end of Parsha Noach when, in reality, Terach was still alive when Avraham left for Eretz Canaan at age 75. Simple arithmetic bears this out.

Another biblical literary technique employed is "telescoping" it's a common Hebrew storytelling technique. Matthew does this, for example. Read his account of the calling of and sending out of the apostles. Sounds like it happened all at once. Read Mark and Luke--they are actually two separate occasions. Matthew telescopes his writings and Moshe uses an achronological approach to Torah, which allows for thematic considerations in the text. Both writers don't spoon feed us the exact chronology!

Deuteronomy 10:8 "At that time (after the Golden Calf breach with the second set of tablets (10:1) יהוה set aside the tribe of Levi.'

Hebrews 7:11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, for under it the people received the law, what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?

The people received the Book of the Covenant law before there was ever a Levitical Priesthood in Exodus 19-24.11. This verse is talking about a totally separate and distinct law (the book of the law) that must of been given after an event that changed a nation of priests, to a nation with a priest - the Golden Calf breach.

It's also helpful to note that all Priests are Levites, but not all Levites are Priests. Levites actually served as helpers to the Priests. They had some priestly duties, but they were not Priests themselves. It could be said that the Levites (not the Priests) were formally set apart for this service after the golden calf incident (Exodus 32:25-29). It is inferred that they replaced the firstborn for this particular service based on passages such as Numbers 3:12. However, this was not a change in priesthood, but rather a change in the office of priestly helpers to the sons of Aaron. Again, the priesthood on earth was established and given to Aaron and his sons before the golden calf incident.

The setting of the Exodus Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19:5-24:8) was the last time Moses ever saw a Melchizedek Israel keeping the Melchizedek Covenant. For after promising to keep the Covenant – Moses goes up the Mountain – 40 days later Israel makes the Golden Calf (Exodus 32); breaks the Covenant, defiles themselves and is no longer eligible to be that Melchizedek Priesthood (including Aaron and his sons). So – Moses started up with a Melchizedek intent but came down to a Levitical reality (Num. 3:12). This ineligibility reigned for the next 15 centuries in the form of the Levitical

Priesthood till Yahshua's death and resurrection, – releasing Him (Romans 7:1/ Galatians 4:4) from the law (the category of Levitical Law Hebrews 7:11-15) to be – the Melchizedek High Priest (Hebrews 2:17; 3:1; 4:14-15; 5:5; 5:10; 6:20; 7:26; 8:1; 9:11; 10:21).

Now what was the given home base setting? That Israel would be a kingdom nation of Priests; Right? This was the Melchizedek Priesthood for there was no such thing as a Levitical Priesthood at that time. So it then becomes evident that when Aaron and his Sons were tentatively mentioned at (you say) Exodus 28:1 actually Exodus 27:21 it was to be a nucleus center with the rest of Melchizedek Israel surrounding them – After the Golden Calf (which Aaron made then lied about) Covenant breach. Yahweh relented on wiping them all out. Why was Aaron and his Sons still allowed that distinction? The best Bible answer I can give is; – Romans 11:29 “For the gifts and calling of Yah are without repentance” (Numbers 23:19). Aaron and his Sons still retaining the nucleus (but no longer Melchizedek anything) were then surrounded by the rest of the Tribe of Levi *instead* of All Israel. The Levitical Priesthood was born, but there would be consequences (Numbers 3:2; 18:1).

Their response to this point was simply to say that some parts of Torah weren't written in chronological order. In other words, they believe that Exodus 28 happened after Exodus 32. I fully concede that parts of the Torah are not written in chronological order. However, some parts of it are -- and the transition between the end of Exodus 31:18 (right after all the tabernacle and priesthood commands) and the beginning of Exodus 32 strongly appear to be chronological. He gives Tabernacle commandments in chapter 31 and ends the chapter saying: *"31:18 And when He had made an end of speaking with him on Mount Sinai, He gave Moses two tablets of the Testimony, tablets of stone, written with the finger of God."* This tells us that Moses is on the mountain as God gives him commandments concerning the Tabernacle and then writes the Ten Commandments on stone. The very next chapter starts out telling us that Moses is still on the mountain when the golden calf incident occurs, and then verse 15 tells us that Moses came down from the Mountain with the stone tablets. One would need a very strong textual argument to show that this is not chronological.

Their entire hypothesis rests on a reverse chronology in this story, and because the foundation of their theory is based on this reverse chronology, this must be addressed -- not just in theory, but with irrefutable proof. The only possible argument that could be made is that the commands given throughout Exodus 25 – 31 are not what Moses received when he was on the Mountain for 40 days and 40 nights, as indicated by Exodus 24:18. But this argument is flawed because the narrative picks up in Exodus 32 with Moses coming down from the mountain. What was he doing on the mountain if not receiving the commands given in Exodus 25-31? Why would the Torah be written in such a confusing way? Every indication is that the entire section is chronological.

It must be reiterated that it is not stated anywhere that there was a change in the priesthood at the golden calf incident. If anything, the ordination of the Levites was established at that point. The Levites are not necessarily priests, though. Again, all priests are Levites, but not all Levites are priests.

Read; Proverbs 25:2 & Numbers 3:12 ***And I, behold, I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel *instead* of all the firstborn that openeth the matrix among the children of Israel: therefore the Levites shall be mine;***

And ask yourself what could have happened to cause YHWH or given Him the legal premise to change the covenant deal? – The only obvious answer is the total Covenant break of Exodus 32 (again see v:10).

3) God says that we are blessed when we keep His commands contained in the Book of the Law.

These two individuals talk about how the Book of the Law was set beside the Ark of the Covenant as a witness against the people of Israel (Deuteronomy 31:26). They interpret this to mean that the instructions in the Book of the Law were added as a punishment -- hence they were “against them.” They later correlate this concept with verses like Colossians 2:14 where it talks about Yeshua canceling the record of debt that stood “against us” -- and they read the “Book of the Law” into that passage. Their conclusion is that Yeshua took away the commandments contained in their definition of the Book of the Law, leaving only their definition of the Book of the Covenant to remain for Believers.

First of all our authors copy of Colossians 2:14 is a twist – it does not say ‘sin debt’ –

Colossians 2:14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that *was against us*, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;

Deuteronomy 31:26 Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of YHWH your Elohim, that it may be there for a *witness against thee*.

And if that isn't strong enough read all of Deuteronomy 31 and pick out the against/ indictment language.

Read the article – <https://torahwithourabbinics.wordpress.com/2014/11/10/cheirographon/>

But if the commands are a blessing then how can it be said that they are against us or added as a punishment for making an idol?

Exodus 32 was the corporate Israel nation breaking Covenant – And Yes; you can say the Levitical and its added Law was a Blessing – Right – over being completely annihilated, but it contains all the curses (plural) and is a curse compared to the status of Israel prior to the Golden Calf at Exodus 19-24.

When we read the context we discover that Deuteronomy 31:26 is teaching us that breaking God's law brings disaster. The Book of the Law stood as a “witness against them” because it informed them of the consequences of their actions. We've all broken the law; therefore, it stands as a witness against us because of our sin. Yeshua took away the

consequence of eternal damnation that we all deserve for breaking the law -- nailing our record of debt to the cross. He did not take away the law.

Nailing our record of sin debt to the cross' is just plain Christianese, void of scriptural validity – we have to remember the Book of the Covenant was the wedding Katubah – once agreed to then became Law – are your wedding vows against you? Confused? Go ahead ask your Wife – I dare you. It was against no one. However; Deuteronomy 31:26 Clearly says – Take this book of the law, .. it may be there for a *witness against thee* – Disregard this to your own peril.

He did not take away the Melchizedek law Genesis 1:1 thru Exodus 24:8-11.

4) There is no reason to believe that Covenants made after Exodus 24:8 are somehow less valid or binding.

A covenant is an agreement between two parties. Just because you have one agreement doesn't mean that you can't have more. When two people get married, they agree to certain terms of a Covenant (e.g., "in sickness and in health"). After the first week of marriage, there are hundreds of laws that are "added" to that agreement (e.g., "don't leave the toilet seat up"). Is God not allowed to have additional expectations of His people after giving them expectations in Exodus 20-24?

You say "Is God not allowed to have additional expectations of His people after giving them expectations in Exodus 20-24?" Yes exactly. Genesis 1:1 thru Exodus 24:11 is Melchizedek also and Yes – especially after they Break the Covenant agreement right from the start – Ezekiel 20:10-25 tells you that.

When I asked these two individuals this question, their response was that the laws given after Exodus 24:8 were "not a covenant." In fact, here is their exact quote from our e-mail exchange:

"BoL [Book of the Law] is Non-Covenant Torah, that was later added as a witness against us for breaking Covenant Torah. These later BoL laws are Not Covenant."

However, this is what Deuteronomy 29:1 says about the Book of the Law:

These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, besides the covenant which He made with them in Horeb." – Deuteronomy 29:1

This is after Exodus 24:8 and God makes it clear that the Book of the Law was called "Covenant."

Again, there is no reason to assume that we shouldn't follow one of God's commandments just because He commanded it after Exodus 24:8.

The author has not had a conversation with either Dr. Perry or myself on this matter, through email or any other venue. This is an untrue statement.

It would help us all to understand between Blood Ratified 'Covenants of Promise' that have to be proposed, agreed on and Blood Ratified with a Covenant confirming meal – just as you see at the Exodus 19:5-24:8-11 Book of the Covenant, opposed to shoe covenants, salt covenant and all sorts of non blood ratified covenants in the Book of the law. Try to find any of these Melchizedek issues in these later Non agreed to 'Covenants' which is more akin to Law enactments, you won't find any past Exodus 24.11 in the Torah.

5) The “change in the priesthood” was not a change to the earthly priesthood.

Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, since there are priests who offer gifts according to the law. – Hebrews 8:4

Hebrews 8:4 tells us that Yeshua cannot be a priest on earth, because according to the law, the earthly priesthood was given to Aaron (Exodus 28:1). This tells us that Yeshua's heavenly priesthood did not affect the earthly priesthood. The earthly priestly system is a copy and a shadow of the heavenly system. The heavenly tabernacle does not replace the earthly tabernacle, just like the establishment of the earthly tabernacle didn't replace the heavenly tabernacle (Exodus 25:9,40).

The author is using parts of Hebrews but ignoring vital texts like:

Hebrews 7:11-12 & 1 Peter 2:9 we must realize that the text is all present, or present-past tense as in already happened 2000 years ago – On earth as it is in Heaven – Remember? – And where are these Levitical priests 'who offer gifts according to the law?'

This is a theology flip, our author comes from a 'no law' church – but just as then is now stuck in an 'all law' position – hiding behind 'the law' that what? Isn't happening? And hasn't happened for 2000yrs? Ever since 70AD – And what is more will not consider that there is a mid-point law position in Melchizedek neither 'no law' or 'all law' – yet Torah; the narrow road!

Their response to this point was simply to ask which priesthood we are part of if Yeshua's priesthood is not on earth (citing 1 Peter 2:9 which states that we [Followers of Yeshua] are a royal priesthood).

My question to them is, if Yeshua is not a priest on earth then why are we? Furthermore, Peter clearly states that he is referring to a spiritual priesthood, not an earthly one (see verse 5 of 1 Peter 2). Not all of us are priests on earth; only the sons of Aaron are priests on earth. However, we all should function as priests from a spiritual perspective (priest means minister and servant of the High Priest). Peter is simply applying the quote from Exodus to Believers in Yeshua to make a point. He's drawing a Spiritual principle to say that we should behave as holy ministers and servants of Yeshua. He isn't randomly declaring that Christians have replaced the sons of Aaron as the literal priests on earth.

Most Christians don't see themselves as Israel or keep the Covenant. How utterly clueless you are – You make my point in spite of yourself – You yourself say “Peter is

simply midrashing the quote from Exodus and applying it to Believers in Yeshua.” Really? This part is correct – What is not correct – Is that you won’t realize that Exodus 19:5-6 is the Melchizedek Priesthood offer “IF” they keep the Covenant – We know at Exodus 32 they did NOT! And how pray tell can Peter be applying it to Believers in Yahshua if it didn’t happen just as you yourself pronounce? – present tense 2000 years ago. 1 Peter 2:9 is then, here & now, to everlasting a call to the Royal/Kingly Melek Zedek Priesthood.

6) Yeshua said that nothing from the Torah (including the Book of the Law) will pass away until heaven and earth passes away (Matthew 5:17-19).

Their response was essentially to agree that nothing has passed away, but they said that we still don’t have to keep the commands contained in the Book of the Law anymore because of the change in priesthood -- which makes the phrase “pass away” rather meaningless.

Again it becomes painfully aware that our author hasn’t read, understood the polemic to begin with with statements like these.

Matthew 5:17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. 18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

Genesis 49:10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; ...

I am come = until Shiloh come – the first time – Think not that I am come to destroy.. but to fulfill this includes Genesis 49:10 obviously during His earthly life time – till all be fulfilled including Genesis 49:10 which has already happened and the Unfolding of Yah’s Kingdom continues to happen – ie be fulfilled.

Commands can be inapplicable because there is no way to literally keep them (as explained above), but the passage is clear that no commandment has been made void or invalid. Indeed, many of the commands that are inapplicable now will become applicable again when Yeshua returns.

Our author is deciding that commandments are inapplicable, whereas nowhere does the bible sanction certain commandments as inapplicable outside of a sanctioned Melchizedek “change also of the law,” “until Shiloh.” Chapter and verse are glaringly absent for this double talk hypocrisy.

7) God has more than Ten Commandments.

As briefly mentioned above, one of the aspects of their hypothesis is that all of the commands contained in the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19:5 – 24:8) were written on the stone tablets. However, Deuteronomy 5:22 states that it was only the Ten Commandments that were written on the two tablets. After Moses gets done repeating the Ten Commandments, he says:

These words the Lord spoke to all your assembly at the mountain out of the midst of the fire, the cloud, and the thick darkness, with a loud voice; and **he added no more**. And he wrote them on the two tablets of stone and gave them to me.

Our author is just too narrow in his study and thinking – Deuteronomy 4:1, 5:1 along with Deuteronomy 9:10, 10:4 needs to be thoroughly investigated.

That phrase “on the mountain out of the midst of the fire on the day of the assembly” identifies one day – the giving of the entire Book of the Covenant at Sinai (Exodus 19:5 – 24:8 specifically Exodus 20 thru 23)

Big difference between ‘the day of the assembly’ and the 40 days of the one man Moses.

Also, Deuteronomy 10:4 states:

And he wrote on the tablets, in the same writing as before, the Ten Commandments that the Lord had spoken to you on the mountain out of the midst of the fire on the day of the assembly. And the Lord gave them to me.

Their response was that the Hebrew word “lo,” which is translated in English as “no” in Deut. 4:22 doesn’t actually mean “no.” I’m not a Hebrew scholar, but I have not been able to verify this at all. Furthermore, they claimed that the Hebrew word “Eser,” translated in English as “ten” (Deut 10:4), could actually mean more than ten. But this Hebrew word is used 157 times in the Bible and every single instance it means the exact number ten. Again, I simply could not verify these claims -- even after checking with people who know Biblical Hebrew to make sure I'm not missing anything.

This is actually very critical, because if these Hebrew words are translated correctly, then it would mean that what these individuals are defining as “Covenant commandments” -- the only ones we should still be keeping -- are actually limited to only the Ten Commandments.

At least be honest – “doesn’t actually mean “no.””??? – doesn’t actually *always* mean no!

Let alone accurate – Deuteronomy 4:22? – don’t you mean Deuteronomy 5:22?

Deuteronomy 4:1, 5:1 ‘statutes AND judgments’ prefaces Deuteronomy 5:22

H3808

לה לוא לא

lo^' lo^' lo^h

; a primitive particle; not (the simple or abstract negation); by implication no; often used with other particles: – X before, + or else, ere, + except, ig [-norant], much, less, nay, neither, never, no ([-ne], -r, [-thing]), (X as though . . . , [can-], for) not (out of), of nought, otherwise, out of, *+ surely, + as truly as, + of a truth, + verily, for want*, + whether, without.

surely, as truly as, of a truth, verily, for want – “more”.

That would be the theological implication of their position if those passages are translated correctly (which they are).

8) There is no reason to assume that the commands placed on the side of the Ark are less important or valid than the commands placed inside the Ark.

Furthermore, if the commands placed on the side of the Ark of the Covenant are somehow less important, then by that formula, the entire rest of the Bible, including the New Testament documents, are therefore even *less* important as they are not included in the Temple at all!

A wonderful example of Greek ‘if-then’ logic – But- We are dealing with the Bible – Hebrew Block Logic and Yes; what was placed “IN” the Ark is separate to Yah therefore more important – Agreed?

Yahshua Himself spoke of the ‘weightier issues of Law’ Matthew 23:23.

9) There is no evidence that this theory is true.

Why is there not a single trace of clear instruction or dialogue about this supposed distinction in the entire Bible? If this theory is true, then it would most certainly be the most important doctrinal revelation since creation. And indeed, it would be reasonable to assume that the prophets would have foretold of it. Also, wouldn't the apostles have gone into great depth on the subject so that there would be no confusion? Furthermore, there is so much arguing between Paul and his opponents on the issue of Torah, but not one single time did he think to just explain to the Circumcision Party that there are two different books!?

“There is no evidence that this theory is true.” Another direct fabrication!

Our author says “Why is there not a single trace of clear instruction or dialogue about this distinction in the entire Bible?” Oh but there is Galatians 3:17-19 from v:10 for one. You say “you would think that the prophets would have foretold it” Oh but they did Genesis 49:10 for one – Ezekiel 20:24-25 for another.

“Not one single time did he think to just explain to the Circumcision Party” see the above – But we also must remember Paul was in a time of initial transition to an old Jew mindset the would not see it another way (much like you).

Paul is brilliant and it seems unreasonable that he would miss such an opportunity to set the record straight. On the other hand, he seems to defend the Torah to the hilt. This topic is extremely controversial between Torah-based Messianics today and those who hold to this doctrine -- how much *more* would it be controversial in a world full of Jewish Messianics who were even more zealous about the Law since the Temple was still standing? Yet there is not a single biblical or extra biblical source telling us of such arguments? This alone makes it very suspicious to me as a modern day creation.

Yet there is not a single biblical or extra biblical source telling us of such arguments?”

This is a clear and easily refutable false statement of facts (see 1-10 below) that the author uses to try and establish a false premise. A false premise in which to entice the reader into drawing a false conclusion. Making false statements like 1, 2 & 3 above now brings into question all subsequent statements made by the author throughout the rest of the article.

1. I for one don't like to look to extra biblical sources to validate a biblical belief, but since the authors first point requires it: The Book of Jubilees penned after the Golden Calf Breach starts in V.1 with V.1 of the Book of the Law: *'Come up to Me on the Mount, and I will give you two tables of stone of the Torah and of the commandment, which I have written, that you may teach them.'* Why would Jubilees start at exactly the correct opening verse of the book of the law if the book of the law is nothing more than a run on from the book of the covenant with no beginning/ opening verse? The chances of 1 verse being exact in its placement out of all the verses of all of scripture is remarkable and should cause one to take pause and reconsider by this fact alone.
2. Christianity has heavily documented *'a change in law'* post resurrection of Christ and has used the unbiblical terms, *"moral law"* and *'ceremonial law'* as terms of distinction of law due to it accepting the change and distinction written in the NEW TESTAMENT Scriptures (Hebrews 7.12) and noting the clear and distinct NEW TESTAMENT usage of the phrase *'book of the law'* (Galatians 3:10).
3. OLD TESTAMENT PROOF of a change and distinction in law: Genesis 49:10 states there will be a change in the law: *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. Until* means impending change, *'a change of law'* (Hebrews 7:12).
4. Even Rabbi Rashi distinguishes between the 2 of them.
http://www.chabad.org/library/bible_cdo/aid/9885/jewish/Chapter-24.htm#showrashi=true
5. Jewish Encyclopedia <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/book-of-the-covenant>

6. **Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages and Literatures at the University of Pennsylvania Jeffrey Tigay** teaches they are two different scrolls. Question posed by a theology student to Professor Jeffrey Tigay, Q: *'It seems to me that the Book of the Covenant (BoC) is different than the Book of the Law (BoL), because in the verse-A leads me to think that BoC already done/finish/complete that time when Moses took the blood and threw it on the people and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant that the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words." On the other hand, BoL is still being written - it's the book where Moses is writing verse-B. So then there are two books, the BoC and the BoL.'* **Answer** from Professor Jeffrey Tigay Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages and Literatures at the University of Pennsylvania: *Ans: Book of the Covenant refers specifically to what was given in Exodus 20:19-23:33, which begins The Lord said to Moses: Thus shall you say to the IsraelitesSo in a sense I think you are right...they are two different scrolls...although the Book of the Covenant is a subsection of the greater Torah Teaching.*
7. **The Elohist ("E")**: *According to the modern documentary hypothesis, the text of the Book of the Covenant was originally independent, but later embedded by the Elohist ("E") in their writings.*
8. **Oxford University Press, England**: It is much debated within academic circles whether the Ritual Decalogue, or the Covenant Code, was the original form, as they have a strong resemblance to one another. It is certainly the case that the Covenant Code resembles an expansion of the Ritual Decalogue, but conversely, the Ritual Decalogue resembles a summarizing of the Covenant Code. Nevertheless, it is equally possible that both of these codes were independently constructed. Raymond Westbrook, "What is the Covenant Code?" in *Theory and Method in Biblical and Cuneiform Law: Revision, Interpolation and Development*, ed. B.M. Levinson (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 15-36.^ **a b** Coogan, Michael D., *A Brief Introduction to the Old Testament*, Oxford University Press, 2009, p. 424.^ **a b c d** Coogan, pp. 109–110
9. Dr. David Perry Th.d. received his Doctorate of Theology from a nationally accredited university; his doctrinal dissertation was based upon the distinction of the book of the covenant compared to the book of the law and the dissertation obviously underwent thorough peer review for him to receive a Doctorate on the subject.
10. **Book of the Law is first alluded to in Deuteronomy 17:18, "write a copy of this law in a book"** Why? Moses already had the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 24:7-8). Then in Deuteronomy 28:61 **"Book of this Law."** First mentioned by name (Book of the Law) in Deuteronomy 29:21. this is a red flag because It states **"..according to all the CURSES of the Covenant that are written in this Book of**

the Law,” this proves that we are looking at two distinctly separate books because there were NO curse's' (plural) mentioned before, during, or at the initiation of the covenant of Exodus 19:5, concurrent through to its ratification of Exodus 24:8. Some might say, 'what about Exodus 20:5? "...**visiting the iniquities of the father to the third and fourth generation...**" (from the 10 Commandments). But this is a ONE specific individual family limited curse. This isn't the personal and national curse's' for covenant breaking, contained in the Book of the Law, Exodus 25 – 40, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Our author says "Paul is brilliant" Yes!!! And if he would have studied him and compared that to Torah he would understand how brilliant.

Romans 10:2 For I bear them record that they have a zeal of 'God', but not according to knowledge. 3 For they being ignorant of Yah's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of Yah.

All of us are to go on to Yah's Spiritual Maturity; (Note, these are Yahshua's words)

Matthew 6:33 But seek ye first the kingdom of Yah, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

Did you notice the two phrases? – 'the righteousness of Yah', 'the kingdom of Yah, and his righteousness'. 'kingdom' in Hebrew is 'Malakah', YHWH Elohim is the King or 'Melek' and 'righteousness' is 'Zedek or in other words in Hebrew – Melchizedek.

10) The Apostles all continued to keep and teach the commands contained in the Book of the Law.

Paul says that "all" Scripture is "breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness." This would include the Book of the Law. James makes the judgment that the Gentiles will learn the rest of the Torah every Sabbath in the synagogue (Acts 15:21) knowing that the rabbis would be teaching the Book of the Law in addition to the Book of the Covenant. Is James advocating that the Gentiles learn false doctrine? Furthermore, all four of the commands listed in Acts 15:20 that Gentiles were specifically commanded to do are found in the "Book of the Law." Paul continued to observe Yom Kippur by fasting in Acts 28:9. Paul takes a nazirite vow in Acts 21:20-26. The list goes on and on.

Did the author just forget or would he have us rather ignore Acts 15:10?

Acts 15:10 Now therefore why tempt ye Elohim, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? This had to do with the "Book of the Law."

Acts 15:21 Yes they/we are to learn the complete Torah – How else are we to ‘rightly divide’ it (2 Timothy 2:15 – By Paul)

@ “Furthermore, all four of the commands listed in Acts 15:20 that Gentiles were specifically commanded to do are found in the “Book of the Law.”

This ignores the fact that; All of these are listed between Genesis 1:1 thru Exodus 24:8-11- The Melchizedek portion of Torah.

There are many more reasons that I can list, but I believe that these 10 reasons are sufficient to demonstrate the errors in this teaching. In conclusion, if and until these objections are addressed, there is simply no reason to believe that there is a distinction between the Book of the Covenant and the Book of the Law or that the Book of the Law is done away with. As Paul says, *all* scripture is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness ... not just the parts of Scripture before Exodus 24:8.

“All” except the parts the author doesn't like, doesn't agree with or can't interpret correctly, which he then puts in the 'not applicable now box.' Like Genesis 49:10 the Premier Torah Scripture of the Prophecy of coming / now come thru Yahshua; Change!!!

References:

- <https://davidwilber.me/articles/matthew-nolan-and-david-perrys-melchizedek-doctrine-subtracting-from-torah>
- <https://www.facebook.com/notes/david-wilber/should-we-only-keep-the-commands-contained-in-the-book-of-the-covenant-and-not-t/10154567992415702>
- <https://torahwithoutrabbinics.wordpress.com/2014/11/10/melkizedeq-priesthood-attack-ii/>

Educational Resources:

- <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2018/02/03/melchizedek-two-book-theory-debunked-torah-tribes-response/>
- <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2018/01/20/book-law-part-1/>
- <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2015/04/04/clearing-covenant-confusion/>