

LIES OF THE JUDAIZERS

Well, I had planned to do a study on the Feast of Tabernacles tonight but unfortunately, I had a very bad week and I couldn't get that study together on time. I apologize to those who were looking forward to this particular study. Next week, God willing, I'll have it.

Earlier in the week, I got into an email conversations with some folks who are into the teachings of Messianic Judaism. One of these people was a sister who referred me to the writings of a certain Messianic Gentile named Brad Scott, who has a web site called "*Wildbranch Ministry*".

<http://wildbranch.org/About/index.html>

You all know that I don't agree with the teachings of the Messianic Jewish Movement, and that I don't hesitate to speak out against them. But I do try to be as polite as possible to Messianic *Jews* because God has placed a special love in our hearts for the Jewish people. Though I'm convinced the teachings of Messianic Jews are wrong, in my view, they have somewhat of an excuse for not letting go of Moses. The *identity* of the Jewish *race* is found in Moses, not in Christ; and the *special call* of the Jewish race rests upon the Law that was given to Moses, not the teachings of Christ or the apostles.

It's the kosher laws, the ceremonial laws, the sacrificial laws, and all the other types of commandments Jewish people received at Mt. Sinai, which set them apart from the rest of the nations. Remove the Law, and you remove the specialness and distinctiveness of the Jewish race. So it's understandable that Jews have a hard time letting go of Moses.

However, I don't have the same level of tolerance for "*wanna-be Jews*"—that is, Messianic Gentiles or Gentiles who observe the Jewish Law. My experience with "*wanna-be-Jews*" is that they are much more arrogant, proud and *unteachable* than their Jewish counterparts. Plus, in my view, "*wanna-be-Jews*" have no excuse for putting themselves under the yoke of the Law. The identity of Gentile believers should be in Christ—in the "*new man*" who is neither Jew or Gentile, neither male or female. The call of Gentile Christians, the salvation of Gentile Christians, and the relationship of Gentile Christians to their Savior is not rooted in Moses—it's rooted in Christ and the Cross.

Gentile believers who allow themselves to be seduced by Judaism are in danger of ending up eternally lost because I've yet to find a "*wanna-be-Jew*" who (deep down in his heart) doesn't think anyone who refuses to obey the Torah is not *really* serving the true God. I've yet to find a "*wanna-be-Jew*" who (deep down in his heart) doesn't think Gentile Christians are serving some kind of lawless deity. Gentile Christians who become involved in Torah observance usually become *self-righteous prigs* and the head of "*Wildbranch Ministry*" is a good example of this.

Mr. Scott has a whole slew of false teachings on his site regarding the Law. One section in particular seeks to *refute* certain passages in the New Testament which clearly teach that Gentile Christians are no longer required to observe the Law. I'm going to look at a few of these refutations in order to demonstrate a *double-talking liar* this man is. He's very good at twisting the meaning of these passages with false logic and Greek word definitions. Many of the arguments he uses to defend bringing Gentiles back in bondage to the Law are used by all the leaders of the Messianic Jewish movement.

His view of the Law is laid out in his “*What We Believe*” page. Here, Mr. Scott sounds very polite and amiable. He says the New Testament is simply *Y’shua’s interpretation* of the Old Testament. The Torah has never redeemed (justified) people. People are saved by grace through faith. The Torah is only designed to *bless* people. The Lord’s purpose for mankind has never changed—His teachings and instructions in the Old Testament continue to be for us today. So the issue of obedience to the Law, according to Mr. Scott, has to do with us being “blessed”. His line is: “Everyone wants to be blessed by God, don’t they? Well, of course they do. So my friends, it’s in *your best interest* to come back under the Law with me”. However, his real attitude comes out in the following article:

“...those of you who are out there running around trying to find as many excuses as you can to support **a lawless theology** and **stick your finger in the face of God**, you will indeed give an account for that soon and very soon. The very reason our country continues to lead the world in all the immoral issues you can think of is because of **lawless**, feel good, let’s make some money, free in Jesus, religious leadership. **You WILL answer for all the clueless masses you led down the wide path to hell, and you WILL stand before a righteous God to explain why you taught that a New Testament Jesus came to free us from an Old Testament God whose commandments** were designed to bless us and keep us safe. I will make it as plain as I can. The current immoral and perilous condition of our nation lies squarely in your lap.”

Moral & Ceremonial Law Part 4
April 8, 2009

Christian leaders who refuse to submit to the Law of Moses are sticking their fingers in the face of God. They are also to blame for the current condition of America and indeed, the entire world. Moreover, we will soon have to give an account for all the people we are leading to Hell. But wait! Why exactly are the clueless masses “on the wide path to Hell”? Is it because they refuse to be “saved by grace”? Is it because they refuse to place their trust in the blood of Jesus for the forgiveness of their sins and justification?

No! They are on the wide path to Hell because they believe “*Jesus came to free them from an Old Testament God whose commandments were designed to bless us and keep us safe*”. In other words, they are on their way to Hell because they won’t obey the Law of the Old Testament.

But wait! I thought obeying the Law only had to do with us being *blessed* or not being blessed. I thought obeying the Law had nothing to do with our salvation. Looks like those who don’t obey the commandments of the Old Testament are losing a lot more than the blessing of God if they are on their way to Hell because they won’t obey the Law. They are losing the SALVATION of God!

Right away you can see this “wanna-be-Jew” is a double-talking liar. He tries to seduce people with friendly words and flattery, telling them that obeying the Law has nothing to do with salvation. But the truth of what he *really* believes deep down in his heart comes to the surface in this article. I dare say this is the case with the vast majority of Messianic Jews and Messianic Gentiles. All their talk about not being justified by obeying the Law is just lies and deception. Deep down in their hearts, most of them believe just what this arrogant prig believes—those who won’t obey the Law will end up in Hell.

Now, let’s look at a few of the passages that Mr. Scott tries to refute in order to convince people that they have not been set free from the Law. The first passage is in Galatians.

*Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, **how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.***

Galatians 4:8-10

I'm not going to quote his arguments at length—but just the highlights which are necessary to let you see what he is saying. He begins his rebuttal of this particular passage by saying:

“Anytime an association is made between the people of YHVH and Torah, there are a handful of **knee jerk scriptures** that are quoted that are supposed to **put a sock in the mouths of anyone who dares to proffer such a relationship**. I would like to spend some time in our teaching section on those scriptures. You know which ones I mean. The majority of texts that are brought up come from Sha'ul and his teachings. **I believe it is an understatement to say that Sha'ul is misunderstood**. My personal experience is that **most 'Christians' I encounter know virtually nothing about his background or the source of his teaching**”.

His arrogance is displayed in the very first paragraph. Any passage of Scripture that he doesn't like; any passage which reveals that we are no longer under the Law, that we are no longer obligated to observe any part of that Law, he calls “knee jerk scriptures”. Then he says most Christians are ignorant of the man Paul—his teachings and the source of his teachings. Well, I've got news for Mr. Scott: no part of the Scripture is “knee-jerk”; and this Gentile knows the background and the source of Paul's teaching very well—probably better than most—and I intend to put a very big “sock” in his lying mouth.

In his next statement, he tries to use “bait-and-switch” logic. His point is that the people Paul is writing to in Galatians were serving pagan Gods before they were converted. So when Paul says they are *returning* to the weak and beggarly elements of days, months, times and years, these things could not have been the *Jewish* beggarly elements of days, months, times and years because the Galatians were never under the Jewish Law to begin with. If they are returning to laws, it's pagan laws not Jewish laws.

“It is always amazing to me to watch how quickly the right hand can betray the left hand. I read a commentary recently on this book, in which the writer carefully established the audience of Sha'ul's letter before blasting the obsolete 'law' as allegedly taught by Sha'ul in the schoolmaster comments in chapter 3. He spent a good deal of time establishing the fact that **the letter was written to believing Gentiles** who were being coerced by 'Jewish converts' to believe that in addition to salvation in Yahshua, they must obey Torah and be circumcised. In other words, the blood of Yahshua was not enough to save, and they needed to add Torah obedience as well. Now, in general, I would heartily agree. But after establishing that Sha'ul's audience was Gentile, **he quickly turned the same audience into 'legalistic' Jews**. Quickly the 'weak and beggarly elements' became Torah and the observances of days, months, times and years became 'Old Testament' observances. This is because if he would have remained with his initial audience, **Gentiles, then he would have had a tough time explaining that those who worshipped other gods and 'knew not Elohiym' were Jews**.

So the first argument of this guy is that the commentator he is referring to is being *dishonest* because he is trying to turn a clearly Gentile audience into a legalistic Jewish one. How so? Because the commentator is interpreting what Paul said about these believers *returning* to days and months and years and times as *Jewish* days, months and years and times—and in Mr. Scott’s mind, Paul would never be saying such a thing to Gentiles. He would only be saying something like that to Jewish believers because *only* Jewish believers would return to Jewish holy days. Gentile believers would return to *pagan* holy days.

But you see, the whole question of what Paul meant by the terms, “days, months, times and years” must be answered by the Scripture, not by the opinion of a self-righteous “wanna-be-Jew”. Only if Mr. Scott is right, can the commentator be accused of trying to turn a Gentile audience into a legalistic Jewish one. If he is wrong—and he is—then he’s the one who is being dishonest.

“In our Galatians text, Sha’ul is saying, “I have delivered you from the sick and beggarly ways **you used to walk**, do not go back to **your old ways**.” Once a person is free from bondage and can get up and stand, **Torah then teaches us how to walk**”.

Mr. Scott says Paul isn’t telling the Galatians not to go back to the Jewish Law. He’s telling them not to go back to “their old ways”—their old pagan ways—which would include pagan days, months, years and times. Then he says, once people have been set free from their old ways (ie: by faith through grace), then “*Torah teaches us how to walk*”. Again, this is the standard line of all Messianics. We don’t obey the Law in order to be justified. We obey the Law to be sanctified (ie: learn how to walk).

They say that when Paul wrote things like: “***Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh***” (Gal. 5:16); or “***If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit***” (Gal. 5:25); or “***...that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit***” (Rom 8:4); he was telling us that we do this by obeying the Law. Messianic Jews think the only thing Jesus came to do was to help us obey the Law the Moses the proper way, the way it’s supposed to be obeyed—through the Spirit.

“Now we come to. . .the accusation that the observance of days, months, and times, and years, are 'Jewish' observances. **Here we have the most profound case of blindness**, for even the most cursory examination of the cultures of any civilization are filled with the study and observation of days, months, times, and years. Why, in an almost Pavlov way, do so many commentators **jump to the conclusion that these are 'Jewish' observances?** Who is our audience here? The Tenakh is full of warnings by YHVH to stay away from the astrologers, observers of times, and stargazers of the nations (D'varim 4:19, 18:10-11; Yesha'yahu 47:3; Daniel 2:2). These ungodly cultures sought the movement of celestial bodies to advise their lives and their futures. They depended upon heavenly formations as indicators of the coming wrath of the gods or the pouring out of their grace. Certain days and months were bad luck because of the positions of various constellations. These observances kept their followers in bondage to them. **This verse has nothing to do with the ordained beginning of months, times, and years as given to us by our Creator from the very beginning**”. . .If Galatians 4 is taken in the context of ALL of scripture, then the reference here is to Gentiles who have been delivered from **their 'own works'** and are exhorted **not to go back to them or their 'gods' for deliverance**”.

Mr. Scott says those of us who view Paul's warning the Galatians against getting involved in Judaism are profoundly blind, and that we are jumping to an unwarranted conclusion when we think Paul is telling them not to go back to the *Jewish* law. Then he says, if Paul's statements are kept in the context of all Scripture, it will become obvious that he was not talking about the Law of Moses in this passage.

Really? Well, how about if we start off by keeping what Paul said in there in the context of the *rest* of the book of Galatians first? What is the book of Galatians about anyway? Let's start with chapter one, which puts the whole issue of observing days, months, times and years into its *proper* perspective and context. After his initial greetings, Paul begins by saying:

*I marvel that ye are so soon **removed** from him that called you into **the grace of Christ** unto **another gospel**: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would **pervert the gospel** of Christ.*

Galatians 1:6-7

Here the Galatian problem is described. Someone is bringing a false "gospel" into the assembly. The gospel they had originally received from Paul is called the "gospel of Christ" and also the "grace of Christ". The false gospel that's being brought into the assembly is a *perversion* of the true gospel.

After telling about his conversion—how he went into the Arabian desert for three years and how he then went up to Jerusalem to confer with Peter—he says that after 14 years of preaching the true gospel of Christ among the Gentiles, false brethren came into those assemblies for the express purpose of bringing the Gentiles into bondage to the Law. More specifically, the law of circumcision.

*Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain. But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, **was compelled to be circumcised**: And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily **to spy out our liberty** which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might **bring us into bondage**: To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.*

Galatians 2:1-5

Notice the issue here is the *spiritual liberty* we have in Christ. This is the root problem of all Messianic Jews and "wanna-be-Jews". They will never be spiritually free. They will never know what it's like to be *free* from dietary laws, and holy days, and sabbaths, and new moons, and the whole culture of Judaism because that's where *their identity* lies—and they will never forsake the thing that gives them their identity. Consequently, they will never know the freedom Gentile Christian have from Moses. Indeed, they despise this freedom because they think it's lawlessness and rebellion. So they think they are doing us a favor by seeking to bring us under the same bondage they live in.

Also, please notice the terms “us” and “we” in this passage, for they are very important. They show the stark difference between the way Paul related to Gentile believers and the way today’s Jewish believers relate to Gentile believers. Paul says false brethren (Judaizers) came into the Galatian assembly secretly to spy out **OUR** liberty which **WE** have in Christ, that they (the Judaizers) might bring **US** into bondage. He says **WE** gave no place to these Judaizers.

You can clearly see that Paul is *identifying himself* with these Gentiles against his own Jewish people (the Judaizers). He identified with anyone who was trying to walk in the “new man”. Race no longer mattered to him as far as fellowship was concerned. The only thing that mattered to him was, are you walking in Christ? Are you walking in the Spirit? Are you walking in the new man?

What a stark contrast this is to today’s believing Jews who do just the opposite! They identify with the *unbelieving* Jews much more than they do believing Gentile because deep in their hearts they are racists. Everything is still about the Jewish race in their eyes, just like it was under the Old Covenant. The only time believing Jews identify with believing Gentiles is when those Gentiles start obeying the Torah. Otherwise, they want nothing to do with us or the way we live. They won’t use Gentile terms for God—like Jesus, Christ, God, and so on. They don’t like to use the term “Cross” because it’s associated with Gentile Christianity; and they won’t use Gentile names of the apostles. Everything is in Hebrew because they think that using Hebrew names somehow makes them more righteous and pleasing to God. It’s keeps them closer to the purity of the Jewish religion, rather than the very tainted Christian religion.

After recounting how the apostles in Jerusalem gave him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship—which was a sign that they were blessing his ministry and affirming the gospel he preached—Paul recounts the incident with Peter. Peter had come to minister to the Gentiles and while he was among them, he eat like them and lived like them. But when some legalistic believing Jews came from the Jerusalem church, Peter withdrew himself from the Gentiles, and his behavior affected the rest of the disciples, including Barnabas. That’s when Paul rebuked Peter in front of everyone for being such a hypocrite. He said why are you, a Jew who has been living like a Gentile, now doing something that *means* the Gentiles should be under bondage to the Law. Then, in the beginning of the next chapter, he says:

*You foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed {as} crucified? This is the only thing I want to find out from you: **did you receive the Spirit by the works of the Law, or by hearing with faith?** Are you so foolish? Having **begun by the Spirit, are you now being perfected by the flesh?***

Galatians 3:1-3 NAS

This is a very important passage because it shows that the whole idea that we should be justified by faith but sanctified by obedience to the Law is a false doctrine. Paul says: “...*did you receive the Spirit by the works of the Law?*”—meaning, where you justified by obedience to the Law?” Then he asks if they are so foolish to think that after having “begun in the spirit”—that is, after being justified by faith—are they now going to try and be “perfected by the flesh”—that is, be sanctified by the Law. Paul is *contrasting* justification and sanctification here. He is talking about receiving the Spirit of God (ie: justification) and being perfected (ie: sanctification). The terms, “the works of the law” and “by the flesh” are synonymous.

Trying to be justified by the works of the law is *the same* as trying to be justified by the flesh. He's saying: "...hey, how were you justified; by the works of the law or by faith"? The obvious answer is by faith. Then he says: "...well, that's the same way you are sanctified—by faith; not by the flesh (ie: not through the works of the Law).

The rest of Galatians chapter three is about the Law of Moses in relation to faith and being justified. So far, the whole issue has been the issue of being justified by faith versus being justified by the Law because *that's* the false gospel these Judaizers were bringing into this assembly. They were saying you needed to obey the Torah in order to *really* be justified. So one of the things Paul discusses in chapter three is the relationship between Abraham and the Law. Up to this point, there is *no other law* being referred to. Every one of the 21 references to "the law" so far has been a reference to the Law of Moses. No mention of any pagan or Gentile laws has been made. Now, in chapter four, Paul says:

*Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in **bondage under the elements** of the world: But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To **redeem them that were under the law**, that we might receive the adoption of sons.*

Galatians 4:1-5

It's wonderful how the Scripture interprets itself, so we are not left trying to figure things out with our human reasoning. Notice what Paul says here. He said when **WE** were children, **WE** were in bondage "under the elements" of the world. Notice again that he is including himself. He is identifying with the Gentiles. So what exactly are "the elements" of the world? Well, read on. He says, when the time was right, God sent Jesus into the world to "redeem them that were under the law". Here he is equating the term "*under the elements of the world*" with being "*under the law*". When you walk under the Law of Moses, you are walking under *the elements* of this world. Next, Paul says:

*Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how **turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements**, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.*

Galatians 4:8-11

According to Mr. Scott, these Galatians were returning to the weak and beggarly elements of *Paganism*. They were returning to their former ways of worship and religion—the weak and beggarly "elements" of this world for justification. If this is the case, then it was the Judaizers who had come into that fellowship who were trying to turn the Gentiles back to their *pagan* ways; for the problem with this church is repeatedly and specifically said to be the influence of the Judaizers who secretly crept in with a false gospel, and who were having a bad influence on the believers.

They zealously affect you, but not well; yea, they would exclude you, that ye might affect them. But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing, and not only when I am present with you. My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you. Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman.

Galatian 4:17-22

Paul said “they”—meaning the Judaizers who had come from Jerusalem—were *affecting* the believers in Galatia. They were affecting them by causing them to observe *Jewish* laws and customs, not pagan ones. They were trying to get them to obey the *Jewish* laws of circumcision. They were trying to get them to obey the *Jewish* laws concerning holy days (primarily the Sabbath), new moons (months) and so on. To say that Paul was telling the Galatians not to revert back to their *pagan* ways would mean this is what the *Judaizers* were encouraging them to do.

Excuse me, Mr. Scott! Do you really expect us to believe that the Judaizers who had infiltrated that assembly, and who were “zealously affecting” those people, were trying to get them to revert back to their *pagan* ways, their *pagan* gods, and their *pagan* days, months, times and years?

Give me a break!

The Judaizers of Paul’s day would no more encourage Gentile believers to return to their pagan ways than Mr. Scott would encourage *today’s* Gentile believers to return to their pagan ways. Jews don’t try to bring Gentiles into *pagan* bondage; they try to bring them into *Jewish* bondage.

After pleading with the Galatians to listen to him; and after reminding them of how much they loved him when he first delivered the gospel to them, Paul asks them a question. He says: “*Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons...*”. Once again, there is no question as to what law is being referred to here. It’s the Jewish law, not some nebulous pagan law. Indeed, the term, “the law” is used 33 times in the book of Galatians and in every single instance, it’s a reference to the Law of Moses.

When Paul warned the Gentiles not to turn again to the weak and beggarly elements of this world, what he meant is crystal clear—if you keep what he said in the context of the entire book of Galatians. He was talking about the Law of Moses, which the Judaizers were trying to impose on these people. Anything we place our trust in for justification is a “weak and beggarly element” compared to faith—and that includes the Law of Moses! Let me say it again (open wide, Mr. Scott!), *anything* we place our trust in for justification is a weak and beggarly element—and that includes the Law of Moses.

Another passage he supposedly refutes is in the book of Hebrews, where the writer says that if “perfection” could have been through the Levitical priesthood, then the coming of another priest and another priesthood would not have been necessary. Then the writer says there has been “a change also of the law” (*Heb. 7:12*).

Apparently someone wrote Mr. Scott and asked if a change in the Priesthood *means* we are no longer obligated to obey the Torah. His answer includes the following statements:

“This question was asked of me just a few days ago. It never ceases to amaze me, **the conclusions people come to** when reading passages for the express purpose of finding something, anything, that appears to denigrate Torah. One has to do some terrific mental gymnastics to draw that conclusion here, but I am asked this often enough to address it for those who do not know how to respond to it.”

“First let me begin by saying that this book is not called the letter to the Ivrim (Hebrews) for nothing. The whole theme of this book is to reveal to the Hebrew people that the Messiah is after the order of Melchizedek, with a better priesthood, **a better covenant** built upon better promises, and a better sacrifice. **Nothing in this book addresses the abolishment of halakhic or haggadic laws.**”

“All the language of the next several chapters points to the change of Torah concerning the priesthood. **There is no mention whatsoever of any changes** in Torah concerning Shabbat, YHVH's feasts, dietary laws, health laws, murder, theft, laws of clean and unclean, marriage laws, government, crime, or anything of the like.”

“Yahshua has satisfied our atonement before YHVH. This is what the priesthood is all about. Sacrifice and offerings did not take the place of the earthly ramifications of murder, theft, adultery, or any other crimes. **Sacrifice and offerings did not nullify** Shabbat, take the place of feasts, substitute our diet, heal anyone of leprosy, or become a city of refuge when someone's brother-in-law was after them. Sacrifice rescued us from death, for the wages of sin is death. Sacrifice and offerings made peace between 'Elohiym and man through a priesthood in a temple. That priesthood has been made higher and eternal by Messiah, and so the law concerning that priesthood has been made higher as well.”

Mr. Scott's whole argument regarding the passage about the change of the law is that this, and everything else in that was written in the book of Hebrews, is just about the installment of a new priesthood. He says none of what is written in this whole book has anything to do with the abolishment of the laws of the Old Testament. Yet even he admits that one of the ramifications of the new priesthood of Jesus was the establishment of a better covenant. He goes on to say: “All the language of the next several chapters points to the change of the *priesthood*. There is no mention whatsoever of any changes in the Torah “...concerning Shabbat, YHVH's feasts, dietary laws, health laws, murder, theft, laws of clean and unclean, marriage laws, government, crime, or anything of the like”.

Mr. Scott is truly deceived. The central theme of the book of Hebrews is the contrast between the Old and the New Covenants. The particular issue of the priesthood is only a part of the overall line of thought being developed throughout the entire book. That line of thought is clearly that the “new” (or second) covenant is *better* than the “old” (or first) one. While chapter 7 of Hebrews concerns the change of the priesthood—from Levitical to Melchizedek—chapter 8 is describing the difference between the covenants themselves. One is old and is ready to vanish; while the other is new.

For if **that first covenant** had been faultless, then should no place have been sought **for the second**. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when **I will make a new covenant** with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: **Not according to** the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For **this is the covenant that I will make** with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for **all shall know me**, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A **new covenant, he hath made the first old**. Now that which **decayeth and waxeth old** is ready to **vanish** away.

Hebrews 8:7-13

The writer of Hebrews states that the first covenant has been *replaced* by a new covenant. The very term “new” covenant means that the original covenant is now “old”. The writer plainly says: “*In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old*.” In addition, he makes it clear that it was God who made the first one old. It wasn’t the anti-Torah Gentiles who made the first covenant old; it wasn’t the Pope who made the first covenant old; it was *God* who made the first covenant old!

The writer also makes it clear that at the time this letter was written, that *first* covenant was decaying and waxing old. Not only was it no longer the covenant God was concerned with, God was fixing to make the whole thing vanish. Vanish means *disappear*. It’s important to understand that the book of Hebrews was written *before* the Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed. Various claims are made for the date of its writing, but the fact that the writer makes mention the recent release of Timothy from prison (*Heb. 13:23*) is proof that it was written in the late 60’s. The Temple was destroyed in 70 AD. So when the writer of the book of Hebrews penned his words about the first covenant waxing old, decaying, and being ready to vanish, the Temple was still standing. Even though Jesus had been crucified and raised from the dead; even though a “new” covenant had been established; blind, obstinate, Jews continued to practice *Judaism* in their Temple. But a few years *after* the writer of Hebrews penned these words, God destroyed their Temple. In so doing, He made it *impossible* for them to practice Biblical Judaism anymore.

The day the Temple was destroyed, *that* was the day the Law of Moses *vanished*. Nobody has been ever able to obey or observe the Law, as it was given to Moses on the Mt. Sinai, since then. In order to obey the Law, you must have a Temple where animal sacrifices are offered and a priesthood that is ordained to offer them. In order to obey the Law, you must also have a Temple to offer all the *other* offerings which have nothing to do with sin and redemption, and which animals were not used.

For instance, you must have a Temple to offer the *first sheave* of the Barley harvest during the days of unleavened bread. You must have a Temple to offer the two loaves during the Feast of Weeks. Without a Temple, none of the literal feasts of Israel can possibly be observed as God commanded. People who

try to observe the feasts of Israel literally, are only fooling themselves because in order to really observe these feasts, not only must you have a Temple, you must also live in The Land. There is *no provision* in the Written Law for observing the commandments of Sabbath, feasts, new moons and so forth, *outside* of Israel. According to Moses, you must have a Temple *and* be living in the Land to properly observe the various feasts. People who try to keep the Law without a Temple, or without dwelling in the Land of Israel, are not obeying the Torah; they are in rebellion *against* the Torah.

One of the things Messianic Jews and “wanna-be-Jews” do to deceive Gentile Christians into bondage to the Law is to say the New Covenant is not really a “*new*” covenant. Rather, it’s only a *renewed* covenant—that is, it’s only a renewal of the *first* covenant. They try to say the Greek term “*kainos*” (new) doesn’t carry the connotation of something coming into existence that was *not* in existence before. Instead, they claim the word simply carries the idea of a new interpretation, or a new understanding, or a new way of relating to, something that is *already* in existence. They try to redefine the term *kainos* because it’s proper meaning makes it clear that the New Covenant is *completely different* from the Old Covenant. It’s new in time; it’s new in character; it’s new in purpose. The term *renew* removes this radical distinctiveness between the New and the Old Covenant.

The last example I’ll use from this guy’s web site is his supposed refutation of Ephesians 2:14-16

*For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and **hath broken down the middle wall of partition** between us; Having abolished 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; And that he might **reconcile both** unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:*

Mr. Scott gives a long dissertation on why this passage doesn’t really mean what it says. His basic view is that Christ breaking down the “wall” that divides is referring to *restoring the division* of Israel from two kingdoms—the Ten Northern tribes and the Two Southern Tribes—into one kingdom. The Ten Northern Tribes were scattered among the “goyim” thousands of years ago. In the last days, God is going to re-gather these Ten Tribes and unite them with Judah (the two Southern tribes).

This guy must have read the writings of Angus and Batya Wooten—two Jewish believers who were once part of the Messianic Jewish Movement, but who went off to formulate their own peculiar doctrine of the Ten Lost Tribes. They teach the same idea this guy does regarding the division and restitution of the “house of Israel”. As you read the following comments, ask yourself what he *means* by the term “Gentiles” in the context of this teaching. Are these Gentiles actually biological Gentiles; or are they biological *Hebrews* of the Ten Northern Tribes?

“The God of Israel, from the beginning, has only had ONE son. The earthly representation of this son, Israel, disobeyed (sinned) and **was divided into two 'sons'** (Ephraim and Judah) or kingdoms, **the Northern kingdom** made up of **ten tribes** and the **Southern kingdom**, made up of **Judah, Benjamin and a good portion of Levites**. These two

kingdoms, called the house of Israel and the house of Y^ehudah had two distinct prophecies told of them according to Hoshea chapters 1-3. The kingdom of **the house of Israel** [the Ten Northern Tribes] would dissolve and be scattered throughout the nations (Gentiles). They would no longer be the people of YHVH and YHVH would no longer have mercy on them.”

“But YHVH, by virtue of His omniscience, knew that **one day these two houses would be reunited** and would once again be His people, with one shepherd, one head, and would be renewed again as ONE man, Israel, His firstborn. There was however, a mystery, that both houses were blinded of, that is now revealed to the holy apostles and prophets. The 'mystery' of the Messiah is **WHO the house of Israel is**. Sha'ul reveals this mystery in the chapter following the removal of the middle wall. **The house of Israel comes from among the Gentiles.**”

“The context of verse 14 and 15 tells us 'what' has been abolished. The answer is the wall of verse 14. Every teacher and student of scripture should ask themselves, *“Is the wall that is being abolished, Torah?”*.

In answer to this question, Mr. Scott quotes three Scripture about Jesus abolishing death, or that death is destroyed—Rom 6:6; II. Tim. 1:10; and I. Corinthians 15:26. Then he says:

It is important to keep in mind that **the wall that divides is written in Torah**. According to the commandments and ordinances, **if you sin then you are separated from YHVH**. There are penalties in Torah for sin and disobedience. There are NO penalties for keeping Torah, only for disobeying Torah. It is absurd to conclude that Torah itself has been abolished, but rather **the ultimate penalty for breaking Torah which is DEATH!** Remember that both houses were dispersed because of sin, and so it is that **both houses will be restored by trusting and following the Messiah**, the restorer of the breach.”

When anyone, Jew or Gentile, repents and believes on the Messiah, their sins are forgiven, the **penalty** has been **paid**, and the **wall** has been **removed**. . .Simply put, the middle wall of partition that has been abolished is the very thing that always divides: **sin, disobedience, and the penalty of death**; that which has always divided the sheep and caused separation between YHVH and His people. Sha'ul finishes this verse by revealing again that this reunion has made *shalom* or completeness of that which has been broken and scattered.

Okay, let’s decipher this double-talk. First of all, he says Israel was divided into two houses; the Northern Ten Tribes and the two Southern Tribes. He says that God, in His Omniscience, knew that one day these two houses would be reunited and would once again be His people. Then he asks who is the “house” of Israel (ie: the Ten Northern Tribes) that will be re-gathered?

Answer: *“The house of Israel comes from among the Gentiles.”*

Then he says: *“...both houses were dispersed because of sin, and so it is that **both houses will be restored by trusting and following the Messiah.**”*

Even though he supposedly answers the question of who the “house of Israel” is, he really didn’t. All he said was, the house of Israel will come from among the Gentiles. He didn’t really say whether these people will be *biological* Hebrews or *biological* Gentiles. However, in using the term “from among the Gentiles”, he is giving the reader the distinct impression that these people will be true, biological, Gentiles.

Unfortunately, this is a ruse. The same “house” that was scattered throughout the nations is the same “house” that is to be restored and re-united with Judah. That house is a **HEBREW** house, not a Gentile house. It’s the **HEBREW Ten Northern Tribes** that are being restored and reunited with the **HEBREW Two Southern Tribes of Judah**, through the Cross in this guy’s mind.

He says the “middle wall of partition” that was broken down is the PENALTY which comes upon every man who breaks the Law. That penalty is first and foremost, separation from God. In other words, a “wall of separation” is erected between us and the Lord when we don’t obey the Law. Then we must be put to death. First separation (the wall), then death. This is the “wall” which has been broken down. Mr. Scott says that when anyone, Jew or Gentile, repents and believes on the Messiah, “*their sins are forgiven, the penalty has been paid, and the wall has been removed*”. Well, let’s look at the context of what Paul said about the middle wall of partition being broken down.

Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished 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; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God;

Ephesians 2:11-19

First of all, it’s clear beyond any shadow of a doubt that Paul is talking to (and about) Gentiles IN THE FLESH. He’s not talking to or about the Ten Northern Tribes of Israel, either before or after their dispersion. He is talking to genuine, *biological* Gentiles—Gentiles “in the flesh”. That means people who have no Hebrew blood in them.

Second, Paul tells these Gentiles “after the flesh” what their status was *before* coming to Christ. He says they were “*without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world*”. This is pretty clear. The Gentile

nations had no relationship with Israel, or with Israel's God. They were strangers from the covenants of Israel; they were far off from God and His people, the Hebrews; they were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel; they were without Christ and without hope in this world. But now, in Christ, these same Gentiles "after the flesh" have not only been brought close to Israel, they have actually become part of Israel. They have become part of the people of God. They have become part of the commonwealth. They have become fellow citizens. They are *no longer* strangers and foreigners.

Then Paul says Jesus is our peace. He is the peace of both the Jews and the Gentiles who trust in Him for redemption. Also, Paul says Jesus hath made both believing Jews and believing Gentiles "one"—that is, spiritually one body. And how did we become "one" in the spirit? By breaking down the middle wall of partition between us. That wall is clearly said to be "*the law of commandments contained in ordinances*". Paul said Jesus "*abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man*".

There has always been *enmity* between the Jew and the Gentile; and that enmity has *always been* over the Law of Moses. It was the Law that kept the Jews separated from the Gentiles. It was the Law that forbid Jews to even enter the house of a Gentile, much less eat with him or have any kind of genuine spiritual fellowship with him.

That's what the story of Peter's vision is all about. Peter was a good and patriotic Jew. He would never step foot in the house of a Gentile. Yet God wanted to send Peter to the house of Cornelius, a Gentile, to give him the gospel. God had to give Peter a supernatural vision so he wouldn't refuse the men who came to take him to a Gentile's home. God was trying to deliver Peter from the Law so he could be used among the Gentiles. Peter was getting the message—that's why he went to Galatia to help Paul with the Gentile converts. While among them, he ate like them and lived like them with no apparent problems with his own conscience. But when the Judaizers of the Jerusalem church came, it was too much for him. That event was recorded to show how damaging the Law is to Jewish and Gentile relationships.

Paul very plainly said the "*law of commandments contained in ordinances*" is the wall. He didn't say the penalty of sin was the wall. THE LAW IS THE WALL! The commandments of the Old Testament is the wall, and Jesus had to tear that wall down before Jews and the Gentiles could become one new man. The *only way* Jews and Gentiles can ever become one new man is if the Law is no longer an issue. As long as Jews walk under the Law, they will never be one in the spirit with Gentile believers—never.

When Messianic Jews deceive Gentiles into observing the Law, those Jews and Gentiles do *not* become one new man. They may become ONE OLD MAN. They are walking in some kind of religious "unity", but that unity is a unity of *legalism*, not a true unity of the Spirit. Nobody walks in the new man by walking under Law. That whole notion is nothing but a giant religious delusion. All the Gentiles are doing when they place themselves under the Law is trading their freedom in Christ for worthless legalism.

I've said this before—the rituals and feasts and sabbaths of Old Testament Israel are a picture of spiritual realities and experiences under the New Covenant. They are a *shadow* of that reality. They are not the reality itself. No Christian is *required* to observe Jewish feasts, Jewish holy days, Jewish Sabbaths, Jewish dietary laws, or anything else Jewish in order to walk in the Spirit.

I need to emphasize this every so often because each year, more and more Gentile Christians are deceived into thinking God is pleased if they involve themselves in Torah observance. Each year, more and more Gentile Christians are observing Jewish feasts and sabbath days, eating Kosher food, and in general, forcing the “new and living way” (*Heb. 10:20*) of walking and living by the spirit, into the legalistic framework of the commandments of Moses.

One very important passage Mr. Scott didn't bother to mention in his refutation list is Romans 3:20-22. Listen to what the Jew, Paul says about the Law in this passage:

*Justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God **without the law is manifested**, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; Even the righteousness of God **which is by faith** of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them **that believe**: for there is no difference:*

Paul said the righteousness of God *without the law* has been manifested. Do you see that? Without the Law! Now, what part of “*without the law*” do Messianic Jew not understand? The Jew, Paul, told Jews and Gentiles at Rome that they can be justified without the law; without any reference to the law. The same applies to sanctification. They can be sanctified without the law; without any reference to the law.

Jews (*whether they are believers or non-believers*) have a major problem with this statement because they just can't stand the fact that God has allowed *non-Jewish people* to become His children without any reference whatsoever to the Law of Moses. Like all other peoples and nations, most Jews are racists. They don't want the Gentiles to have the same privileges they have before God because that would take away the “specialness” of the Jewish race in their eyes.

They feel that if Gentile believers have all the same privileges that they do with God, without any **reference** to Moses whatsoever, then the Jews are no longer “special”. Therefore, they try to turn Gentiles into Jews (*culturally and spiritually*) so the “specialness” of the Jewish people is not diluted or lost.

The simple truth is this: the Jews are jealous of Gentile believers and they refuse to accept the reality that the Gentiles can serve God, and have all the standing and privileges they do before God, *without* being Jews, or living like Jews, or worshiping like Jews. They can't stand the idea that we can be God's people and serve Him faithfully *without* obeying the Law.

That whole idea irritates them to no end. It drives them crazy because they hate the spiritual liberty and freedom Gentile believers have in Christ. They hate it because they will never have it. They will never have experience that freedom because they will never let go of Moses—and they will never let go of Moses because their identity is in Moses and in the Jewish race. Their identity has never been in Christ and the “new man” (*which is a new race of NEITHER Jew or Gentile--NEITHER male or female*).

They will never be free, and they don't want anyone else to be free either. They are just like the people Jesus denounced back in His day: “*But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that*”

are entering to go in” (Matt 23:13). Messianic Jews won't be happy until every last Christian on the planet is serving their false, legalist view of salvation. Another passage Mr. Scott doesn't deal with is the one in Acts where the whole topic of the Law and Gentile believers was addressed.

*Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. Wherefore my sentence is, that **we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God:** But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.*

Acts 15:18-20

This would have been the place to set the Gentiles under subjection to the Law. If all the garbage Messianics preach were true, this would be the place where their doctrine is substantiated by the Word of God. This would be the place where their ideas would be proven valid. This counsel was **THE** time and **THE** place where the question of how Gentile believers were to relate to the Law of Moses, was asked and answered!

So the answer you find here is the truth because this answer was given by *Jews*, not by Gentiles. What is the answer to the question of whether or not Gentiles are required to obey the Law? Does the answer given by these Jews match the teachings of Messianic Jews and Gentiles? Did the Jewish leaders of that counsel tell the Gentiles to observe or obey the Law of Moses because, after all, the Law is eternal; or because after all, Jesus said He didn't come to destroy the Law; or because, after all, Paul said we uphold the Law; or any of the other twisted arguments Messianic use?

No! The Jewish apostles and elders said: “...*trouble not the Gentiles...*”.

TROUBLE NOT THE GENTILES with your obsession with the Law.

TROUBLE NOT THE GENTILES about circumcision.

TROUBLE NOT THE GENTILES about eating Kosher food.

TROUBLE NOT THE GENTILES about keeping the Jewish feasts and new moons and Sabbaths.

And I say the same thing to every Judaizer today—and especially to Brad Scott—stop troubling the Gentiles with your obsession with the Law!

And to those who will not stop troubling the Gentiles, who will not stop trying to trick them into following the Lord Jesus through the Law instead of through the Spirit, I say: “let every *curse* in the Law come upon you and your family”—for that is surely what you deserve!

I warned that this was going to happen in one of my brochures. As the anarchy and rebellion of Gentile Christianity intensifies in the end-time apostasy, believers will start *reacting* against all this lawlessness and carnality and they will swing all the way to the other side of the pendulum, into legalism. They will end up

trying to be sanctified by Torah observance. Thank God there are a few Jews out there who understand and accept what the New Testament says about the Law, and they are not afraid to stand up for the truth. One of them is the Jewish writer named Arnold Fruchtenbaum. Concerning the New Covenant, he writes:

The New Testament is clear that in the age of the Church the **dietary laws, special feast days**, and other **legal observances** are subsumed under our freedom in Christ. Paul stressed in Romans 14 that under the new covenant, Christians can have the freedom to observe every day alike, rather than feeling the compulsion to fix certain days as unique, above the others. Since Christ has come, that to which **all the shadows of the Old Testament were pointing** has come. In Colossians 2:17, Paul encouraged the Colossians to “let no one act as your judge in regard to food or drink or in respect to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath day”. Individual Christians, both Jewish and Gentile, have the freedom in Christ to enjoy all foods and days. They have the freedom to celebrate any number of Jewish events, (e.g., a bar mitzvah or Hannukah) as simply a part of the Jewish calendar, **but not with any “redeeming” religious significance**. Where the proponents of **Hebrew Christian congregations err is in the incorporation of the “types and shadows” for the “Substance” of their worship.**

Fruchtenbaum, A. G.

Israelology : The Missing link in Systematic Theology

The reality or the substance is so much more glorious than the shadow! People who involve themselves in the Law, or who try to walk in the spirit according to the written commandments of Moses, are not only short-changing themselves. They are walking a very dangerous walk indeed. Nothing *kills* the life of the Spirit of God in an individual more than walking in legalism. It was legalism that murdered Jesus, and that same legalism will murder your spirit-man if you give it half a chance.

Of course, there are other kinds of legalism besides the Jewish kind. There have also been various forms of legalism inside the Christian churches. However, that kind of legalism is on its way to extinction—like the dinosaurs. Most of the churches are now in a free-fall into rebellion against any kind of rules or laws. The restraint of selfishness, worldliness and even blatant sin, is now *passee* in the vast majority of today's Gentile churches. So that kind of legalism is no longer the threat it once was to people.