

The Book of the Covenant vs. The Book of the Law? - 119

- They start out with: *The validity of God's law is being attacked.*

1 Tim 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of Elohim, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

2 Cor. 8:13 And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished/katargeo/betêl-טל·ב. to stop, to cease, to hinder.

Eph 2:15 Having abolished/katargeo/betêl-טל·ב. in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace.

Note: it's only the law/torah of commandments contained in ordinances that falls under the *abolishment clause*; NOT the law/torah contained in covenant!

The Synagogue of Sa.tan is trying to resurrect a MINISTRATION OF DEATH.

2 Co 3:7 But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, (Deut 27 Ezek 20;25) was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; (second set of tablets) which glory was to be done away:8 How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious?9 For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.

2 Tim 1:10 But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Yahusha Messiah, who hath abolished/katargeo/betêl-טל·ב. death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.

(Defining abolish, obsolete, done away with)

What abolished DOES mean:

Ezr 6:8 Moreover I make a decree what ye shall do to these elders of the Jews for the building of this house of Elohim: that of the king's goods, even of the tribute beyond the River, expenses be given with all diligence unto these men, that they be not abolished/hindered.

Darius makes a decree not to hinder/abolish the work of the men who are rebuilding the temple. So the context of abolish is based upon not hindering the new building up of a temple that was previously destroyed.

The context of the “*abolished*” clause in the NT is the book of the law is NOT to hinder the building of the One New Man into the Commonwealth of Israel, as a Holy nation and a Kingdom of Priests.

The book of the law is no longer a hinderance to the building up of the new temple man that was previously destroyed.

Ezr 4:21 Give ye now commandment to cause these men to cease, and that this city be not builded, until another commandment shall be given from me. Context is the building up of a new temple and commandments being given and commandments ceasing.

Ezr 5:5 The context is one cannot cause the building up of the new temple to cease because it's by the hand of Yah.

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

Exo 19:8 informs us the Book of the covenant is of faith, “***All that יהוה hath spoken we will do.***” That's of faith.

Whereas the Book of the law was not of faith it was: ***imposed on them until the time of reformation. Heb. 9:10.***

What abolished DOES NOT mean:

Heb. mâchâh מנח, Gk: apollumi, destroyed.

Heb. 9:16 For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. 17 For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.

A Will, a death is required in order to secure what יהוה promised to do.

You can only have one Will in administration at a time.

By the 2018 will being signed and sealed by all parties it's the Will in.

Darius made command, a decree concerning the administration of the building of a new temple.

- They say: *a fringe segment of the Messianic Movement:*
- They go on: *New Revelation*
- More: *Received gods law at Mt. Sinai* (BOC was actually received not BoL)
- *BoC Exo 20-24:8. Begins with the 10 comms in Exo 20. Ends Exo 24:8 BoL Exo 24:9 - Deut. 34.* (False premise = false conclusion)
- they then switch it up and then say “*some proponents say*” *it’s actually Gen 1-Exo 24:8.* Still wrong! How can you make an argument for your beliefs against another belief if you don’t even know what the foundation of the other belief is?
- *It was then taught that the BoL was added to the BoC as some kind of punishment for Golden Calf!* (This is untrue, they don’t even comprehend the teaching. You cannot add to a broken covenant. Gal 3:15)
- *The Levitical priestly system was not part of gods original plan.* (He got that right, lets see: **kingdom of priests, Levi paid tithe in Abe - Heb.7.9; Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away - Heb. 8.13,** then we have: Genesis 49:10, Exodus 32, Numbers 3:12, Numbers 8:15-17, Joshua 5:5 – and Hebrews 7:11-12 evidences it)
- *Tziti Tzit and YK are in BoL - abolished.* (see: abolishment clause)
- YK was first instituted in the BoC anyway - Gen. 3.21 on the 10th day of Tishri - and we are instructed how to keep it in Heb.9.8 NOT Lev 16:1. ***The Ruach this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing:9 Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and 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.....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 Messsiah, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to יהוה , purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living יהוה ?***

- Tzitzit:

Gal 3:14 That the blessing of Abraham might come on the nations through Messiah Yahusha; that we might receive the promise of the Ruach through faith.16. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Yahusha.

This same Abraham who never wore Tzitzit, This same Isaac, same Jacob-Israel - to whom the promises were made.

Tzitzit were instituted because the children of Israel couldn't even keep the 4th commandment and went a gathering sticks...why? V.14 of Galatians...BECAUSE THEY HADN'T RECEIVED THE PROMISE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT!

2 Co 9:8 states; And יהוה is able to make all unmerited favor abound toward you; that you, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good mitzvoth/work.

Rom 7:6 we are delivered from the BoL/law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.

Rom 8:3 For what the BoL/law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh.

- *The bible never makes a clear distinction between the BoC and the BoL, in-fact the opposite is true.* The Josiah effect - 2 Cr 34. Synonym stumble. *Why read the BoL tear your clothes and then read a completely different book, it just doesn't make any sense.*
- *The priesthood was given to aaron and his sons before the Golden Calf.* Torah is not chronological in mitzvoth but achronological. Heb. 7:11 testifies to this truth.

Deut 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.' **Heb 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?

Exo 24:12 clears this up: **“And יהוה said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them.”**

- Next they build a straw man stating a truth: *all priests are Levites (tribe of Levi) - not all Levites are priests (Sons of Aaron)* then blowing it over with: *It could perhaps be said, that the Levites were ordained for the service after the sin of the Golden Calf, But that wouldn't of been the official establishment of the Levitical Priesthood, if anything it would only be the establishment of the priestly helpers, to the sons of Aaron.*

Num 3:9 you shall give the Levites to Aaron and his sons....and they shall attend to their priesthood.

- Then they admit to being aware of the Chronological achronological truth but deny it with a graph which shows.....”*Moses up the mountain from Exo 20-32:15.*” And state, *“it’s clear that the entire section is chronological.”*

They truly lumped Moshe’s 10 ascents up Mt. Sinai into 1 long staycation. from Exo 20-32:15. They miss his first 4 ascents and then lump another 4 ascents into 1 and then completely miss another 2 ascents for a total whopping fail of 6 ascents missed.

1. Ex 3
2. Ex 19:3
3. Ex 19:8
4. Ex 19:20
5. Ex 20:21-23:33 (includes the blood ratification of the BoC. Nothing can be added e.g. accents 6-10! Don't lump accents strung together with a Greek chronology)
6. Ex 24:9
7. Ex 24:12
8. Ex 32:1
9. Ex 32:31
10. Ex 34

Their 2 pillars:

1. The bible never makes a clear distinction between the BoC and the BoL

2. The priesthood was given to Aaron and his sons before the sin of the golden calf.

Challenge: *demonstrate a distinction between BoC and BoL:*

“write a copy of this law in a book” Why? Moses already had the BoC (Ex. 24:7-8). Then in Dt.28:61 we see **“Book of this Law.”** BUT it is first mentioned by name (Book of the Law) in Dt.29:21.

This passage destroys their first pillar in one verse, the pillar falls because this text states **“..according to all the CURSES of the Covenant (Ex. 34) that are written in this Book of the Law,”** conclusively showing that we are looking at two distinctly separate books!

The problems begin with the fact that there were NO curse's' (plural) mentioned before, during, or at the initiation of the covenant of Ex.19:5, concurrent through to it's ratification of Ex.24:11.

Challenge: *Causal relationship between the sin of the golden calf and God's commandments given throughout Exo -Deut.*

Deut 31:26 Take this book of the law and put it at the side of the Ark of the Testimony of vuvh your Elohim, that it may be there for a witness against you. The Covenant and the Promise are not part of the Law. The law in the New Testament Paul is speaking of is none other than *'The Book of the Law'* (Gal 3:10) that is not part of the Covenant – that cannot be mixed in as Covenant.

Gal 3:19 'Wherefore then serveth the law (BoL Gal 3:10). It was added because of transgressions Transgressions? *To what? The Law?* Are we really to conclude that the law, was 'added' to the law, because of transgressions *to the law?* That doesn't make any sense. Neither does the Torah being added to Torah.

The only way that Gal 3:19 makes sense in light of v:17 & :18 of Gal, is that the 'Law' which could never be Covenant was 'added' (along side in a pocket) next to the Covenant because of *'transgressions'* against the Covenant with the sin of the Golden Calf which is exactly what Deut 31:26 records.

2 pillars down.....