

Living Faith Christian Fellowship



A Thorough Answer and Rebuke to Andrew Ste. Marie's Dastardly Abuse Of The Scriptures in an Attempt to Defend His Error

A Scriptural Response to "Righteousness Exceeding The Pharisees" written by Andrew Ste. Marie as an attempt to defend his heresy against Mark Bullen's Bible teaching.

By Bro. Mark Bullen

www.TheFaithOnceDelivered.info

www.TheRightJesus.com

Though beginning with a noble and charitable air, Andrew quickly turns to the same unscholarly blunders of his fellows who are bent on supporting their Marcionite slanders of God and His inspired Word. This is all cloaked behind pious sophistry and a claim of scholastic superiority; so I am going to point out the subtle wrests of Scripture and the obvious blunders with the confidence that all intelligent readers will at once see the snake hiding behind the pretty leaves. Don't forget, Andrew is saying what he does after claiming to have read my books, which leaves him without excuse. Thus we are not dealing with a poor sincere mis-taught man; but one who has had truth in his hands and still clings to error – all the while denying the obvious – that he is committed to a confused marcionite ideology.

I would recommend those in earnest study of this subject to stop here and listen to a message which will lay a Biblical foundation for truth in this matter. Once this message is understood the falsehood and error of Ste. Marie will be obvious and undeniable.

http://www.thefaithoncedelivered.info/newsermons_g000037.mp3 **“God Loves His Program”**

A message preached by Mark Bullen which unveils Andrew Ste. Marie's heretical foundations.

Much of Christianity has been influenced by Gnostic doctrines and ideas since the times of the Apostles. Paul clearly said in Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. 29 For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. 30 Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.”

This became a reality even while the apostles were still living, and many of the early church writings, which are mostly 100 years removed from the apostles, were tainted with error in some form – usually because they divorce the New Testament from the Old Testament. There was much controversy with heretics of many sorts while the apostles were still preaching; and it only became worse after they passed on.

When it seems God isn't being consistent do we assume our perception is the final word and thus charge God with inconsistency? NO, we realize that “God is consistent” and our perception must be faulty. The Marcionite Gnostics interpreted Jesus as correcting Moses and presenting a different standard of righteousness than what God had presented in the OT. Instead of building on the clear statements of Scripture that “God is unchanging” and Jesus is the “same yesterday, today, and forever”; they built on their faulty perception and argued that the Father of Jesus had different ethics than the God of Moses' Law and creation. They went different places with this thought; but the basic foundation was the supposed difference in ethics between Jesus, His Father and the God of the Law in the Old Testament. Actually the Marcionites were more logical than the modern Mennonites because they concluded: “If the God of the Old Testament says he is unchanging and the God of the New Testament says he is unchanging; but they have different ethics, *then there must be two gods' because a true God doesn't change his ethics!*” Gods don't change their ethics and then claim to never change unless they are liars. Mennonites cannot seem to get this; but continually claim that God changed his ethics, but still He is unchanging... ?? – *Yeah that was my reaction too – sad isn't it.*

It has been my observation that many may believe the premise behind a heretical belief system; but not all are capable or willing to think the premise through to the logical conclusions. Those who do take the foundational thoughts to their logical conclusions are often renounced by those who only take the premise part way or to illogical conclusions. They don't realize they are all really in the same heretical boat. The Marcionites and Mennonites are in the same boat concerning Jesus correcting Moses' Law, and the slander this brings upon Jehovah; but they have not taken it to its logical conclusions as the Marcionites did. You will be able to see this as we go along. If sincere people knew how the Mennonites and Marcionites are building on the same foundation, they would, or *should be*, very concerned. Let's have a short history lesson:

Marcionism

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Marcionism was an Early Christian dualist belief system that originated in the teachings of Marcion of Sinope at Rome around the year 144.^[1] Marcion believed Jesus was the savior sent by God, and Paul the Apostle was his chief apostle, but he rejected the Hebrew Bible and the God of Israel. Marcionists believed that the wrathful Hebrew God was a separate and lower entity than the all-forgiving God of the New Testament. This belief was in some ways similar to Gnostic Christian theology; notably, both are *dualistic*,...**The premise of Marcionism is that many of the teachings of Christ are incompatible with the actions of the God of the Old Testament. (Are you listening?)** Focusing on the Pauline traditions of the Gospel, Marcion felt that all other conceptions of the Gospel, and especially any association with the Old Testament religion, was opposed to, and a backsliding from, the truth. He further regarded the arguments of Paul regarding law and gospel, wrath and grace, works and faith, flesh and spirit, sin and righteousness, death and life, as the essence of religious truth. He ascribed these aspects and characteristics as two principles, the righteous and wrathful God of the Old Testament, who is at the same time identical with the creator of the world, and a second God of the Gospel, quite unknown before Christ, who is only love and mercy.

“Marcion is said to have gathered scriptures from Jewish tradition, and **juxtaposed these against the sayings and teachings of Jesus in a work entitled the *Antithesis*.**^{[16]” (Pay Attention!)}

Historic Marcionism, and the church Marcion himself established, appeared to die out around the 5th century, although similarities between Marcionism and Paulicianism, a later heresy in the same geographical area, indicate that Marcionist ideas may have survived and even contributed to heresies derived from Paulicians in Bulgaria (Bogomilism) and France (Catharism) (**Anabaptist groups**). Whether or not that is the case, Marcion's influence and criticism of the Old Testament are discussed to this very day.

For some, the postulated problems of the Old Testament, and the appeal of Jesus are such that they identify themselves as modern day Marcionites, and follow his solution in keeping the New Testament as sacred scripture, and rejecting the Old Testament canon and practices. A term sometimes used for these groups is "New Testament Christians". Carroll R. Bierbower is a pastor of a church he says is Marcionite in theology and practice.^[31] The Cathar movement (**Anabaptist**), historically and in modern times, reject the Old Testament for the reasons Marcion enunciated. It remains unclear whether the 11th century Cathar movement is a continuation of earlier Gnostic and Marcion streams, or represents an independent re-invention.

It is very important to note that **where** the Marcionites **went** with their PREMISE is **not** the core of their wicked error; but **the PREMISE itself!** Their readers were too smart to allow them to reconstruct the predictions of the prophets, like Ste. Marie attempts, so they had to reject them as referring to something other than Jesus. The main problem and slander upon

God is the **PREMISE** that the ethics of the New Covenant are opposite to the ethics of the Old Covenant or at least incompatible and inconsistent. This is the heresy of both: Marcion, Ste. Marie, and the modern Ana-baptists (along with some of the ancient Anabaptists). This is the **ALIEN** exposed in our book "Alien Exposed". Ste. Marie is just proving my case by demonstrating his alien agenda in wickedly attempting to reconstruct the entire Bible to his beliefs. Woe to such a one!

In the chart below we are comparing the statements of modern Marcionites (The "Marcionite Church of Christ") with Ste. Marie's words. Judge for yourself! Ste. Marie denies being a Marcionite; but let me paste some undeniable proof which reveals his true feelings, which is the foundation of this entire article. His words are in **BLUE** in the right column as he builds on the same premise as Marcion and uses the same term concerning Jesus' teaching - "Antithesis".

Modern Marcionite Church Website

marcionitechurchofchrist.yolasite.com

"No good tree bears bad fruit, nor does a bad tree bear good fruit. Each tree is recognized by its own fruit." - Evangelion (aka Luke 6:43-44)

With this verse Marcion began his central argument: that the God of the Old Testament is not and cannot be the same deity as the one revealed by Jesus Christ. To a modern Christian this may sound supremely strange. Weren't we all taught that the New Testament is the fulfillment of the Old?

...So in the spirit of the Antitheses let's compare for a moment the fruit of Jehovah and the fruit of the Heavenly Father:

Jehovah's "fruit":

This is what the Lord of hosts has to say: 'I will punish what Amalek did to Israel when he barred his way as he was coming up from Egypt. Go, now, attack Amalek, and deal with him and all that he has under the ban. Do not spare him, but kill men and women, children and infants, oxen and sheep, camels and asses.' 1 Samuel 15:2-3

I will make Mount Seir utterly desolate, killing off all who try to escape and any who return. I will fill your mountains with the dead. Your hills, your valleys, and your streams will be filled with people slaughtered by the sword. I will make you desolate forever. Your cities will never be rebuilt. Then you will know that I am the LORD. Ezekiel 35:7-9

My angel will go before you and bring you to the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Canaanites, Hivites, and

So, we are back to our original question: Did the Old Testament teach hatred of enemies? My conclusion is that, although there are some glimpses of the bright new day to come, the Old Testament did indeed teach and exemplify the ill treatment – indeed, hatred – of enemies.

And the **LORD** spake unto Moses, saying, **Vex the Midianites, and smite them:** For they vex you with their wives, wherewith they have beguiled you in the matter of Peor, and in the matter of Cozbi, the daughter of a prince of Midian, their sister, which was slain in the day of the plague for Peor's sake (Numbers 25:16-18).

And the **LORD** spake unto Moses, saying, **Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites:** afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people. And Moses spake unto the people, saying, Arm some of yourselves unto the war, and let them go against the Midianites, **and avenge the LORD of Midian.** Of every tribe a thousand, throughout all the tribes of Israel, shall ye send to the war (Numbers 31:1-4).

When the **LORD thy God** shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; And when the **LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them:** Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son (Deuteronomy 7:1-3).

But of the cities of these people, which the **LORD thy God doth give thee for an inheritance,** thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: But **thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely,** the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; **as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee**

Jebusites; and I will wipe them out. Exodus 23:23

Anyone who is captured will be run through with a sword. Their little children will be dashed to death right before their eyes. Their homes will be sacked and their wives raped by the attacking hordes. For I will stir up the Medes against Babylon, and no amount of silver or gold will buy them off. The attacking armies will shoot down the young people with arrows. They will have no mercy on helpless babies and will show no compassion for the children. Isaiah 13:15-18

O Babylon, you will be destroyed. Happy is the one who pays you back for what you have done to us. Happy is the one who takes your babies and smashes them against the rocks! Psalms 137:8-9

For the LORD your God is a consuming fire, a jealous God. Deuteronomy 4:24

...and this is but a tiny sample of Jehovah's "fruit"!

But what of the Heavenly Father? His fruit is clear:

"But I say to you who hear, love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you. "Whoever hits you on the cheek, offer him the other also; and whoever takes away your coat, do not withhold your shirt from him either.

"Give to everyone who asks of you, and whoever takes away what is yours, do not demand it back. Luke 6:27-30

Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres. 1 Corinthians 13:4-7

...again but a small taste of the fruit of the Father, revealed by his Son.

(Deuteronomy 20:16-17).

Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of Egypt; How he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, *even all that were feeble behind thee*, when thou *wast* faint and weary; and he feared not God. Therefore it shall be, when **the LORD thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about**, in the land which **the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to possess it, that thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it** (Deuteronomy 25:17-19).

So we have here the positive words of God regarding the Israelites' enemies, who were to be vexed, smitten, utterly destroyed, and have vengeance wreaked upon them – all without mercy. What could be more different from the teaching of the New Testament on the treatment of enemies?... I find it particularly hard to understand how someone could read in Numbers 31:2 that God commanded the children of Israel to take vengeance, and then compare it with Romans 12:19, where vengeance even for ourselves is forbidden, and argue that the ethics of the two covenants are the same. **They are opposites!**

...Now, to come all the way back to the Sixth Antithesis of the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus' quotation, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy," is not a verbatim quotation of a specific Old Testament text, but is an accurate summary of the teaching and example of the Old Testament in its relationship to neighbors and enemies. **Jesus superseded this teaching and example, and replaced it with an ethic of absolute love for all – including enemies – in which every true Christian must follow the example of his Heavenly Father, Who is good to all – even His enemies.** (emphasis mine)

Could any confession be clearer?? What **example** do "true Christians" have in Jesus' Father if not from the God of the Old Testament? – the teaching and example Jesus superseded? Ste. Marie says that Jesus led us **away** from the **example and teaching** of the **God of the Old Testament** to the **example and teaching of Himself and His Father – a different God!** What else could this mean? What example do we have of Jesus' Heavenly Father? Only what He has told us in that verse, according to Ste. Marie. He subtly denies that the God of the Old

Testament, who gave Moses the Law and commanded the war and killing, is Jesus' Father OR our example! He is a bonafide Marcionite heretic, though he doesn't realize or understand this. This is sad, but true; and everyone who espouses his doctrine falls into the **same camp**. He hides behind the false front that Jesus is just expanding the law; but then states over and over that Jesus' teaching was the antithesis (opposite) of God's Law – Just like Marcion did. He is just a grievous wolf hiding in sheep's' wool, and all true sheep need to beware. Listen up "Plain People" – Before you die, you'd better make sure you are following the RIGHT JESUS. Go to www.TheRightJesus.com and you will find help.

The TRUTH is: WE who are the TRUE Christians DO believe we can follow the example of Jesus' Father (Jehovah) concerning the proper application of ALL Jesus' teaching; because it is all consistent with the revelation of Jesus' Father from Genesis to Malachi. Just because some simpletons cannot see the connection and consistency of God's revelation, doesn't mean it is not there in plain sight. You won't see it, though, if you are LOOKING FOR SOMETHING ELSE.

Pr 28:5 Evil men understand not judgment: but they that seek the LORD understand all things.

God IS LOVE. Do you believe that? Is the God of creation, the flood, and the Law LOVE? Do you understand God's judgment? If you cannot understand how LOVE for truth and righteousness also necessitates HATE for iniquity, then you cannot understand God or Jesus. Listen to what GOD said about JESUS:

Heb 1:8 But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. **9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;** therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Did Marcion ignore what is said about Jesus in Luke 19 when he returns? What about what Paul says concerning Jesus when He returns,

"2Th 1:8 In flaming fire **taking vengeance** on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ:"

I tend to agree with Paul in Romans where he is speaking about the moral judgments of the God of the Old Testament thus:

"Ro 3:3 For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? **4** God forbid: yea, **let God be true, but every man a liar;** as it is written, **That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged."**

Jesus came to "justify" God in His sayings and overcome heretics who wrongly judge God, because they don't understand His judgment or believe His Word. Just because people did not properly obey or understand God's Law, because they did not "believe", their unbelief, which led to abuse, doesn't make God's Word wrong or ineffectual (Heb 4:2). This verse alone proves our case right and Ste. Marie a Marcionite heretic.

LOVE is only virtuous when LOVE is for RIGHT with HATRED for evil. God is LOVE, but also the JUDGE who must justly deal out punishments and rewards impartially based on man's obedience or rebellion to the righteousness they know.

Rom. 1:18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who **hold the truth in unrighteousness**;...2:11 For there is no respect of persons with God. 12 For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; 13 (For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. 14 For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: 15 Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;)

THE LAW we are speaking of is God's revelation of his moral judgments, which are consistent and unchanging; because God's knowledge and holiness is consistent and unchanging.



Before we go on, Note first the picture chosen for the cover of Ste. Marie's article: Dirk Willems turning back to pull his pursuer out of the icy waters to save his life. This seems to be a very important icon for the modern Anabaptist in his sacrifice of himself to save an enemy. It was indeed noble to stop and pull the man from the ice; but it was not necessary to honor God; nor commanded by Christ. As he pulled him from the ice, he then should have run -- unless he was actually not able to. Did not Jesus say, "When they persecute you in this city, flee to another"? If he actually could not get away, then he is not to blame; but was a sad victim of human cruelty. BUT HOW does this sacrificing of one's self represent the pacifist who allows girls to be raped and family members murdered when they actually could have stopped it. There is no nobility in allowing innocent blood to be shed if we can stop it. Sure, you can sacrifice yourself; but non-resistance in these people's definition also means sacrificing those under our care; which is NEVER God's will!

Prov. 24:10 If thou faint in the day of adversity, thy strength is small. 11 If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; 12 If thou sayest, Behold, we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it? and shall not he render to every man according to his works?

Did Peter dishonor God or act unloving to the keepers of the prison who were put to death when he was released by the angel? Was God unloving in this? ARE there holy and appropriate priorities in God's Love? Did Paul dishonor God, or was he unloving to Aretas and his governor when he escaped out the window and fled from Damascus? Did Jesus dishonor God or was he unloving to those who wished to cast Him down the hill or stone Him because, until His "hour was come", He always made an escape and avoided capture? It is false piety to give one's self up to torture and martyrdom when God has given a clear way to escape and commanded you to do so.

This type of false piety is from misguided emotional feelings which the victim thinks is superior spirituality; when in fact it is inferior. Do they not realize that the disciple is thinking he is above his Lord when he is actually falling short of the instruction of his Lord?

Next, let's look at the title chosen: **“Righteousness Exceeding The Pharisees”**. Any true scholar can read the verses prior to Christ's comment on this issue and see that this very subject and title destroys this man's case from the roots. Notice:

Mt. 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.”

Pause: Does “fulfill” mean God's laws or commandments are no longer relevant? Could it **ever** be the *antithesis* of God's Law? Did Jesus obey them for us and thus “fulfill” them? Are they fulfilled now and obsolete? Is Jesus about to correct and change them into something different? Every intelligent reader can but read the next verse and immediately see the answer.

“...19 Whosoever **therefore** shall break one of **these** least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. 20 For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.”

Jesus says that every little command is still valid and must be obeyed or it will affect your entrance into the kingdom of heaven. If you categorize any of the OT commandments as insignificant or obsolete, you will be categorized the same way and not allowed into the kingdom of heaven. This He says will happen to the Pharisees in their present condition; because this partiality with God's Law is what they were guilty of. When God's commandments are not obeyed without partiality then you have the wresting, partiality, and hypocrisy of the Pharisees. They were not properly recognizing the authority of God's Word, but were stamping their own values on God's commandments. Sadly, this is exactly where Ste. Marie plants himself. By diminishing the commands of the OT, he is diminishing himself in the eyes of God and jeopardizing his position in the kingdom of heaven. Every intelligent reader can see this at once; but can anyone convince Andrew and his friends of it? I wish they could. When you understand VS 19 and 20, then you understand that Jesus is not correcting Moses' Law, but correcting the “righteousness of the Pharisees”. How obvious does it have to get?

The point they so desperately miss is that this New Covenant that they tout as a *new ethic* is clearly said by God more than once to be the writing of HIS LAWS IN OUR MINDS AND HEARTS; not the changing and discarding of His Laws. The New Covenant was to be with the house of Israel and the Laws spoken of are undeniably those given through MOSES and other inspired writers in the OT. The message link above establishes this fact beyond doubt. Romans 8:1-13 states emphatically that the result of Spirit rebirth and walking in the Spirit is that of now being subject to God's Laws and fulfilling the righteousness of God's Law. When Jesus gave His famous summarization of man's obligations in Loving God with all his heart and loving his neighbor as himself, He immediately qualified this as what the Law and the Prophets had been saying from the beginning. When He gave the “Golden Rule”, He again immediately qualified this as “The Law and The Prophets”. I have documented beyond necessity the fact that God's Moral Laws are still God's standard and are the very basis of the New Covenant. All of this totally destroys the foundational errors of Andrew's position. If only he would humbly

acknowledge it to his own credit; because he professes to have read our material and is not ignorant of it.

All the blue pastes below are from Ste. Marie's article with my replies in black. Some of the longer quotes within his article I've colored red as well as some long quotes I give. This is to try and avoid confusion as to who is speaking. If you pay attention, you should be able to see what he is saying and what I am answering.

Position – Andrew Ste. Marie – The New Covenant Ethic

God is unchanging, but man is changeable. Because man is changeable, and because his circumstances and situations change, but God does not, God's moral/ethical standards not only can change, but *have* changed, and *must* change. Because of the hardness of the Jews' hearts, God through Moses allowed a standard of righteousness and morality which was lower than His perfect will for mankind. The prophets foretold of the coming of a new kingdom and a new ethical standard, and the coming of soft, spiritual hearts. When these spiritual hearts were given, it was now possible to live out a higher ethic, given by Jesus Christ, primarily in the Sermon on the Mount. Christians now have the privilege of living up to this ethic by the grace (power) of God. The Scriptures must be interpreted Christocentrically – Christ being seen as the center of the Scriptures – with everything being harmonized with His Words. His words must not be interpreted in subjection to the words of the Law of Moses, which God called weak, faulty, growing old, decaying, and vanishing away.

Here is the serpent's lair cloaked in pretty leaves. Let's uncover what is really being said here so everyone can see it clearly.

1. "God is unchanging, but man is changeable. Because man is changeable, and because his circumstances and situations change, but God does not, God's moral/ethical standards not only can change, but *have* changed, and *must* change."
 - **WHAT?** Because man's circumstances and situations change, then God's moral/ethical standards have changed and must change???? -- But, of course, God does not change?? How shallow minded can one get?
 - God's STANDARDS cannot change; but his remedial prescriptions may change for different NEEDS – ALL based on the SAME STANDARD OF HOLY LOVE, which is God's own nature and NEVER changes. Because God is the same, HIS remedial prescriptions are always consistent and are never obsolete – give the same situation and God will always give the same protocol.
 - I hope I'm not the only one who can see the complete absence of logic and common Bible knowledge in this statement. When God says He doesn't change, He is not speaking about His socks and shoes – He is speaking about HIS WORD, HIS JUDGMENTS, STATUTES, AND MORAL STANDARDS/ETHICS. These men are charging God with compromising with sin. The proper view of God's Law is that it is the wisest, most appropriate action in that particular situation, and is never something that God has to later call "adultery" or "coming of evil", etc.

■ What about God does not change??

- i. **Ps 33:11** The **counsel of the LORD standeth for ever**, the thoughts of his heart to all generations
- ii. **PS 19:7** The **law** of the LORD is **perfect**, converting the soul: the **testimony** of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. 8 The **statutes** of the LORD are **right**, rejoicing the heart: the **commandment** of the LORD is **pure**, enlightening the eyes. 9 The **fear** of the LORD is clean, **enduring for ever**: the **judgments** of the LORD are **true** and **righteous altogether**.
- iii. **Ps 12:6** The **words** of the LORD are **pure words**: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7 **Thou shalt keep them**, O LORD, thou shalt **preserve them from this generation for ever**.
- iv. **Pr 19:21** There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the **counsel of the LORD, that shall stand**.
- v. **1Peter 1:25** But the **word of the Lord endureth for ever**. And **this is the word** which by the gospel is preached unto you.

2. Peter quoting from Isaiah – THIS IS THE WORD – no change.

- Listen to Malachi's introduction of the Messiah from the mouth of God who in the same breath commands them to return to His Law and also says this in the next chapter.
 - i. **Mal 3:5** And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the LORD of hosts. 6 **For I am the LORD, I change not**; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed. 7 Even from the days of your fathers ye are **gone away from mine ordinances**, and **have not kept them**. **Return unto me, and I will return unto you**, saith the LORD of hosts.
 - God's whole point is that the Messiah would prove that God's standards/ethics have not changed, but men need to return to them. **Could anything be more plain?**
2. "Because of the hardness of the Jews' hearts, God through Moses allowed a standard of righteousness and morality which was lower than His perfect will for mankind."
- "Hardness of the JEWS hearts" What Bible scholar alive really believes that Jesus was saying that the only people with hard hearts were ANCIENT JEWS? Zero! NONE. Jesus is speaking to the same group of people when He gave His statements as Moses was – ISRAELITES. Jesus didn't say, "because of the hardness of THEIR hearts, Moses wrote THEM this precept"; but that is the way Ste. Marie and friends interpret it. Jesus said, "because of the hardness of YOUR hearts, Moses wrote YOU this precept" SOON we will hear Ste. Marie telling us that "hard hearts" lasted until Pentecost, which, he says, is why Peter had a sword – Ha, ha. Anyhow, he admits that Jesus is talking to the SAME type people as Moses with the SAME problems.

- Did Jesus tell the same people something different than He did through Moses? Moses wrote it to all God's people for all time in Jesus' use of it. God made a new covenant with Israel and then grafted the Gentiles into it. The covenant was the writing of God's Laws in men's minds and hearts, so they would please HIM. The reason for the new covenant was because they didn't keep the old one – READ IT. The Word of God is to US – Jesus said, “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by EVERY WORD that proceedeth out of the mouth of God”. Why don't they take Jesus at face value and believe HIM??
 - They are accusing God of giving a revelation of his moral judgments that is a compromise with sin; and then later sending Jesus to the SAME PEOPLE with the SAME hard hearts to tell them God's Word was teaching them to commit adultery? – If this isn't Satanic Heresy, I don't know what could be. MALACHI CLEARLY TELLS US THAT THE MESSIAH WILL BE PREACHING AGAINST ADULTERY AND FALSE SWEARING AS DEFINED BY MOSES' LAW – the ABUSE of God's Word, not the sincere USE of it. Being that this is so plain and easy to see, I have to conclude that these men are simply “ismites” – how else could they sweep such obvious truth under the rug to maintain their position that Jesus is correcting Moses?
 - God's Word commanded the Jews to stone any man who worked miracles, but then led them away from God's Statutes – this means that every sincere and faithful Jew would have to reject Jesus IF He was doing what these men say. Jesus accused the Pharisees in MK 7 of making the Word of God through Moses obsolete through their own teaching – would Jesus condemn this while doing the same thing?? Jesus plainly said that if men didn't hear and believe Moses, then they would not hear and believe Him; but the opposite would be true if Jesus were calling Moses an enabler of adulterers! Think people!
 - God's Law was always and every time a REMEDY for man's problems, not an ENABLER for man's sin!!! As a REMEDY it was the holiest, wisest and most appropriate thing to do and could not be improved upon by anyone!! IT WAS JESUS' REMEDY! MOSES' WORDS WERE JESUS' WORDS! When Jesus supposedly brought His “new ethic” that these men claim – where did He get it? GENESIS!! MOSES' LAW!! YES, MOSES' LAW INCLUDED GENESIS! Jesus didn't bring anything new, but simply took them to God's original intent for marriage IN THE LAW, which is the only proper context in which to view Deut 24 IN THE SAME LAW – as a remedy when sin has marred the original design – WHICH MEANS this precept was given because of hard hearts which messed up the original design and thus needed a remedy from God! DO MEN STILL DO THIS TODAY? Yes, men have the same hard hearts which calls for a remedial precept when the original design is messed with.
3. ["The prophets foretold of the coming of a new kingdom and a new ethical standard, and the coming of soft, spiritual hearts. When these spiritual hearts were given, it was now possible to live out a higher ethic, given by Jesus Christ, primarily in the Sermon on the Mount."](#)
- O MY! [“When these spiritual hearts were given”](#). Was Jesus speaking to the recipients of these new soft spiritual hearts? No, He was discussing the proper interpretation of Moses' Law with the same hard hearted Jews that Moses was speaking to.

Were there no spiritual hearts in Moses' day? What about Moses, Joshua, Caleb? What about Abraham, Joseph, Job, Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, Enoch, Noah, and all the prophets?? Does Ste. Marie think he is more spiritual than these?? Why does God set up these men as our examples if only we have the soft and spiritual hearts? This guy - Ste. Marie - does not know what he is talking about. Read the OT and you will find that God was calling those people to repent and have soft hearts for thousands of years before Jesus came. New Testament saints are warned to not harden their hearts! LISTEN TO THIS! The promise of soft hearts was the writing of **God's Laws** in men's hearts by the Holy Ghost - IF they stayed in the program. **God's Laws**, not new ones, written in our hearts were the promised CURE of the New Covenant. "Thy Word have I hid in my heart that I might not sin against thee" is OLD TESTAMENT too!!

- The New Kingdom prophesied to come is *still coming*, and we are to be preparing for it - READ LUKE 19. If you need more proof, read our book about Biblical non-resistance. We are the servants occupying till Jesus comes. When He comes we will also be the servants who slay his adversaries and rule with Him over the nations - no, we are not to be pacifists or "non-participation" in government heretics. Peace does not come to the earth through pacifism, but through Jesus conquering the earth's governments and ruling over this planet.
- i. **REV 2:25** But that which ye have already hold fast till I come. 26 And he that overcometh, and **keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: 27 And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father.** 28 And I will give him the morning star. 29 He that hath an ear, **let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.**
- In the here and now, we are "holding fast" unto the end of this age so we can receive a kingdom to come and reign with Christ. Compare all the Scriptures that speak of the coming kingdom which we are now preaching and serving through the church. The church is NOT the kingdom, but only Christ's servants occupying till Jesus comes "having received the kingdom" - LUKE 19
- 4. Christians now have the privilege of living up to this ethic by the grace (power) of God. The Scriptures must be interpreted Christocentrically - Christ being seen as the center of the Scriptures - with everything being harmonized with His Words. His words must not be interpreted in subjection to the words of the Law of Moses, which God called weak, faulty, growing old, decaying, and vanishing away.
 - It requires someone who knows their Bible to grasp the incredible error in this statement.
 - First, *"We who are having the LAWS of GOD written on our hearts by the Holy Ghost have the privilege to live up to another standard which condemns the Laws written on our hearts"* Can you see this?? This is what this man is saying.
 - Second, *The Scriptures must be interpreted Christocentrically - Christ being seen as the center of the Scriptures - with everything being harmonized with His Words.* MEANS: "We must interpret all the Bible by *"our interpretation of Christ's Words"* even if "our interpretation of Christ's words" is contradictory to the rest of the Bible. First, they

decide what they want Christ's words to mean, then they make all the Bible fit to it! Can anyone NOT see this?

- Third, **His words must not be interpreted in subjection to the words of the Law of Moses**, MEANS: We cannot allow that Jesus, THE WORD MADE FLESH, will speak consistent with His previously inspired Words, even though the previous inspired Words declare that He WILL speak consistent; because we don't like his previous inspired words as much as our false interpretation of His more recent inspired words. LISTEN: **“God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, 2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son,”** **Who is the speaker every time!!!**

Heb 13:8 Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever. WHAT IS THE SAME IF NOT HIS MANIFESTATION OF HIS HOLINESS AND RIGHTEOUSNESS TO MANKIND?

- Fourth, **“...the words of the Law of Moses, which God called weak, faulty, growing old, decaying, and vanishing away.”** Does anyone see the slip?? God said the Old Covenant was waxing old and would vanish away – a covenant is a relationship agreement. The Old Covenant included the moral and ceremonial laws God gave through Moses and also included all his revelations in the Old Testament Scriptures. The New Covenant is also a relationship agreement between the SAME two entities – God and Israel – (we Gentiles are graft into this)
 - i. Heb 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 established upon better promises. 7 For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. 8 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: 9 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. 10 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:... 13 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.”
 - ii. Jesus is the mediator of a new relationship agreement between God and Israel – **the same two entities in the first covenant**
 - iii. The fault of the first covenant was that **they didn't keep it.**
 - iv. The remedy was a new covenant where the Laws from the first covenant were written in men's minds and hearts, so they were more apt to keep them! The NT declares the fulfillment – Rom. 8:4; Acts 21; Rev. 22:14, etc
 - v. The first covenant – or relationship agreement – was decaying, waxing old, and would vanish away – **BUT THE MORAL LAW OF GOD, WHICH WAS THE BASIS OF THE FIRST RELATIONSHIP AGREEMENT IS NOW THE BASIS OF THE SECOND RELATIONSHIP AGREEMENT AND THE ONLY DIFFERENCE IS THAT WE**

SHOULD NOW KEEP THESE LAWS BETTER BECAUSE THEY ARE WRITTEN ON OUR HEARTS!!!

- vi. JESUS, THE MEDIATOR OF THIS NEW RELATIONSHIP AGREEMENT, CAME TO CLARIFY THE LAW OF GOD AND CLEAR IT FROM ABUSE SO THAT IT COULD BE WRITTEN ON OUR HEARTS.
1. This is why in Acts 21 there were thousands of Jews which believed and were all zealous of the Law – This is exactly what God said the Messiah would accomplish in Malachi!
 2. This is why in Romans 8:1-13 it is made very clear that to walk in the Spirit is to fulfill the righteousness of the Law (moral law) of the OT, and that the description of the carnal mind is that it is not subject to God’s Law.
 3. This is why at the end of Romans 2, the apostle Paul declares that the Gentile believer who keeps the Moral Laws of God (The righteousness of the Law), but not the ceremonial, is more acceptable to God than the Jew who only keeps the ceremonial law, but violates the moral law. The moral law is eternal; but the ceremonial is only a type and shadow of Christ’s priesthood.

Now that we have exposed the rank error and heresy of Andrew Ste. Marie’s position, do you think he will repent and change along with all those who read this? My experience has been that “ism-ites” just keep repeating the same error, even when shown clearly that it is error. Since Ste. Marie has already read my books, then he is without excuse for his blatant error.

Next paste from Ste. Marie: I will insert my answers in black. I feel sorry for people who make such confident statements only to find they were wrong. O well, he could have listened to good counsel when he had it and not made a fool of himself here.

God’s Moral Standard Can and Does Change

“God *is* not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent” (Numbers 23:19a).

Indeed, God cannot change; “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever” (Hebrews 13:8). This is a truth which is clear in Scripture, and is taught throughout. “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning” (James 1:17). But does this mean that His ethical and moral instructions to mankind can never change? Mark Bullen asserts that it does. Nevertheless, we must examine whether in *God’s* mind, His unchangeable, immutable nature is inconsistent with giving different moral/ethical commandments to different people at different times.

- What about giving contradictory standards to the SAME people with the SAME problems at different times? This is what we are dealing with.
- God’s standard is HOLY LOVE – So his instructions will always and only be from this fountain - THEREFORE given the same situation, you will always get the same judgment call – THIS IS GOD’S IMMUTABILITY.

Can an unchanging God give different sets of directions? I will demonstrate from the Scriptures the truth on this subject. Bullen will have to agree with this method, since regarding his teaching against nonresistance, he wrote: Amen, but yours fails to do so, and we will soon *demonstrate* that...

These few examples serve to *demonstrate* the truth, so when we *interpret*, we won't be off track. You can't argue with truth *demonstrated*. (Emphasis his)¹¹

Let us begin with marriage. Regarding the teachings of Jesus on divorce and remarriage, Mark Bullen wrote:

What the Law of God taught could not have been called adultery by the Messiah – the Word in the flesh.¹² If God gives laws in one covenant that allows divorce and remarriage as the appropriate remedy for a moral problem; then those steps cannot be called adultery in another covenant.¹³

However, on the specific issue of marriage, we know that God *did* change the standard in the past. We will begin with the often-asked question, “Where did Cain get his wife?” Adam and Eve were the only people on earth, and all humans are their descendants. So where did Cain get his wife? Since Eve was “the mother of all living” (Genesis 3:20), we know that Cain's wife must have been Cain's sister. Seth's wife was also his sister. Probably nearly all of Adam and Eve's children married their siblings. This was all that was available at the time, and God allowed it. In fact, He set up the situation in which it was necessary, calling that creation “very good.” It was righteous!

- God never condemned men during those early times for marrying their sisters; but put a stop to it as a wise, loving Father should when it became unnecessary AND unhealthy. This is no change in God's moral judgments; but simply a different instruction for a different need. If our genetics were not breaking down and we found our family was the only people on earth – like after the flood; then we would again marry sisters out of necessity. If in-breeding were not dangerous, God probably would not have stopped the practice. Sometimes brothers and sisters reared with the same values and beliefs would make better mates with less danger of problems. When full grown and married of their own will and choice, there would be no moral trespass any more than Abel or Cain had; but God knew the dangers before men knew much about genetics.
- What we also learn from God's revelation to mankind about Himself – which was the only revelation of God's character for the first 4000 years of history – **is that there are moral priorities in moral precepts.** Helping get someone to the hospital in an emergency is more important than obeying the speed limit and traffic lights. **This is not a change in the law-giver; but an understood priority in the line-up of moral principles.**
 - i. **Did Jesus understand or agree with this?** *Mt 12:1 At that time Jesus went on the sabbath day through the corn; and his disciples were an hungred, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. 2 But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the sabbath day. 3 But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungred, and they that were with him; 4 How he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests? 5 Or have ye not*

read in the law, how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless?

- Jesus understood and even used this principle to defend Him and His disciples against the Pharisees. The Jews believed that in order to save life anything became lawful except adultery, idolatry, or murder. This they learned from the Law. OK, THINK, When it was necessary to propagate the race and the genetics could handle it, God allowed men to marry their sisters; but when it was not necessary and the genetics could not handle it well, God said, NO. DOES GOD STILL FEEL THIS WAY?? YES! GOD HAS NOT CHANGED – HE HAS DECLARED THAT HE DOESN'T CHANGE. The Scriptures never condemn those who married their sisters before the Law said STOP. The Scriptures DO condemn immorality in those same times, which is why you have Noah's Flood, the destruction of Sodom, the Tower of Babel, and the choosing or condemning of certain people. **We need to learn from God's unchangeable ways, not try to prove that God's immutability is false.** THOSE WHO ARE SMART LEARN FROM GOD'S WORD; But knuckleheads try to force their opinions in contradiction to God's Words.
- Jesus gleaned from the Law that it was OK for David to eat unlawful bread when **saving life was priority**; and He used this principle for His own life – Because He knew that God's moral principles are **unchanging**, and **we can learn to know God through His Word** – IF WE FOLLOW JESUS' EXAMPLE.
- SO, Can we follow Jesus' example and learn God's WAYS and priorities from the same Scriptures Jesus had? YES, because God's WAYS are immutable.
 - i. **PS 19:7** The **law** of the LORD is **perfect**, converting the soul: the **testimony** of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. 8 The **statutes** of the LORD are **right**, rejoicing the heart: the **commandment** of the LORD is **pure**, enlightening the eyes. 9 The **fear** of the LORD is clean, **enduring for ever**: the **judgments** of the LORD are **true and righteous altogether**.
 - ii. **Ps 12:6** The **words** of the LORD are **pure words**: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7 **Thou shalt keep them**, O LORD, thou shalt **preserve them from this generation for ever**.
 - iii. **1Peter 1:24** The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: **But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.**

Quoting Is. 40:8 The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.

1. SAME WORD

- iv. **John 1:1** In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.... 14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,
- v. **2Ti 3:16** All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is **profitable for doctrine**, for reproof, for correction, for **instruction in righteousness**: 17 That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto **all good works**.

- God’s Law includes the first five books of the Bible. In these five books we have 2500 years of history before the Law was given by Moses on Sinai. So, in Moses giving the law from the mouth of Jesus, the WORD, he gave the history and then the commandments for the people. The history explained the reason and backdrop of the present commandments. The history showed man’s lives getting shorter and the genetics breaking down. God’s Laws were given for society as it is now – after the fall, flood, and Babel. God’s laws were given as remedial guidance for man’s present fallen state, and part of this remedy was avoiding marriages with sisters for genetic reasons, not strictly moral reasons as the Bible never condemns those in the past who practiced such out of necessity. Jesus doesn’t now condemn Cain and Abel, nor did Moses’ Law or the prophets. They were condemned for other matters, though as we said.
- This “change” in instruction isn’t anything like God giving a remedial precept in one covenant and later calling His own commandment/remedy adultery in a new covenant with the same people based on the same law! – So this is not “apples and apples”. This is not God changing his moral standards of holiness; but rather God GIVING a moral standard to people with a history to explain it. YOU are the goofs who say Christ took us back to the beginning – so can we now marry sisters or run around naked?

But close marriages did not end with Cain, Seth, and their brothers and sisters. The practice persisted for about 2,000 years into earth history. Abraham married his half-sister Sarah (Genesis 20:12). Isaac’s wife Rebekah was his first cousin once removed (see Genesis 22:20-23). Jacob’s wives, Leah and Rachel, were his first cousins on his mother’s side (Genesis 29:10). Amram, the father of Moses, married his own aunt (Exodus 6:20). Lest anyone think that God disapproved of such close marriages, Rebekah was miraculously provided by God as the wife of Isaac (Genesis 24). But what happened on Mt. Sinai? What had formerly been necessary, righteous, and approved – even facilitated and arranged – by God, became sin.

- Oh? Did marrying first cousins become sin?? Where? First cousins becoming wives was **never** forbidden as you boastfully claim, but was a common practice. Once God gave his Word on marriage practices for His people 2500 years after Adam, show me where he has changed his Word. We have essentially the same issues the people had who received the Law, and 29 years after Pentecost, the Jewish Christians being zealous of God’s Law was right and proper. The Righteousness of God’s Law being fulfilled in His people who walk by His Spirit is what we have now as the description and purpose of the New Covenant.

None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover *their* nakedness: I *am* the LORD (Leviticus 18:6).

- You do the same thing which this verse that you do with Jesus’ Words – YOU ASSUME you know that “near of kin” is in the mind of the writer **without listening to the qualifying statements to follow**. Jesus says “Swear not” and you assume before hearing the qualifying statements. Jesus says, “resist not evil” and you assume before hearing the qualifying statements. It is your arrogant assumptions that leave you a heretic.

Through the rest of the chapter, this principle is applied to many human relationships, including sisters and halvesisters (verses 9, 11) and aunts (verses 12-13) (cf. Leviticus 20:17, 19; Deuteronomy 27:22). Thus, according to the Law of Moses, the marriages of Abraham, Isaac,

Jacob, and Moses' own father Amram would have been unrighteous. What God had formerly approved of and even miraculously provided for would now be sin.

- See the assumption? What God “miraculously” provided was a cousin for a wife, which is still lawful according to God’s Word.
- After the council in Acts 15, Gentiles eating blood would lead to excommunication but not necessarily the day before; but is that God changing His moral standards? No, it is the fact that grace covers ignorance until God’s moral standard is established. Once established it is to be obeyed. Once established we can depend on it to reveal the mind of God – WE DON’T HAVE TO CHECK BACK LIKE THE WEATHER FORECAST TO SEE IF GOD’S MORALS HAVE CHANGED! The apostles used the Old Testament Scriptures to establish their basis for truth in the ACTS 15 decision – THAT IS BECAUSE God’s ways are immutable!
- This only proves my case against yours, as your “demonstration” falls flat – Shame on YOU.

Another example is the divine direction regarding diet. When Adam and Eve were first created, God gave the following instructions:

And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which *is* upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which *is* the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein *there is* life, *I have given* every green herb for meat: and it was so (Genesis 1:28-30).

God gave Adam and Eve three commandments: 1) Multiply, 2) have dominion over the rest of creation, and 3) eat plants. Following the Fall of man and throughout the pre-Flood era, God never took back or changed His instructions regarding the eating of plants and not meat.

- How presumptuous! Cain was a tiller of the ground – for what?? Fall gourds and decorations? No, food. Abel was a keeper of Sheep – for what?? Wool socks? Did Abel keep sheep, but get his food from Cain? Go figure.
- When Adam and Eve fell, God slew an innocent animal and clothed them. He obviously gave some instruction concerning blood sacrifices, as this would be the basis for Cain and Abel’s knowledge of the subject and the foregoing transgression of Cain. Have you ever considered that the person offering the sacrifice also ate of it? This was a sort of communion service with God – See I Cor 10:16-22. Abel ate his sheep.

It is probable that sinful, disobedient men did eat meat without God’s permission and it is certain that animals did so,¹⁴ but God had not changed His instructions as far as we know from Scripture. We can well imagine that Noah, as a preacher of righteousness (II Peter 2:5), would have preached against any who dared to eat meat contrary to God’s instructions. However, following the Flood, God gave this set of instructions to Noah and his descendants:

And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon

all that moveth *upon* the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered. Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things. But flesh with the life thereof, *which is* the blood thereof, shall ye not eat (Genesis 9:1-4).

Notice that now, following the Flood, the flesh of animals is given as food just as plants had been given earlier. These examples show that, while God Himself is obviously unchanging, His instructions to mankind – even His ethical/moral instructions – can change *when the situation of mankind changes*.

- If man's diet changed after the flood due to a drastically new environment, is that a moral change in God? (+_+) Is it anything near Jesus calling the obedience to His own inspired Law adultery in a New Covenant with the **same** people based on that very Law?
- Dietary Laws are clearly Ceremonial Laws, not Moral Laws, so this is really irrelevant to the debate. This is all explained in the Message at the beginning of this article and in our books.
- Being that Noah and his family were the only people on earth, God gave them similar instructions as He had previously given to Adam and Eve at their beginning – to multiply and replenish the earth with a few other necessary instructions:
 - i. *Ge 1:28 And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. 29 ¶ And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. (In The Garden of Eden)*
 - ii. *Gen 9:1 And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. 2 And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered. 3 Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things. 4 But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat. 5 And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. 6 Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man. 7 And you, be ye fruitful, and multiply; bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein. (After the Flood)*
- Now, we can safely assume that before the flood many of these things mentioned were already in existence, like not eating blood, not shedding man's blood, killing animals that shed man's blood, and killing those guilty of murder. Remember how Cain was afraid of being slain by those who found him after the murder of Abel? Yes, and we can also assume the eating of meat was before the flood also as we said above. We just have here a quick overview of God's basic instructions given to Moses and His sons concerning their government on the earth.

This is very important. God is unchanging, but man is not. Man changes; his situation changes; his circumstances change. In response to these changes, God's moral/ethical instructions must sometimes change. Many reasons could be given why God may have changed His directions regarding marriage and diet. For the first 2,000 years of earth history, mankind probably had very pure genetics, relatively free from the negative effects of mutations which could express themselves in harmful conditions for the offspring of close marriages. By the time of Moses, perhaps close marriages were hazardous – or would shortly be so, especially in a closed population such as that of the Israelites, who were forbidden to marry the children of the pagan nations around them (Exodus 34:16; Deuteronomy 7:3). Regarding meat-eating, the post-Flood climate appears to have been quite different from that before the Flood. We can imagine that whereas plants had been an adequate diet before then, the harsher conditions of the post-Flood world now required that the flesh of animals be consumed for growth and reproduction. Regardless of the specific reasons for the change, what we can learn regarding these examples is that an unchanging God can give different moral/ethical instructions depending on the changing situation of changeable mankind.

- These issues really have nothing at all to do with Jesus correcting Moses or not.
- These issues do not prove that God changes his moral standards in the sense we are speaking of. We are speaking of God's Holy Word giving divorce and remarriage as remedial guidance for a bad situation to ISRAEL; and later Jesus saying that if ISRAEL obeyed God's Word to ISRAEL, they were committing adultery! That is the foolishness we are exposing and Ste. Marie is trying to defend.

These examples, moreover, cannot be explained away by Mark Bullen and other proponents of an “eternal, unchanging moral law” as examples of a change in a ceremonial law. There were no “ceremonies” before the Fall of man. Eating plants was not a ceremony. Eating meat was not a ceremony. It would have been immoral and unethical to eat meat prior to the Flood, but it was permissible after that. Marriage is not a ceremony; rules concerning marriage and sexual activity are moral/ethical rules. It was righteous, moral, and ethical, before the Law of Moses was given, to marry your sister, your cousin, or your aunt. After the Law of Moses was given, it was unrighteous, unethical, and immoral. In fact, it is so widely recognized as wrong, that today we have a special name for it: incest. Mark Bullen says that the dietary laws of the Mosaic Law were part of the ceremonial law.¹⁵ While this is doubtful,¹⁶ it needs to be pointed out that for Noah to eat a pig was not immoral, unethical, or unlawful. God had given him “every moving thing that liveth” as food. So Noah could have enjoyed bacon and pork chops if he so desired.¹⁷ He could have eaten a bat if he wanted to. He could have eaten a heron, or an owl, or a shark if he wanted to, and could catch one. But when the Law of Moses was given, it was now unlawful and unethical to eat these animals. Again, various ideas could be given as to why God outlawed the eating of these kinds of meats. But it is undeniable that once again, the moral laws regarding food had changed. And finally, once again, under the New Covenant, dietary laws were changed – all meats were once again cleansed and allowed for the consumption of God's people (Acts 10:9-17; I Timothy 4:3-5).

He is so confident while exposing his ignorance. What a shame.

- **But it is undeniable that once again, the moral laws regarding food had changed.** – Laws concerning diet are not moral laws, but ceremonial, unless we are dealing with suicide by eating poison or gluttony and drunkenness.
- Ceremonial Laws are laws which make things holy or unholy by APPOINTMENT and not by the NATURE of the action. Obviously Ste. Marie doesn't understand this. We have ceremonial laws even in the New Covenant. Baptism is holy and obligatory by **appointment** and not by the **nature** of the act – there is nothing holy or unholy about getting wet or washing. When Jesus said to do this act of obedience it became morally incumbent upon all true believers; but it is still not a moral law, but a ceremonial law. Moral laws are moral in nature. Murder, adultery, bearing false witness, etc. are moral issues, and can never be right just because man is in a different covenant with the same God. Will they, like atheists, claim that righteousness is simply relative and there are no moral absolutes? God's moral judgments are eternal and cannot change with the change of a covenant; but ceremonial laws usually do; and this does not in any way reflect a change of moral standard in the covenant parties; but only a change in the processes within the agreement. If they cannot understand this, then they need to stop writing books.
- Many ceremonial laws are based on moral principles. The moral principle in these laws would still stand even if the application is different. Example: Circumcision was based on the idea of “putting off the flesh” and though we don't have to be physically circumcised today, we DO have to have the circumcision of our heart and spirit, which the ceremonial law taught and typified. The ceremonial aspect is cast away; but the moral principle lives on, and this moral principle reveals God's person and character, which is unchanging. **WE CAN ALWAYS TRUST GOD'S WORD TO REVEAL GOD'S MORAL CHARACTER AND KNOW THAT IT WILL NEVER CHANGE.**
- The civil laws are moral in nature. We are to apply the same moral principles in civil government today where they were meant to apply. The exact same situations may not exist, but the moral principles those particular laws were founded upon are God's moral judgments and are eternal as God is. True Bible students understand these things; **BUT TRUE BIBLE STUDENTS DON'T EXPECT THE INDIVIDUAL TO ENFORCE CIVIL LAWS, AS THEY WERE GIVEN TO THE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.**
- Calling the eating of plants “holy” and the eating of meat “unholy” is ceremonial in nature. How do I know??
 - i. **Ro 14:17 For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.**
 1. Meat, drink, and righteousness are not in the same class
 - ii. **1Co 7:19 Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.**
 1. Circumcision is only holy by the appointment of God, and not by anything in its own nature. But the moral principle lives on -- Col 2:11 In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:

- For God to command a diet to his chosen people in a certain land for their health and safety and then relieve them of this when sending them to all the world as witnesses in every nation and climate is not a change in His moral character; but consistent with His wisdom and holiness to always do what is appropriate – HOLY LOVE.
- The Ceremonial Laws were a wall of partition to keep the Jews a peculiar people until Christ could be manifested; but then that wall was taken down so Jews and Gentiles could fellowship in the same body. The ceremonial law was not necessary to make a man inwardly holy. It was only right when God said to do it; because it was right to obey God – not because it was holy by nature.
- Ste. Marie’s presumptuous and ignorant statements against the truth we teach give no defense for their heresy in their interpretation of Jesus contrary to His own inspired Scriptures, which Jesus clearly declared He was not changing.

THINK: *Mt 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: **for this is the law and the prophets.***

- If Jesus brought a new law based on new moral ethics, then HE CANNOT SAY THIS unless it is not true of the “new ethic” --- They cannot both fit here together!

THINK: *Mt 22:40 On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.*

- You hopefully know what those two commandments were – If Jesus is presenting a different Ethic, HE CANNOT SAY THIS, unless the NEW LAW doesn’t hang from the same principles – THEY CAN’T BOTH HANG THERE!
- Notice how this annihilates the next section of error.

Christocentric Exegesis

We have now demonstrated both that it is possible for God’s moral/ethical instructions to mankind to be changed, and that God’s moral/ethical instructions for mankind have in fact changed in the past. Because we know it is possible for the ethical standards which man is expected to live by to change, we must know how to interpret the Bible so that we will know which set of ethical instructions we are supposed to live by. This method of interpreting the Bible is Christocentric exegesis. That is a fancy term which simply means that Jesus’ teachings given in the gospels are always given the most weight, and everything must harmonize with them.

■ Listen to Jesus then!!!

- i. Matt 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. 19 **Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.**
- ii. Mt 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: **for this is the law and the prophets.**

- iii. Mt 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.**
- iv. Mt 23:1 Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, 2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees **sit in Moses' seat: 3 All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do;** but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.

His words must not be forced to fit the mold of the Mosaic Law; His teachings must not be wrested to fit a certain interpretation of Paul. Rather, Jesus' words are looked at first and most, and are given supremacy over everything else. Everything else must be interpreted with reference to the teachings of Jesus.

- What you want is for the whole Bible to be interpreted by YOUR INTERPRETATION of Jesus' Words. This means that if the rest of the Bible harmonizes **against** your interpretation, you will not listen, because you vainly imagine you have **Christocentric exegesis!** Ignorance and arrogance are a very poor combination.
- Jesus was the AUTHOR of ALL the Scriptures! **Moses' Law is JESUS' TEACHING!**
 - i. **Joh1:1** In the **beginning** was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the **Word was God. ...14** And the **Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,**
 - ii. **I Tim 3:16** “**God** was manifest in the flesh...”
 - iii. **Joh 10:35** **the scripture cannot be broken;**
 - iv. **Mt 22:29** Ye do err, **not knowing** the scriptures, nor the power of God.
 - Jesus wanted them to KNOW the OT Scriptures – then they would not be in error!

Mark Bullen, in contrast, has started with the assumption that God's moral standard *never* changes, and this assumption has an enormous influence on the way in which he *must* interpret the teachings of Jesus. His assumption forces him to fit Jesus' teachings into the mold of the Mosaic Law.

- Jesus, in order to be the perfect Lamb of God, **had** to obey completely all the Law of Moses. This you are obviously ignorant of. In order for Jesus to make the following statements, He could not be condemning the moral standards of Moses' Law in His preaching.
 - i. Mt 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: **for this is the law** and the prophets.
 - ii. Mt 22:36 Master, which is the great commandment in the law? 37 Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. 38 This is the first and great commandment. 39 And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 40 **On these two commandments hang all the law** and the prophets.
- You continually avoid the fact that the “Mosaic Law” was **Jesus' inspired Word** that he continually quoted and defended His whole ministry – which His Father wanted Him to write on our hearts – which His Spirit leads us to fulfill – which Malachi said the Messiah would call men back to --- Which the apostles preached.....Woe to any fool who tries to diminish it and interpret Jesus in opposition to it.

- i. 2Ti 3:16 **All** scripture is given by inspiration of God, and **is** profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, **for instruction in righteousness**:
- ii. Mt 4:4 “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.**”

However, if we are free from this foundational assumption which Mark Bullen has made (and which he frequently states)☺, then we can be open to consider the possibility that Jesus may have taught a higher morality than Moses did – just as Moses taught a stricter code of morality than that which the patriarchs were held to.

God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds (Hebrews 1:1-2).

- Listen to your verse! **GOD** spake in times past and **GOD** spake through Jesus – and it was to the **same people** with the **intent of writing His laws in their hearts**. This fact blows your whole case out the window! Come out with your hands up!

Jesus is the final and highest revelation given to us by God. He was bringing back God’s perfect will which He had in mind from the beginning (Where do we find this? Genesis?). His words are what we should have dwelling richly in us:

Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord (Colossians 3:16).

- **HA!** You will soon quote the Psalms to try and prove that the ethics of the Old Testament are “opposites” of the New Testament; but you have just shot yourself in the big toe by quoting this verse which makes the **WORD** of CHRIST compatible with the **PSALMS**. “teaching and admonishing one another in psalms” is all too obvious to give you any hiding place. By the way: The **WORD OF CHRIST** is the entire **BIBLE**; because Christ is the **WORD** from the beginning!

Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life (John 6:68).

- Was Simon Peter choosing between Jesus and Moses? **NO**, Jesus in Luke 16 had Abraham telling the rich man that his brothers needed to listen to Moses and the Prophets – Jesus was speaking consistent with God’s Inspired Word.
- How can **YOU** follow Jesus in this statement: *Mt 4:4 Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.*
- i. If there is any contradiction **YOU CAN’T DO IT!**

The Witness of the Prophets

Mark Bullen makes very little use of the writings of the prophets in evaluating the relationship of the covenants. (He makes significant use of the prophet Malachi, who we will discuss in some detail later.) The prophets gave a clear and resounding witness of what would happen when the Messiah came, including the giving of new ethical teachings.

- In this section, Ste. Marie is going to reveal some of the rankest wresting of Scripture I’ve ever seen. Anyone who has read my books and then says I don’t make use of the prophets

is not being honest; but I would certainly fear God too much to abuse the prophets as this man does. There is NO prophecy that says Jesus would bring new ethical teaching which would in any way contradict, correct, or change God's inspired law; but only defend and call men back to it. Watch the wresting as he proceeds.

The first prophet to foretell the teaching ministry of the Messiah was, surprisingly, Moses himself.

The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; **unto him ye shall hearken**; According to all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the LORD my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the LORD said unto me, They have well *spoken that* which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and **will put my words in his mouth**; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, *that* **whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him** (Deuteronomy 18:15-19).

This prophecy of Christ and His teachings (which is explicitly applied to Christ by the apostles – Acts 3:22-32; 7:37-38) foretold that this Prophet would be like Moses, would be an Israelite, and would speak all the words which God commanded Him. Moreover, it was *these* words – the words of *this* Prophet – which all would be obligated to hearken to (hearken means “to hear and obey”). Mark Bullen seeks to apply this prophecy to every prophet who prophesied after Moses, including Christ. However, the prophecy is singular – *a* Prophet would be raised up by God.

- All intelligent readers who know the Scripture know that God altered his mode of communicating with Israel at this point in history and began using prophets. Just like when Israel asked for a king, God gave them “*a*” king from then on – Just like the change in mode to using prophets, the Messiah would be the ultimate Prophet **and** ultimate King. The Messiah was prophesied as the Son of David; but those prophecies had their initial reference to Solomon and their ultimate reference to Messiah. So it is with God's beginning to use prophets to speak to the people the “Word of the LORD”. All you have to do to prove this is read the entire passage, which Ste. Marie failed to see. See for yourself!

Deut. 18:9 When thou art come into the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. 10 There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, 11 Or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. 12 For all that do these things are an abomination unto the LORD: and because of these abominations the LORD thy God doth drive them out from before thee. 13 Thou shalt be perfect with the LORD thy God. 14 For these nations, which thou shalt possess, hearkened unto observers of times, and unto diviners: but as for thee, the LORD thy God hath not suffered thee so to do. 15 ¶ The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; 16 According to all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the LORD my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. 17 And the LORD said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. 18 I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. 19 And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him. 20 But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die.

21 And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? 22 When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.

- This applied to **all the prophets**, including Jesus. This was the **MODE** God would use to instruct Israel, rather than what the other nations were doing with their “diviners”. Add to this another exhortation from God’s Word.

Deut 13:1 If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, 2 And the sign or the wonder **come to pass**, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; 3 Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the LORD your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul. 4 Ye shall walk after the LORD your God, and fear him, **and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him.** 5 And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death; because he hath spoken to turn you away from the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, to thrust thee out of the **way which the LORD thy God commanded thee to walk in.** So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee.

- As said earlier, every sincere and God loving Jew would have had to reject Jesus and call for his death if he had been **leading them away from God’s commandments**. The way we today test prophets/teachers is with the **Scriptures**, and this is what God set up long ago in Deut when He first began using prophets to speak to His people.
- When God said He would raise up a prophet and put HIS WORDS in His mouth, the people were safe to assume that HIS WORDS from every prophet would coincide with HIS WORDS in the **Scriptures – the previous prophets, including MOSES**. This is how they knew it was HIS WORDS. A prophet giving different laws and commandments would be seen as leading to a different god – YES that is exactly what it would be. Just as today we would charge someone with presenting a different Jesus when they present a “Jesus” with different teachings (II Cor 11:4). Any Bible scholar knows this – to bad Ste. Marie is again revealing that he is not a Bible scholar, but biblically illiterate or guilty of knowingly wresting the Scripture.

This was to be a Prophet like no other. Furthermore, it is clear from the Scriptures that the Jews at the time of Jesus expected that this Prophet was still to come, and that it was one unique prophet unlike others, although they did not realize that the Prophet like Moses was the same person as the Messiah (John 1:19-25; 6:14; 7:40-41). In what way was Christ like Moses? How was He more like Moses than any of the other Old Testament prophets? Moses had authority from God to give new commandments to the people, which they were obligated to obey. These commandments had never been given or required before.

- Actually much of what Moses codified was known before Moses – this is common knowledge to those who know the Bible (Gen 26:5). There is NO reason to believe that Moses was telling the people to look forward to a great prophet who would teach an “Anti-thesis” to God’s Holy Word given through Moses and all the other prophets! How moronic!

- Jesus did **not** have authority to give new commandments contrary to the Scriptures -- Joh 12:49 For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. AND God clearly tells us what His Son would speak – In the OT – Read Malachi 2-4.
- The only NEW COMMANDMENT is this: *John 13:34 A **new** commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; **as I have loved you**, that ye also love one another.* This is the only *NEW* commandment Jesus gave as it could never have been given before.

God required much more of His people under the Mosaic Covenant than he ever had before! All of the other Old Testament prophets – Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, etc. – pointed back to the Law of Moses for the people’s standard of behavior. They did not have authority from God to hand down new ethical commandments to the people. However, Christ had the authority from God to give new commandments – new laws – which then another group of apostles, prophets, and teachers would point back to as the authoritative basis for life in God’s kingdom.

- Sorry dreamer, it didn’t happen that way.
- Listen to Jesus!
 - i. Matt 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. 19 **Whoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.**
 - ii. Mt 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: **for this is the law and the prophets.**
 - iii. Mt 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.**
 - iv. Mt 23:1 Then spake Jesus **to the multitude, and to his disciples**, 2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees **sit in Moses' seat**: 3 **All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do;** but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.

In this way, Christ was like Moses. The rest of the prophets, while pointing back to the Law of Moses as authoritative for their time, yet pointed forward to a new day, when the Prophet like unto Moses would institute a new covenant. This new covenant – and the new revelation of the kingdom of God which would accompany it – was foreseen to have ethical teachings distinctively different from those of the Law of Moses. Isaiah prophesied:

And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of the LORD’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the **God of Jacob**; and he will teach us of **his ways, and we will walk in his paths**: for out of Zion shall go forth **the law**, and the **word of the LORD** from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more (Isaiah 2:2-4).

- How can anyone say that Isaiah is declaring that God will give new ethical teachings distinctly different from those of the Law of Moses **when Isaiah says the exact opposite?** This is blind stubbornness in trying to wrest the Scripture to one's own purposes. The NEW COVENANT is clearly the writing of God's Laws in Israel's hearts – not new and distinctly different ones. Every intelligent Bible student knows this.

This prophecy foresees the spiritual house of the Lord (I Peter 2:5) which would be established in the last days. "Many people" would be attracted by this new revelation of God's plan and purpose for man, a veiled prophecy of the coming of the Gentiles to faith in God and obedience to the new covenant. It was foretold that this new law (?) would come out of Jerusalem and the land of Israel, as actually occurred when the Twelve Apostles and others spread out from the land of Israel, taking God's new covenant Word all across the then-known world. Finally, in this age,(?) the Lord would "judge among the nations" and "rebuke many people." This new covenant age would affect far more than just the nation of Israel, as had been the case with the Old Covenant (Error – not so) God's rebukes and reproof would have their effects for the Gentiles as well. And what would be the effects of these judgments and rebukes? War and carnal fighting would cease, just as Jesus and the Apostles taught.

- How presumptuous! In Jesus' day there were synagogues in every nation – look at the list that came to Pentecost! Don't tell me the Old Covenant only affected Israel – it laid the groundwork for the establishment of the churches in every nation. YES, the noble "Bereans" in every land searched **the OT Scriptures** to be sure Jesus was truly the Messiah.
- Did Jesus fail?? Did Isaiah Lie? "And what would be the effects of these judgments and rebukes? War and carnal fighting would cease, just as Jesus and the Apostles taught." Foolishness! Jesus *never* said War and Fighting would cease in this age -- not until He ruled with a Rod of Iron with His saints! Listen to Jesus speaking to His disciples:

Mt. 24:4 And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you.

5 For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. 6 And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. 7 **For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:** and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. 8 All these are the beginning of sorrows. 9 Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. 10 And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. 11 And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. 12 And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. 13 But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.

Lu 22:36 Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. 37 For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end.

- The prophecy of a coming day of peace is not just concerning a few pacifist in the pacifist churches; but NATIONS who submit to King Jesus and “No man shall make them afraid” under Christ’s reign (Micah 4:1-4), so they beat their swords into plows. This only applies to Christ’s Millennial Kingdom. Matt 24 tells us about the church age.

Isaiah later prophesied about the coming Servant of the Lord:

Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, *in whom* my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law. Thus saith God the LORD, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein: I the LORD have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, *and* them that sit in darkness out of the prison house. I *am* the LORD: that *is* my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images. Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them. Sing unto the LORD a new song, *and* his praise from the end of the earth, ye that go down to the sea, and all that is therein; the isles, and the inhabitants thereof. Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up *their voice*, the villages *that* Kedar doth inhabit: let the inhabitants of the rock sing, let them shout from the top of the mountains. Let them give glory unto the LORD, and declare his praise in the islands (Isaiah 42:1-12). **HOLD IT – Vs 13:** “The LORD shall go forth as a mighty man, he shall stir up jealousy like a **man of war**: he shall cry, yea, roar; he shall **prevail against his enemies.**” **Now you may proceed ☺**

The Father is speaking in this prophecy of His Son, the Servant. God’s Spirit was upon the Servant, and the Servant would bring judgment to the Gentiles. The plan of God was expanding to include the Gentiles, rather than just one ethnic group (**ignorant statement**). The islands were going to wait for the Law of the Messiah. This phrase clearly indicates that the Servant would give a Law, and it was a specific entity which the islands and the Gentiles were going to be waiting to hear. It implies a body of commandments different from those given to Moses (**ignorant statement**). JEHOVAH then goes on to describe His power, and to promise that He would be with the Messiah in His work, giving the Messiah Himself as the New Covenant to the people, and giving Him for a light to the Gentiles – again, a prophecy that the Gentiles were going to be included when the Messiah came to give the New Covenant. In verse 9, the prophet says something very interesting: “Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them.” The Law of Moses, the Mosaic Covenant, was the “former things” to which Isaiah was referring (**ignorant statement**). It was passing away, and something *new* was coming to take its place; Isaiah was telling about it “before they spring forth.” This new law would come from the mouth of the Servant, the Messiah, and would be preached to the ends of the earth. The response to this message is a resounding new hymn of praise (verses 10-12). A few verses later, God declares:

Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see. Who *is* blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger *that* I sent? who *is* blind as *he that is* perfect, and blind as the LORD’s servant? Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not. The LORD is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake; he will magnify the law, and make *it* honourable (Isaiah 42:18-21). **HOLD IT – next verses...22** But this is a people robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison houses: they are for a prey, and none delivereth; for a spoil, and none saith,

Restore. 23 Who among you will give ear to this? **who will hearken and hear for the time to come?**
 24 Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? **did not the LORD, he against whom we have sinned? for they would not walk in his ways, neither were they obedient unto his law.** 25 **Therefore he hath poured upon him the fury of his anger,** and the strength of battle: and it hath set him on fire round about, yet he knew not; and it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart. (Is 42:22-25)

This passage contains a further prophecy that the Servant would “magnify the law, and make *it* honourable.” The Law would not escape untouched; rather, it would be magnified – fulfilled – extended – and made honorable (ignorant statement)., as we will discuss more later in this article.

- Our snake is going to try and say the Law was not honorable, so Jesus had to make it so; but anyone who read the WHOLE passage knows that is not what is being said. Magnify does not mean “change”. Teaching an ANTITHESIS is NOT magnifying the Law of Jehovah.
- NOTICE: The LORD is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake; he will magnify the law, and make *it* honourable
- i. He is not DISPLEASED with His Law – THAT is why He is going to defend it, magnify it, and restore it proper honor, which the disobedient people have marred.

In Isaiah 51, in the midst of a hymn in praise of the coming redemption, we read:

Hearken unto me, my people; and give ear unto me, O my nation: for a law shall proceed from me, and I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the people. My righteousness *is* near; my salvation is gone forth, and mine arms shall judge the people; the isles shall wait upon me, and on mine arm shall they trust (Isaiah 51:4-5).

Here God promises that “a law shall proceed from me” – in the future. He was telling His people that a new revelation, a new law, would be proclaimed.

- What moronic assumptions! “Filthy dreamers” is the NT expression for such people. Listen to the same Isaiah as he begins his book: Isa 1:10 Hear the word of the LORD, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the **law of our God**, ye people of Gomorrah. Every Bible student knows what Law this is
- Again, listen to Isaiah in chapter 40: **Isa 40:3** The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. 4 Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain: 5 And the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it. 6 The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field: 7 The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the LORD bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. 8 **The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.**
- **Quoted by Peter: 1Pe 1:25** But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. **And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.**
- Again Hear Isaiah as he instructs the people concerning seeking the Lord and false prophets. He is speaking of the Messiah and how they will know Him.

i. **Isa 8:13** Sanctify the LORD of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. 14 And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. 15 And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken. 16 Bind up **the testimony**, seal **the law** among my disciples. 17 And I will wait upon the LORD, that hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him. 18 Behold, I and the children whom the LORD hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the LORD of hosts, which dwelleth in mount Zion. 19 And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: **should not a people seek unto their God?** for the living to the dead? 20 **To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.**

1. Every student of Scripture knows what is being said – if any man, prophet, etc. speak not in accord with God’s Laws and testimony already given through His inspiration, then there is no light in them. The people knew they must test every prophet. Jesus said, “If you believed Moses, you would believe me”. THINK ABOUT IT.
2. 1Jo 4:1 Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world
 - a. WE do this like the Bereans – searching the Scriptures – ALL OF THEM.

■ Again LOOK AT THE VERSES THAT FOLLOW THE ONES WRESTED BY STE. MARIE ABOVE IN ISAIAH 42:18-21 so as to mean that Messiah would change the Law.

i. Is 42:18 Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see. Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent? who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as the LORD’s servant? Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not. The LORD is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable 22 But this is a people robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison houses: they are for a prey, and none delivereth; for a spoil, and none saith, Restore. 23 Who among you will give ear to this? who will hearken and hear for the time to come? 24 Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? **did not the LORD, he against whom we have sinned? for they would not walk in his ways, neither were they obedient unto his law. 25 Therefore he hath poured upon him the fury of his anger,** and the strength of battle: and it hath set him on fire round about, yet he knew not; and it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart.

1. Would God say He was going to make his “dishonorable law” honorable in the same breath that He tells them He poured out His wrath because they didn’t obey the “dishonorable law” that He planned to completely 😊 change anyway???
2. This proves the opposite of what Ste. Marie is wresting it to mean. Did he not read it? Is he honestly that lame? Is he maliciously twisting Scripture or is he just ignorant? God knows! Jesus DID magnify the Law and make it honorable so He could write it in our hearts and THOUSANDS OF JEWS COULD BE

ZEALOUS OF IT AFTER CONVERSION TO CHRISTIANITY IN THE NEW COVENANT – ACTS 21 – 29 YEARS AFTER PENTECOST!!!

The people would be enlightened and the islands would wait on and trust in God – once more, a prophecy of the inclusion of the Gentiles in the day of the new law and covenant (Knucklehead assumption). In Isaiah 55:3-4, we have another prophecy of the Messiah and the New Covenant:

Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, *even* the sure mercies of David (Romans 4 – Does Ste. Marie know what this is? NO). Behold, I have given him *for* a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people.

- The “sure mercies of David” proves the New Covenant would be built on the same Law David was under and the same Gospel principles David understood – Romans 4.

Notice that the Messiah, the one who was going to make the “everlasting covenant,” would not just be a witness and a leader, but also a *commander*. The giving of new moral precepts was seen by the prophets as something which was going to occur at the giving of the New Covenant (ignorant statement). Isaiah later prophesied:

And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob (**transgression of what?**), saith the LORD. As for me, this *is* my covenant with them, saith the LORD; My spirit that *is* upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, saith the LORD, from henceforth and for ever (Isaiah 59:20-21).

Notice: As for me, **this is my covenant with them**, saith the LORD; My spirit that *is* upon thee, and my words **which I have put in thy mouth**, shall **not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, saith the LORD, from henceforth and for ever** (Isaiah 59:20-21).

- “have put” is past tense. Jesus is the WORD, The Scriptures are HIS WORDS, and the new covenant is HIS WORD being written in the hearts of God’s faithful because the Spirit of Christ will also be in His people. **NOTHING ABOUT NEW AND DIFFERENT WORDS.**
- “SHALL NOT DEPART” proves Jesus didn’t come with different words!!

The work of the Redeemer – the Messiah – would be to turn the descendants of Jacob away from transgression (**transgression of what?**). Then the Lord – the Father – gives a description of the New Covenant: The words which He would command the Messiah to speak would never depart from His mouth, or from the mouth of His spiritual seed, forever. These words – the words of the Messiah – would be repeated forever. They would be the lasting message which God wants repeated. We must obey and teach these words – (Doesn’t mean they are new and different). The prophet Jeremiah also foretold of the new covenant. In Jeremiah 31:31-34, we read:

Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that 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 *that* I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: But this *shall be* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put **my law** in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother,

saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

Mark Bullen acknowledges that this is a prophecy of the New Covenant in Christ, but states:

After AD 70 the ceremonial law was impossible to observe; but God's morals never change, and so the **moral aspects of the law are still binding, being eternal. God makes them the very foundation of the New Covenant as He writes them on the hearts and minds of Jew and Gentile believers...**Notice that it DOES NOT say that God will write **new and different laws** on our hearts. **AMEN** (Emphasis his)

There are some serious weaknesses in this argument, which Bullen repeats *ad nauseam* (for those who ignore them ad nauseam – I'm sorry the Truth of God's Word makes you sick – that is common with ism-ites). First, the Jewish people receiving this prophecy would have understood the "ceremonial" laws to also be part of the laws of the Old Covenant, and thus would probably have assumed they would have been among the laws written on hearts in the New Covenant (Notice I said after AD 70). But we know, as those on the other side of the cross and Pentecost, that the sacrifices, Temple, etc. have been done away with.

- **WRONG:** It was twelve years after Pentecost before ONE person was baptized apart from the entire Law – **moral and ceremonial**. The Jewish believers in the apostolic church NEVER stopped observing the ceremonial law, nor could they until the destruction of Jerusalem. It was a later revelation to Peter and Paul that Gentile believers could remain Gentiles and be a part of the church without becoming Jews. They still had to obey the moral law, called the "righteousness of the Law"; but were not bound to the ceremonial, except a few entrance requirements – Acts 15. The book of Romans explains the reasons and dynamics of this – Listen to our verse by verse teaching through Romans.

So we cannot assume that the body of laws which God was speaking about was identical with the Law of Moses, as we know that at least part of the Law of Moses was not written on our hearts and brought into the New Covenant – at least not in literal, fleshly form – Wrong: Those who know what Paul is saying in Romans 2:25-29 know what God did. READ Acts 21 to see the whole Law written on 1000's of Jewish believer's hearts) Notice also that this New Covenant is specifically said to be "not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers." This New Covenant is envisioned as radically different from the Old, Mosaic Covenant (Moronic). It is a false assumption that just because the passage says "my laws" and not "new laws," that therefore, the laws would not be new.

- Has this man ever read the Bible through?? What nonsense! The Bible was written to Israelites until the epistles were written to the churches – They knew what Law God was talking about – READ Malachi 3-4! Listen to Jesus in Mt 5:17-19! Read Acts 21. What planet did you come from?

Furthermore, the passage itself says that the covenant which the New Covenant would not be "according to" was specifically "the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day *that* I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt". This phrase, indicating a specific *day* on which this covenant was made, is very important (The word DAY rarely means the exact

24 hour period in the Bible, but the “TIME” OR “SEASON” – AS IN THE “DAY OF THE LORD”).

- What was “NOT ACCORDING TO THE FIRST COVENANT” was that it would be written in our minds and hearts by the Holy Ghost – NOT THAT GOD’S MORAL STANDARDS CHANGED!

This covenant was specifically defined by Jeremiah earlier in the book:

Thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel; Put your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you. But they hearkened not, nor inclined their ear, but walked in the counsels *and* in the imagination of their evil heart, and went backward, and not forward (Jeremiah 7:21-24).

The covenant which was made “on the day” when the Israelites came out of the land of Egypt, *did not consist in burnt offerings and sacrifices*. The covenant, on that day, **was the commandment to obey the voice of God and walk in His ways**. (emphasis mine)

- So in the New Covenant we are not supposed to do that?????? Because it is “radically different”??? You are running in circles and shooting your other big toe!
 - Go read a commentary and quite showing your ignorance.
 - God is simply saying that the core issue was not the ceremonial laws, but the moral laws and the relationship with God – Jesus told the Pharisees, “*Mt 9:13 But go ye and learn what that meaneth, “I will have mercy, and not sacrifice:” for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.*”
- i. I say the same to you – go learn what that meaneth, for it means the same thing as Jeremiah is saying.

The same identifying phrase, denoting the day when the Israelites left Egypt, is used in both passages. The passage in Jeremiah 31 thus clearly indicates the changing of the command given “on the day they left Egypt” defined in Jeremiah 7 (displaying ignorance again)! Thus, the New Covenant is truly not according to the Old Covenant, including in its ethical aspects.

- What a bird! This man just tried to prove in his ignorance that the New Covenant would be radically different than, “But this thing commanded I them, saying, **Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you**” ??????? The New Covenant would be radically different than this?
- **Listen to Paul quote the OT for NT believers:** “for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. 17 Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, 18 And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. 7:1**Having** therefore

these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.” 2 Cor 6:16-7:1

- THESE ARE OT PROMISES TO ISRAEL AND THEY APPLY TO US – GOD HAS NOT CHANGED AND WE CAN LEARN FROM THE OT WHAT PLEASES GOD.

Finally, the tables of the Ten Commandments were more than once called by Moses the “tables of the covenant” (Deuteronomy 9:9, 11, 15; cf. Exodus 34:28; Hebrews 9:4). Exodus 34:28 even specifically names the Ten Commandments as “the words of the covenant.” Thus, any promise of a New Covenant would certainly be including an improvement of the ethical aspects of the Mosaic Covenant, as represented by the Ten Commandments.

- STOP forcing your opinion that a New Covenant MUST have an improved ethic – We are not dealing with MOSES as a man, but WITH GOD’S WORD. God claims Moses’ Law as HIS LAWS, HIS WAYS, HIS ORDINANCE, HIS STATUTES, HIS JUDGMENTS – and you are insisting that He must improve them in order to make a new covenant. That is not what the Bible teaches – you are just a stubborn heretic.

The prophet Ezekiel also spoke of the New Covenant (Ezekiel 16:59-63; 37:26). He gave an extremely important prophecy about what would happen when the New Covenant was given:

And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh: That they may **walk in my statutes**, and **keep mine ordinances**, and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God (Ezekiel 11:19-20).

It would be very difficult to overestimate the importance of this prophecy. When the New Covenant comes, God is going to give to those who embrace it *one heart*, and a *new spirit*. The old stony heart would be miraculously removed (?), and a soft, spiritual, fleshy heart would be granted. The result of this is that the receivers of this new heart would now be able to obey God’s commandments, unlike the ancient Israelites, who continually failed (? – **How has the church done? Look at history! Israel was not incapable of obedience**). This prophecy is pivotal; keep it in mind as we proceed. We will discuss it further in this article.

- It is indeed very difficult to overestimate the importance of this prophecy in revealing your ignorance and heresy **as it completely annihilates your case**. What is MY STATUTES and MINE ORDINANCE? Go read any commentary.
- **The fulfillment is in ACTS 21 – read it! Thousands of Jews zealous of God’s Law!**
- **PAY CLOSE ATTENTION:**

Romans 8:1 There is therefore now no condemnation (**From what?**) to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. 2 For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. 3 For what the law (**Moses’ Law**) could not do, in that it was weak through the **flesh**, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, **condemned sin in the flesh (not the law)**: 4 That the righteousness of the law (**SAME LAW**) might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. 5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they

that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. 6 For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. 7 Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God (**SAME LAW**), neither indeed can be. 8 So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.

- We are talking about the LAW given from JESUS through MOSES. We were under its condemnation – **it could not atone**, but only condemn – “sin and death” – is what it could pronounce to sinners. Jesus atoned for our trespasses against the Law and gave us His Spirit so we could better live up to the “righteousness of the Law” – a term which specifically denotes the MORAL LAW as opposed to the ceremonial – see Romans 2:25-29 for proof. The Carnal mind is denoted as that mind which is **not subject to GOD’S LAW – same law!** So they cannot **NOW** please God because they do not fulfill the righteousness of the law; but those who walk in the Spirit do! **THE LAW IS STILL RELEVANT AND OBLIGATORY.** Of course that is what the New Covenant was all about – writing God’s Laws in our heart. **THIS IS THE NEW SOFT HEART WHICH KEEPS GOD’S COMMANDMENTS**
- LOVE IS NOW OBLIGATORY – IT IS THE FULFILLING OF GOD’S LAW.
- If you need more proof than this, you are just rebellious.

This shows that Ste. Marie is just an Ism-ite struggling to keep his ism from sinking under the weight of truth by false props and misrepresentations. Shame on you Andrew.

Is the Law Divided?

Central to Mark Bullen’s argument is the separation of the Law of Moses into two parts – the ceremonial law and the moral law. Bullen wrote:

The Law of Moses was a covenant between God and Israel; and contained both moral laws, and also ceremonial laws...Sometimes the word “law” is referring to the ceremonial aspects, and sometimes it is referring to the moral aspects; and this must be determined by the context in which it is used.²¹ There is a definite difference between moral Laws and ceremonial laws. The Bible makes this distinction very plain. The Moral Law is eternal and the Ceremonial Law is temporal and specifically related to the covenant in which it was given. The ceremonies God gave were object lessons about God’s plan of salvation. They taught that God’s relationship with man required more than submission to the Moral Laws; but that atonement for man’s sin was necessary also. The Moral Law never becomes irrelevant; but the Ceremonial Law is irrelevant once it is fulfilled or a new covenant replaces it with other rituals or practices. The Moral Law is God’s view of morality for eternity; but the ceremonial laws given to man (including Moses’ Law) are types and shadows awaiting the reality that they illustrate.²²

This is not a novel opinion (**duh!**), nor a new objection to the Anabaptist obedience to the teachings of Jesus. In fact, after reading the Schleithem Confession, which taught separation from the world, nonresistance, and the nonswearing of oaths, no less a man than John Calvin had a very similar reaction:

Therefore, there resteth none other evasion, to these enemies of all order, but to say, that God requireth a greater perfection in the Christian Church than he did among the people of the Jews. Now this is very true, touching ceremonies. But that we have any other rule to live by, touching the moral law, as we call it, than had the ancient people, is a false opinion. They that have so thought, took occasion out of the fifth [chapter] of Matthew where it appeareth at the first brunt, that the Lord Jesus doth add something unto the law, which before was not

commanded unto the people. But when we do mark diligently what the law of Moses doth contain, and do lay the one to the other, & make comparison, we perceive that the intention of our Saviour Jesus, was not to make any addition: but only to restore the law to his true understanding, which was depraved by the false glosses of the Rabbis.²³ **AMEN!**

Having given this opinion, Calvin later mocked the Anabaptists:

Therefore to say that Moses did but half teach the people of Israel to honour and serve God, is a blasphemy, first forged by the Papists, and now renewed by these poor fantasticals, which take for a revelation from heaven, whatsoever fables they have heard of their grandmothers.²⁴

Calvin later reiterated his contention that only the ceremonial law had been changed in the New Covenant:

Touching that Paul calleth the law childish doctrine: that meaneth he only of the ceremonies and figures. And in a like sense he saith that the law could not bring her Disciples to perfection. Forasmuch as the end, the accomplishment and verity thereof, is in Jesus Christ. In the rest, as pertaining to the doctrine of life, [the Moral Law,] such as it was in the beginning, such is it even now at this present, alike to us and to the children of Israel. For it varieth not, but as the will and justice of God is immutable, even so the law which is a true and certain declaration thereof, doth remain unto the last end, such as it was at the beginning. If it be granted touching swearing, Jesus Christ hath simply interpreted the commandment of God his father, and hath added nothing thereunto, as we must needs confess: then have we won that which we require.²⁵ **Basic Bible Truth**

In our response to this teaching, please keep one thing firmly in mind: I am not arguing that there are not many different types of laws in the Mosaic Covenant or the Law of Moses. It is obvious that some laws concerned ethical behavior, and other laws concerned religious ceremonies. Rather, to the teachings of Mark Bullen and John Calvin, I reply that the mere existence of different types of laws in the Mosaic Covenant does not imply that the entire Law is divided into two separate entities. The moral, ceremonial, civil, hygienic, environmental, and other laws contained in the Mosaic Covenant all form one harmonious whole, “the Law,” which cannot be theologically divided.

- Sorry, but you are wrong again. ALL the laws had to do with being acceptable to God in a covenant relationship. Therefore, they all fall under moral issues or ceremonial issues. Hygienic laws kept them ceremonially “clean”, so they could worship. Environmental laws were moral principles applied to stewardship in farming, etc. Civil Laws were God’s morals applied to social structure. All the particulars may not apply to us; but the moral principles DO; and we must learn and apply them. IT IS THE LAW OF LOVE – Jesus said so.

There are many reasons to reject the Calvin/Bullen thesis that the Law of Moses is divided into two parts, one of which has been replaced in the New Covenant (the ceremonial law) and the second of which is still binding (the moral law). The first and most obvious reason is that it is never clearly taught in Scripture, contrary to the confident assertions of Mark Bullen.

- Ste. Marie, just because you are too stubborn or ignorant to receive truth, doesn’t mean it is not there. Romans 2:25-29 has been explained clearly in my writings and you even quote a small portion – I wonder why you did not quote it all. We will walk through it here, and any intelligent Bible student will have to admit that Paul believed as we assert. By the way, just because Calvin was wrong on some issues doesn’t mean it is wrong to agree when he is right. Yes, Calvin was wrong on some issues; but we would all agree with Him on many

points – So showing he agrees with me doesn't slander my points – especially when you agree with Marcion on your whole “antithesis”. Listen close:

- Here is the paste from “The Alien Exposed”, which he claimed to read in red.

Romans 2:25 *For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. 26 Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? 27 And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, **if it fulfil the law**, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? 28 For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: 29 **But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.***

These very arguments which show that New Testament Gentile converts had to obey God's Moral Law also prove beyond doubt that **there is a difference between the moral and ceremonial aspects of God's Law**, and, furthermore, that a New Testament Gentile convert could be fulfilling the moral law and be pleasing to God while still considered as an uncircumcised Gentile – not keeping the ceremonial law.

So... can it be said that the “uncircumcised” or “man who does not obey the ceremonial law” is at the same time keeping “the righteousness of the law” (moral law)? Yes, the whole point here is that one can keep the moral law and be a Jew inwardly while not keeping the ceremonial law and being a Jew outwardly. Can anything be clearer? This means he was not circumcised, did not obey the dietary laws, washings, temple service, Sabbaths, feasts, etc. The New Covenant Gentile convert had the circumcision of the heart, but not the outward circumcision of the flesh. (Col. 2:11)

1. “The uncircumcision” and “The Gentiles” are the same people, and these terms are used to denote those who have not been converted to Judaism.
2. “Circumcision” and “the circumcision” are terms that denote those under Judaism. Look up how these words are used in the NT and you will learn I am telling you correctly.
3. The “righteousness of the Law” is speaking about the eternal moral issues that must be fulfilled in the lives of New Testament believers – see Romans 8:3-4 - Same writer, same book, same arguments.
4. In the passage above Paul is arguing that if the Gentile convert or “uncircumcision” **keep** the “righteousness of the Law” he is a Jew **inwardly**, but not **outwardly**. This **proves** that Paul separated the Law of Moses into the INWARD and the OUTWARD. He called the outward ceremonies by the term “circumcision” and the inward morality by the term, “the righteousness of the Law”. These designations are seen throughout Scripture and, without an ax to grind and an ism to defend, any sincere student of Scripture can see it. READ our books, and you will see it.

Again, I do not mean that certain New Testament passages do not sometimes refer to ceremonial aspects of Moses' Law, but I mean that the New Testament never clearly teaches that the Law of Moses or the Mosaic Covenant is split into two separate entities, one of which remains binding and the other of which has been done away. Despite Mark Bullen's arguments to the contrary, it is simply not there. (We will be examining his specific arguments in support

of this part of his thesis later in this paper.) Because the divide is never clearly taught in Scripture, theologians who support this divide have a serious problem, namely, knowing where to draw the line between the ceremonial and moral laws.

- We have just showed this to be wrong. Above we explained the difference in the nature of a moral law and a ceremonial law – remember- one is holy only by appointment, and the other is holy by nature. We also prove this again in Hebrews 8 – What is written on the hearts and what is done away? Figure it out!

At first glance, the job appears pretty easy – of course, “thou shalt not kill” is moral, and the Passover sacrifice is ceremonial. But when one knows the actual contents of the Law of Moses, the job becomes more and more complex. Joshua Geiser raised this very issue with Mark Bullen:

In the last part of that paragraph [in Matthew 5], when He speaks of breaking or keeping the commandments, do you believe He is speaking of the law of Moses? If so, that raises more questions. Now we have to decide what part of Moses’ law is still in effect today. Away with all the sacrificial laws, for they were fulfilled in Jesus Christ. What other laws were fulfilled in Jesus Christ, and which still stand? The moral laws, you say; those still stand. Okay, which laws are moral and which are not? For instance, do you make sure to not sow two different kinds of seed together in a field (hybridization), and to not use fabrics woven of two different kinds of cloth (cotton/polyester)? Remember, “the least of these commandments.”²⁶

To this challenge, Mark Bullen replied:

Good question. I have shown clearly in my writing that part of the law was fulfilled in Christ and his heavenly priesthood, and part was written on our hearts as the foundation of the New Covenant — This is not interpretation, but is clearly stated in Hebrews and demonstrated in my book. Anything that was a type, shadow, or only had local temporary relevance — and therefore could not be a moral judgment or part of God’s “ways” and holiness was ceremonial and civil in nature. Any law that was a part of God’s holiness, way, and judgment is moral and eternal law. This is not mysterious, but may require some study.²⁷

Although Bullen asserts that he had “shown clearly” the separation, and tries to give an easy, pat answer for what is moral and what is ceremonial, a perusal of his own books in chronological order shows that he himself has struggled with the answer to this very question.

- What buffoonery! **That was not the answer I gave to that statement.** I broke it down and answered each part thoroughly. Here is the answer to the first sentence of the question for example.

“Judaism was in full force when Jesus spoke these words, and Jesus was a perfect Jew (inwardly and outwardly) so he could be the spotless, sinless lamb to make atonement. In Matt 23 Jesus says that his listeners should obey the Pharisees on matters of “law-abiding” because they sit in Moses’ seat — this is obviously to Jews as they are the primary ones Jesus preached to while on earth. The Law of Moses was the church standard for every New Testament believer; and this did not change for anyone until Cornelius — 12 years after Pentecost! For the first 12 years after Pentecost all evangelism included circumcision and submission to Moses Law — both moral and ceremonial. This is a very important point that many miss. God had to give Peter a special vision in order for the church to let go of the Ceremonial Law for Gentile converts. In Acts 21 — which is about 29 years after Pentecost — the Jews were still obeying ALL Moses’ Law, though they had a New Covenant view of it, and were IN THE NEW COVENANT THEMSELVES. This is not interpretation, but facts of history!”

- You can see what really happened in the actual letters represented on our website – www.thefaithoncedelivered.info LOOK FOR YOURSELF.
- Ste. Marie can try to do to my writings as he does to the Scriptures – pick a portion here and there, patch them together, and force his opinion and interpretation upon them; but God knows the truth and will hold him accountable for such deceitfulness.
- LISTEN: In Matt 5:19 Jesus is speaking to JEWS and speaking of EVERY SINGLE LAW IN THE OT. This is undeniable. Jesus kept Moses’ Law perfect – He had to in order to be the spotless Lamb. Joshua asked and I responded to HOW THIS APPLIES TO US. Ste. Marie only represented what he wanted to be read for his own deceitful purposes. Any intelligent student of Scripture realizes that WE are Gentiles and ACTS 15 leaves us free from conversion to Judaism – THUS WE ARE THE “UNCIRCUMCISION/GENTILE” WHOM PAUL REFERRED TO IN ROMANS 2:25-29 THAT KEEP THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW; BUT NOT THE CEREMONIAL ASPECTS OF JUDAISM. Romans 8 backs this up as does the whole Bible. I am going to repeat this for Ste. Marie *ad nauseam* because ismites need such repetition – we must upset their stomach, because their head is too thick to penetrate.

In his first book related to the covenants and ethics, *What the Bible Really Teaches About Divorce and Remarriage*, Bullen defined the ceremonial law as: The part of the law that was done away in Christ was the part fulfilled, which included all the types and shadows.²⁸

This, of course, is not very informative in terms of exactly *which* laws were “done away in Christ.”

- This is just sleazy politics – This man is dishonest and unethical. How sad for his soul. He is not representing my answers and responses, just sound-bites.

So in his next book, *Did Jesus Correct Moses*, Bullen elaborates:

God gave some sort of rituals or ceremonies to teach about God’s conditional salvation through blood atonement...**Ceremonies** to teach that sin was a real problem that must be dealt with by a blood atonement or God could not have a relationship with man. (Emphasis original)²⁹

He mentions the priesthood, tabernacle, and circumcision as being the “ceremonial law”. He included an “etc.” in one list, but these are the only items he mentioned. This, too, is woefully inadequate as a definition, as it leaves way too many laws binding.

- In neither of these passages did I intend to give a comprehensive list -- I assumed all intelligent students of Scripture already understood this. Go read the books and you will see that other points were being made. There are answers if these men have questions; but to assume, accuse, and try to discredit true Bible issues to defend your Ism is shameful.

So in his next book, *The Alien Exposed*, Bullen expanded the definition of the ceremonial law yet further:

...the whole point here is that one can keep the moral law and be a Jew inwardly while not keeping the ceremonial law and being a Jew outwardly...This means he was not circumcised, did not obey the dietary laws, washings, temple service, Sabbaths, feasts, etc.³⁰ (See he did read it!)

So now dietary laws, washings, and holy days are added to the Law which was “done away.” But then, when Joshua Geiser challenged him regarding the agricultural and clothing regulations of the Mosaic Law, Bullen expanded the definition yet further:

What you will find is that most [commentaries] agree these precepts were directed towards some superstitious or idolatrous practices in their day, or were object lessons much like clean and unclean meats which helped teach them separation – making them ceremonial in nature.³¹

- What hypocrisy! This was a direct answer (part of it) to a question concerning the “woolen and linen” issue and other clothing regulations, not a definition of ceremonial law. Poor guy was looking so hard for a definition of ceremonial law – he could have just asked.

So now, for Bullen, not only are agricultural and dress laws ceremonial, but the defining line of ceremonial has been expanded. Whereas in 2012 in *Did Jesus Correct Moses*, the ceremonial law was defined as laws teaching about blood atonement, now the definition is expanded to include “object lessons...[to] teach them separation”. This is a perfect illustration of the extreme difficulty in separating between moral and ceremonial in the Mosaic Law.

- This is a perfect illustration of your crooked and perverse ethics in deliberately misrepresenting the facts.
- No, this is not difficult for Bible students who understand the nature of moral and ceremonial laws. These different quotations were for different purposes – not one is given as a complete definition of what encompasses ceremonial laws. Most of the civil and ceremonial laws had underlying moral principles which they illustrated; but only the moral principle is preserved. I am sorry that Ste. Marie and friends can’t figure this out.
- The Bible clearly teaches that the “middle wall of partition” between Jews and Gentiles was taken down; but we know that this could not mean matters of morality; but only issues pertinent to Judaism. The Laws that God was writing on the hearts of New Covenant believers were moral principles representing God’s eternal holiness, not matters only relevant to Jews under Judaism. This is undeniable.

Basically, it becomes an arbitrary, every-man-for-himself affair.

- Only for those too stubborn and proud to be taught.
- These foolish beasts wish to claim that we are simply to obey JESUS and not MOSES; but they have to do the SAME THINGS with JESUS TEACHINGS as we are saying concerning MOSES’ LAW. MUCH OF JESUS’ TEACHINGS HAD TO DO WITH SABBATH KEEPING – do they keep the Sabbath? Jesus told Peter to pay temple tax – do they? Jesus upheld circumcision – do they? Jesus kept the feasts – do they? Jesus taught his disciples to obey the Pharisees (Mt 23) – do they? Jesus told the Pharisees to keep the whole law impartially and not leave out the tithe of mint, anise, and cummin – do they do this? Jesus was a full fledged JEW – are they?? Jesus told the rich young ruler that the way to inherit eternal life was to keep Moses’ Law – Do they obey this? NO, they have to separate the moral aspects of Jesus teaching from the ceremonial aspects in order to obey Jesus. They have to seek out and apply the moral principle behind the teaching when the teaching applies to someone or something else -- THEY KNOW THIS, but are just in a

“save the ism” frenzy because I have exposed their heresy. If they weren’t so desperate to save their heresy, they could learn.

Whereas Bullen would insist that the Sabbath was part of the ceremonial law,³² others – such as Sabbatarians, some Messianics, and in the sixteenth century, the tiny Sabbatarian Anabaptist sect³³ – insist that the Sabbath was a moral law. It is, after all, part of the Ten Commandments, and it is hard to see a connection between the Sabbath and the blood atonement.

- Please don’t show your insincere ignorance like this.
- How do we know where to put the Sabbath? First, we know that a day being holy is BY APPOINTMENT and not by NATURE. Second, we can see where Paul put it – *Col 2:16 Let no man therefore judge you in **meat**, or in **drink**, or in respect of an **holyday**, or of the **new moon**, or of the **sabbath days**:*
 - i. All these are holy by appointment and not by nature –*Paul puts them together!!*

Furthermore, why would we not include the commandments regarding swearing by God as part of the ceremonial law? They are, after all, related to worship and a repudiation of idolatry. This would make them ceremonial, would it not? (NO) Yet Mark Bullen insists that the Mosaic commandments regarding swearing are still valid today (which we will examine in detail later).

- We have proven what Jesus meant concerning swearing and showed that even Menno Simons understood that Jesus and Paul (9 times) did use swearing according to the Law of Moses; but not the man-made oaths which Jesus clearly rebukes. We also showed that unless Malachi is a false prophet, Jesus was preaching against **false swearing, not lawful swearing** – should I believe a nut like you over Malachi??

Another problem is that the Mosaic Law cannot be simply divided into two parts. Although Mark Bullen repeats again and again that there is a moral and a ceremonial law in the Mosaic Law code, theologians actually make a third division, which Mark Bullen also finds himself forced to recognize – the civil law.

Since the church is not the civil government as it was in the Old Testament, stoning is not for the church.³⁴

Thus, he is conveniently excused from carrying out God’s moral judgment calls given in the Old Testament Law, as he passes them off onto the hands of the civil government, claiming that magistrates today must live by those laws.

- How utterly moronic? I didn’t say it wasn’t for the New Covenant! The Civil Laws are based on God’s moral judgments, but they are directly given to magistrates, not civilians – duh! Did Christ expect me to take the law into my own hands? If a law was given specifically to a priest, a husband, a farmer, a soldier, a king, etc. – They are not binding upon me until I fill one of those roles. This is first grade stuff, guys! Do you obey NT teaching that was given to bishops when you are not one? Do you submit to your husband when you are not a wife? PLEASE stop lowering yourself – it is shameful.

Having illustrated the difficulty in drawing the line between the ceremonial and the moral, let us return to our theme of examining the theological validity of this teaching. There are many Scriptural considerations which lead to the conclusion that we cannot fall back on any separation of the Mosaic Law into two or three distinct, divisible entities.

1. The Mosaic Law is so far-reaching that it is hard to divide all of the laws neatly into just two or three categories. There are moral teachings (regarding murder, stealing, etc.); there are ceremonial or religious teachings (the sacrifices and temple services); there are civil teachings (commandments regarding jurisprudence, the cities of refuge, etc.); there are hygienic teachings (regarding the proper disposal of waste, the treatment of lepers, etc.); and there are environmental laws (regarding the harvesting of birds and cutting trees). How are we to neatly divide all of these laws into two or three categories, and then decide which ones apply to us today and which ones do not?

- Yea, I understand, first grade was very hard for me when I was six – This must be pretty tough for you.
 - That which is only holy by appointment, and is not appointed as such in the NT, is not binding. That which is holy or moral by nature is still so, and we are to learn from God's Law the **WAYS OF THE LORD**. Any sincere believer can understand such things, and we would be happy to answer the questions on the specifics.
 - Jesus put it in a nutshell -- Mt 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: **for this is the law and the prophets.**
- i. **The moral principles live on forever, even where the application changes.**

2. Some laws bridge the gap between moral and ceremonial, and other, requirements. For instance, lepers were banished from the camp to avoid the contamination of others; this could be called a law regarding hygiene or sanitation. Yet the ceremony governing the readmittance of the leper into the community upon healing is undoubtedly a ceremonial law.

- Ah! so you are recognizing the moral aspects even among the ceremonial and civil laws. What moral issues can we see here?
- i. It is wrong to jeopardize society's health for the sake of the feelings of one individual – **moral issue**
- ii. God wants authorities to enforce quarantine to protect society – **moral issue**

Listen to Paul: 1Co 9:6 *Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working? 7 Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? 8 Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? 9 For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? 10 Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope.*

- Paul understood the moral aspects of the Law of Moses, even the ones behind agricultural issues, were to be gleaned for OUR USE and he used it as the basis of his and Barnabas' right to forbear working. READ the whole passage.

3. Different types of laws are often intermingled in the same contexts. For instance, let us examine Deuteronomy 22. The first four verses discuss restoring a neighbor's cattle, or helping him if his cattle have fallen. Verse 5 is a law regarding cross-dressing. These are clearly

moral/ethical commandments. Verse 6, however, is an environmental protection law, regarding the harvesting of birds. The next verse has a law regarding construction of a new house – a moral commandment, because the reason for the law was “that thou bring not blood upon thine house”. Verse 9 has a law that “Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with divers seeds: lest the fruit...be defiled.” This law does not seem to fit neatly in either the moral or ceremonial categories, but is agricultural in nature. (Notice, *contra* Mark Bullen, that the reason for this law was not to “teach separation,” but was to prevent the genetic contamination of their seed supply.) Verse 10 says, “Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together.” What category should this be put in? It does not seem to fit in any manmade category.

- *Ad Nauseam*: That which is only holy by appointment, and is not appointed as such in the NT, is not binding. That which is holy or moral by nature is still so, and we are to learn from God’s Law the WAYS OF THE LORD.
- Matters of conservation are so because of a moral principle of stewardship. If God says to take only the eggs and leave the bird, it is because it is morally wrong to jeopardize future generation’s supply of food by abusing the environment now. We are to glean God’s wise judgments to find the moral principles – AND YES, if we are harvesting birds, we should be moral in it also.
- I really think Ste. Marie could see this if it were not for his blind frenzy to save the ism.

Or how about verse 11? “Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts, *as* of woollen and linen together.” Verse 12, regarding the fringes upon the garments, could conceivably be called ceremonial (cf. Numbers 15:38-40). The rest of the chapter concerns jurisprudence in cases of sexual misconduct or slander, closing with the undoubtedly moral commandment, “A man shall not take his father’s wife, nor discover his father’s skirt.”

So if Mark Bullen is correct, and the moral law is for us today, the ceremonial laws are not, and the civil laws are for the civil government today, we would have to go through the entire Law of Moses, just as we have this chapter, and cut the entire thing in pieces to find out what applies today and what does not. And there would still be laws which we could not be sure about!

- Pity, Pity – poor boy, Studying to show himself approved unto God by rightly dividing the Word is just so laborious and hard ☹ I love to read and discern what moral precepts I can glean to make my walk brighter and wiser! “Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path” READ Ps 119 for the Spiritual Man’s view of God’s LAW.

There are 613 commandments in the Law of Moses. Has anyone – John Calvin, Mark Bullen – produced an infallible index to all 613 commandments, cataloguing which ones are moral, which are ceremonial, and which are civil, and showing which apply to today and which do not? *That is what we need if the Calvin/Bullen thesis is true!*

- AMEN! 2Ti 2:15 Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, **rightly dividing the word of truth.**
- 2Ti 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17 That the man of God may be perfect, **thoroughly furnished unto all good works.**

- 1Co 10:11 Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and **they are written for our admonition**, upon whom the ends of the world are come.
- **Ro 15:4** For **whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning**, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.
- Mt 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.**
- **Get busy learning the Bible and stop whinning.**

Finally, we have a historical consideration. (We will delve deeply into historical evidence in Part 2.) The teaching of the division of the Mosaic Law code into moral, ceremonial, and civil parts is generally credited to Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225-1274) (**Ignorant Statement**). I do not know of any teacher of the church who taught this prior to him (Try Paul). If this is such a clear teaching of Scripture, and if the apostles truly taught it to the churches that they founded, why was it lost for so many centuries until a Roman Catholic monk finally “rediscovered” this “truth”? (**Ignorant Statement**). All of this mental quagmire can be totally avoided if we simply discard Mark Bullen’s foundational assumption, namely, that God’s moral/ethical instructions can never be changed. If we discard that assumption, then we can come to the much simpler conclusion that any Old Testament/Mosaic law which is repeated, in letter or in principle, in the New Testament, is binding for Christians. The rest is not.

- Great! Listen to Jesus in the NT.
- Mt 5:19 Whosoever **therefore** shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.
- Mt 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

BUT WAIT! MR. STE. MARIE, YOU HAVE JUST BROUGHT YOURSELF and all your unfortunate followers UNDER JUDAISM - O FOOLISH MAN! GO LOOK AT HOW MANY CEREMONIAL ASPECTS OF MOSES’ LAW ARE **REPEATED** in letter or in principle, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT!!!

- BY YOUR FOOLISH DEFINITION, YOU HAVE BROUGHT EVERY GENTILE UNDER JUDAISM!! How shameful to set yourself up in the highest seat only to be brought down to the lowest in the sight of all – Should have listened to Jesus.
- **LISTEN TO JESUS** – Matt 23:1 Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, 2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees **sit in Moses' seat: 3 All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do;** but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.
- As said earlier, everyone must do with Jesus’ teaching what must be done with the Old Testament Law. What are we to learn about the “ox in the ditch”? Are we just to learn about Sabbath keeping Jewish style? NO, but there is a moral principle we learn from this.

There is the principle of GOD’S HOLY LOVE behind every commandment as Jesus said, and we are to search it out and LIVE BY IT.

- If you really want to have some fun, call all these self proclaimed scholars together and ask them when the Old Covenant was OVER and the New Covenant BEGAN – Go ahead ask them! Was **any** of Jesus’ teachings New Covenant? Or was it **all** Old Covenant? **They DON’T KNOW!** They all have a different answer! Jesus told the rich young ruler to inherit eternal life by keeping the commandments – do they teach this? Jesus said the rich man’s brothers on earth must repent and hear “Moses and the Prophets” to be saved, do they teach this? This reveals the underlying fallacy of these foolish dreamers. They say that Jesus was to bring in a NEW ETHIC; but when I show them in MK 7:1-13 where Jesus obviously still supports capital punishment for rebellious youths beyond their parent’s control, they say, “Well, that is Old Testament”. Thus they categorize themselves just like the Pharisees who “make the Word of God of none affect by their tradition”.
- Jesus put “what Moses said” on the same level as “the commandment of God” (MK 7) and then rebuked them for making God’s Word through MOSES of none affect by their “new ethic” – THINK! – would Jesus be doing the same thing He is rebuking these men for??? ABSOLUTELY NOT. Thus your whole case falls flat!

Now we do not have to parse the Law into two, three, or more pieces and try to find out what applies and what does not, all based on human wisdom. In fact, Mark Bullen himself admits that at least one moral law *has* changed, at least partially! After explaining how polygamy was tolerated under the Mosaic Law, Bullen then says: (misrepresentation)

In the New Testament God calls us back to His original intent for all his creation where possible...With these wise and patient steps, monogamy was restored and polygamy ceased in the faithful Christian churches. God expects more from Christians because they have been given more light.³⁵

So if God’s moral judgments *never change*, and in the same situation He will *always* give the same judgment call, as Bullen repeats *ad infinitum* – why then was polygamy permitted and tolerated under the Mosaic Covenant, but (as Mark Bullen himself admits) was caused to cease among Christians?

AGAIN, you only quote what you wish for your deceitful purposes – notice the “...” in the first sentence? What was there? This was:

“I say, “where possible”, because when a man came to Christ with two wives, he was “grandfathered” in to the church, not told to divorce. This man could not, however, be a church leader because they did not want polygamy to be set up as an example before the church.

1Tim 3:2 A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of **one wife**, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach;

1Tim 3:12 Let the deacons be the husbands of **one wife**, ruling their children and their own houses well.

Titus 1:6 If any be blameless, the husband of **one wife**, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly.”

- *This is what was missing – Go read the whole book and you will see it makes perfect sense.*
- In the NT polygamy is still tolerated, but in the proper light of Moses’ Law which records God’s original intents for marriage in Genesis. God never commanded polygamy as a solution to a problem except in the Levirate marriage, which was specifically for Jews in the Land of Israel for inheritance issues. God did tolerate it, and **still does under the same principles. Jesus authored those precepts, as HE is the WORD – and HE is not ashamed of what HE DID.**
- Just as you are more accountable now that I have explained the WORD more clearly to you, so WE as Christians are more accountable for God’s Word the more we understand it. This is not God’s moral judgments changing, but me understanding them better, and so more being expected of me.
- I’m really sorry you have not had the capacity to understand what I have written; but you should ask questions and not assume to accuse, discredit, or claim scholastic superiority when you simply do not know what you are talking about.

Why would it be sin for a Christian to marry a second, third, or fourth wife, when it was not sin for a Hebrew to do so? Nevertheless, in the above quote, Bullen does get it right! The New Covenant does call us back to God’s original intent for all creation. Bullen’s addition of “where possible” to this sentence seems to be his loophole to crawl out of his own admission, when it suits him.

- How do we know God’s original intent for all creation? Did Jesus take us back to God’s Law, like Malachi said or come with an antithesis? What did Jesus refer to in order to rebuke the abuse of Deut 24?...Moses’ Law - GENESIS!! So, we are accountable to Moses’ Law – the Pentateuch! Or, is it done away? We are accountable to rightly divide ALL the Word of God.
 - i. Mt 5:19 Whosoever therefore shall break **one of these least commandments**, and shall **teach men so**, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.
 - ii. Mt 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.**

JESUS AUTHORED THE ENTIRE OLD TESTAMENT

- iii. Did Jesus forget about polygamy when making these statements???
- iv. Was He ashamed of what He inspired?
- v. Was Jesus telling people to be polygamists in Matt 5:19 or Mk 4:4?

Any true student of Scripture knows the answers. God’s WAYS, judgment calls, his allowances, and His original intentions can be gleaned from the New and Old Testament Scriptures by all sincere and intelligent students. IT IS ALL INSPIRED, RELEVANT, CONSISTENT, AND STILL VALID FOR THE PURPOSE IT WAS STATED. What Jesus did in the OT, He would again do in the same situation – His moral judgments are unchangeable.

■ Heb 13:8 Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever. DO YOU BELIEVE?

God's grace (divine power and influence) is granted to us to make it possible to live as God originally intended men to live! (**NAKED?** – are you sure? So Jesus is taking us back to what Moses taught ...in Genesis? Clothes are due to the hardness of men's hearts too you know.) As a final point, it is not true that the New Testament clearly teaches that only the ceremonial commandments of the Law of Moses have been "done away." As only one example, let us look at II Corinthians 3:6-11: As only one example, -- where are all the other examples ☺)

Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, **written and engraven in stones**, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which *glory* was to be done away: How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation *be* glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excellet. **For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious** (II Corinthians 3:6-11).

Notice that Moses' Law, the "ministration of death," is explicitly defined for the purposes of Paul's argument here as that which was "written *and* engraven in stones." There is only one part of the Mosaic Law which fits that description – the Ten Commandments themselves. Notice that Paul calls them "done away"! The Ten Commandments, undoubtedly all moral commandments (with the possible exception of the Sabbath), have been "done away" in Christ!

Therefore, we conclude that the idea of a bipartite or tripartite division of the Law of Moses is Scripturally and logically untenable and is of no help in interpreting the relationship between the Two Covenants.

■ You, as usual, completely miss the point. "undoubtedly all moral commandments (with the possible exception of the Sabbath), have been "done away" in Christ! How wicked

Notice the first sentence... Who also hath made us able ministers of the **new testament**; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life... and ask yourself, "the 'letter' and 'spirit' of what?" Do you understand grammar? Then you can see we are speaking of the **letter** and **spirit** of the **same thing**. We are not dealing with New Covenant VS Old Covenant; but of ministering the LETTER or ministering the SPIRIT of the NEW COVENANT – Look at it! BUT, you say, the LETTER is clearly speaking of the giving of the law at Sinai – AH, you are getting closer! What was the New Covenant supposed to be but the writing of God's laws on our hearts by the Holy Ghost. The New Covenant is based on God's Law! It is a covenant with the SAME HOLY GOD.

THINK! If the New Covenant is based on some different Law, then this makes no sense; but if the New Covenant is THE SAME LAW ministered with spiritual understanding, then we are dealing with "the LETTER of the law **without** the Spirit" VS "the ministering of the SPIRIT **with** the LAW" – this is the Spirit that inspired it and also the Spiritual meaning behind it!! The spiritual meaning has to do with NOT looking to the Law for justification; but looking to God's gracious salvation plan for justification – Abraham & David understood this – Ps. 32 & Rom. 4. Note the contrast – ministration of condemnation – the plumb line VS the ministration of Justification/Righteousness (same idea) – the atonement of Christ. Jews generally

misunderstood the law to be God's means of justification; but spiritual people could see the plumb line which condemned was not God's means of justification (Galatians).

The "spirit of the Law"; the "spiritual meaning of the Law"; and the "spiritual power to fulfill the Law" are very closely related and are more practical than mystical. Consider that being "filled with the Spirit" and letting "the Word of Christ dwell in us richly" are used interchangeably; and when the preacher preaches the Word of God, he is "ministering the Spirit" to the people.

Listen to the beginning of the chapter:

- **2Co 3:3** "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart."

What is the contrast? What was written on stone? **The same thing written on hearts!** What was written with ink before is now written with the Spirit of God. (Moses wrote with ink after God wrote on stones)

YES, you can see it now can't you? IF THE MINISTRATION OF THE **LETTER** OF GOD'S LAW WAS GLORIOUS, HOW MUCH MORE THE MINISTRATION OF THE **SPIRIT** OF GOD'S LAW – **which is what the New Covenant is** – The writing of God's Law in our hearts with a spiritual understanding and Holy Spirit power to fulfill it's intent - LOVE. Compare with Heb. 8:8-11.

- i. The letter ministered apart from the indwelling Holy Spirit and proper spiritual understanding of the Law was a ministration of condemnation – The plumb-line without the power – **Romans 7** – read it!
- ii. **The Holy Spirit made the difference** - Romans 8 --- **LISTEN CLOSE!!! HERE IT IS!!**

Rom. 8:1 There is therefore **now no condemnation** to them which are in Christ Jesus, **who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.** 2 **For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death (HOW?).** 3 **For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:** 4 **That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.** 5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. 6 **For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.** 7 **Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.** 8 **So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.**

SEE IT?? What caused the DEATH and what gave LIFE? **Not a change of the Law;** but the giving of the SPIRIT to fulfill the Law – **which is clearly stated as SUBJECTION to the Law of God!** So the apostle was ministering – not just the letter of the law – but ministering the Spirit that gives us a clear understanding of the true nature of the Law and helps us fulfill the righteousness of the law. The ministering of the NEW COVENANT WAS THE LAW OF

GOD IN OUR HEARTS WITH HOLY GHOST POWER TO FULFILL IT – LIFE INSTEAD OF CONDEMNATION!

THIS PROVES MY CASE BEYOND ANY SHADOW OF DOUBT.

■ **HERE is the proper view of God's Law:**

- i. **I Tim 1:5** Now the end (*goal and aim*) of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned: 6 From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling; (*that is you*) 7 Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm (*you again*). 8 But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully;
- ii. **This is what Jesus was saying** when He said, “This is the law and the prophets” (Mt 7:12) and “on these two commandments hang all the Law of the Prophets” (Mt 22:40) – This is what He meant --- HE WAS GIVING THE “END” OR “GOAL” OR “INTENT” OF GOD’S LAW. **God’s Law was only meant to be used by sincere people to maintain holiness in society – charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned!**
- iii. **LISTEN AGAIN - Romans 13:8** Owe no man any thing, but to **love** one another: for he that loveth another hath **fulfilled the law**. 9 For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be **any other commandment**, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt **love** thy neighbour as thyself. 10 **Love worketh no ill** to his neighbour: therefore **love is the fulfilling of the law**.
 1. The **Same thing** Paul says to Timothy – LOVE – Charity out of a pure heart **IS** the Law and the Prophets as Jesus said – THE MORAL BASIS AND FOUNDATION OF EVERYTHING TAUGHT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT was LOVE. DID JESUS CHANGE THIS OR JUST CLARIFY AND MANIFEST IT BETTER???? ALL INTELLIGENT AND HONEST BIBLE STUDENTS CAN IMMEDIATELY SEE THIS!
 2. If LOVE was the **basis of the Law** and therefore the fulfillment of the Law, then this “new ethic” must be contrary to LOVE? THINK! This means Deut 24 was and is fulfilled by LOVE – This means it was only meant to be used by sincere men for the purpose of maintaining holiness in society – not a compromise with hard hearted men which allowed adultery - or it would not be based on LOVE. If you think so, then you don’t understand LOVE in Bible terms.

So, now you can chime in with PS 119 and Ps 19 below: Praise His Name!!

Ps 19:7 The law of the LORD is **perfect**, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple (IF ONLY THEY WOULD LISTEN). **8** The statutes of the LORD **are right, rejoicing the heart** (OF THE TRUE

BELIEVER): the commandment of the LORD is **pure, enlightening the eyes** (GO AHEAD – LET IT). **9** The fear of the LORD is clean, **enduring for ever** (AMEN): the judgments of the LORD **are true and righteous altogether** (AMEN). **10** More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. **11** Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward. (HOPE YOU DON'T BLOW IT AND MISS OUT)

The Two Kingdoms and the Present Kingdom of God

Mark Bullen himself realizes that this issue is a crux of the debate between himself and the Anabaptists. He told Joshua Geiser:

You equate the church age with Christ's future kingdom, which is not the case and seems to be a root of your error.³⁶

Bullen's failure to fully realize the present nature of the kingdom of God is indeed a root of *his* error, in our view. In fact, anyone who does not preach the coming of God's kingdom as the gospel is preaching "another gospel." Furthermore, Bullen's failure to differentiate between the natures of the coming kingdom and the present kingdom leads him into an erroneous form of arguing against nonresistance. We do not claim that the kingdom of God exists today, on the earth, in all its fullness. Rather, we believe that true Godly churches are colonies of heaven on earth, and that all true Christians are citizens, not of this world and its kingdoms, but of the kingdom of God.³⁷

- Can anyone see the juggling act? I speak of equating the church age with Christ's FUTURE kingdom. He says, "anyone who does not preach the COMING of God's kingdom as the gospel (good news) is preaching "another gospel". This man claims to have read my books; but anyone who reads the chapter in "Resist Not Evil" called "Is The Prince of Peace a Pacifist" will see the subtle "tip-toe through the tulips" here.
- They want Christ's Kingdom here now to be non-resistant; but acknowledge that the coming Kingdom will not be, and we will not be pacifists there – but we are now to be preaching the good news of a coming Kingdom which is contrary in the foundational principles to the one we now claim exists (+_+) So this must be the dispensation of pacifism??
- They use the Prophecies in Micah 4 as referring to their non-resistant churches – anybody can see this is not speaking of pacifism, but when Jesus conquers and reigns over NATIONS.

Micah 4:1 But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the LORD shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. 2 And many **nations** shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. 3 And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks:

nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. 4 But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and **none shall make them afraid:** for the mouth of the LORD of hosts hath spoken it.

- The present age can be seen in Jesus' words in Mt 24:6 *And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet.* 7 *For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:...* 12 *And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.* 13 *But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.* 14 *And this **gospel of the kingdom** shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and **then shall the end come.***
- All intelligent readers can see that Micah 4 is speaking of another time – YES, after the “end” and Jesus returns to reign. The gospel of the Kingdom is the “good news of the coming kingdom of Christ”. Is there any aspect of this now? Let me quote from some of what Ste. Marie claims to have read: IN RED
- The chapter from the book “Resist Not Evil” below starts with LUKE 19:1-27 – read it.

We don't know how this Kingdom will occur exactly; but we do know a few things about it. Just looking at this parable we can see that the Kingdom of God was not to immediately appear; that Jesus would be gone for a **long time** (Mt 25:19) to receive for himself a kingdom and return; that his servants were to be occupied doing his business while he was gone; and that when he returned, having received the kingdom, he would both reward his faithful servants with positions of authority and judge those who opposed him or were unfaithful. We, the Christian Church, are in the category of “occupying” till he comes. He is coming to reign; and his faithful servants will reign with Him over “cities” of people. Who exactly will they be? Will it be on this earth? Will believers be immortal, while those over whom they reign are still mortal? We can be confident on some points; but cannot be dogmatic on all the details. Below are some observations about Christ's Kingdom that are quite certain:

#1 It is not here now in the sense that we are to expect it in the future. Were those servants who were commanded to “occupy” already in the kingdom? Yes and No. They were already under their king and serving him; but not yet in the kingdom that was coming. The disciples were with Jesus when he told the Pharisees, “The Kingdom of God is within you” and they knew what that meant; but they still asked Jesus in Acts 1:6, “Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” We are now to be waiting for a coming kingdom, striving to be worthy to inherit it, and being tested to see if we are faithful in little so we can then be trusted with much (five or ten cities, etc.). Notice in the following Scriptures the difference between NOW and LATER when Jesus returns. I will insert and N for NOW, and a L for LATER.

- *Mt 5:5 Blessed are the meek (N): for they **shall inherit** the earth. (L)*
- *Mt 5:10 Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake (N): for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. (L)*
- *Mt 5:19 Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so (N), he **shall be** called the least in the kingdom of heaven (L): but*

whosoever shall do and teach them (N), the same **shall be** called great in the kingdom of heaven. (L)

- **Mt 5:20** For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (N), ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.(L)
- **Mt 6:10** Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.
- **Mt 7:21** ¶Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, (N) shall enter into the kingdom of heaven (L); but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. (N)
- **Mt 25:34** **Then** shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, **inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:**
- **Ac 1:6** When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?
- **Ac 3:21** Whom the heaven must receive **until the times of restitution of all things**, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.
 - This time of restitution relates to “the regeneration” spoken of in Mt 19:27 below in #2
- **Ac 14:22** Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we **must through much tribulation (N) enter into the kingdom of God.** (L)
- **1Co 6:9** ¶ Know ye not that the unrighteous (N) shall not inherit the kingdom of God?(L)
- **2Th 1:5** Which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, **that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God,(L) for which ye also suffer (N)**
- **2Ti 4:1** ¶ I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead **at his appearing and his kingdom;**
- **2Ti 4:18** And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will **preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom:** to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.
- **Heb 12:28** Wherefore we **receiving a kingdom** which cannot be moved,(L) let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: (N)
- **Jas 2:5** Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and **heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?**
- **2Pe 1:11** For so an **entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom** of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

#2 We who have suffered with Christ here and faithfully finished our course will reign with Him over other people. Zechariah 14 seems to say it will be those left after Christ conquers the world.

- **Zech 14:16** And it shall come to pass, **that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the**

LORD of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles. 17 And it shall be, that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, **even upon them shall be no rain.**

- **Mt 19:27** Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? 28 And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, **in the regeneration** when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.
- **Lu 22:28** Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. 29 And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; 30 That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.
- **1Co 6:2** Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?
- **2 Tim 2:11** It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him: 12 **If we suffer, we shall also reign with him:** if we deny him, he also will deny us:
- **Re 2:26** And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: 27 **And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers:** even as I received of my Father.
- **Re 5:10** And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: **and we shall reign on the earth.** (compare **Zech 14:16**)

#3 Christ's Throne is called the Throne of his father David. Christ is called the "Son of David". This Kingdom is future.

- **Mt 25:31** When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, **then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:**
- **Lu 1:32** He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: **and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:**
- **Ac 2:30** Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, **he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;**

#4 We are now to spread the glad tidings of this coming kingdom and call men to the hope and preparation for it. We are now in the highways and hedges compelling people to come to the wedding.

- **Mt 22:9** Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, **bid to the marriage.**
- **Lu 8:1** And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, **preaching and shewing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God:** and the twelve were with him,

- *Ac 8:12 But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.*
- *Ac 14:22 Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.*
- *Ac 19:8 And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God.*
- *Ac 20:25 And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more.*
- *Ac 28:23 And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening.*
- *Ac 28:31 Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him.*

Now, with these definite principles in mind, let us consider a few things. If there is coming a kingdom where the “Just One” will reign with a Rod of Iron; will enforce righteousness on the earth; will reign on the throne of his father David; will have His saints reigning with him; etc....And, If we are now to be proclaiming the glories and hopes of this King and Kingdom, so men will repent and prepare their hearts for the coming King....And, If we are seen now as ambassadors for this coming kingdom of righteousness....where does pacifism come in??? It simply doesn't fit; and the church of Jesus Christ on earth now is not THE kingdom; but is waiting and preparing for and preaching the coming kingdom. The church is betrothed as the King's Bride; but the marriage has not taken place. We are therefore in some degree in His realm, His “kingdom”; but not in the fullest sense. IF what we have now is a taste and foreshadowing of the coming kingdom, THEN THERE SHOULD BE NO MATERIAL DIFFERENCE IN THE FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES.

- You can read the whole chapter on our website; but consider that this man read this before saying what he says. Only an Ism-ite could do that.

It is undeniable that the gospel which Jesus and the apostles preached was the gospel of the kingdom of God. In fact, I am not aware of any place in the gospels where Jesus calls the gospel anything other than the gospel of the kingdom (if a qualifier is used).³⁸ So what is this kingdom? Is there a present aspect to it? Indeed there is. A very simple reason to accept the present nature of the kingdom of God is summed up well by Michael Lewis:

This first bit of evidence is as basic as it can be for it answers the simple question “What constitutes a kingdom?” The answer is obvious: a king, a people over which He rules, the king's law, and a location. Given that Jesus is a real king, that He rules over a people now located in His church, that Jesus has made clear His law and that we, His citizens live on earth, we may assume that, at this level, the kingdom does in fact exist. Furthermore, since Jesus' law orders us socially (servants living in mutual submission), and economically (stewards of God's resources that we generously give to others) and

specifies who and who does not use power (none coerce, employ power or violence), we find that Jesus orders us politically, not only spiritually. This ordering is political by definition.³⁹

Jesus told the Pharisees, “But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you” (Luke 11:20; cf. Matthew 12:28). We, of course, know that Jesus did cast out devils through God’s power; thus, we must also conclude that the kingdom of God was there present in Jesus’ time, and is still present today.

Many of the kingdom parables of Jesus also point clearly to the present nature of the kingdom He was describing. The kingdom is the growing mustard seed (Matthew 13:31-32; Mark 4:30-32; Luke 13:18-19), like leaven hid in dough (Matthew 13:33; Luke 13:20-21), like a treasure hid in a field (Matthew 13:44), like a merchant looking for pearls (Matthew 13:45-46), like a net catching all sorts of men (Matthew 13:47-50), like a householder hiring servants (Matthew 20:1-16), like a king inviting guests for his son’s wedding (Matthew 22:1-14), like the growing wheat (Mark 4:26-29). All of these parables have definite *present* aspects. The kingdom explained in the parables is both *now* and *later*. The kingdom explained in the parables is not just “heaven.” It is the kingdom of God existing on this earth now, to be consummated in full glory later.

- Is this refuting any thing I already said? NOT AT ALL – The servants in Luke 19 were serving their King while He was gone and thus, “under His kingdom”; but Jesus clearly made the point that the Kingdom of God that he had been preaching was NOT AT THIS TIME. Would the disciples be asking Jesus before He ascended if He was now going to set up His kingdom if they had been preaching the present existence of it? THINK! Some say, “O, but they didn’t understand”. Oh, and you do? Jesus had just spent 40 days speaking to them about the “things pertaining to the kingdom of God:” – and you think they didn’t understand that much?
- All the parables refer to the present preparation, preaching, and being tested for the coming kingdom. It is simple deception for Ste. Marie to imply he is refuting me here.

The Apostle Paul also believed in the present kingdom of God. In I Corinthians 15:22-28, we read:

For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming. **Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.** For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under *him*, *it is* manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

Notice in this passage how Jesus will in the future deliver the kingdom to the Father, once all rebellion against God has been subdued. Paul says Jesus “must reign” until every enemy has been subdued, the last of which will be death. Clearly then, the kingdom of God exists right now, Jesus is currently reigning, and must reign until all rebellion has

been extinguished – at which time He will deliver the kingdom to His Father. The kingdom is now!

- AS USUAL the verse teaches the exact opposite of what Ste. Marie believes
- Christ’s reigning is designated by the following description: **when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.** All intelligent readers know that this is not done through pacifism, and it is not being done NOW; but will be done “at Christ’s coming” – which is where the verse puts it – after Christ returns. Yes, He is now reigning in my heart; but the kingdom being in my heart doesn’t hinder me praying: “Thy Kingdom Come, Thy Will Be Done in earth as it is in heaven”, because I am in the “occupy till he comes” mode, and not “reigning with Christ” at this time. Not that hard, fellas!

Paul furthermore says:

Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated *us* into the kingdom of his dear Son (Colossians 1:12-13).

Notice that the kingdom of Christ is a place where we have (past tense) been translated! It exists and is a reality right now! There are many aspects of the kingdom of God, and one of those aspects is that the kingdom is *within* its citizens.

- Ask yourself? Do I now have an inheritance? Yes, but when will I get it? We are made MEET to be partakers, and thus we are no longer in the kingdom of SATAN, but in the Kingdom of Christ – Just like the “occupying servants” were. This verse in Colossians is speaking of “their hope” and is the same as what is said in Acts 26:18 *To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the **power of Satan unto God**, that they may receive **forgiveness of sins**, and **inheritance** among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.*

And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you

(Luke 17:20-21).

- **If you read the whole passage in context**, you will find that it means the Kingdom of God is “in your midst” or “among you” in the person of Jesus – Just listen to the next verses: 22 *And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall **desire to see one of the days of the Son of man** (Him being present among you), and ye shall not see it.* 23 *And they shall say to you, See here; or, see there: (looking for Messiah) go not after them, nor follow them.* 24 *For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day (When the Kingdom of God is revealed).* 25 *But **first** must he suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation (As King)* 26 *And as it was in the days of Noe, **so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man.*** 27 *They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all.* 28 *Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded;* 29 *But the same day that Lot went out of*

*Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. 30 **Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.** –*

○ **When His Kingdom comes and He is revealed as KING --- NOT NOW**

- This passage is not just saying the kingdom of God is in our hearts. That is why the disciples still asked him the question in Acts 1:6 – they weren’t uninformed – See Acts 1:3 – **They knew what they were talking about.**

This kingdom comes within us when the King Himself dwells within us and reigns over sin and death (Romans 5:14-21). The kingdom of darkness recedes in its influence over one’s life, as the reign of Jesus subdues lustful passions and the glory and beauty of God’s rule expands in the believer’s life. As this righteousness of God is lived out more and more in each Christian’s life, he experiences peace – both peace *with* God in a right relationship with Him, and the peace *of* God in his life, which he can extend to others. This is followed by the joy of the Holy Ghost. This is explained in Paul’s statement, “For the kingdom of God is...righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost” (Romans 14:17). But kingdoms do not and cannot exist only within the hearts of people. The very word requires a corporate, visible expression. Invisible kingdoms do not exist; they are imaginary, the realm of myth and legend. The kingdom of God is not invisible, whether in the life of an individual or in the corporate lives of Christians. God would not have it any other way. He has ordained that His kingdom be manifested visibly on the earth by the church. The church – the individual, local body of Christians – is quite literally a colony of heaven on earth. Just as the colonies of the old kingdoms of Europe were extensions of the reigns of their monarchs into foreign or hostile territory, so the church is an extension and visible manifestation of the reign of God in the territory currently under the influence of the “god of this world,” Satan, the archenemy of the Living God. As an extension of the reign of God, the church is obedient to all that its Monarch has commanded, and shows the entire world what a society can be if all men obeyed the All-Wise Ruler. The purpose of the church is to put God’s wisdom on display, not only to the watching world, but also to the angels (Ephesians 3:10).

AMEN! This in no way refutes what I believe or teach. The application of this is where we part ways. He claims that this **present aspect** of Christ’s reign is **foundationally different** than the **future aspect** of it – yet, we are now to be preaching the coming glorious kingdom and being present ambassadors for it. Therefore, the two must be on the same foundational principles – and they are!

As a society of heaven living on this earth, we are a city set on a hill which cannot be hid (Matthew 5:14b). We are a candle giving light to all that are in the house (Matthew 5:15-16). We are the light of the world (Matthew 5:14). Our light is to shine before all men, so that our good works are seen by them and God is glorified.⁴⁰ We are on display even to the angels of Heaven, revealing the wisdom of God, the goodness of His reign, the bounty of His provision, and the wholesome nature of His commandments. Although it

does not, must not, and cannot use the worldly sword, the kingdom of God will prevail upon the earth.

- **SEE THE SLIP?** Sneaky as a snake: WHERE DID THAT COME FROM? Does this man believe that pacifism will prevail and bring peace to the earth?? Is that what the Bible teaches?? Follow if you wish; but I'm not that stupid.
- They say that the “two kingdom concept” is the Kingdom of Christ VS the Kingdom of earthly government; but what saith the Scripture?
 - Acts 26:18, “*from the power of Satan unto God,*” -- **HERE ARE THE TWO KINGDOMS. NOW LISTEN AGAIN.**
 - **Romans 13:1** Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. 2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. 3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: 4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. 5 Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. 6 For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.
- **GOVERNMENT IS ORDAINED OF GOD** and is not an opposing Kingdom. If those in Satan's kingdom fill positions, then God's ordinance is miss-used; but the same is true in the HOME, CHURCH, and every other ORDER THAT GOD HAS ORDAINED. God never ordained an office that must be filled by people, but His people cannot fill it. That is just a foolish Marcionite blunder.
- **THE TWO KINGDOM CONCEPT IS THE POWER OF SATAN VS. THE POWER OF GOD – THE NARROW ROAD VS. THE BROAD ROAD – NOT WHAT THESE MEN TEACH.**
- One of the last things Jesus told his disciples in the light of coming dangerous times was “sell your shirt and buy a sword”. WHY? The pacifist whines, “Yes, but Jesus took Peter's sword away”. No, he did not, but told him to sheath it. THINK! If I bought my son a hammer, but then when he dented my car bumper, I told him to put it away. What would he conclude? That it was never right to use it in the future? Or, that it was not appropriate to use it when he did? Why must people be told such simple things?

It is the mustard seed which was planted, and has grown into a tree (Matthew 13:31-32). It is the rock cut out of the mountain without hands, which will fill the whole earth. Its origin is divine, its essence and existence are incorruptible and indestructible, it will consume all other kingdoms, no one will inherit it, for it shall never die, and it will stand forever.

And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, *but* it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms (**oooh that sounds violent – just how does pacifism do this??**), and it shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream *is* certain, and the interpretation thereof sure (Daniel 2:44-45).

The kingdom of God is the net which gathers in all kinds of people (Matthew 13:47-50) – **For what?** It is the kingdom of the humble, where only those who have become as humble as children are allowed entrance, and the humble are counted great (Matthew 5:3; 18:3-4) **This is clearly future entrance in the context.** The kingdom is part of heaven come down to earth. It is the realm where righteousness dwells. It is that place where the will of God is done *on earth*, as it is in heaven (Matthew 6:10); only those who do God's will enter His kingdom (Matthew 7:21) **Context is future – READ IT.** It is an alternative society, taking care of itself and its members as a true nation and making sure that the needs of all are met (Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-37; 6:1-7; Galatians 6:10). None are hungry, none are without clothes, and none are without shelter, in this society. It is a society of the humble (Matthew 5:3). It is the realm where the will of God is accomplished (Matthew 6:10; 7:21). It is the realm where Jesus is acknowledged as King, and His commandments and decrees are carried out. It is a society of the repentant (Matthew 3:2; 4:17; Mark 1:15). It is the only society which is indestructible (Hebrews 12:28; Daniel 2:44-45). **IF we are occupying till he comes – just like we said**

Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved (**future**), let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear (**until then**): For our God *is* a consuming fire (Hebrews 12:28-29).

SEE THE CONTEXT in the previous verses:

Heb 12:26 Whose voice then shook the earth: **but now he hath promised**, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven (**FUTURE**). 27 And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the **removing of those things that are shaken**, as of **things that are made**, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain – **THE ETERNAL**. 28 Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: 29 For our God is a consuming fire.

- Mt 24:35 Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.
- 2 Peter 3:9 The Lord is not slack concerning his **promise**, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. 10 But the **day of the Lord will** come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. 11 Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, 12 **Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God**, wherein the

heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? 13 Nevertheless we, **according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.**

- This takes in the kingdom from the time Jesus returns to the time when He delivers it up to His Father after putting down all enemies and then making a new heaven and new earth. The things that are made will burn up and only eternal things will remain.

Just like Jesus in His first coming, the present kingdom is a nonresistant kingdom under the cross. In the future, at Jesus' second coming, the kingdom will be completely victorious, when King Jesus comes in victory, as a Judge and not a Suffering Servant.

- What a mega-assumption based on what? Nothing! READ our book if you wish to know the truth in this matter – www.thefaithoncedelivered.info
- Picture Jesus whipping the men and animals out of His Father's house – the temple. But, just because He did not believe in starting insurrection against the government and His time was come to be delivered up to death, they assume He was a pacifist – Brilliant, huh? Listen to the description of Himself when he returns in Luke 19 and the description of His Father in Mt. 22:7 and Luke 20:16. Look at what Jesus said about the Roman Centurion he met, and what the Holy Ghost said about Cornelius before conversion.

Where is the Cross?

The final point regards the cross. By this, we do not mean the cross of Jesus, but the cross which every believer is called upon to carry. There is precious little evidence of this cross in the covenantal teachings of Mark Bullen. The suffering that comes from being a follower of Jesus, as we live in obedience to His commands, is negated by Bullen's teachings on divorce and remarriage, nonresistance, etc. What are we supposed to suffer in obedience to Jesus if we do not have to obey His radical, earth-shaking teachings?

- So, because you feel the weight and burden of telling sincere, repentant, seeking families with divorce and remarriage in their past that they must now break up their home to go to heaven - YOU THINK YOU ARE BEARING THE CROSS OF CHRIST?? And because I do receive them; and, according to God's Word, would defend my wife and daughter against the rapist, I'm **not** bearing the cross of Christ? Poor fella with a misguided martyr complex – probably because he is dishonoring his honorable father who faithfully served our country in the military and therefore his relatives probably see him as the fool he is.
- How amazing to say this when the Anabaptist martyrs whom they so venerate Do NOT AGREE WITH THEM BUT WITH ME!
- The truth is YOU DON'T WANT TO DEAL WITH SINNERS AND THEIR PROBLEMS – You don't want to bear the cross of helping those families with divorce and remarriage in their past like we do. Once a Mennonite bishop said to me, "If we open that door, do you realize what kind of people we would let in?" I said, "Yeah, repentant sinners."
- HAS IT EVER occurred to you that Jesus and the disciples never split up remarried couples and even took in polygamous marriages into the church? Do you vainly imagine that Jesus was hated and crucified for splitting up remarried couples and being a pacifist? Wow.

- The cross Jesus called us to bear is that of standing for the truth against a world of the ungodly and even of religious heretics who abuse the Bible like you do. **COME ON OVER AND STAND WHERE I STAND IF YOU WANT TO FEEL THE CROSS OF FIGHTING FOR TRUTH AND NOT A CROSS OF YOUR OWN FOOLISHNESS.**

Someone may ask, “How can you ask a divorced person to remain single? How can you ask a remarried person to leave his/her second spouse? How can you ask a military man who wants to follow Jesus to give up his career?” There is one answer: The cross. The cross is an instrument of death – a heavy, splintery, unattractive item. It is not a piece of jewelry or a nice wall decoration. It is an instrument of death to the flesh – uncomfortable, mortifying, agonizing, slow, and killing (not to mention shameful and repulsive to the natural man). Everyone who would follow Jesus must take it up. No, those who have never been divorced, or remarried, or joined the military, will not have to face the things that those who have done so will have to face – but every one of us must take up the cross and face situations and choices perhaps just as hard as any other Christian. How can we ask someone to endure such pain, or give up so much? Because “he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me” (Matthew 10:38).

- What a pitiful blockhead. **SHOW ME IN THE SCRIPTURE WHERE THE CROSS OF CHRIST WAS SPLITTING UP REMARRIED COUPLES AND REPENTING OF BEING IN THE MILITARY OR GOVERNMENT?** Was this the issue with Cornelius? Erastus? The Philippian Jailor? The Ethiopian Eunuch? Read the attitude of the apostles toward these men in Government. Read Jesus’ attitude toward the Roman Centurion He met!! Read John the Baptist’s attitude and instructions to the soldiers he baptized. Just because some man can ramble off his mouth as though he knows something does not mean it is Bible truth. The sad and pitiful part is that he writes this down and thinks he has accomplished something grand – and there are actually many people who are too shallow in the Bible knowledge to see the assumptions and delusions involved.

Has the Moral Standard Changed?

Having presented these foundational correctives to Mark Bullen’s position, we can hasten on to the crux of our argument. The first foundational correction, “God’s Moral Standard Can and Does Change,” demonstrated not only that it is possible for God to change His moral/ethical instructions to mankind, but that He has done so in the past. Therefore, without Mark Bullen’s foundational teaching that God’s moral standard can never change, we can be open to the *possibility* that Jesus could indeed have changed the moral standard in the transition from the Old Covenant to the New Covenant. But the bare possibility, of course, does not prove that it actually occurred. Thus, we must enter the core of the issue and ask the crucial question: “Is there any evidence that the moral/ethical standards *did* change in the transition between the Mosaic and the New Covenants?” Let us begin our survey with Jesus Himself, with His revelation of God’s character in the Sermon on the Mount. (For the purposes of this section, we will not be examining what the practical application of Jesus’ words to our day should be. For now, we are just concerned with the topic of whether Jesus did change the moral standard or not.)

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus clarified the position of His teachings within the overall scope of God’s revelation to man.

Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to **destroy**, but to fulfil. 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. **Whosoever therefore shall break** one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I

say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 5:17-20).

- I fear when Jesus said, “think not” that our friends took Him literal. ☹

These statements were made before the famous Antitheses (This is Marcionism) (Matthew 5:21-48), to be discussed next. Jesus states first that He was not going to destroy the Law or the Prophets; instead, He had come with the express purpose of fulfilling the Law and the Prophets. What does this mean? To fulfill the prophets meant to accomplish what they had prophesied about the Messiah. What does it mean to fulfill the Law? To answer this question, we must answer what it would have meant to destroy the Law and the Prophets. (to break them and teach so – Jesus said) Jesus did not, as the Marcionites claimed, come to unmask the Giver of the Revelations of Moses and the Prophets as some inferior, evil god. Jesus did not come to claim that the Law and the Prophets were not valid, or were somehow Satanic or evil. (You deny it, but you do it! Too simply to see it though)

- Actually the word **destroy** is of the same meaning as “**break**” in verse 19 – it is the **same root word**. Jesus is saying He did not come to break, diminish, or make the law of none affect as he rebuked the Pharisees for in MK 7:1-13
- Notice: JESUS defines what He meant by “destroy” – Whosoever shall BREAK one of these least commandments and shall TEACH MEN SO. HE defined it for us!
- If Jesus did not come to invalidate the law and the prophets as you state, then your position falls flat, you just don’t have the sense to see it.

He came *to fulfill the Law*.

The Greek word for “fulfill” used in this verse is (*pleroo* – Strong’s #4137). This word has a wide variety of meanings, including “to make replete, i.e. (literally) to cram (a net), level up (a hollow), or (figuratively) to furnish (or imbue, diffuse, influence), satisfy, execute (an office), finish (a period or task), verify (or coincide with a prediction), etc.” (*Strong’s*). Other lexicons also give a wide range of possible meanings. So how are we to know what Jesus meant by this statement?

- **One meaning they don’t give is “opposite”. You claim that the Sermon on the Mount is Jesus’ “famous antithesis” to Moses’ Law. Marcion was the first to call Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount “The Antithesis”! Consider the definition:**

Antithesis noun: **antithesis**; plural noun: **antitheses**

1. a person or thing that is the **direct opposite** of someone or something else.

- "love is the antithesis of selfishness"

- synonyms: (**complete**) **opposite**, converse, contrary, **reverse**, inverse, obverse, other side of the coin;

- You cannot force “fulfill” to mean “opposite” or “strongly contrasted” YOU ARE A Marcionite DECEIVER!

Perhaps some near-contemporaries who spoke koine Greek as their first language could easily understand what Jesus meant here. In this case, the witnesses are unanimous: (They don’t even agree)

- Shameful, Shameful. I hope I’m not the only one who can see this snake and what he is doing here. So, if we want to know what Jesus meant – who do we ask? Some hand-picked

Gentile churchmen who also supported much error that they do not wish to discuss? TRUTH: Ste. Marie and friends actually agree more with Marcion than with the men they quote concerning Jesus' Words. Marcion's whole argument was his "antithesis" interpretation of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount – THEY ARE PREACHING MARCION'S ARGUMENTS. NO early church writer agreed that Jesus' teaching was an antithesis to Moses' Law, except Marcion.

- Why not look in the BIBLE for the USE of that WORD? The apostles of Jesus knew what he meant and they were inspired by the Holy Ghost! Pay attention:
- What does "fulfill the Law" mean to Paul?

Romans 8:3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: 4 That the righteousness of the **law might be fulfilled (SAME WORD JESUS USED)** in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. 5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. 6 For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. 7 Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: **for it is not subject to the law of God**, neither indeed can be. 8 So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.

- How do we fulfill the Law of God? BY BEING IN SUBJECTION TO IT AT THE HEART/MIND LEVEL!

Paul meant the same thing as he did in Romans 2:25-29

- **Ro 2:25** For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou **keep the law**: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. 26 Therefore if the uncircumcision **keep the righteousness of the law**, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? 27 And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, **if it fulfil the law**, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? 28 For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: 29 But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."

Romans 13:8 Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath **fulfilled the law**. SAME WORD JESUS USED - What does fulfill the law mean?

Galatians 5:14 For all the **law is fulfilled** in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. SAME WORD JESUS USED- What does fulfill the law mean?

Col 1: 25 Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to **fulfil the word of God**; SAME WORD JESUS USED – WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Col 4:17 And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou **fulfil it**. Same word – what does it mean?

And that the Lord did not abrogate the natural [precepts] of the law, by which man is justified, which also those who were justified by faith, and who pleased God, did observe previous to the giving of the law, but that He **extended and fulfilled them**, is shown from His words...For all these do not contain or imply an opposition to and an overturning of the [precepts] of the past, as Marcion's followers do strenuously maintain; but [they exhibit] **a fulfilling and an extension of them**, as He does Himself declare... (Irenaeus, c. 180). 41 (Note that Irenaeus was not only a native Greek speaker, but was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the Apostle John.)

- Just because our friend Irenaeus is actually defending US in this passage does not mean I endorse all the man said, as he is known to endorse some error – even in the very age of Jesus. EXTEND AND FULFILL is obviously applying God’s Law through Moses in a more extensive way than the Pharisees had – teaching it though many wonderful parables and examples. Why didn’t he embolden this phrase: **For all these do not contain or imply an opposition to and an overturning of the [precepts] of the past –, as Marcion’s followers do strenuously maintain.** That would be an “Antithesis”. Why didn’t he emphasize this? Does Ste. Marie understand English?? Irenaeus is not on this man’s side as he thinks he is. This quote completely destroys Ste. Marie’s position and he can’t even see it!
- Listen to Irenaeus: *Irenaeus book IV. CHAP.II3. **But since the writings (litera) of Moses are the words of Christ, He does Himself declare to the Jews, as John has recorded in the Gospel: "If ye had believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, neither will ye believe My words."(3) He thus indicates in the clearest manner that the writings of Moses are His words. If, then, [this be the case with regard] to Moses, so also, beyond a doubt, the words of the other prophets are His [words], as I have pointed out. And again, the Lord Himself exhibits Abraham as having said to the rich man, with reference to all those who were still alive: "If they do not obey Moses and the prophets, neither, if any one were to rise from the dead and go to them, will they believe him."(4) ...Lest, therefore, we should incur the same punishment as these men, the Lord reveals [to us] their end; showing at the same time, that if they obeyed Moses and the prophets, they would believe in Him whom these had preached, the Son of God, who rose from the dead, and bestows life upon us; and He shows that all are from one essence, that is, Abraham, and Moses, and the prophets, and also the Lord Himself, who rose from the dead, in whom many believe who are of the circumcision, who do also hear Moses and the prophets announcing the coming of the Son of God.***
- Does Irenaeus agree with Ste. Marie?? No. I quote Irenaeus even more extensive in my response to the Caneyville letters. See on our Website.

This verity of the gospel then stands unimpaired: “I am not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but rather to fulfil them.” He also dissipated other doubts, when he declared that the name of God and of the Good belonged to one and the same being...**whose commandments He both maintained and augmented** with His own supplementary precepts. (Tertullian, c. 208).⁴² (Tertullian spoke Latin and Greek – it is not known which was his first language.) (Thanks Tertullian for telling Ste. Marie he is wrong)

- Friends, I’m sorry, but this is really sad and deceitful. This man has not proved his case with his supposed evidence.
 - First, compared to the scriptures we use above, Tertullian is of no authority.
 - Second, These people would not follow Tertullian in many areas.
 - Third, Tertullian **does not agree with their position** – I’ve quoted him extensively in my works to prove this. See my answer to Geiser’s attempt at using Ante-Nicene writers.
 - Fourth: It is impossible to both maintain and augment Deut 24 by now declaring the sincere use of the precept to be adultery. YES, Jesus applies and taught the Law in a greater more wonderful and understandable way than any before – But, Let me quote Irenaeus, the closest one to the apostles, “**but that He extended and fulfilled them, is shown from His words...For all these do not contain or imply an opposition to and an overturning of the [precepts] of the past.**” ☺ Remember?

After that, the Lord, “**amplifying** the Law,” **openly adds** the prohibition of anger against a brother to that of murder. Not even by an evil word does He permit it to be vented. (Tertullian, c. 198).⁴³

- To amplify my voice is not to contradict it! LISTEN: Le 19:18 Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the LORD.
- Intelligent Reader: Did Jesus add something contrary or lacking in the Law or did he apply it as God intended? Jesus DID NOT say that anger was the same as murder – I don’t care who said what in the 3rd and 4th century about it. Jesus said that to be angry with your brother **without a cause** would make you in danger of God’s punishment just like being a murderer did. He doesn’t say it would be an equal punishment; but that you would be in danger of hell by transgressing God’s Law in the “grudge” and lack of “love” just as you would be in transgressing God’s Law by murder.
 - **THINK!** Jesus and the apostles clearly taught that LOVE fulfilled the Law; because all the Law and prophets was based on LOVE to God and neighbor. OK, which Law did Jesus change? Was there one NOT based on LOVE? Did Jesus add anything NOT based on LOVE? If he said something based on LOVE, then it was based on the SAME PRINCIPLES as the LAW. IT COULD NOT CONTRADICT – COULD NOT CONTAIN OR IMPLY OPPOSITION TO OR AN OVERTURNING OF THE PRECEPTS OF THE PAST.
 - **These men (Ste Marie and friends) are not just trying to say Jesus amplified the Law** – They are saying that Jesus made the law of none affect, that we are not to obey it, and that Jesus actually rebukes and corrects what Moses’ said – They are just trying to avoid the obvious and showing their confusion at the same time.

And how, one may ask, did He not destroy it? in what way did He rather fulfill either the law or the prophets? The prophets He fulfilled, inasmuch as He confirmed by His actions all that had been said concerning Him; wherefore also the evangelist used to say in each case, “That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet.”...But the law He fulfilled, not in one way only, but in a second and third also. In one way, by transgressing none of the precepts of the law...This then was one sense in which He fulfilled it. Another, that He did the same through us also; for this is the marvel, that He not only Himself fulfilled it, but He granted this to us likewise...For since the law was laboring at this, to make man righteous, but had not power, He came and brought in the way of righteousness by faith, and so established that which the law desired: and what the law could not by letters, this He accomplished by faith. On this account He saith, “I am not come to destroy the law.” But if any one will inquire accurately, he will find also another, a third sense, in which this hath been done. Of what sort is it then? **In the sense of that future code of laws, which He was about to deliver to them.** For His sayings were no repeal of the former, but **a drawing out, and filling up of them.** Thus, “not to kill,” is not annulled by the saying, Be not angry, but rather is filled up and put in greater security: and so of all the others. (John Chrysostom, c. 390).⁴⁴

- **SAME AS BEFORE:** Listen: For since the law was laboring at this, to make man righteous, but had not power, He came and brought in the way of righteousness by faith, and so established that which the law desired: and what the law could not by letters, this He accomplished by faith --- **NOW READ ROMANS 8:1-4** – This is what Chrysostom is referring to – **PROVES MY POINT** against his once again.
- **LISTEN AGAIN:** In one way, by transgressing **none** of the precepts of the law...This then was one sense in which He fulfilled it. This means Jesus could not teach or lead the people contrary to God’s Law. Jesus could not call lawfully remarried people adulterers without transgressing God’s Law.

Jesus could not say that lawful swearing “cometh of evil” without transgressing the Law of God.

- This “future code of Laws” is not a change in God’s moral judgments; but a proper application of them beyond what the Pharisees taught – what the Law-giver intended. But this wasn’t absent from God’s Law! Jesus only highlighted what they had passed over!
- The only people who could be led astray by Ste. Marie are those ignorant of the OT – they probably have never read it!!

So we have here several complementary definitions of “fulfill” – extension, augmentation, amplification, and addition. This fits quite well with Isaiah’s prophecy that the Messiah would “magnify the law, and make *it* honourable” (Isaiah 42:21) (YES it does! but agrees with me, not you). Jesus extended and fulfilled the Law, making it stricter and more stringent.

- Jesus could not make “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart...and thy neighbor as thyself” more strict or stringent!! You guys need to plug in your brain before engaging your mouth. You can only be more accountable to light when you have seen it clearer; but that is not what we are dealing with in your heresy.
 - Jesus APPLIED God’s Law where the Jewish teachers failed to!
 - Jesus illustrated and exemplified it like no other teacher; but NEVER taught contrary.
 - I proved above that Isaiah was not saying that Jesus would make the Law honorable because it lacked in that area before – This is not what Isaiah was saying and every intelligent read knows this.
- **Ste. Marie and friends are teaching thus:**
 - *Moses compromised and allowed divorce and remarriage; but Jesus says that to obey Moses’ Law is now adultery.*
 - *Moses said that, when divorced and remarried, the first marriage could never be renewed because that would be an abomination; but Jesus wants remarried people to leave their present covenant and go back to the first or remain single.*
 - *Moses taught men to swear by God only; but Jesus says that any swearing at all “cometh of evil” which is calling Moses’ precept the producer of evil and thus Moses was evil, and if inspired by God, then God is evil.*
 - *Moses taught men to defend their life and family against the murderer and rapist; but Jesus said we must stand by and watch our wife and daughters raped and murdered to be right with God.*
 - *Moses allowed that men could be godly and also a part of the Government; but Jesus taught that only ungodly men could fill government positions.*
- Is this what “magnify the Law and make it honorable” is speaking of? Friend, if you are that ignorant of Scripture, then I give up. Go follow the deceiver.

“O, Brother Mark is calling names again – bad boy!” LISTEN, I promise I am trying my best to use the most fitting names I know – give me a little slack, please. Would you rather I use

“brute beasts”, “vipers”, “fools”, “serpents”, “spots”, or “cursed children”, etc. like the Bible? It is all the same thing.

He magnified the Law, making it bigger and more demanding. Standing as it does at the head of the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount, this saying on the Law fits very well into the context understood in this way. It was an introduction to Jesus’ establishment of what could very well be called “The Fulfilled Law.” In another sense (corresponding to Chrysostom’s #2), Jesus Himself is the fulfillment of the Law – all that the Law had been aiming for. The Law was intended for life, but it could not bring life. It only brought life by leading us, as a schoolteacher, to the One Who could give life and bring righteousness. Jesus fulfilled the Law by providing for us what the Law taught us we needed.

- This man cannot see the myriad of contradiction here: Was the Law aiming for Jesus by teaching the opposite ethic?? HOW?
- Again -- How could a law that taught us to stone someone who did what they claim Jesus did – lead us to Jesus??
- How could the law “teach us what we needed” when it was telling us contrary to Jesus??

LORD, save this man from his stubborn foolishness --- GO READ ROMANS 8!

Verse 18 tells us that the smallest part of the Law of Moses could never be destroyed, until it had all been fulfilled. This seems quite problematic for a division of the Law into two or three entities (moral, ceremonial, and civil). Read with this paradigm, the verse would seem to imply that until *all* of it had been fulfilled, *none* of it could pass out of force. Mark Bullen claims that Jesus had fulfilled all (or at least most) of the ceremonial law, and thus it is no longer in force, but the moral law of Moses is still in force, and must continue to be fulfilled by obedience to its precepts. This saying of Jesus’ seems to witness against such an interpretation.

- WHAT DOES VERSE 19 MEAN THEN?? VERSE 19 proves you a heretic, Ste. Marie. The only reason you misrepresent me here is because you only quoted part of my answer above to Joshua Geiser – well, I filled in the intentional blank you left so everyone could see the real answer. YOU KNOW WELL THAT ANIMAL SACRIFICES BEING FULFILLED IS DIFFERENT THAN “THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS” BEING FULFILLED. Stop acting ignorant of the obvious just to lead people astray. How was sacrificing lambs fulfilled???? How is “Thou shalt not bear false witness” fulfilled?? Think people.

Rather, it seems much more natural to view the word “fulfilled” here in the sense that we saw above – extension, augmentation, amplification, and addition. The *entire* Law – moral, ceremonial, and civil – received this “fulfilling” in the life, teaching, ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. (This is not what “fulfilling” means – I’m embarrassed for you) Thus, the entire Law is no longer in force in its literal sense in the lives of Christian believers. Still, the Law has not perished or been destroyed; it still exists in our Bibles, and is still useful.

- O my! It is really hard not to be sarcastic as such silliness -- *the entire Law is no longer in force in its literal sense in the lives of Christian believers. Still, the Law has not perished or been destroyed; it still exists in our Bibles, and is still useful.* Ha ha ha.

- SO, fulfilled means “no longer in force”; But that is what Jesus said “destroyed” meant! Jesus said “destroy” means “pass away” and “break and teach men to break” – Thus you have interpreted Jesus words to mean the exact opposite of what He said! What a Scholar!!!

Read in this context, we see that Matthew 5:19 is both a conclusion to the previous two verses, and part of an introduction to the Antitheses to follow. Those who break and teach against the least commandments would be regarded as unimportant in God’s kingdom; those who teach and keep all of them would be considered great. What commandments? The commandments of the *Fulfilled Law of Jesus*.

- How wicked! So in verse 18 Jesus speaks of a law that “still exists” in our Bibles, but is no longer in force; but in the **next verse** He is speaking of His “new and improved” law which calls God’s moral precepts adultery, evil, etc? What a bunch of hoopla.
- Go ahead and believe this error you ismites – it is just what you were wishing for, you poor fools. Too bad you didn’t learn grammar.
- Mt 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. 19 Whosoever **therefore shall break one of these least commandments**, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.
 - NOTE: In Verse 17 we are the LAW and THE PROPHETS, so there is no doubt we are speaking of Moses’ Law in the OT either being DESTROYED or FULFILLED – opposites. Next in Verse 18 we are speaking of “the law” as in vs 17 – SAME LAW; but the contrast is whether a “jot or tittle” would pass away (destroyed) or be FULFILLED – opposites. Verse 19 “**Whosoever THEREFORE**” connects us with vss 17 and 18 – “whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so” --- compare with DESTROY and PASS AWAY in vss17 & 18. What is the OPPOSITE of “destroy” “pass away” and “break – teach”? “Whosoever shall DO AND TEACH”! So we have:
 - Destroy – pass away – break and teach VS. fulfilled – fulfill – do and teach
 - THIS IS PROPER INTERPRETATION – any intelligent reader can see it!
- **NOW LISTEN TO JESUS** – Matt 23:1 Then spake Jesus to the **multitude**, and to **his disciples**, 2 Saying, **The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat:** 3 **All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do**; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.
 - THIS WAS AFTER THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT!

- **Mt 23:23** Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the **weightier matters of the law**, judgment, mercy, and faith: these **ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.**
- **After the Sermon on the Mount. – Read the whole chapter -- SAME with Mark 7**

All of this makes perfect sense,

- God help him.... What a pity. Pass the Tums, please.

... then, of verse 20: “For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” The kingdom of God, which Jesus was ushering in, could not be built on the foundation of the literal commandments of Moses. The scribes and Pharisees were the textbook examples of scrupulous obedience to the Law of Moses (although we know they sometimes “cheated”) – and yet Jesus said that their righteousness was not enough in His kingdom!

- **O MY!** The scribes and Pharisees were the textbook examples of scrupulous obedience to the Law of Moses. Has this man ever read his Bible????
- The kingdom of God, which Jesus was ushering in, could not be built on the foundation of the literal commandments of Moses --- So this man is claiming that the scribes and Pharisees built their lives on the literal and proper application of Moses’ Law and this is what Jesus is saying is not enough to enter Heaven; but they must renounce Moses’ Law and follow His new law???
- So, in Vs 17 he is speaking of Moses’ Law, Verse 18 he is speaking of Moses’ Law, Verse 19 he is speaking of the New Law, and in verse 20 he is speaking about obedience to Moses’ Law. --- What a wicked and stupid twisting of Scripture!

What did Jesus really believe? LISTEN

Mk 7:5 Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? 6 He answered and said unto them, **Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. 7 Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. 8 For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men,** as the washing of pots and cups: and **many other such like things ye do.** 9 And he said unto them, Full well ye **reject the commandment of God,** that ye may keep your own tradition. 10 **For Moses said,** Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: 11 But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free. 12 And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; 13 **Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.**

Intelligent Reader: All you have to do is read the whole Bible and you will be delivered from Ste. Marie's foolish and wicked deception.

- Most unlearned readers do not understand the magnitude of this man's heresy and abuse of the Scripture. According to him, Jesus was really worthy of being put to death by those who adhered to Moses' Law as the Word of God and were obeying Malachi and looking for the Messiah Malachi had prophesied who would call the people back to God's Law.

No, His kingdom is based on a higher ethical standard than that of the scribes and Pharisees – on a higher ethical standard than that of Moses. It is based on the ethical standard revealed by Himself as the Fulfilled Law of the Sermon on the Mount. That this is a correct interpretation of Jesus' teaching on the Law in Matthew 5:17-20 is confirmed by a careful reading of the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount.

- Only a blind ism-ite could accept such nonsense. I've proved this wrong verse by verse in my sermons and books through the Sermon on The Mount.
- **Ste. Marie is doing exactly what Jesus is accusing the Pharisees of doing above – making the Word of God – what Moses said – of none affect by their own teaching.**

The Antitheses is the title given to Matthew 5:21- 48, where Jesus quotes from the Law of Moses and makes contrasting statements of His own, on His own authority.

- WRONG – simply look at Jesus using the Scripture against Satan. He says, "It is written" – which means He is speaking about the proper intent and used of God's Word against Satan's abuse. YES, Satan did quote Scripture; but mis-used it like Ste. Marie is doing. When Jesus was referring to the TEACHERS of Moses' Law and not the proper use of it, He declared, "ye have heard that it hath been said" – He never said "Is was written, but I say..." Because this is not the contrast He was making. I'm serious, anyone who can read should be able to see the wicked abuse that Ste. Marie is making of Jesus' words.

We will briefly look at the Antitheses here, and examine them in more depth later. The Antitheses are some of the clearest evidence that Jesus did indeed intend to teach a higher ethical standard than that of Moses. A brief reading shows that this is the most natural and common-sense way to read the text in question. Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment (Matthew 5:21-22).

- This is in no way lowering or diminishing Moses' Law; but dealing with a miss-focus concerning emphasis. What Jesus says IS ALSO IN THE LAW; but was being neglected. It is the same as if I said, "If you don't obey God, you will not make it to heaven"; but I say unto you, "If you don't love, appreciate, and honor God, you won't make it to heaven". I have not corrected or changed the original word, but have only amplified the true spirit of the word OBEY. Jesus taught the true spirit of the Law; but this only makes the Law MORE APPLICABLE AND BINDING.

- SO, IS THOU SHALT NOT KILL STILL VALID? DUH! Even so, what the Law says about swearing, divorce, etc. is still in effect, and what Jesus said about this was lifting God's Law to a higher standard than the Pharisees taught it; but not a higher standard than JESUS HAD WHEN HE SPOKE THROUGH MOSES – OTHERWISE JESUS IS NOT THE SAME YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND FOREVER. The people are the same, but they have misused the Law and the Law-giver is here to straighten that out. Any and all intelligent readers can see this.
- Our Mr. Ste. Marie has told us that Jesus made the Law bigger and stricter and then tells us that He made it obsolete, so we don't even have to worry about it.

Jesus here quotes from the Law of Moses – from the Ten Commandments, no less (Exodus 20:13; Deuteronomy 5:17). He then contrasts this with His own teaching, in which unjust anger is viewed just as seriously as murder. This offers an enormous extension of the Law of Moses. The second antithesis provides a similar extension: Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart (Matthew 5:27-28). Once again, Jesus' standard of righteousness is much higher than that of Moses.

- NO, deceiver, it is not. Folks I am not dealing with a man who is just ignorant unless he is lying about reading my books; but I'm dealing with a fool or a deceiver who is deliberately hiding truth he had received

The third antithesis appears to take away a Mosaic allowance: It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery (Matthew 5:31-32). This is a bold removal and restriction of a temporary concession to hard hearts granted in the Mosaic Law.

- Question: Did Moses allow divorce and remarriage when there was no legitimate cause for such? If a man was abusing Moses' Law would he be guilty of committing adultery through legal channels? Is this what Jesus intended when inspiring Moses?
- Question: Was Malachi a false prophet? NO – well then Jesus is only rebuking the abuse of Moses' Law, not the proper use of it. I am really sorry this simpleton cannot see that.

The fourth antithesis is bolder yet, for it overturns an express Mosaic commandment!

Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all (Matthew 5:33-34a). This is authoritative!

- Do we believe Jesus' inspired Word in Malachi that Jesus was preaching against false swearing? ESPECIALLY when Paul swears according to the Law 9 times in the inspired New Testament? You have no case. You stopped the quote of what Jesus said, because you didn't want to hear the qualifying statements. What a fool.

The fifth antithesis is equally bold, as it appears to completely remove a Mosaically prescribed judicial right:

Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil (Matthew 5:38-39a).

- It was never a “Mosaically prescribed” judicial right to relate to your fellow man with this precept. “Thou shalt love thy neighbor” is Moses’ Law – so go figure and stop showing your ignorance. YOU know the answer; but you are ignoring it, because you are a deceiver – a dishonest man.
- For those who don’t know the answer – God gave the “eye for eye” precept to judges and magistrates; but people were using it for interpersonal relationships – Jesus is rebuking this ABUSE of His Own Inspired Law.

The sixth and final antithesis was probably the most shocking to its original audience. It superseded the entire tenor of the Old Covenant in its relationship to non-Israelites. It would call for an enormous reordering of thoughts and attitudes and an abolition of prejudices, and an enormous amount of sacrifice in daily life.

Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies (Matthew 5:43-44a).

So we see that a brief overview of the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount gives the distinct impression that Jesus was doing exactly what it was prophesied that He would do (magnify the law) and exactly what He said He was going to do (fulfill the law).

- You poor foolish man. If you started telling your children, “I know mama said to hate snakes; but I say that you should love and feed them” WOULD YOU BE MAGNIFYING HER OR HER LAW? WOULD YOU BE FULFILLING IT? NO. YOU NEED TO LEARN ENGLISH AND GRAMMAR BEFORE YOU START SETTING YOURSELF UP TO TEACH THE BIBLE.
- If the whole law was based on “Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them”; then Jesus is just teaching it properly. Magnifying and fulfilling the Law IS NOT WHAT YOU ARE CLAIMING. Would an English teacher please stand up and tell this man he flunked the class.

In accordance with the predictions of the prophets, He was ushering in a new ethical standard, higher and better than that revealed to Moses, and which was going to have the effect of the destruction of the weapons of violence and the teaching of peace to the Gentile nations.

- Sorry Charlie, you are dreaming again. Jesus never taught pacifism – never! All He did was tell Peter to sheath his sword after telling him to buy one.

This is also clearly shown in Jesus’ encounter with the Pharisees regarding divorce and remarriage. And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away *his* wife? tempting him. And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put *her* away. And Jesus answered and said unto them, **For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept.** But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man

leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same *matter*. And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery (Mark 10:2-12).

Jesus here explicitly identified the motivation behind one of the teachings of Moses being “the hardness of your heart.”

- Will you believe this heretic over Jesus? *Mt 22: 37 Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. 38 This is the first and great commandment. 39 And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. 40 On these two commandments hang **all** the law and the prophets.*
- Take your choice. I believe Jesus. The entire NT declares that the spirit of the Law was LOVE and Paul says *1Ti 1:5 Now the **end** of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned:*
 - **END means goal and aim – not the termination of it.**

His own teaching, however, was to lift up the original, Edenic standard, and the reality of the joining together of man and woman by God Himself.

- Jesus was simply teaching Moses’ Law – Genesis – as the part of Moses’ Law they were ignoring. They were being Partial in the Law as Malachi said.

(We will examine the teachings of Jesus on divorce and remarriage in detail later. For now, we are only concerned about the relationship of Jesus’ teachings to Moses’.) So once again, we see that Jesus’ teachings surpass those of Moses, both in authority and in ethical quality. Moses’ Law, as pointed out by Jesus, contained provisions and concessions given due to the “hardness of heart” of the Israelites. But Jesus expects us to surpass and exceed the righteousness of hard-hearted persons.

- Jesus said the SAME things to the SAME people that Moses’ did but showed the **result** of their abuse as adultery – defined by Moses’ Law of course.

But according to Mark Bullen:

Every law is due to the hardness of men’s hearts; because the law is for transgressors...Sinful man could not enjoy fully what Adam and Eve had originally had, and provisions had to be made for the hardness of men’s sinful hearts.

In other words, Jesus’ saying about hardness of hearts has no special reference to the ethical quality of Moses’ commands as being a concession to the wickedness of man. Jesus did not mean that Moses’ laws were a *concession* to the hardness of hearts, but rather an attempt to *control the results* of hardness of heart.

- You are a dishonest man: You know what I actually said. God’s Laws were **remedial** for a “**what to do now**” situation since man was a fallen race and sin was marring lives and relationships. God’s Laws told men what wise and careful steps to take to **remedy a sinful situation**. That is why when Jesus told them it was due to the hardness of men’s hearts, he was not just speaking to “ancient Jews”, but to all the fallen race, because God’s moral Laws apply to them as well. To say that God makes concessions is to say that God’s answer to sinful men is a **compromise** with their evil desires in allowing them to be gratified; rather than a wise and righteous ruling as to “**what to do now**” that sin was happening. Are we to be “holy as He is Holy”? Then we should compromise holiness and allow sin in the church, right? O, you say, no, but “be ye holy as I am holy” is quoting the OT, so that means we should obey it in that context, right? You guys are such nitwits; it is hard to even be serious with you and your foolish wresting of God’s Word – Do we laugh? or cry?

So, is it really true that “Every law is due to the hardness of men’s hearts”? Hardly! There are at least two reasons why this statement is manifestly false: 1) God gave laws to Adam and Eve in Eden (do not eat the forbidden fruit; eat plants; multiply and replenish the earth), and no one would argue that they had spiritually hard hearts at that time!

- We are speaking in the same context as Jesus when referring to the law – We are speaking the same as the apostles. Eve did have to harden her heart against the penalty to disobey that Law, so if she had kept a soft heart, the law would not be necessary. I say this with the understanding, that a law without sanctions is merely a directive, suggestion, guideline, instruction, etc. When you put a sanction/penalty to it, then it is a law. “Ye shall surely die” was the sanction to keep Eve from dying; but she hardened her heart and died anyway. The Angels which “kept not their first estate” hardened their hearts against God and so trespassed His Laws for them – **LAWS HAVE PENALTIES WHICH ARE MEANT TO BE A PREVENTATIVE AGAINST HARDNESS OF HEART**. Any precept which is a remedy for when the Law has already been broken is just as much or more due to hardness of heart. Without the possibility of hardness of heart, there would need to be no Laws, but only direction and guidance.
- LISTEN to God’s Word.

I Tim 1:5 Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned: (The goal of God’s Laws) 6 From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling; 7 Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. 8 **But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully; 9 Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man,** but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners...

- If we were dealing with a true Bible student, we would not have to be teaching these Bible basics right now. God’s Laws are designed as **REMEDIES** for sinful situation. It is a plumb line to manifest crookedness. It **WAS NOT DESIGNED FOR RIGHTEOUS MEN**; but to deal with the unrighteousness of men. Those who are living by **LOVE** are fulfilling all these precepts without that threat of penalty. This is a **general rule** concerning the Law that Jesus was telling the Pharisees to expose their partiality and abuse of God’s Law. Deut 24 was not a standard of excellence; but a remedy for mankind’s stupidity; so when they used it,

they were acknowledging their fallen state and foolishness as a people. This greatly deflated their miss-guided egos.

- **If a husband and wife were walking with soft hearts before God like Zachariah and Elizabeth, they wouldn't need Deut 24 now would they???? This is elementary folks.**

2) This statement completely fails to take into account the prophecy of the giving of soft hearts, which we will be discussing in more depth later. Notice that first, Moses gives laws “for the hardness of your heart”, but Ezekiel prophesies that soft, spiritual hearts would one day be granted to man and then he will be able to keep God’s commandments. What does Jesus announce, when questioned about Moses’ Law? Moses gave laws “for the hardness of your hearts.”

- What a trial of my patience. A man having a soft heart is the MAN’S CHOICE in humbling himself before God. It is not solely a New Testament concept or something that suddenly everyone received! Jesus upbraided His own apostles with having hard hearts. Read Hebrews 3 where we are warned against hardness of hearts – whose choice is that? This guy does not know his Bible – all he knows is his ism and trying to force it upon the Word of God.

- Did God ever say He would give soft hearts before men repented or was this a part of the work of the Holy Spirit *then* and *now* as we hide **God’s Law in our hearts that we might not sin against Him?** Listen to the prophecy he is speaking of!!

- **EZ 36: 26** A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will **put my spirit within you**, and cause you to **walk in my statutes**, and ye shall **keep my judgments, and do them.**

- **IN CONTEXT – WHAT LAWS ARE WE SPEAKING OF? COMPARE WITH ROMANS 8**

- **Now listen further – EZ 36:37** Thus saith the Lord GOD; **I will yet for this be enquired of by the house of Israel, to do it for them;**

- THE SOFT HEART CAME AFTER REPENTANCE TO BOTH OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT SAINTS WHO HUMBLER THEMSELVES BEFORE GOD – IT IS NOT JUST A NEW TESTAMENT ISSUE, THOUGH *MORE PROMINENT* IN THE NEW COVENANT.

- **Listen to Ezekiel again: This is previous to Ez 36 and 36 cannot be interpreted apart from what has already been said on the subject:**

- **Ez 18:31** Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and **make you a new heart and a new spirit:** for why will ye die, O house of Israel?
- **Could they do this? YES** Moses was the meekest man on earth – Abraham was the friend of God – Enoch walked with God and went to heaven, etc. etc. etc.

- Moses' Law commanded men to love God with ALL their hearts – could they do this?
 - **Ps 119:2** Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek him with the whole heart. REAL OR FANTASY?
 - **Ps 119:10** With my whole heart have I sought thee: O let me not wander from thy commandments. REAL OR FANTASY?
 - Consider Enoch, Noah, Joshua, Elijah, Caleb, Daniel.....!
 - God told them to circumcise their hearts – could they do this?
 - Did Abraham --- YES, Read Romans 8 and Hebrews 11
 - Do you really believe you have a softer heart than all the hero's of faith that are said to be our example? READ PS 119 AND SEE IF YOU SURPASS!
- The prophets, like Joel, said that when Messiah came, God would pour out His Spirit upon all classes of humble believers as only certain special characters experienced in the OT, but not that it was a “giving of soft hearts” which nobody had in the OT – this is part of this man's dream world. A soft heart comes by degrees, and we are commanded to be “being” filled with the Holy Spirit and not be allowing our hearts to harden like some did in the OT and the NT. What happened to Ananias, Sapphira, Demas, and all who fell away from the faith after them? What about the churches in Rev 2-3? Ya'll stop dream'n and wake up.

It could hardly be anything else than a veiled reference to Ezekiel's prophecy of the soft hearts, and an announcement that the day of soft hearts was near, when men would not have to have a law of concessions, but would be able to bear all of God's commandments and keep them with soft, spiritual, hearts of flesh.

- **Luke 1:5** There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judaea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia: and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth. 6 And they were **both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.**
 - So, what happened here? Were they the only ones?? GUESS WHAT! They didn't need Deut 24 because they were both living by God's plan in Genesis for marriage – YES, Deut 24 was only needed when there was hardness of heart – sin happened and needed a remedy! NOT EVERYONE WAS HARD HEARTED AND NEEDED THAT!

A close examination of the saying of Jesus regarding hardness recorded in Matthew 19:8 makes Bullen's contention even less likely. “He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.” Notice that Moses did not *make* the Law due to the hardness of hearts; it was something he “suffered” or allowed the people to do. This is important! It was not that Moses was giving a solution to a problem; he was allowing them to do something they wanted to do, but which was not God's best for them.

- Wicked Satanic assumptions and accusations against God’s Holy Word that God was allowing them to sin as part of His inspired Law. God forgive this imbecile as he doesn’t know the magnitude of his insult to you.
- How does this line up with “on these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets” and “man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God?” and “Love fulfills the Law” and “The end of the commandment is charity...” and “Ps 19:7-11” and “Romans 8” etc. etc. etc. This man is an unbeliever who doesn’t believe Jesus inspired Moses.
- “Suffered” simply means “permitted” – but why? Do we assume God permitted sin? They do!! – NO, God permitted divorce and remarriage as a “what to do now” rule for remedying a sad situation caused by the hardness of men’s hearts.
- **CASE IN POINT!!! JOSEPH WAS A RIGHTEOUS MAN!! IF MARY WAS GUILTY, AND THE EVIDENCE SAID SO – SHE MAY HAVE BEEN RAPED OR SHE MAY HAVE HAD AN AFFAIR – BUT THIS SITUATION WAS DUE TO THE HARDNESS OF MEN’S HEARTS BY ALL APPEARANCES – WHAT WAS A RIGHTEOUS **SOFT HEARTED** MAN TO DO???? GOD’S LAW ALLOWED HIM TO PUT HER AWAY, RATHER THAN STONE HER (**Soft Heartedness**); AND THEN TO MARRY ANOTHER WOMAN. THIS SITUATION WAS DUE TO THE HARDNESS OF HEARTS AND WAS NOT NEEDED IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN; BUT IT WAS NOT A CONCESSION FOR SINFUL MEN TO DO WRONG AND GET BY WITH IT!! GOD FORBID!!** It was a remedy to a bad situation so those with sincere soft hearts towards God could solve the problem in a godly way.
- God used the same precept when speaking of putting Israel away – Did God have a hard heart? NO He had a soft heart to not destroy them completely; but the situation was caused by hard hearts! Those situations are still caused by hard hearts and righteous soft hearted people still need God’s answers, not some amateur who thinks he can teach the Bible – Yes, I’m talking to you Ste. Marie.

Furthermore, notice who it was that Jesus accused of having the hard hearts. It was not the wife “put away for some uncleanness,” but the husband who did the putting away! “Moses because of the hardness of **your** hearts suffered **you** to put away **your** wives”.

- “YOU JEWS” doesn’t equate to “you husband divorcing” -- Case in point – Joseph and God were the ones putting away; but the wife was the seeming problem.

The divorcer is accused by Jesus of having the hard heart – not the one who had done the act for which the husband responded with divorce.

- Just because a heretic makes an assertion does not give it any weight. READ Ps 19:7-11 READ 1Tim 1:5 -- Just read the book of Deut. God’s Law was “their wisdom” and had the promise of “life and blessing”, etc. etc. Jesus is not saying the divorcer was the hard hearted one in every situation and God was allowing them to abuse the wife of their youth – a thing which God hates as Malachi tells us in the same breath as telling them to return to God’s Law.

Jesus was not the only one to teach that His commandments surpassed the moral and ethical level of the Law of Moses.

Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ *is* the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth (Romans 10:1-4).

Praise God! Christ is the end of the law! (**What a rebel!**) Mark Bullen claims that this means "goal and aim." In a sense, this is true, but the Greek word used for "end" here is generally used to mean just that – THE END! The reign of the Law of Moses was OVER with the coming of Christ (cf. Luke 16:16).

- Our poor deceiver/moron is at it again: What part of the Law are we speaking of? We are speaking of obtaining a righteous standing with God – justification – atonement – and this was thought to be through animal sacrifices; but Jesus was the END God had in view. This is not speaking about the END – Over and through – of God's moral laws as the New Covenant was for the purpose of those laws being fulfilled in our lives by writing them in our hearts – something our deceiver/moron denies.
- Christ is the goal of the Law for JUSTIFICATION – this is what RIGHTEOUSNESS means in this verse – a way to obtain a righteous standing with God. The blood of bulls and goats could not do this; but it all pointed to Jesus – the goal – the aim – the substance that all the types foreshadowed. The Jews would not let go of "bulls and goats"; but stumbled over their Messiah being the "Lamb of God".
- "End" means the same as in **I Tim 1:5 Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned:**
 - **What does this mean? I am asking intelligent readers who love God's Word**
- **James 5:11** Behold, we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the **end** of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy.
 - **What does this mean?**
- **I Peter 1:9** Receiving the **end** of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.
 - **What does this mean? – will there be no faith afterwards?**

Of course there was a time of transition involved as the church separated itself from the synagogue; but the new, Fulfilled Law of Jesus Christ took the place of the Law of Moses as the authoritative guidebook for the life of God's people. Christ's coming put an end to the authority of the Law!

- Do you want to see their confusion? Ask them about this "time of transition" and what in it applies to us, and what does not? They are just shooting from the hip, because they don't know what they are talking about. The apostles were all fully obeying Moses' Law 29 years after Pentecost, and all the Gentile converts were circumcised and brought completely under

Moses law until Cornelius – 12 years after Pentecost. Where is the transition and what applies today? Just read my books for the real answers.

But that is not all the verse says. It says that Christ is the end of the law *for righteousness*. In other words, Christ's coming and His putting an end to the authority of the Law of Moses was not for the purpose of allowing His people to cast off restraint. Rather, He put in place a new and better righteousness which exceeded the righteousness of the Law of Moses. He was the end of the law *for* righteousness. The very goal of His putting an end to the Law was so that righteousness could be accomplished in the lives of His people! And not just a Mosaic righteousness, but a righteousness which exceeded the Mosaic righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees – and this for every one who believes in Him.

- Pity and Shame! Talk about zeal without knowledge. Go back and READ Romans 1- 10 and you will see the context – **not** of a “new ethic” coming and making the Jew’s faithful obedience to God’s Law through Moses **now** to be “**ignorance of God’s righteousness**” and “**going about to establish their own righteousness**” by doing what God’s Word told them to do. NO! NO! Romans 1-9 makes it very clear that Jesus came to teach the spirit of God’s Law and give us more power and understanding to fulfill it in our lives. I’ve quoted those passages over and over so look back at Romans 8:1-13 – and all of chapter 2.
- Listen to this heresy: *The very goal of His putting an end to the Law was so that righteousness could be accomplished in the lives of His people!*
 - This means that Jesus did away with God’s Law so that people would stop obeying it and instead live like Ste. Marie here. What a knucklehead!
 - **Compare: Romans 8:3** For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: 4 **That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.** 5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. 6 For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. 7 Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: **for it is not subject to the law of God**, neither indeed can be. 8 So then **they that are in the flesh cannot please God.**
 - **HOW do they please God? By being in subjection to His Law!**
 - **Compare: Romans 7:12** Wherefore **the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.** 13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? **God forbid.** But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. 14 **For we know that the law is spiritual:** but I am carnal, sold under sin.
 - We are delivered from the condemnation of the law by the atonement and Priesthood of Christ, but not from obligation to obey the law because it was bad or lacking.
- *not just a Mosaic righteousness, but a righteousness which exceeded the Mosaic righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees*

- SO, again our deceiver is equating the lives of the Scribes and Pharisees with the original intent and proper obedience to Moses' Law – What an illiterate when it comes to reading the Bible! READ Matt 23 and Mark 7!

LISTEN TO JESUS – Matt 23:1 Then spake Jesus to the **multitude**, and to **his disciples**, 2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: 3 **All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.**

- But, But, But, Jesus, what about the new law? What about the discard of Moses' Law?
- What about the Pharisees wonderful obedience to Moses Law?
- What about Jesus being the ENDING of the Law?
- NOTICE THIS WAS AFTER THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT!

Listen! 29 years after Pentecost – “ACTS 21:20 And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which **believe**; and they are **all zealous of the law**:(As Malachi said) 21 And **they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses (Was it true?)**, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. 22 What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. 23 Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; 24 Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and **all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepst the law.**

- “The Law” only has one meaning – consistent with our position 100%
- NEED WE ANY FURTHER WITNESSES??? Not unless you are a ismite too.

The End of the Reign of the Law

So what law are Christians to be subject to today? What code of ethics and moral instruction are we to give heed to? Are we supposed to obey the Law of Moses, the words of Christ, or try to reconcile the two?

Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God (Romans 3:19).

So who does the Law address? It only addresses or speaks to *those who are under the Law*. The Law of Moses has no authority to speak to those who are not under the Law!

- I'm sorry, but it is so hard to deal with a bozo who thinks he can do whatever he pleases with the Bible according to his personal desire to make it say whatever he wants it to.
- LISTEN to the verse, that **every** mouth may be stopped, and **all the world may become guilty before God**

- He is talking about where it says “As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one:” Now the point Paul is making in speaking to the Jews is showing them that they are included in this, and not just Gentiles. The verse doesn’t say what you are trying to force it to say.
- When God’s Law was given to Moses, it was for all the world because if they wanted to be in a relationship with God for salvation, they had to come under it.--- Everybody who knows the Bible knows this. Now lets look at his next blunder.

Now let me ask you – are Christians “under the Law”? Obviously not! “For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace” (Romans 6:14). Can anything be clearer than to say that according to the Apostle Paul, the Law of Moses has no authority to command Christians?

- Romans 6:14 is dealing with another issue – Whether a slip and fall in a Christian’s life will bring them under the condemnation and damnation of the law, or if they have grace to get back up and keep going. **“Shall we sin” Paul says, because we are not under the Law as a plumb-line without grace to get back up – GOD FORBID.** But what is sin in Paul’s mind?? It is the transgression of God’s Law (Romans 7,8 also I John 3:4). Was Paul a Christian?? Did Paul obey God’s Law? YES, we’ve already quoted Acts 21 – 29 years after Pentecost all the apostles are still faithfully obeying Moses’ Law.
 - *Re 12:17 And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.*
 - *Re 14:12 Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.*
- YOU ARE JUST CONFUSING PEOPLE, ANDREW, AND YOU NEED TO SIT DOWN AND SHUT UP BEFORE YOU BRING MORE DAMNATION ON YOUR HEAD.

Paul further wrote in Romans 7:1-6:

Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of *her* husband. So then if, while *her* husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, **ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even** to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. **But now we are delivered from the law**, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not *in* the oldness of the letter.

The Law has no more dominion over those who have died to sin and risen in a glorious, spiritual resurrection, and are part of the Bride of Christ. We are delivered from the Law! It does no good to say that this only applies to the “ceremonial law,” since through the rest of the chapter, Paul is clearly speaking of moral/ethical behavior. He even goes so far as to quote one of the Ten Commandments in verse 7 as an example. He is speaking of the entire Law – including its moral/ethical aspects. To go back to being ruled by the moral Law of Moses is spiritual adultery according to the Apostle.

(sigh) How many times have I quoted Romans 8:1-8 -- which is what Paul is working up to in Romans 7. Listen close: For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. **But now we are delivered from the law**, that

being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not *in* the oldness of the letter.

- The first sentence (7:5) is illustrated in Romans 7:14-25 – The convicted Jew not yet born again.
- The second sentence (7:6) is illustrated in Romans 8:1-13 – The born again believer. WHAT IS DEAD? Is it the LAW? Or is it our old man who was under the condemnation of the Law? When the old man died with Christ – was crucified with Christ by our repentance and conversion – we were delivered from the condemnation of the Law. “That being dead” was our old man and old life – which was under the sentence of death. God did not kill his own law to deliver us criminals! What justice is that? We entered into Christ’s death to deliver us from the sentence of death upon us from God’s Law.
- Let’s allow Paul to tell us what died:
 - **7:23** But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. 24 O wretched man that I am! **who shall deliver me from the body of this death?** 25 I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind **I myself serve the law of God;** but with the flesh the law of sin.
 - **8:1** There is therefore **now no condemnation** to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk **not after the flesh**, but after the Spirit. 2 For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. 3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, **condemned sin in the flesh** (NOT THE LAW): 4 **That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.** 5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. 6 For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. 7 **Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.** 8 **So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.** 9 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. 10 And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. 11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. 12 Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. 13 **For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.**
- Intelligent readers who are not desperately trying to be the life support system for their ism can clearly see that God’s Law to the carnal is CONDEMNATION; but to those who are living in the Spirit and understand the grace of God, Christ’s atonement, His priesthood, etc. can truly fulfill the righteousness of the Law of God because the LOVE of God is shed abroad in their hearts and that is what the Law required – LOVE.

In a very important passage in Galatians, Paul asks and then answers the question, “Wherefore then *serveth* the law?” What purpose did/does it fulfill – what good is it? Paul answered:

It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; *and it was* ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not *a mediator* of one, but God is one. *Is* the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster *to bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. **But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.** For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Galatians 3:19-26).

The Law was “added because of transgressions.” This tells us that we are not speaking of the so-called “ceremonial law”; we are speaking of the entire Law of Moses, including its moral aspects, since the Apostle is thinking of “transgressions.” But for how long? Immediately after explaining the reason for the giving of the Law, Paul tells us that the Law had an expiration date! It was only “added” “till the seed should come”! Once the Spiritual Seed, Christ Jesus (Galatians 3:16 makes it clear that Christ was the “seed”), came, the Law “expired”! It was no longer needed. It was a schoolmaster, but once “that faith is come,” we do not need to be under the instruction of the schoolmaster. Rather, we can listen directly to the heavenly commands of Jesus, and follow them. The Law has expired, and we are no longer under its dominion.

- **Listen up.** Gal. 3: 6 Even as Abraham believed God, and **it was accounted to him for righteousness.** 7 Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. 8 And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, **preached before the gospel unto Abraham,** saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. 9 So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. 10 For as many as are (SEEKING JUSTIFICATION) of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. 11 But that **no man is justified by the law** in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith. 12 And (JUSTIFICATION BY) the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them. 13 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: 14 That the **blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ;** that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (AND BE THUS JUSTIFIED – RIGHTEOUS IN THE SIGHT OF GOD).
- **What does this all mean?** We are speaking of people before the Law, during the Law, and Christians in the New Covenant – They all are either seeking justification by FAITH or by the WORKS OF THE LAW – **This is the issue.** Did the blood of bulls and goats really atone for sin? Or did Christ need to come and atone for sin? **THIS IS THE ISSUE** and it applies to Abraham before the Law, David under the Law, and Christians in the New Covenant all the SAME – READ Romans 4 if you don’t understand this.
- “The just shall live by faith” is an OT concept quoted from Hab. 2:4 and understood by spiritual Jews
- “The law is not of faith” only has one meaning – trying to save ourselves (BE JUSTIFIED) through the Law system is not walking by faith in God’s true salvation/justification program – 1. We cannot perfectly keep the moral law, and 2. The blood of bulls and goats cannot atone. Abraham, David, the prophets and all spiritual Jews understood this; but the carnal Jews held to their ISM contrary to the Scriptures and thus lost their souls – being ignorant of God’s plan of justification and going about to establish their own through the Law system of atonement.

- **NOW the question:** Was the Law system of atonement meant to supersede God’s original plan of the “Lamb of God”? NO, LISTEN: [for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.](#) If the atonements of the Law could have truly covered sin, then a righteous standing – justification and salvation – should have been through the sacrifices of the Law, but it was only a school master to teach us about such principles in Christ’s atonement and priesthood. **THIS IS THE ISSUE**
- Was the Law (moral and ceremonial) a system to bring salvation? NO, it was a plumb-line and a tabernacle to 1. Hinder transgressions by teaching God’s standards and, 2. Teach us about the Salvation that the Messiah would bring. The Messiah came to make a true atonement for sins, and be our High Priest to save us from our sins; but **SIN IS STILL THE TRANSGRESSION OF THE MORAL LAW** – in the New Covenant. The Law as a system – plumb line and tabernacle – gave way to Christ – God’s original plan – plumb-line and Christ’s sacrifice and priesthood – God’s plumb-line did not cease. Paul who wrote Romans 8 also wrote Galatians.
- **NOW LISTEN TO PAUL’S CONCLUSION:**

GAL. 5:3 For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. 4 Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are **justified by the law (the issue)**; ye are fallen from grace. 5 For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness (**Justification**) by faith. 6 For in Jesus Christ neither **circumcision (Judaism)** availeth any thing, **nor uncircumcision (Gentilism)**; but **faith which worketh by love. (still binding on all believers)** 7 Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? 8 This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you. 9 A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. 10 I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be. 11 And I, brethren, if I yet **preach circumcision (Judaism)**, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased. 12 I would they were even cut off which trouble you. 13 ¶ For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but **by love serve one another.** 14 For **all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. (still binding upon all believers)**

- We are not justified through the Law system, but through God’s true salvation program of faith and Grace. In Jesus Christ practicing Judaism or not practicing Judaism is not the issue; but a **FAITH WHICH WORKS BY LOVE.** So to be saved in Jesus Christ, we must practice LOVE, which is the essence of God’s Moral Law -- **SO SAID JESUS AND THE APOSTLES.**
- **SO WE ARE NOT UNDER JUDAISM; BUT WE ARE UNDER THE MORAL LAW – WHICH IS LOVE TO GOD AND OUR NEIGHBOR.**

AGAIN THE BIBLE IS CONSISTENT WITH WHAT I’M TEACHING AND PROVES YOU WRONG.

You would never get by with butchering the Scriptures to way you do if it weren’t for the ignorance of all those patting you on the back. May God open all your eyes before you feel His wrath against your corruption of His Word.

[Later in Galatians, Paul wrote:](#)

For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only *use* not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, *even* in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. **This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.** For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. **But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.** Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are *these*; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told *you* in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. **If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit** (Galatians 5:13-25).

Paul here points out the need to abstain from fulfilling the lusts of the flesh. Formerly, they had the Law to chain in the flesh and keep it under control, but Paul has just been teaching that we are not under the Law's dominion. What is the answer? If we walk in the Spirit, the lusts of the flesh will not be fulfilled – and the Law of Moses is unnecessary. We know that we are walking in the Spirit if the lusts of our flesh are not being fulfilled. If this is true in our lives, then we are not under the Law! We do not need the Law of Moses to chain us down and hold us away from the object of our fleshly desires. We rather have the Spirit, and the flesh is crucified; the Spirit keeps us on the straight and narrow way to glory while the Law holds down those who have not the Spirit.

- O MY, you cannot see that you are contradicting yourself and surrendering your case even while abusing the Scripture
- THINK: If, as you say, the Spirit is now doing what the law once did – which is keeping us from fulfilling our flesh, then you are admitting unwittingly that **THOSE WHO WALK IN THE SPIRIT FULFILL THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW** – Romans 8:4. Did the flesh change? Then neither did the “non-fulfillment” of the flesh change – God's Law.
- If the Spirit that inspired the Law is now in us – guess what? He is going to be working in us to fulfill the righteousness of the Law – writing God's Law in our hearts.
- BUT, let me show that, though what I have said you just admitted is **true, your interpretation is not.** Being “under the Law” or “at liberty” as long as we are walking in the Spirit has to do with the **condemnation** of the Law – Just as Romans 7 and 8 are speaking of. If we don't walk in LOVE – which fulfills the Law and keeps us in “Justification by grace”; then we come back under the condemnation of the law. This is what it is saying and

ONCE AGAIN THE BIBLE PROVES MY CASE AGAINST YOUR CORRUPTION OF SCRIPTURE.

Finally, we have a very important statement made by Paul to Timothy:

Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and *of* a good conscience, and *of* faith unfeigned: From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling; **Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.** But we know that **the law is good, if a man use it lawfully**; Knowing this, **that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient**, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; According to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust (I Timothy 1:5-11).

Paul is warning Timothy about certain people who desire to teach the Law, but have no clue what they are talking about. They do not understand the Law itself! Paul acknowledges that the Law of Moses is good, but only *if* it is used rightly. He then goes on to give the principle of the right use of the Law: *The Law of Moses is not made for righteous men*. Righteous men do not have to have the Law of Moses preached to them! Rather, the Law is for “the lawless and disobedient.” It is for the conviction of “the ungodly and for sinners.” Look at that list of sinners which Paul gives – those are the people to whom the Law of Moses can be preached, for their conviction. But righteous men do not need the Law of Moses preached to them! Thus, for Mark Bullen to preach the Law of Moses to saved men, and try to get them to live according to the old precepts of the Law of Moses, is a misuse of the Law. Let him preach the Law to the men listed by Paul in this passage, and let him preach the New Covenant words of Jesus to those who are walking according to the Spirit.

- Poor fella: Should I preach Moses’ Law to lost people??? That is not what you want me to do – you are so inconsistent and confused.
- **YOU MISSED THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF WHAT PAUL SAID:** Now the **end** of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and *of* a good conscience, and *of* faith unfeigned: From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling;
 - This is the same thing Jesus said about the Law – 1. It was only meant to be used by sincere people to maintain HOLY LOVE in society, and 2. Practicing true LOVE therefore fulfills the Law.
 - **If** the Law was a compromise with sin for sinful men to do as their flesh pleases, then LOVE could not fulfill the Law, and the **END** of the commandment could not be Charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned. **THINK**
 - **WHAT DOES “END” MEAN NOW? The same thing it means in Romans 10.**
 - **Those living in LOVE are thus fulfilling the righteousness of the Law – Romans 8**
 - **Those living in LOVE are not hard hearted; but soft hearted, and the Law was not necessary for them – They wouldn’t need Deut. 24 – This is what Jesus meant by “for the hardness of your heart” he wrote you this precept.**
 - **YOU JUST ADMITTED that the Law should be preached to Lost men; but when those lost men obey God’s Law in Deut. 24:1-4 – YOU WON’T LET THEM IN YOUR CHURCH, BUT SAY THEY ARE LIVING IN ADULTERY!**
- What a mess you are! **YOU WOULDN’T HAVE TO ENDURE THIS HUMBLING EXPERIENCE HAD YOU LISTENED TO MY WRITINGS TRYING TO TEACH YOU THE BIBLE. NO, YOU SET OUT TO MAKE ME LOOK LIKE A FOOL; BUT INSTEAD YOU HAVE MADE YOURSELF AN UTTER MORON IN THE EYES OF ALL INTELLIGENT READERS.**
- It would be to your honor to repent and confess your delusion – your respect could then be rebuilt.

What Changed?

We have stated before that although God never changes, His moral/ethical instructions to mankind may

indeed change if man's situation changes. So with that in mind, and seeing that Jesus did indeed change the ethical instructions for His people, what in man's situation changed to allow this change in instructions? This is very significant! Remember what Jesus said about Moses' commands on divorce and remarriage:

He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so (Matthew 19:8). And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put *her* away. And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept (Mark 10:3-5).

Moses gave precepts or laws "because of the hardness of your hearts." Notice again that this is a concession to the Jews' hardhearted, sinful nature, and was not God's best for the situation.

- It is so tempting to call this guy a moron, but this time I'm going to refrain.
- NOTE: "was not God's best for the **situation**." Compare: "We have stated before that although God never changes, His moral/ethical instructions to mankind may indeed change if man's **situation** changes." You cannot have it both ways! Either God's Moral judgments ARE THE BEST FOR THE SITUATION – OR GOD IS NOT LOVE – HE IS NOT HOLY – HE IS NOT WISE – ETC. ETC. ETC.
- Somebody needs to shake you awake! I have said over and over that God's instructions change due to the situation; but this is not a change in God's moral judgment! God is acting on the same moral opinion and standard every time He makes a moral judgment – or He is not God – not immutable and not LOVE. BUT God is LOVE, and every judgment given is LOVE, GRACE, WISDOM, etc.!! In the divorce and remarriage issue, THE SITUATION HAS NOT CHANGED in our day! You just finished telling me to preach Moses' Law to the LOST SINNERS. DO YOU? What if they come to Christ having obeyed Moses' Law on divorce and remarriage? What will you do? YOU will not let them in the church! You will tell them obeying God's Law left them in adultery and on their way to hell!
- God is unchanging in His moral judgments because HE IS AND ALWAYS WILL SPEAK WHAT IS LOVE! GIVEN THE SAME SITUATION, GOD WILL ALWAYS GIVE THE SAME JUDGMENT CALL – Remember your upset stomach from me saying this over and over??

However, this was the best they could live up to. It would be fair to assume that Jesus would have said the same thing about other Mosaic commandments which He "fulfilled" in the Sermon on the Mount. But as we have said before, Ezekiel made a very important prophecy which is crucial to understanding the covenants:

And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh: That they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God (Ezekiel 11:19-20).

Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do *them* (Ezekiel 36:25-27).

Jesus was probably thinking of these prophecies when He said what He did about Moses and the hardness of the Israelites' hearts. Ezekiel prophesied that a day was coming when the hard hearts,

which had resulted in the concessions contained in the Law of Moses, would be removed. God would grant a new Spirit, a new heart – a soft, spiritual heart of flesh (**is that why they crucified him?**). The result of having this heart of flesh would be that now, obedience is possible! “That they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and **do** them.”

- Was obedience possible before the Spirit came at Pentecost thou mighty theologian? O Lord, help this man to escape his delirium.
 - Ge 26:5 Because that Abraham **obeyed** my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.
 - Jos 22:2 And said unto them, Ye have **kept all that Moses the servant of the LORD commanded you**, and have **obeyed my voice in all that I commanded you**:
 - **Remember Zachariah and Elizabeth?**
 - **If man was incapable of obedience, then God was wrong to be angry with them and punish them. You are sounding like a Calvinist.**
- I’ve already answered this above – **THINK** – Jesus never preached to anybody on the far side of Pentecost!! **NOBODY** – so why was He confusing people with a new law they “could not obey!” **YOU SIMPLY DO NOT KNOW WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT.**

Now let me ask again the question we are considering – what changed in the situation of mankind which allowed and necessitated a change in the moral/ethical instructions by which God’s people must live? It was the fulfillment of Ezekiel’s prophecy! It was the coming of the Holy Spirit! When the Holy Spirit came, it allowed man to have the power – it even “caused” (36:27) men – to walk according to the new and higher ethic of Jesus Christ!

- You are miss-using the word “cause” and Ezekiel’s prophecy. The Holy Ghost helps us to fulfill the righteousness of God’s Law – which was based on Love – because the love of God is shed abroad in our heart by the Holy Ghost -- But as Romans clearly says, **We** must mortify the flesh and determine to walk in the Spirit – God does not coerce anyone.

The giving of the Holy Spirit was an epoch-making, earth-shaking event in the history of man’s relationship to God – yet Mark Bullen gives this event scant attention in his discussion of the covenants (Go read my books). This is crucial! When the Spirit came, obedience was restored to mankind (**O, REALLY?**), and he could now live according to God’s ways, the way God truly wanted man to live. The commandments given only because of the hardness of heart could now fall away, and Jesus could reveal the perfect will of God in all its splendor – and man could actually keep it!

- You have got to be getting dizzy going in circles like this. Reminds me of another couple fellas – (remember the termite in the yo-yo?)
- Believe as you wish; but God’s Word cannot be forced to teach your delusion – Simply cannot be, and you will give account to God for wresting the Scripture.
- **THE NEW COVENANT WAS GOD’S LAWS WRITTEN IN OUR HEART TO AID US IN KEEPING THEM; BUT YOU ARE MISS-CONSTRUING THE WHOLE MATTER JUST TO KEEP FROM ACCEPTING DIVORCED AND REMARRIED PEOPLE IN**

YOUR CHURCH. Yes, the one's that I was supposed to preach Moses' Law to – remember?

All this happened because it was “the fulness of time” (Galatians 4:4). The schoolmaster had accomplished his task (**Ha, NOT WITH YOU**), teaching mankind what he needed to know (**ABOUT WHAT?**). Mankind could now see that living obedient lives was impossible under the Law (**WHAT A HERETIC!** – so nobody went to hell? How could a just God do that?). It was time for something new to happen – the fullness of time had come – and God acted decisively. Notice that before the coming of the Holy Spirit, Jesus Himself rebuked his disciples for their hardness of heart (Mark 16:14) (Oh, no, wasn't that only for the ancient Jews whom Moses wrote to – remember?), and Peter could not consistently live up to the New Covenant standards (he fought with carnal weapons [John 18:10] and swore [Matthew 26:74; Mark 14:71]). But when the Holy Spirit came, full obedience to the perfect will of God became possible.

- **O my!** So, let me get this straight – Jesus told his disciples to sell their shirt and buy a sword because they were still in the OT and could not live as a pacifist yet?
- And you think Peter swearing when He denied Jesus was according to God's Law? Peter was swearing as the Law of Moses said? Ha, Ha, Ha, Ha, Ha, Ha, Ha, Ha, Ha..... O, *my* stomach hurts now.

DID God think the people could obey Him? READ THE BIBLE

- Ex 15:26 And said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the LORD thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the LORD that healeth thee.
- Ex 16:28 And the LORD said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?
- Ex 20:6 And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.
- Le 22:31 Therefore shall ye keep my commandments, and do them: I am the LORD.
- De 5:10 And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.
- De 11:1 ¶ Therefore thou shalt love the LORD thy God, and keep his charge, and his statutes, and his judgments, and his commandments, alway.
- De 26:17 Thou hast avouched the LORD this day to be thy God, and to walk in his ways, and to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and to hearken unto his voice:
- De 28:1 ¶ And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the LORD thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth:
- De 28:9 The LORD shall establish thee an holy people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, if thou shalt keep the commandments of the LORD thy God, and walk in his ways.
- Did God and Moses think they could obey? Could thy honor their parents, tell the truth, be grateful for what they had, Love God, etc.?
- YES, The New Covenant set up a new system whereby it was easier – it did not change impossible to possible – but less likely to more likely. It is not mystical, but very practical – the ministry of the local church – Eph 4.

Examination of Bullen's Specific Arguments

Having laid out the positive case for the establishment of a unique, New Covenant ethic, higher and better than the ethic revealed to Moses, we can go on to examine the specific arguments used by Mark Bullen in support of his thesis.

God's Moral Standards Can Never Change

Bullen writes:

The Bible is a progressive revelation in many areas, but it never contradicts itself. Circumstances change, and covenant arrangements change; but God never changes. Genesis 1:1 says, "In the beginning God..." The Bible teaches that God pre-dates the world; and that God's nature, purpose, views, opinions, and standards are unchanging. In eternity past God had the same nature, views, opinions, and purposes as He has today, and will have forever. God's morality is unchanging, and God's judgments will always be the same when the exact same circumstances exist. Give the same scenario, and God will always give the same judgment call. God lived by the Law of Love before He created the world, and God still lives by the Law of love. **God's Law is always the best thing to do under the circumstances – always.** (Emphasis his)⁴⁶

Of course, we have been replying to these claims throughout the foregoing pages. Nevertheless, there is another point which must be made: Essentially every argument Bullen uses to support the supposed unchanging, eternal nature of the moral laws revealed to Moses could just as well be used to support the unchanging, eternal nature of the ceremonial laws revealed to Moses.

- Sigh...The ceremonial law is not naturally fulfilled by LOVE in those who might not even know the Letter of the Law; but the moral laws are, and can be eternally – big difference. The golden rule – Mt 7:12 IS the law and the prophets – but this is primarily speaking of moral laws, not ceremonial diet, cleansing, sacrifice, or temple service. Though the ceremonial law is based on God's love in redemption, it is not the focus when we are speaking of fulfilling the "righteousness of the law" as in Romans 2:25-29, Romans 8:1-4; or Love fulfilling the Law as in Romans 13:10, etc.

The arguments would fit perfectly. Many examples could be given, but let us consider just one. Bullen writes:

Did Jesus believe it was right to make God's moral judgments of none affect [sic] by new teaching? Listen to Jesus, and His esteem for what "Moses said". Do you think Jesus would come and do the same that He is rebuking these men for doing? *Mark 7:5 Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? 6 He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. 7 Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the **commandments of men**. 8 For laying aside the **commandment of God**, ye hold the **tradition of men**, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. 9 And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the **commandment of God**, that ye may keep your own tradition. 10 For **Moses said**, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: 11 But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free. 12 And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; 13 Making the **word of God** of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.*

Notice how Jesus makes what "Moses said" synonymous with "commandment of God" and "Word of God" and also contrasts it with the "tradition of men" or "commandment of men". What Moses said was not the "commandment of men", but the commandment of God! These religious leaders were making a moral obligation void by the introduction of new teaching, i.e. teaching introduced since the Law was given by Moses. Jesus makes it clear that no new teaching is valid or correct if it makes what Moses commanded (the Scriptures)

void or “of none affect”. We can be sure that Jesus never did such a thing as present new teaching which makes one of God’s moral judgments of none affect [sic]. Jesus believed the Old Testament Scriptures were inspired by God; because He is the one who did it. (emphasis his)⁴⁷

Notice that all of this could apply as well to the so-called “ceremonial law.” It, too, was “what Moses said.” It, too, was “the commandment of God.” It, too, was “the word of God.” It, too, was inspired by God. It, too, had been corrupted by the traditions and commandments of men (as, for instance, in the case of the Sabbath – which Mark Bullen says is part of the ceremonial law). Jesus indeed (even according to Mark Bullen) brought a new teaching which resulted in the ceremonial law being set aside and no longer enforced. Mark Bullen continually inserts the phrase “moral precept” into his above-quoted discussion, but nothing in the Scripture he quoted requires us to limit the discussion to “moral precepts.” The arguments Mark Bullen uses could just as easily be used (and just as erroneously) to support present-day observance of the “ceremonial” law.

- YOU are the one who said everything “repeated” in the New Testament is now binding on Christians! So, if this could apply to the ceremonial law – where does it leave you? HUH?
- **Did Jesus introduce new teaching that made the ceremonial law set aside?? NO**, What Jesus said to the Pharisees applied to ALL the Law; but His illustration is a **moral precept**; and I was using it to combat yo-yos who were saying Jesus changed the moral law. NO, Jesus did not make **any of the law** obsolete by his teaching or example – The Law was fully followed until Cornelius – Acts 10 - when God Almighty, through His head apostle, gave a word from Heaven which allowed Gentiles to be baptized and accepted into the congregation of Christians without coming under Judaism and obeying the ceremonial laws. BEFORE this both moral and ceremonial laws were fully followed, which proves Jesus was teaching contrary to the Law.
- READ Romans 2 again and you will see again the division of moral and ceremonial and that Gentiles did keep the righteousness of the law – the LOVE behind every precept was mandatory practice.
- Jesus never broke the Sabbath or any ceremonial laws according to the Law of Moses; but only violated some Pharisaic traditions, which were not in line with God’s Law.

Bullen’s argument also fails to appreciate the change of circumstances brought about by the coming of the Holy Spirit. For instance, he writes:

God’s Law in every respect is the proper application of Love – so if the circumstances are the same, the same expression of love is still appropriate.⁴⁸

- Jesus said this was true – does he deny it? How is it that LOVE NOW FULFILLS THE LAW if this has changed?

I can agree with this for the most part. But what Mark Bullen fails to realize is that the circumstances now *are radically different* from the time of Moses! The Holy Spirit has come! We are now liberated from the hardheartedness of former days, and are enabled to keep the perfect will of God. The circumstances are not now and never will be the same as they were in the time of Moses.

- “hardheartedness of former days” What a nut! A minute ago he was telling me to preach the Law of Moses to the lost man, but if this lost man obeys Moses’ Law and then comes to

Christ, Ste. Marie will tell him he is living in adultery (remarriage) and cannot be saved without undoing what Moses Law allowed him to do. FOOLISHNESS

- Again, Jesus **didn't** say, “because of the hardness of **ancient Jews** hearts”; but because of the hardness of **YOUR** hearts – people are just the same!!
- Ste. Marie just got finished telling us that Peter was still in the “hard-heartedness of former days” as a Spirit anointed, miracle working, Gospel preaching apostle, -- and said that is why he carried a sword and swore. So, what is it that Paul rebukes the Jews for in Hebrews 3-6? What was the Corinthian's, Laodicean's, and Cretian's problems? Why did Peter need rebuke from Paul? What happened to Demas? Do people still get divorced? WHY????? He later admits that people still get divorced and need laws concerning it – I Cor 7. Remember the termite in the yo-yo? Yah, we got us another one!
- The Baptism of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost is clearly said to be power for witnessing and not a preventative for hardness of heart. **YOU CANNOT EVEN RECEIVE THE HOLY GHOST UNTIL YOU REPENT FIRST FROM A HARD HEART.** After you have received the Holy Ghost, you have to still keep your heart soft and not be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin or the Holy Ghost will be grieved and leave – **SO WHO CHANGES THE HARD HEART? WE DO.** Yes, God's Spirit will help; but God's Spirit strove with man before the flood too and has ever since. Don't tell me things are radically different so that people don't have to deal with hardness of heart any more – You are display your hard heart through this whole treatise because you refuse to believe God's inspired Word against your man-made ism.
- Sorry Ste. Marie – Wrong again.

Making God's Law of None Effect

Having quoted (above) Mark Bullen's argument regarding “making the word of God of none effect,” let us examine this argument. Bullen writes:

What the Pharisees were teaching made a man “**Free**” from a moral principle – would Jesus have been guilty of doing the same? Could not the Pharisees have justly condemned him with hypocrisy had he been making the commandments of God of none effect by his own tradition? (Emphasis his)

What Mark Bullen misses is that the Pharisees were not teaching, as Jesus was, a higher righteousness than the Law of Moses. Rather, they were making a “legal” shortcut to allow *disobedience*. Jesus was not making it right to dishonor father and mother; He was not making it righteous to commit adultery; He was not teaching that murder is okay in His kingdom. Rather, He was surpassing the Law of Moses – fulfilling it – in all of its aspects. And we all know that Jesus was not making “his own tradition” or following any human tradition. Rather, He had an authoritative word from His Father for everything He said.

For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak (John 12:49-50).

- One thing you people continually miss is the fact that Jesus in appearance was a MAN and as a MAN the Jews had to evaluate his message according to the Scriptures if they were righteous. He did not have a sign in the heavens declaring that He was the Messiah and therefore had authority to change the Scriptures. He couldn't change the Scriptures without

going against His own Father's Word and therefore being a false Prophet. Jesus was the WORD made flesh and HE inspired Moses to write this: **Deut 13:1** If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, 2 And the sign or the wonder come to pass (working miracles), whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods (includes different teachings), which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; 3 Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the LORD your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul. 4 **Ye shall walk after the LORD your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him** (different teaching means a different God). 5 And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death; because he hath spoken to turn you away from the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, **to thrust thee out of the way which the LORD thy God commanded thee to walk in** (Claiming the same God, but teaching different Laws was essentially a different God – see EX 32:5). **So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee.**

- If the Jews could show that Jesus was correcting Moses' Law, they were obligated by the WORD of JESUS to label him a false prophet, as evil, and kill him!!
- YOU and yours are guilty of making Jesus a false prophet and justifying the Jews in killing him – though you are too stubborn and simple to see it.
- Your knot-head definition of “fulfill” is simply non-sense as any intelligent reader knows, and “magnifying” and “fulfilling” does not ever charge God's Law with adultery or evil – as your teaching does.
- If Jesus was teaching what you say, then He would indeed make God's Law of NONE AFFECT –as you have yourself said earlier in this very paper!! YOU argue that Jesus' teaching makes the moral law of God “set aside”.
- Just because you think your Ism is a higher righteousness than God's Inspired Word doesn't make it so. Jesus said ALL the LAW was based on God's LOVE and therefore LOVE now fulfills the OT LAW – This cannot be true if Jesus came and taught that Deut. 24 produces continuous adultery and swearing by God “cometh of evil” and defending those who are “drawn unto death” is now sin!!
- YOU ARE DECEIVED AND A DECEIVER.

Jesus, the Jews, and the False Prophets

Mark Bullen claims that if Jesus really was teaching a higher and better ethic than the Law of Moses, the Jews may well have been justified in having Jesus killed. He bases this on Deuteronomy 13:1-5:

If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, And the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the LORD your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the LORD your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him. And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death; because he hath spoken to turn *you* away from the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, to

thrust thee out of the way which the LORD thy God commanded thee to walk in. So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee (Deuteronomy 13:1-5).

In commenting on these verses in his second letter to Joshua Geiser, Bullen wrote:

If Jesus spoke to correct or call what the law commanded sin or evil, which you believe He did in the matters of divorce, swearing, and defending the weak — I say, if Jesus spoke to call all divorce and remarriage adultery, and all swearing evil, and forbade physical force in the protection of those in danger, then the people most attached to Moses [sic] law, believing it was the teaching of the Father, would have to stone Jesus for being a false prophet...How could God condemn the Jews for killing Jesus if He changed, corrected, called them to a different law, and said what Moses commanded was evil (Matt 5:37)??? This command in Deut 13 was consistent with the command to hear the prophet Moses spoke of (Deut. 18:15), because that prophet (Jesus) would have God's Words in His mouth just like Moses did, and would only speak truth according to what was written. Jesus NEVER spoke contrary to God's Holy Scriptures, but defended them, clarified their meaning, and preached them with power and clarity.⁵⁰

This argument simply does not hold water. God's instructions in Deuteronomy 13 told the people that if a prophet came and told them to go serve other gods, who they had not known, that prophet should be stoned. It does not say that when the Messiah comes, and when He does what will be prophesied of Him (namely, bringing in the new ethical standard of the New Covenant), that He should be stoned.

- Nobody but you and a few other amateurs interpret the prophets to say that Messiah will come and bring in a NEW ETHICAL STANDARD higher than God's inspired Word. What could be higher than God's Inspired Word which declared itself to be PERFECT, HOLY, JUST, ETC. God himself said He loved His Law and that He wanted to write it in our hearts. YOU are playing with fire.
- ALSO, NO FALSE prophet SAYS he is leading them to OTHER GODS; but just as Aaron with the golden calf, - they CLAIM to be a prophet of the LORD. Do you think the false apostles who presented what Paul calls ANOTHER JESUS, ANOTHER GOSPEL, AND ANOTHER SPIRIT come right out and say it? NO, YOU FOR EXAMPLE CLAIM TO PRESENT THE TRUE JESUS WHILE ACTUALLY YOU ARE PRESENTING A COUNTERFEIT. (2 Cor 11)

Rather, false prophets preaching other gods would be punished with death, under the law of Deuteronomy 13. Jesus never taught the people to follow other gods. Furthermore, taken to its logical conclusion, we could take Mark Bullen's argument and say that, in fact, *Moses* should have been the one stoned. Indeed, we could take Mark Bullen right back into the time of the ancient Israelites, and he may have written a book asking *Can Moses Correct the Patriarchs?* In this book, our ancient Mark Bullen could argue that God's moral standards never change; His moral standard is eternal and everlasting, and thus, Moses could not take away a man's right to marry his aunt, or his right to eat a pig. Who does Moses think he is, anyway? God's moral instructions to the patriarchs cannot be changed! Thus, we have the right to reinterpret the Law of Moses to show that Moses was just trying to clarify abuses and misunderstandings of the patriarchal system; everything is still the same. We can still marry our aunts and eat pigs. And anyone who questions this interpretation is saying that Moses should be stoned. Do you know what? Our ancient Mark Bullen would probably get a pretty good hearing from the stiff-necked Israelites of Moses' day. But we can see that such an argument is pure nonsense. It still is today.

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

SHAME, SHAME One thing you terribly miss – God spoke from Mt. Sinai in the audience of millions of people **to establish His Law** – it was not just a man presuming to do so. Jesus did not change God’s Laws and the reception of the Gentiles was a matter of **direct revelation from God with witnesses** to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on Gentile men and women – IT WAS NOT A HUMAN BEING. God clearly declares that His moral judgments never change – why is this snake trying to deny something taught throughout the Bible.

- “Where there is no law, there is on transgression” -- on many subjects God had not given a judgment call yet. If He had called something sin, it would still be sin. Giving updated instructions due to man’s fallen state or the breakdown in genetics or the change of man’s environment is not a change in God’s Moral judgments – I’m sorry you cannot see that.
- If Jesus had preached contrary to God’s Word, He would indeed be presenting **another god** to the people – Just as changing Jesus’ Word today presents another Jesus. (2 Cor 11)
- For Jesus to call His own inspired directives “adultery”, “evil”, etc. disqualifies Him from ever claiming immutability --- IF HIS MORAL JUDGMENTS CHANGE, THEN WHAT IS UNCHANGING????
- If a political candidate said he was “pro-life” and then later said he was “pro-choice” would we have a right to say he cannot claim immutability?? Could he ever claim to be the same “yesterday, today, and forever”? Of Course not!
- The change in the Law **due to a change of priesthood** is a change in the Law **concerning priesthood** – this is not a change of God’s moral judgments.

Malachi

Now we come to one of the biggest foundations upon which Mark Bullen has built his argument, and one of the most important arguments he draws on continually – and that is the ancient prophecy of Malachi, the last Old Testament prophet. For space’s sake, I will not quote the entire book of Malachi here, but I encourage you to stop reading this paper at this point and read the entire book of Malachi before returning to this discussion. God, through Malachi, gave a scathing rebuke to the Jews for a corrupt, hypocritical, half-hearted observance of the Law of Moses. It was a stern warning and rebuke, given about 400 years before the birth of Jesus. The book also contains very clear prophecies of the coming of John the Baptist (4:5-6; possibly 3:1a) and Jesus Christ (3:1-5). Mark Bullen finds in Malachi an apologetic for his position. This theme is developed most extensively in chapter 4 of *The Alien Exposed*, and referenced throughout Bullen’s writings on the covenants. An extensive quotation from Bullen will illustrate how he reads and uses the book of Malachi.

(I’ll make his quotation of my book red to reduce confusion – Listen close)

Malachi is the last word of God to the Jewish people before nearly 400 years of silence. This silence was finally broken by the preaching of John the Baptist as he introduces the Messiah. Malachi, along with addressing the sins of the people, gives them an introduction to the Messiah and His mission along with instructions to prepare them for this grand event. In the book of Malachi we find God scolding them harshly for some misconceptions they had developed. In chapter one, we see them as ungrateful and unbelieving in their treatment of God...In chapter two we see God’s scathing rebuke for the misuse and misrepresentation of His Law and Ways...The present priests were not properly representing God’s Law, but corrupting His ways. He charges them with being partial in the Law — only taking what they liked and wanted. This abuse of the Law caused many to stumble by

justifying sin...One example given was their unlawful divorces which dealt treacherously against the bride of their youth. A divorce according to God's Law was not dealing treacherously with the wife, because it was only allowed when "uncleanness" was found in her — see Deuteronomy 24:1-4. The word "uncleanness" is the Hebrew term **`Ervah** (#6172 — Strong's); and literally means, "nakedness", or "something shameful or repulsive". **`Ervah** is translated 51 times as "nakedness" in the Old Covenant, once as "shame", and once as "uncleanness". So these men were putting away their wives unlawfully probably to obtain another. The priests justified this evil by saying they were still "good in the sight of the LORD" and that "he delighted in them".

Now listen to God's reply to this:

Malachi 3:1 Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the **LORD**, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts. This is referring to Christ's coming 400 years later. Listen to what God says to them in response to their foolishness. ***Malachi 3:2*** But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: ***3*** And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness. ***4*** Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, as in the days of old, and as in former years.

Jesus fulfilled this and we find in Acts 21 that thousands of Jews believed on Jesus and were zealous of the Law of God (See Also [sic] Isa 42:21).

What else will God do in the person of Christ?

Malachi 3:5 And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the LORD of hosts. ***6*** For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed. ***7*** ¶ Even from the days of your fathers ye are gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them. Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the LORD of hosts.

Alright, what have we learned?

1. The Messiah will prove to them that He is a God of Judgment and has not changed His mind.
2. Jesus will preach against the **sorcerers** (rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft); against the **adulterers** (those abusing God's Law and dealing treacherously against their wife by unlawful divorce and remarriage); and against the **false swearers** (those swearing contrary to God's Law); and against the rulers who mistreated the poor, fatherless and widow.
3. God's message through the Messiah would prove that He is a God of judgment that never changes concerning His moral judgments of right and wrong.
4. He calls them to return to His Law, and promises then that He will return to them.

Now, to complete our introduction to the Messiah and God's will for these people we turn to Malachi chapter four.

Malachi 4:4 Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments. ***5*** Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD: ***6*** And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.

So, God is telling us that the Messiah will come to correct misconceptions about God and His Law in order to purify His people and get them back on track. The Messiah will call Israel back to a right conception of God

and His laws in order to establish a firm foundation for the New Covenant where God has promised He would write His laws in our hearts and minds. Obviously God would have to clarify His law and rebuke misconceptions before He could make a new covenant with Israel based on His laws being written in their hearts.⁵¹

So Bullen insists that 1) the book of Malachi reveals that God's moral standards never change (based on 3:6); 2) that the Messiah was only going to correct misconceptions about the Law (not create new law); 3) that since the Messiah was coming to preach against adulterers and false swearers (3:5), therefore, He could not have given a higher definition of adultery or changed the ethics of swearing. However, this sketch of Malachi is simplistic and ignores too much – and again, Bullen's argument can just as easily be turned to defend the continued keeping of the “ceremonial” law.

- Dear knucklehead and friends, THE JEWS **WERE** SUPPOSED TO CONTINUE TO KEEP THE CEREMONIAL LAWS AND WERE STILL DOING SO 29 YEARS AFTER PENTECOST! God simply made it impossible in AD 70. During the lives of the apostles they never taught Jews to forsake Moses – Acts 21 declares this specifically. It took a direct revelation from HEAVEN to allow Gentiles to be baptized without coming under the WHOLE LAW.
- You ignore that fact that God clearly says He LOVED HIS LAW (Mal 2:11) and would call Israel BACK TO HIS ANCIENT LAWS – **not give them new ones** – YOU CANNOT DO BOTH.
 - **Mal 3:3** And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness. 4 Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, **as in the days of old, and as in former years.** 5 And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the LORD of hosts. **6 For I am the LORD, I change not;** therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed. 7 ¶ Even from the days of your fathers ye are **gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them. Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the LORD of hosts.**

So let's take a closer look at Malachi. In Malachi 1:6-14, God rebukes the people for their corrupt practices regarding sacrifices – a part of the so called “ceremonial law”. 2:1-12 pronounces judgment on the priests who participated in such corruptions, and “caused many to stumble at the law”. 2:13-16 reveals the “dealing treacherously against the wife of thy youth” in divorce as one of the reasons why the Lord was rejecting their offerings. God goes so far as to state that He hates divorce (verse 16)! Verse 17 reveals how the Lord was tired of hearing them reaffirm the goodness of those who do evil. Now we come to the pivotal chapter 3. The Messiah would come as the “messenger of the covenant,” and would be like the refiner's fire and the bleacher's soap. He would purify the corrupt order of priests in order to bring about a new (renewed) order of things, when the offering of the Lord would be pleasing to Him again. He would preach against sorcerers, adulterers, false swearers, and oppressors. Now notice – we who believe that Jesus “fulfilled the law” and “magnified the law” can affirm, with Mark Bullen, that Jesus preached against adulterers and false swearers! That is manifestly true.

- NO you cannot! You do not believe that Jesus preached against adulterers in the context of God's Law – which is clearly what Malachi is saying; and you do not believe that Jesus preached against FALSE SWEARERS; but against LAWFUL SWEARERS ALSO --- ALL SWEARING IS WHAT YOU BELIEVE JESUS PREACHED AGAINST
 - YOU ARE EITHER DISHONEST OR STUPID

- Only an ignoramus can accept your miss-use of “fulfill” and “magnify”.

But that affirmation and the prophecy of Malachi do not on their face say that Jesus was not to reveal a higher standard of what constituted adultery, or that He would not make a higher law regarding the swearing of oaths. The text simply does not say that, and we cannot squeeze more out of the text than what it actually says.

- YES IT DOES – It clearly states that God loves his “holiness”, that in order for the people to return to HIM they must return to HIS ORDINANCES -- That the Messiah will bring the people back to God’s Laws “as in former days” and “days of old”; and that Messiah will show them that God “does not change”. God is clearly angry because they are “partial” with His laws. God clearly says Messiah will refine them as they WERE in their BEGINNING; and that Messiah would preach against FALSE swearers; and adulterers in the context of God’s Law – NOT CALLING LAW ABIDING JEWS ADULTERERS WHEN THEY OBEYED GOD’S LAW!

Verse 6 says that “*I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.*” Mark Bullen takes this as evidence of the unchanging nature of God’s moral standards, but as we have already seen, God’s moral instructions do indeed change under certain circumstances.

- AMAZING! So God can actually declare it; but you believe your pea-brained evaluations more than the actual statement of God Almighty about Himself. His moral judgments and instructions never conflict – never contradict – never condemn each other – never tell us something is moral OK, and then tell us it is morally wrong.
- What did the apostles understand this to mean??
 - Jas 1:17 Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.
 - Heb 13:8 Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.
 - YOU DON’T BELIEVE THIS

Moreover, the verse itself is not concerned with moral/ethical standards, but with God’s faithfulness in not consuming the Israelites due to His displeasure with them. Bullen’s application of this verse simply stretches it too far. Bullen’s application of Malachi simply asks for too many liberties with the text, as revealed by the fact that directly after verse 6 – a favorite of Bullen’s – there is a section on how the people had been disobeying the *tithing laws*, and how God was displeased with them for that. To be consistent, Bullen would have to insist that tithing laws should also be followed by Christians, because they were mentioned in this context in Malachi.

- The Jews **did** have to obey the tithing laws. You say that Christians are to obey everything repeated from the OT in the NT – What did Jesus say to the Pharisees about tithing mint, anise, and cumin? He said to do it – “and not to leave the other undone” so they had to do it. DO YOU follow your own teaching? NO you don’t.
- The moral principle of giving God the first-fruits IS TAUGHT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT – WHAT DO YOU THINK PAUL MEANT: *1Co 16:2 Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.* Being that the tithing Laws of Israel were ceremonial in nature;

but the moral foundation still exists, we don't have to tithe the same way they did; but follow the principle as taught in I Cor 16:2. If you don't understand this, then ask. Space and time now is limited.

But I doubt he would go that far (**you didn't ask**). I certainly doubt he would actually suggest enforcing the tithe in its real application from the Old Testament, in which all the tithes went to the priests of the sons of Levi – not to some local church or its pastor. Finally, in 4:4, we find God's admonition to remember the Law of Moses. Bullen again takes this as evidence that the Law and the moral standards were unchanging. But of course God wanted them to remember and continue obeying the Law of Moses (**keep committing adultery?**); Jesus and the Holy Spirit had not yet come, and the new standard of righteousness had not yet been revealed (**So they had to keep committing adultery?**). Malachi had no authority to reveal such a new standard of righteousness (**What a goof**). Yet again, to be consistent, Bullen would have to uphold *all* of the Law of Moses, even the “ceremonial law” – since God was surely insisting that they also uphold the “ceremonial” law, especially considering the amount of space in Malachi devoted to discussing the “ceremonial” aspects of the law. In brief, Malachi does not support Mark Bullen's argument.

- It not only supports and proves my case; but proves yours to be wicked heresy
- As said earlier – THE JEWS WERE TO KEEP THE CEREMONIAL LAWS AND DID. The fulfillment of Malachi's prophecy can be seen 29 years after Pentecost in ACTS 21!!! Thousands of Jews believed and were all zealous of the Law! IF THEY WERE ALL ZEALOUS OF THE LAW OF MOSES AND WERE UPSET AT THE THOUGHT OF SOMEONE TELLING JEWS TO FORSAKE MOSES – Then how is YOUR interpretation of Malachi and the Sermon on the Mount fulfilled?? Maybe it needs to be *“augmented, expanded, supplemented....”*?
- **If you were so ignorant of my teaching and meaning, maybe you should have discussed it before spending all this energy making a fool of yourself.**
- **Every true student of Scripture believes that God is immutable in His moral judgments – this is not NEW from Mark Bullen.**

The Sermon on the Mount – Changing Moses or Misconceptions?

The Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount,

Antithesis

a person or thing that is the **direct opposite** of someone or something else.

- **"love is the antithesis of selfishness"**
- synonyms: (**complete**) **opposite**, converse, contrary, **reverse**, inverse, obverse, other side of the coin;

...as we discussed above, provide very strong evidence for the reality of a change of ethical expectations between the covenants. Mark Bullen attempts to refute this using an argument which many have used before him, and many others still do today.

When Jesus said, “By them of old time” He wasn't seeking to correct Moses. In this passage He did not say, “It is written”; however, when contending with Satan he always said, “It is written” (Matt. 4). Saying, “It is written” means we are speaking of this passage in it's [sic] original and proper context, application, and intent; however, saying, “*Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time,*” refers to the application and usage of

those teaching [sic], which in this case was wrong or insufficient. Even if Jesus said something that the law had also said, His correction has to do with the context and usage of that statement, which came from the interpreters, not from Moses. He was dealing with the common misconceptions about the Law. Remember how God through Malachi rebuked them for being “partial” in the Law and causing many to stumble 400 years previous to this?...When Jesus says, “...but I say”, He is saying, “But **The Word of God** says...” He is preaching the spirit or “original intent” of the Law — if you don’t have the right spirit or intent, then you are not fulfilling the righteousness of the law. If you just rest in the “letter” and ignore the spirit or intent of any law, you are missing the point and using it out of context. Obviously anyone who obeys the spirit of the Law will also be obeying the letter of that law. (Emphasis his)⁵²

Therefore, if Jesus was only “correcting misconceptions” about the Law of Moses, then the details of the Law of Moses are still in force today – and in spite of what appears to be the clear teachings of Jesus, the swearing of oaths, divorce and remarriage, and carnal warfare are still permissible to Christians today. Notice that Bullen provides no proof other than his own assertion to support his argument that saying “Ye have heard that it was said” refers to “the application and usage.” Of course we acknowledge that Jesus did, at times, confront the erroneous interpretations of the scriptures given by the scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees (Matthew 15:3-9; 23:16-24; Mark 7:9-13). But it is also clear that this was not what Jesus was doing in the Sermon on the Mount.

- YOU offer NO PROOF but your assertion – My proof has to do with the obvious usage of words, which is undeniable – Jesus NEVER SAID, “ye have heard that Moses said” or “it is written” when making the contrast with the “righteousness of the Pharisees”; but Jesus DID use those phrases when speaking of what Moses and the Scriptures said in the context they were said.

So let us take a close look at the Antitheses and see if the text of Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount will bear such an interpretation as Mark Bullen (and hordes of others) gives them.

- NOTE: (and hordes of others) can clearly see that the Son of God could not, would not, did not, come to condemn His Father’s Law – His own inspired Word – and give a what??? ANTITHESIS??? A complete opposite contrast??

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing (Matthew 5:21-26).

In the first Antithesis, Jesus quite clearly quotes from Moses himself. It is an absolute assumption that one can quote from Moses, and really mean to be referring to some interpreter of Moses. The fact is that Jesus quoted from the Ten Commandments and added His own commandments to the precept, taking the application far beyond abstinence from murder.

- The intelligent Bible student understands the point Jesus was making, which is not an ANTITHESIS at all. Our knucklehead needs to find a better word for his position. Anyway, What Jesus “added” was not added at all, but the proper acknowledgement of a part of the Law they, the teachers, were leaving out due to their partiality in teaching. The teachers were teaching the law with partiality so Jesus basically said, “You have just heard that you

shouldn't kill; but I am telling you, based on the Law of God, that you should love your neighbor as yourself – which means when you hate or mistreat him without proper cause, you are ALSO IN DANGER OF THE JUDGMENT OF GOD. This refers back to Jesus' statement: *Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. 20 For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. YOU HAVE TO DO AND TEACH THE WHOLE LAW OF GOD. Which is what in Jesus' "nutshell"? Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.*

- **In light of this, HOW can Ste. Marie come to such goofy conclusion?** Joseph Smith got his doctrine from Morony; but Ste. Marie comes up with his own moronic doctrine all by himself.

Furthermore, if we are to actually believe that Jesus was correcting pharisaical or other Jewish misconceptions, and if we are going to build our own Christian ethics and way of life upon this teaching, we are going to need some solid evidence that this is so. These are the words of God we are talking about – this is serious! *What* would the "misinterpretation" be that Jesus (supposedly) has in view in the First Antithesis?

Mark Bullen says:

"Thou shalt not kill" means "thou shalt not murder or shed innocent blood." God commanded killing, but only by those who had proper jurisdiction and only upon principles of justice. If the Jews thought that their interpersonal relationships were alright as long as they didn't kill, they were greatly mistaken.

Of course they would have been greatly mistaken, but did you notice the "If" in that last sentence? Bullen cannot even bring forth any evidence that the Jews did teach such a thing (Mt 5:19,20), much less that such a skewed interpretation might even possibly be what Jesus had in mind in the First Antithesis! The Second Antithesis says:

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart (Matthew 5:27-28).

Once again, we must first notice that Jesus is quoting *Moses*. He is not quoting some rabbi; he is quoting Moses, and one of the Ten Commandments, no less. And again, what rabbinical misinterpretation might He have in mind in this antithesis, and what evidence do we have that the rabbis were misinterpreting this commandment in any way which Jesus would have been correcting? Regarding these verses, Bullen writes:

The scribes had only emphasized one aspect of committing adultery, but they forgot about, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife." Jesus is teaching heart holiness, which is the "spirit" or "righteousness" of the law.⁵⁴

Bullen gives no evidence that his synopsis is an accurate summary of Second Temple scribal teaching on the commandment against adultery. Furthermore, it is not accurate to say that Jesus' teaching in the Second Antithesis is simply a repeat of the Tenth Commandment against coveting a neighbor's wife. This is because the Tenth Commandment only mentions *wives*! It was only wrong to covet a neighbor's wife; not to lust upon his daughter, or his sister, or a widow, or any other unmarried woman. Jesus' teaching on lust was much broader and stricter than anything Moses had taught.

- What a Buffoon! *only mentions wives!* Ex 20:17 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, **nor his maidservant**, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor **any thing that is thy neighbour's. The man never read it!**
- We are talking about **adultery in the heart** – Which is the sin of violating a marriage covenant. To desire a single woman when you are single is either wholesome seeking of a wife or it is fornication in the heart depending on the situation. For Jewish men to desire a second wife was not called adultery. What was adultery in the heart was to desire another man's wife – married or betrothed. Jesus and the Jews he was talking to knew what He meant based on the Law He was defending.
- Telling people not to commit adultery in their heart is NOT and antithesis to “thou shalt not commit adultery”; but is the SPIRIT of the precept.
- LISTEN AGAIN; Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for **this is the law and the prophets.** **THIS IS THE SPIRIT OF THE PRECEPT!**

The Third Antithesis says:

It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery (Matthew 5:31-32).

We will be dealing extensively with divorce and remarriage later in this article, so we will save much discussion of this antithesis for then. Nevertheless, I want to point out that Jesus' quotation is a correct summary of the instructions given in Deuteronomy 24:1-4; He was not quoting what some rabbi had said. His teaching, furthermore, is stricter than that of Moses in Deuteronomy 24, as we will see in depth later in this article.

- SINCE JESUS IS PREACHING THE SPIRIT OF THE LAW – GUESS WHAT HE IS PREACHING AGAINST??? The LETTER without the SPIRIT --- This is being partial in the Law. To teach the letter of the Law without the Spirit or true intention of the lawgiver is to abuse the Law – Any law! That is why “original intent” is so important when teaching the Constitution of the USA. Every intelligent student knows this.
- Teaching the SPIRIT of a LAW is NEVER and antithesis --- How MORONIC!

The Fourth Antithesis says:

Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil (Matthew 5:33-37).

Once again, who was Jesus quoting? It was an accurate summary of Mosaic teaching on oaths (Leviticus 5:4-6; 6:2-5; 19:12; Numbers 30:1-2)

- WRONG AGAIN: The law was specific to swear by God's name – not to just perform “thine oaths”. Intelligent Bible students know that the Jews innovated greatly with many of their own “oaths”. Just “performing” these oaths was not enough! They should not use them at all!

- Malachi said Jesus would preach against ‘FALSE SWEARERS’. DID HE? YES!! THIS PROVES HE WAS NOT CORRECTING MOSES’ LAW!

In fact, it was probably Leviticus 19:12 that He had in mind with this antithesis. Once more, we ask, what erroneous rabbinic teaching could Jesus have had in mind? Notice that Jesus’ polemic against contemporary Jewish teaching on oaths reads very differently from His words in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 23:16-22) (NOT WHEN YOU UNDERSTAND THE ISSUE) I could not find that Mark Bullen defined specifically what error he believed Jesus was addressing here, although he believed Jesus was preaching against the “abuse” of Moses’ Law – from the context of his statement, by swearing by something other than God. (Go read chapter seven in “The Alien Exposed”) Once again, where is the evidence for Jewish teaching on oaths during Jesus’ lifetime? (**TRY THE BIBLE**) Where is the evidence that they were teaching some sort of “abuse” of Moses’ Law? (Beyond what Jesus said in Matthew 23 – and as we said above, His polemic against Jewish false teaching on oaths (DUH!) is very different from His instructions to His own followers in Matthew 5.) We will be addressing oaths in more detail later.

The Fifth Antithesis says:

Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have *thy* cloke also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away (Matthew 5:38-42).

Once again, Jesus directly quoted Moses, the law which is known as the *lex talionis* (law of the talon) (Exodus 21:22-25; Leviticus 24:17-21). Jesus boldly removes this allowance for judicial redress of grievances, essentially forbidding the use of the worldly courts to His people. His people were to take wrong, not return it or seek for the government to bring their offenders to justice. Yet according to

Mark Bullen:

In the matter of an “eye for an eye” Jesus is correcting a misconception that arose due to a wrong application of God’s Law. This command was given to the magistrates and judges as part of the just process of law. It was never intended to be a principle for interpersonal relationships **as the Jews were using it!** (Emphasis mine)

Now *how* do we know that the Jews were using the *lex talionis* as “a principle for interpersonal relationships”? Bullen defends this extraordinary claim by the following:

How do we know this is the case Jesus is dealing with?

1. The command is given in Moses’ Law as part of the civil law to judges in the course of their duty.
2. Jesus is speaking about interpersonal relationships, because His words, “*But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.*” has never applied to the magistrates on duty who “bear not the sword in vain”. Rulers are commanded to punish the evil and reward the good. If they resist not evil men, they are violating God’s design expressed by Paul in Romans 13. Jesus is therefore showing that “eye for an eye” was being misapplied.⁵⁷

The logic here is stretched to the breaking point. It is clear that the *lex talionis* was originally intended to be a judicial principle limiting the severity of a sentence passed on a wrongdoer, and that Jesus’ words in the Sermon on the Mount were not intended for governments to live out. (*uh, my logic is stretched to the breaking point?*) But to conclude from this that the Jews were misrepresenting the *lex talionis* is a tremendous leap of logic. **HA HA HA**

- If they were miss-using it as Jesus clearly says, then they were misrepresenting it! Why should this stretch anyone's logic? Wow.

It seems far more faithful to the text of what Jesus said to conclude that Jesus was taking away from His followers the right to a judicial righting of their wrongs, even in "legitimate" measure.

- What an ignorant ismite! Paul's example is too clear to ignore! Paul knew God's will and Jesus' meaning better than you ever will. Listen to what he said to the Christians who had legitimate complaints against another brother! He told them to set up a church court for the settling of matters between brethren – why? Because in the Kingdom coming we will be judges and judge the world and angels – so, based on the SAME PRINCIPLES of that coming Kingdom, Paul says they should be able to settle matters "in house" without going before the unsaved.
- Paul, when attacked by the unsaved, did not shrink from suing for protection based on his legal rights
- WHO DO YOU THINK YOU ARE??

This righting of their wrongs was not to be taken by their own hand, nor by someone else in their behalf (I APPEAL TO CAESAR?). In fact, if someone wrongs you in the court or legal system itself, you must give them more than they demand (verse 40)!

- No, goof, Jesus is saying that if they sue you and the Judge rules in their favor, that you should actually go beyond to right YOUR wrong. Jesus isn't assuming the judge is wicked.

Seemingly as further proof for his thesis of the Jewish "misinterpretation" of the *lex talionis*, Bullen quotes Adam Clarke's commentary on Matthew 5:38:

It seems that the Jews had made this law (the execution of which belonged to the civil magistrate) a ground for authorizing private resentments, and all the excesses committed by a vindictive spirit. **Revenge was often carried to the utmost extremity, and more evil returned than what had been received.** This is often the case among those who are called Christians. (Emphasis mine)

Notice how Clarke begins his comment about Jewish use of this law with an "It seems," as if there was no conclusive proof for what he was about to say. Then he appears to contradict himself – or perhaps has gained some new, omniscient insight enabling him to pontificate on the relative frequency of abuse of the eye for eye principle. To quote such a thing in defense of one's position is ridiculous.

- What an arrogant buffoon. You who continually blunder in your ignorance of the Bible and History and Logic – attack someone whose learning and experience in the rabbinic writings, history, and Semitic languages makes you look like a nursing baby in comparison – how foolish! He is simply saying that one abuse often leads to another – a point which you have proved throughout your writings.

The Sixth and final Antithesis says:

Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren

only, what do ye more *than others*? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect (Matthew 5:43-48).

At this point, Mosaic Law-keepers rejoice to find an antithesis – and such an important one! – in which Jesus’ “it hath been said” is (partially) not a direct quotation of Moses. Since “hate thine enemy” is not a direct quotation of any saying in the Old Testament, they conclude that Jesus must have been quoting some kind of rabbinic distortion, and therefore Jesus’ challenging command to “love your enemies” must only be interpreted and practiced in the context of the commands of Moses – and war, therefore, is perfectly allowable as an expression of love to enemies.

- What a stubborn fool -- Listen to JESUS AGAIN: *Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets. THIS IS THE SPIRIT OF THE WHOLE LAW!*
- This is God’s very nature – God is Love. He did not just start being love in the New Testament “new ethic”! Every intelligent reader knows this. THIS MAN IS DENYING IT.
- Anytime Jesus teaches LOVE, he is teaching the Spirit of God’s Law! What you need to do is LISTEN and learn GOD’S DEFINITION OF LOVE OVER YOUR OWN FOOLISHNESS.
- IS GOD LOVE?? IS GOD A “MAN OF WAR”? IS GOD A JUDGE? IS GOD KNOWN TO DESTROY HIS ENEMIES UNDER JUST AND RIGHTEOUS CIRCUMSTANCES? GO FIGURE IT OUT YOU PROUD PACIFIST.
- You really believe like Marcion – but your doctrines are cloaked and shrouded in lies and deception due to your own ignorance and stubborn pride.

In *The Alien Exposed*, Mark Bullen opens his discussion of this antithesis by asking the question, “**Did the Law of God teach the Jews to hate their enemies?** (emphasis his)”⁵⁸ He immediately answers this by quoting part of Adam Clarke’s commentary on Matthew 5:43:

The Jews thought themselves authorized to kill any Jew who apostatized; and, though they could not do injury to the Gentiles, in whose country they sojourned, yet they were bound to suffer them to perish, if they saw them in danger of death. Hear their own words: “A Jew sees a Gentile fall into the sea, let him by no means lift him out; for it is written, Thou shalt not rise up against the blood of thy neighbor: - but this is not thy neighbor.” **Maimon.** This shows that by neighbor they understood a Jew; one who was of the same blood and religion with themselves. (Emphasis mine)

This “evidence” is extremely shaky. Notice what I bolded and underlined, which is Adam Clarke’s source for the quotation he uses for the Jewish teaching. That is an abbreviation for Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon, a.k.a. Moses Maimonides (1135-1204). Notice the dates of his lifetime – he was a medieval Rabbi! His thoughts on the Law of Moses have no relevance whatsoever to what the Jews of Jesus’ day believed about the Law! Such evidence is completely irrelevant, coming from a rabbi who lived over 1,000 years after Jesus.

- What you fail to understand is that Jewish Rabbis build upon works of previous rabbis or they would be rejected outright as an inovator. You don’t know as much as you would like to think.
- Maimonides did have a good thought concerning your book: “Do not consider it proof just because it is written in books, for a liar who will deceive with his tongue will not hesitate to do the same with his pen.”

But of course, the question at hand is deeper than just “did the Jews of Jesus’ day believe they should hate their enemies,” but, “Do the Old Testament scriptures teach hatred of enemies?”

- Jesus clearly declares that “Jews thinking it was OK to hate their enemies” predated Jesus himself.

Apparently realizing this, Mark Bullen tries to prove that the Old Testament itself taught an ethic of enemy-loving. Of course, if this is true, and the enemy-love taught by the Old Testament is the same ethic as that taught by Jesus, then carnal warfare and lethal self-defense are not inconsistent with Christianity.

- Hey Bozo! JESUS said ALL THE LAW AND PROPHETS were based on LOVE. The apostles tell us the LOVE fulfills the LAW -- You are denying this!!! This makes you a rank heretic!
- Love is Love is Love is Love – If God’s Law is based on Love, and God is LOVE, and LOVE fulfills the Law, THEN JESUS COULD NOT BE TEACHING LOVE AS AN ANTITHESIS TO GOD’S LAW!! DUH!! Can you improve on LOVE? Can there be bad love and good love? Can there be ½ love and full love? Can there be poor love and better love? NO, BECAUSE IF IT IS NOT LOVE 100% THEN IT IS SOMETHING ELSE – SELFISHNESS – DECEPTION – IGNORANCE – ETC. GOD NEVER GIVES ANYTHING BUT LOVE FOR GOD IS LOVE!!!
- LOVE IS THE BASIS OF GOD’S WRATH, JUDGMENT, HATRED, WAR, HELL – ALL OF IT!!
- JESUS ONLY SAID WE ARE TO LOVE OUR ENEMIES AS GOD DOES **That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven:** for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others?* do not even the publicans so? **Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect** AND WE CANNOT LOVE THEM DIFFERENTLY OR WE ARE NOT BEING PERFECT AS GOD IS.
- THIS MEANS JESUS’ TEACHING ON LOVE HAS THE SAME BOUNDARIES AS WHAT WE SEE IN GOD’S LOVE FOR ENEMIES – AND WE DARE NOT THINK WE HAVE IMPROVED OR WE ARE A PROUD IDIOT. THIS IS SOUND DOCTRINE FROM GENESIS TO REVELATION!

Bullen backs up his claim by quoting the following verses (all bold emphasis mine): **(and mine ☺)**

If thou meet **thine enemy’s** ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him **that hateth thee** lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him (Exodus 23:4-5).

Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge **against the children of thy people**, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I *am* the LORD (Leviticus 19:18).

But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I *am* the LORD your God (Leviticus 19:34).

For the LORD your God *is* God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward: He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment. **Love ye therefore the stranger:** for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt (Deuteronomy 10:17-19). Thou shalt not abhor an **Edomite**; for he *is* thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an **Egyptian**; because thou wast a stranger in his land (Deuteronomy 23:7).

Rejoice not when thine **enemy** falleth, and let not thine heart be glad when he stumbleth: Lest the LORD see *it*, and it displease him, and he turn away his wrath from him (Proverbs 24:17-18).

If thine **enemy** be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink: For thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the LORD shall reward thee (Proverbs 25:21-22).

■ **note: This is what the apostle Paul quotes to give authority to his teaching on non-resistance – this can only mean he is teaching it in the same sense as God’s Scriptures already did in the OT. DON’T MISS THIS.**

Plead *my cause*, O LORD, with them that strive with me: fight against them that fight against me...For without cause have they hid for me their net *in* a pit, *which* without cause they have digged for my soul...False witnesses did rise up; they laid to my charge *things* that I knew not. They rewarded me evil for good *to* the spoiling of my soul. But as for me, when they were sick, my clothing *was* sackcloth: I humbled my soul with fasting; and my prayer returned into mine own bosom. I behaved myself as though *he had been* my friend *or* brother: I bowed down heavily, as one that mourneth *for his* mother. But in mine adversity they rejoiced, and gathered themselves together: *yea*, the abjects gathered themselves together against me, and I knew *it* not; they did tear *me*, and ceased not...Lord, how long wilt thou look on? rescue my soul from their destructions...Let not them that are mine enemies wrongfully rejoice over me...For they speak not peace: but they devise deceitful matters against *them that are* quiet in the land...*This* thou hast seen, O LORD: keep not silence: O Lord, be not far from me. (Psalm 35, selections)

Save me, O God; for the waters are come in unto *my* soul. I sink in deep mire, where *there is* no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me. I am weary of my crying: my throat is dried: mine eyes fail while I wait for my God. They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of mine head: they that would destroy me, *being* mine enemies wrongfully, are mighty: then I restored *that* which I took not away (Psalm 69:1-4).

So what are we to make of this? As these verses are arranged and quoted in Bullen’s book, it certainly looks like impressive evidence that there was a clear ethic of enemy-loving in the Old Testament, and thus the ethics of the covenants are the same – with the same allowances for violence.

■ **YES, they are from the SAME GOD, who IS LOVE.**

Upon closer examination, however, the evidence falls apart. Of course, there are hints in the Old Testament of a higher ethic of love for all, and there were some men (such as Isaac, Joseph, and Elisha) who stood head and shoulders above their contemporaries in their treatment of enemies. But this does not mean that there was a clearly enjoined ethic of enemy-loving in the Old Testament. Specifically, we must closely examine the verses quoted by Mark Bullen, and see what they say and what they do not say. The passages from the Law of Moses are very clear. The enemies being discussed are “the children of thy people” (Leviticus 19:18), against whom one might have a personal reason for animosity. Jewish enemies were to be treated well. Also, it was commanded that Egyptians, Edomites, and sojourning strangers were not to be hated or mistreated. However, for others, the rules were off! Again, given the broader Old Testament context, the passages from Proverbs were probably only intended in the context of Jewish enemies, although in the New Testament, we see that they have been broadened in their applicability.

■ **Is God LOVE? Is God’s Law based on LOVE? Does LOVE fulfill the Law?**

It is with the psalms that Bullen’s argument totally falls apart. In Mark Bullen’s quotation of selections from Psalm 35 (as given above), he left out some very significant portions:

Let them be confounded and put to shame that seek after my soul: let them be turned back and brought to confusion that devise my hurt. Let them be as chaff before the wind: and let the angel of the LORD chase *them*. Let their way be dark and slippery: and let the angel of the LORD persecute them...Let destruction come upon him at unawares; and let his net that he hath hid catch himself: into that very destruction let him fall. And my soul shall be joyful in the LORD: it shall rejoice in his salvation.

These sentences were deleted by Bullen from his own quotation of Psalm 35. You can decide for yourself if this psalm seems to describe any kind of enemy-loving policy which was enjoined by Jesus.

- **This only proves that the two sentiments are not inconsistent – I have no problem accepting that and seeing the appropriateness of it; but you want to judge the Word of God by YOUR interpretation of Jesus – How foolish and arrogant! If the two sentiments co-exist in God’s Word, then why think they don’t co-exist in Jesus? They DO!**
- I quoted what was relevant for the point made. Jesus said that in Psalms David was inspired by the Spirit of God. The NT says that Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Does Ste. Marie believe this? GOD IS LOVE and all the Scriptures are inspired by HIM. So are we to have the same spirit in us that inspired the Scriptures?
- In Col 3:16 Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.
- **Ps. 2 speaks specifically of Jesus --- LISTEN:** 1 Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? 2 The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying, 3 Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. 4 He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. 5 Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. 6 Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. 7 ¶ I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. 8 Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. 9 **Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.** 10 ¶ Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. 11 Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. 12 **Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.**
- **LISTEN AGAIN: Rev. 2:26** And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: 27 And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father. 28 And I will give him the morning star. 29 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.
- **SO NOW --** You can decide for yourself if this psalm seems to describe any kind of enemy-loving policy which was enjoined by Jesus

LISTEN NOW TO THE PROOF OF STE. MARIE BEING A GNOSTIC – MARCION WOULD LOVE THIS GUY.

Finally, Psalm 69 is probably a messianic psalm, and so its applicability to a question of Old Testament ethics is dubious.

- **O O O MY! – IT IS OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS BOZO!** It is Old Testament – The writer is Old Testament, those who sang the psalms and prayed them were Old Testament people. By the way! Everything Jesus said was Old Testament too! When did the New Testament begin? Think about it.

So, we are back to our original question: Did the Old Testament teach hatred of enemies? My conclusion is that, although there are some glimpses of the bright new day to come, the Old Testament did indeed teach and exemplify the ill treatment – indeed, hatred – of enemies.

And the **LORD** spake unto Moses, saying, **Vex the Midianites, and smite them:** For they vex you with their wiles, wherewith they have beguiled you in the matter of Peor, and in the matter of Cozbi, the daughter of a prince of Midian, their sister, which was slain in the day of the plague for Peor's sake (Numbers 25:16-18).

And the **LORD** spake unto Moses, saying, **Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites:** afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people. And Moses spake unto the people, saying, Arm some of yourselves unto the war, and let them go against the Midianites, **and avenge the LORD of Midian.** Of every tribe a thousand, throughout all the tribes of Israel, shall ye send to the war (Numbers 31:1-4).

When the **LORD thy God** shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; And when the **LORD thy God shall deliver them** before thee; **thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them:** Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son (Deuteronomy 7:1-3).

But of the cities of these people, which the **LORD thy God doth give thee for an inheritance**, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: But **thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely,** the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; **as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee** (Deuteronomy 20:16-17).

Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of Egypt; How he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, *even all that were feeble behind thee*, when thou *wast* faint and weary; and he feared not God. Therefore it shall be, when the **LORD thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about**, in the land which the **LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to possess it, that thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it** (Deuteronomy 25:17-19).

So we have here the positive words of God regarding the Israelites' enemies, who were to be vexed, smitten, utterly destroyed, and have vengeance wreaked upon them – all without mercy. What could be more different from the teaching of the New Testament on the treatment of enemies?

■ Let's see –

- Luke 19: 27 But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.
- Mt 21:44 And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.
- 2Th 1:5 Which is a manifest token of the **righteous judgment of God**, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer: 6 Seeing it is a **righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you;** 7 And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the **Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels,** 8 **In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ:** 9 **Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;** 10 When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day.
- Rev 6:10 And they cried with a loud voice, saying, **How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?**

- Romans 13:4 For he is the **minister of God to thee for good**. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for **he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil**. 5 Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. 6 For for this cause pay ye tribute also: **for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing**. 7 **Render therefore to all their dues:**

SAME GOD, SAME LOVE, SAME ETHIC --

Yet the evidence does not stop there. Throughout the Old Testament Scriptures, we find many instances of imprecations – curses being called down from God upon one’s own, or God’s enemies. Here are a few examples:

Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned: and let his prayer become sin. Let his days be few; *and* let another take his office. Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow. Let his children be continually vagabonds, and beg: let them seek *their bread* also out of their desolate places. Let the extortioner catch all that he hath; and let the strangers spoil his labour. Let there be none to extend mercy unto him: neither let there be any to favour his fatherless children. Let his posterity be cut off; *and* in the generation following let their name be blotted out. Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with the LORD; and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out. Let them be before the LORD continually, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth. Because that he remembered not to shew mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart. As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him: as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As he clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones. Let it be unto him as the garment *which* covereth him, and for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually. *Let this be* the reward of mine adversaries from the LORD, and of them that speak evil against my soul (Psalm 109:6-20).

Let me not be ashamed, O LORD; for I have called upon thee: let the wicked be ashamed, *and* let them be silent in the grave (Psalm 31:17).

I find it particularly hard to understand how someone could read in Numbers 31:2 that God commanded the children of Israel to take vengeance, and then compare it with Romans 12:19, where vengeance even for ourselves is forbidden, and argue that the ethics of the two covenants are the same. **They are opposites!**

■ **Good Marcionite. What is the opposite of love? Jesus said God’s law was summed up as LOVE. The apostles taught that LOVE fulfills the law and GOD IS LOVE.**

- **NOW, who** commanded the children of Israel to take vengeance on evil doers?? GOD
- The state leaders are “ministers of God” to take vengeance on evil doers when?? New Testament.
- Jesus will come and take vengeance on all those who now disobey Him – Same ethic??
- If Paul is teaching a different ethic in Romans 12:19 – THEN WHY DOES HE QUOTE THE OLD TESTAMENT AS HIS AUTHORITY???
- NOTE: I find it particularly hard to understand how someone could read in Numbers 31:2 that God commanded the children of Israel to take vengeance, and then compare it with Romans 12:19 Now Listen close: God says in Romans 12:19 (Paul is quoting the OT ethic to establish his NT ethic – duh!) – Anyhow, God says, “vengeance is mine” – It still is! In the OT ethic God used those in government (including His people) to execute God’s vengeance. In Romans 13 God calls those in authority His ministers to execute His vengeance on evil doers. GOD is the SAME, the vengeance is the SAME, the tool is the SAME, the ethic is the SAME – so why would

anyone suppose God's chosen people today could not serve in government and be God's tools just like in the OT? Why would anyone think Paul is teaching something different when Paul is quoting the OT in **two places** in Romans 12:19-20 – and Ste. Marie KNOWS this – I TOLD HIM SO – What a snake!

Plead *my cause*, O LORD, with them that strive with me: fight against them that fight against me. Take hold of shield and buckler, and stand up for mine help. Draw out also the spear, and stop *the way* against them that persecute me: say unto my soul, I *am* thy salvation. Let them be confounded and put to shame that seek after my soul: let them be turned back and brought to confusion that devise my hurt. Let them be as chaff before the wind: and let the **angel of the LORD** chase *them*. Let their way be dark and slippery: and let the **angel of the LORD** persecute **them**. For without cause have they hid for me their net *in* a pit, *which* without cause they have digged for my soul. Let destruction come upon him at unawares; and let his net that he hath hid catch himself: into that very destruction let him fall (Psalm 35:1-8).

- The “angel of Jehovah” is JESUS pre-incarnate! The same yesterday, today, and forever!
- The cry of the righteous will be heard and avenged by Jesus –
 - **Lu 18:7** And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily.
 - **2 Thess 1: 7** And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, 8 In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: 9 Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;

Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth: break out the great teeth of the young lions, O LORD. Let them melt away as waters *which* run continually: *when* he bendeth *his bow* to shoot his arrows, let them be as cut in pieces. As a snail *which* melteth, let *every one of them* pass away: *like* the untimely birth of a woman, *that* they may not see the sun. Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living, and in *his* wrath. The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance: he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked. So that a man shall say, Verily *there is* a reward for the righteous: verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth (Psalm 58:6-11).

O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy *shall he be*, that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy *shall he be*, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones (Psalm 137:8-9).

Give heed to me, O LORD, and hearken to the voice of them that contend with me. Shall evil be recompensed for good? for they have digged a pit for my soul. Remember that I stood before thee to speak good for them, *and* to turn away thy wrath from them. Therefore deliver up their children to the famine, and pour out their *blood* by the force of the sword; and let their wives be bereaved of their children, and *be* widows; and let their men be put to death; *let* their young men *be* slain by the sword in battle. Let a cry be heard from their houses, when thou shalt bring a troop suddenly upon them: for they have digged a pit to take me, and hid snares for my feet. Yet, LORD, thou knowest all their counsel against me to slay *me*: forgive not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight, but let them be overthrown before thee; deal *thus* with them in the time of thine anger (Jeremiah 18:19-23).

NOTE Jas 5:10 Take, my brethren, **the prophets**, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an **example of suffering affliction**, and of patience. **Psalms was written by prophets suffering affliction – and they were not pacifists!**

So we see that the supposed ethic of enemy-loving, which Mark Bullen claims to find in the Old Testament, did not run very deep. Even in psalms where the psalmist mentions returning good for evil, such action had very definite limits (**And they still do!!**) – continued rejection of the psalmist's goodness was met with ferocious imprecations of impending doom. Even the love of fellow-Israelites was severely limited, and could end in divinely-ordained warfare at times. For instance, when the tribe

of Benjamin had defended some perverts who had defiled a Levite's concubine, the rest of the tribes – at God's direction – fought against the tribe of Benjamin and nearly annihilated it (Judges 19- 20). I doubt Mark Bullen today would advise conservative Christians to take up arms and annihilate liberal denominations who are accepting homosexuality or some other form of disobedience to God's Word.

- Choke choke choke... What?? Are you too blind to see that God telling civil authorities to put down evil and bring justice against a crime is **not the same** as an individual civilian taking the law into his own hands and executing other civilians? And you are writing a book? Go find an honest way to spend your time.
- IF JESUS WERE REIGNING THEY WOULD BE ANNIHILATED – BROKEN TO SHIVERS! I WOULD BE HELPING – Praise God! Rev 2:25-29
- If God's ministers (Romans 13) were running the state as Jesus wants them to, they would execute every criminal God told Moses to execute.

In short, the difference between the two covenants' approach to enemies and persecutors can hardly be illustrated better than by comparing the last words of an Old Testament martyr and a New Testament martyr.

And the Spirit of God came upon Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest, which stood above the people, and said unto them, Thus saith God, Why transgress ye the commandments of the LORD, that ye cannot prosper? because ye have forsaken the LORD, he hath also forsaken you. And they conspired against him, and stoned him with stones at the commandment of the king in the court of the house of the LORD. Thus Joash the king remembered not the kindness which Jehoiada his father had done to him, but slew his son. And when he died, he said, **The LORD look upon it, and require it** (II Chronicles 24:20-22).

And they stoned Stephen, calling upon *God*, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, **Lord, lay not this sin to their charge**. And when he had said this, he fell asleep (Acts 7:59-60).

Listen to JESUS on this very issue: Mt 23:29 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, 30 And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. 31 Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. 32 Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. 33 Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? 34 Wherefore, behold, **I send unto you prophets, and wise men**, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: 35 **That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.** 36 Verily I say unto you, **All these things shall come upon this generation.** 37 O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! 38 **Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.** 39 **For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.**

NOTE Jas 5:10 **Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience.**

- This includes Zacharias! Should we do this? The situations with Zacharias and Stephen were definitely different, because Stephen's killers "thought they did God service"; but Zacharias' KNEW BETTER AND KILLED HIM FOR REBUKING THEIR BLATANT

IDOLATRY! TOTALLY DIFFERENT SITUATIONS CALL FOR DIFFERENT RESPONSES!

Same Spirit, same GOD, same LOVE, same LAW.

- Ac 23:3 Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?
- 1Co 16:22 If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, **let him be Anathema Maranatha.**
- Gal. 1: 8 But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, **let him be accursed.** 9 As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, **let him be accursed.**
- Ga 5:12 **I would they were even cut off which trouble you.** 13 For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. 14 **For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.**
 - **NO contradiction.**

Now, to come all the way back to the Sixth Antithesis of the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus' quotation, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy," is not a verbatim quotation of a specific Old Testament text, but is an accurate summary of the teaching and example of the Old Testament in its relationship to neighbors and enemies. Jesus superseded this teaching and example, and replaced it with an ethic of absolute love for all – including enemies – in which every true Christian must follow the example of his Heavenly Father, Who is good to all – even His enemies.

- Jesus superseded God (who is LOVE) and the Law He said was based on LOVE, and which is fulfilled by LOVE, in order to teach *an ethic of absolute love for all – including enemies – in which every true Christian must follow the example of his Heavenly Father, Who is good to all – even His enemies.*
 - **HOLD ON! We got us a bonafide Marcionite!** Who is the LORD that commanded all the killing in the OT? Is it the Father of Jesus? Must we follow the example of Jesus' Heavenly Father – who is good to all – even His enemies? Who is He? Is He the one who commanded all the killing? What about the flood? Sodom and Gomorrah? Who inspired the Psalms?
 - What a moronic Marcionite.

To sum up this section, I want to quote from Michael E. Lewis's highly-recommended book, *Church and State*, regarding the Antitheses:

The changes Jesus makes are fundamental changes, not clarifications. Some affirm that Jesus is not modifying the Law of Moses in any way, but only clarifying or correcting corruptions. The problem with this is that we have no record of Jewish teaching that contained the corruptions that Jesus would be addressing.

- What about Malachi, the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, etc. etc.? How Stupid! All through the NT we find that the Letter alone is not enough; but one must teach the Law with the Spirit of The Law. Jesus dealt with these issues throughout his ministry.

- Matt 5:19, 20 states the problem and the context of Jesus' Words!! *19 Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. 20 For I say unto you, **That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.***

On the contrary, Jesus accurately states proper Mosaic law, not corruptions and He does not use what we might call corrective language, but rather language that introduces new law (moronic). Even the context is a law-giving context. Fundamentally changing the Law would itself constitute a gross violation of the Law. However, Jesus goes beyond this and we find Him taking tremendous liberty with the Law (Gnostic lies!). We have Jesus and the apostles picking grain on the Sabbath when a man gathering sticks on the Sabbath was stoned (**Different**). And we find Him overturning the dietary Laws (**Where?**), and exercising grace and mercy even on those who ought to be punished under Moses' Law (**Where?**). And lastly we find Jesus loving His and God's enemies refusing to follow the example in the Old Testament where imprecations are called down on enemies, both God's and ours...Thus, when King Jesus comes the Law has accomplished the purpose for which it was intended; the Law has led us to Christ (**illogical**). The Law of Moses is no more, now is the age of the New Covenant and a New Law with greater ethical demands, demands that man can now meet by the power of the Spirit.

- O my! I thought it couldn't get any worse. They are making Jesus into an AntiChrist – anything that is ANTI-GOD'S WORD IS ANTI-CHRIST.
- How could the LAW LEAD US TO CHRIST AS THEY INTERPRET CHRIST? The Law would naturally lead us **away** from an ANTI-LAW CHRIST who “takes great liberties” in breaking and changing the Law! How could they say this???? What fools.
 - The man picking up sticks was stoned for despising the Law of God – Jesus was not doing this! He was rebuking their abuse and misinterpretation!
 - Jesus didn't change dietary laws! Only the Gentiles were received without them **12 years after Pentecost** and Peter was still obeying them!
 - Jesus didn't make any judgments contrary to God's Holy Word – These men are just ismites fighting for their pacifism.
 - The Bible tells us to follow the examples of the OT prophets – psalms was written by prophets
 - Jas 5:10 Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an **example** of suffering affliction, and of patience.
 - The Jewish Christians WERE IN THE NEW COVENANT while obeying ALL Moses' Law – the Apostles were still obey it 29 years after Pentecost in Acts 21 with thousands of other believing Jews in the church of Jerusalem!

O Lord, deliver us from Morons – *“But these, as natural brute (means “stupid”) beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption;” 2 Peter 2:12 That is what Peter and Jude called such.*

Another main argument of Mark Bullen's regards the keeping of the Law of Moses after Pentecost. He writes:

Moses' Law was still binding on all men until 12 years after Pentecost when Gentiles were accepted without circumcision. The Jews were still under Moses' Law (both moral and ceremonial) in Acts 21 (29 years after Pentecost); and the Moral Law is binding on all men for eternity.⁶¹

The Law of Moses was in full force when Jesus gave the Sermon on the Mount and continued to be the church standard for all believers for the first twelve years after Pentecost. Cornelius was the first to be baptized without coming under the ceremonial law. No Gentile could be baptized without coming under circumcision and the Law of Moses for twelve years after Pentecost! Jesus did not liberate his disciples from obeying Moses' Law (Matt 23); but allowed Gentile converts to start being accepted without the ceremonial law and circumcision **after** Peter's vision concerning Cornelius...Do Gentile converts like Cornelius now have to obey God's **moral laws** or are they free from these also? The events of Acts 21 are about 29 years after Pentecost, and we find the believing Jews, including Paul, still being faithful to the Law of Moses — and they continued so until at least AD 70 when Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed. (Emphasis his)⁶²

Judaism was in full force when Jesus spoke these words, and Jesus was a perfect Jew (inwardly and outwardly) so he could be the spotless, sinless lamb to make atonement. In Matt 23 Jesus says that his listeners should obey the Pharisees on matters of "law abiding" because they sit in Moses' seat — this is obviously to Jews as they are the primary ones Jesus preached to while on earth. The Law of Moses was the church standard for every New Testament believer; and this did not change for anyone until Cornelius — 12 years after Pentecost! For the first 12 years after Pentecost all evangelism included circumcision and submission to Moses Law — both moral and ceremonial. This is a very important point that many miss. God had to give Peter a special vision in order for the church to let go of the Ceremonial Law for Gentile converts. In Acts 21 — which is about 29 years after Pentecost — the Jews were still obeying ALL Moses' Law, though they had a New Covenant view of it, and were IN THE NEW COVENANT THEMSELVES. This is not interpretation, but facts of history! (Emphasis his)⁶³

Every convert baptized for the first twelve years after Pentecost was also circumcised and brought under all Moses' Law. The Gentile converts from Cornelius onward were exempted from circumcision and the ceremonial law; but the Jewish believers were still observing Moses' Law until AD 70 when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed and they could not observe the ceremonial law anymore. In Acts 21, which is 29 years after Pentecost (After [sic] the writing of Romans, Galatians, Corinthians and James), we find that all Jewish believers, including Paul, were still observing Moses' Law — **and they were all in the New Covenant and had the same gospel we do.** This is history, not interpretation! After AD 70 the ceremonial law was impossible to observe; but God's morals never change, and so the **moral aspects of the law are still binding, being eternal.** (Emphasis his)⁶⁴

So, "all evangelism included circumcision and submission to Moses' Law," and "Every convert baptized for the first twelve years...was also circumcised and brought under all Moses' Law." How does Bullen know that? Contrary to his assertions, there is no Biblical or historical evidence that the early Jewish Christians required circumcision of Gentile converts before the conversion of Cornelius.

- What a shame that this man continually exposes himself to ridicule by his moronic attacks against the Bible doctrine I teach. He obviously doesn't know what happened with Cornelius and why it was significant. Cornelius was the FIRST Gentile received **without** coming under Judaism – Duh! This means that those before had to! The Samaritans were already practicing a corrupted Judaism and naturally had to straighten out their practice when converted – any true Bible scholar knows these things, folks!

That is because there is no evidence that there *were* any Gentile converts before Cornelius, except those who were *already* proselytes to Judaism (see Acts 6:5).

- Gentiles could at any time become a proselyte to Judaism, and the Christians were all Jews who believed Jesus was the Messiah – SO, if a Gentile wanted to become a Christian, he had to become a Jew – **This is just historic fact folks.**

- At Pentecost there were many Jews from around the World who went back preaching Christ. If any Gentile neighbor wanted Christ, it was understood He was the Messiah of the Jews, and they would become a Jew to follow the Jew's Messiah. Historic FACTS

When we read in Acts 11:18, the reaction of the Jerusalem Christians to the conversion of Cornelius, we see that they were surprised – not that a Gentile became a Christian without being circumcised – but that a Gentile became a Christian at all! “When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.” This shows that the door of salvation had, up to that time, not been opened to Gentiles at all.

- O Pity! A Gentile by definition is someone who is **not under Judaism!** For God to grant repentance to a Gentile meant – **AS** a Gentile – **remaining** a Gentile – This means he was accepted without coming under Judaism. I feel sorry for you as you strive to be the hero of the ismites and you are only setting yourself up for ridicule.
- The Ethiopian Eunuch was a Gentile proselyte to Judaism – now a Jew by religion, he was baptized – no problem – but Cornelius was baptized WHILE STILL A GENTILE, BECAUSE GOD Poured THE SPIRIT UPON HIM AS A GENTILE ---- FIRST TIME SINCE JUDAISM BEGAN!
 - Ruth, Rahab, Uriah the Hittite, and thousands upon thousands of Gentiles became “Jews” by conversion throughout Israel's history – GET acquainted with HISTORY.

Circumcision plus baptism did not make Gentiles into church members before the conversion of Cornelius.

- YES it did! “Circumcision” was a term which included “coming under Judaism”.
- If one is Biblically literate enough to know that “circumcision” was the term used for those who come under Judaism, then you also know that before Cornelius THAT IS WHAT WAS REQUIRED!

Furthermore, to prove that Jews continued to keep the “ceremonial law” following Pentecost is really a small accomplishment. Of course they did! That had not only been part of their religion, but part of their culture and society for centuries (So had the moral law). It was part of who they were. For a Jew to keep observing Passover is like an Amish man to wear suspenders (**What a dunce**). The argument proves nothing regarding the ethics of the covenants – it does not prove that the Christian Jews continued to live by a lower, Mosaic ethic rather than the ethic revealed by Christ.

- Listen to how the apostles refer to their keeping of the Law 29 years after Pentecost
 - Acts 21: 20 And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are **all zealous of the law**: 21 And **they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses**, saying that they ought not to **circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs**. 22 What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. 23 Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; 24 Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their

heads: and **all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law.**

- WHAT LAW ARE WE TALKING ABOUT – JESUS’ SUPPOSED “ANTITHESIS” OR THE “OLD MOSAIC LAW”? We are talking about “forsaking Moses” – can anything be clearer?

■ YOU CAN RUN, BUT YOU CANNOT HIDE!

Finally, the argument is not even entirely true! We know for a fact that Paul, at least, was less “observant” of the “ceremonial law” than Bullen would have us believe. Yes, he generally kept the “ceremonial law,” but he was a bit liberal with it (**dunce again**). As just one example, Paul states in Acts 24:17 that he had been absent from Israel for many years. The Mosaic Law, however, required every adult male to be present in Jerusalem three times a year for Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles (Deuteronomy 16:5-6, 11, 16-17). So we know that Paul was not following the Law in every detail. This refutes Bullen’s assertion that Jewish Christians were *obligated* to observe the “ceremonial law” up until the destruction of the Temple.

- ...and the world was ignorant until you arrived, right? The BIBLE says that Paul kept the Law! Paul says so, James says so – but you know better? What a fella.
- The obligation to appear before the Lord three times a year was for those IN THE LAND where it was possible. Did you know there were Law abiding Jews still living in Babylon and Egypt and all over the Roman Empire? They were Law abiding Jews, but could not come three times in the year to Jerusalem – the city would not even hold them all! The rule was for Israel IN THE LAND.
- Were there faithful Jews in Babylon those 70 years? Yes. Maybe you don’t know what you are talking about???
- Listen to Paul – I Cor. 7:17 But as God hath distributed to every man, **as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk.** And so ordain I in all churches. 18 **Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised.** Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. 19 Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God. 20 **Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.**
 - This clearly means that Jews were to abide as Jews and Gentiles as Gentiles – though both were CHRISTIANS.
 - Acts 15 is very clear to only relieve Gentiles from Judaism – not from Holiness and LOVE
 - Acts 21 is very clear to the same end.

Paul wrote:

To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law (I Corinthians 9:21).

This verse clearly shows us that the Laws of Moses and Christ are two different entities, and that while Paul was not under the former while among Gentiles, he was always under the Law of Christ and bound to obey it. In short, this argument is useless for Bullen's case.

- Not so far, Mr. Confident. Paul is simply saying he is indeed under THE LAW, but under it in regards to the Christian Faith which allowed him to reach out to Gentiles as Peter did for the first time with Cornelius – REMEMBER WHAT PETER SAID.
 - ACTS 10: 28 And he said unto them, Ye **know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation;** but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean. 29 Therefore came I unto you without gainsaying, as soon as I was sent for: I ask therefore for what intent ye have sent for me?
 - Acts 11:2 And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, 3 Saying, **Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them.**
- God had to tell them from heaven that this was OK, as **they had not learned this from Jesus! They were still strictly following Moses' Law as Jews!**
- After this, they could eat and fellowship and evangelize among Gentiles without fearing God's displeasure – **THIS IS WHAT PAUL IS SPEAKING OF.**
- REMEMBER 29 years after Pentecost – James and Paul are still keeping Moses' Law faithfully; and only Gentiles were released from it.

Jerusalem Council

The Jerusalem Council is a very pivotal event in the history of the church. It opened the door for the Gentiles to enter the church without having to submit to the Law of Moses, especially circumcision.

- **Wrong again – what a pity!** I hope you can gain at least a little education from this humbling experience. You should have asked questions and conversed with me before attacking my teaching when you know so little about the Bible.
- PETER'S VISION AND BAPTISM OF CORNELIUS OPENED THE DOOR TO GENTILES APPROXIMATELY 8 OR 9 YEARS BEFORE THIS AD 50 COUNCIL!!
 - Where were you 9 years ago? Long time huh!
 - This council **only confirmed** that open door against the continuing controversy.

Since it is such a key event, I quote here the entire description of the event in Acts 15:1-31:

And certain men which came down from Judaea taught the brethren, *and said*, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question. And being brought on their way by the church, they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: and they caused great joy unto all the brethren. And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and *of* the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them. But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, **and to command them to keep the law of Moses.** And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter.

And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men *and* brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as *he did* unto us; And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they. Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them. And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men *and* brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. 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. For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day. Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; *namely*, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren: And they wrote *letters* by them after this manner; The apostles and elders and brethren *send* greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia: Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, *Ye must* be circumcised, **and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment**: It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, Men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell *you* the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, **to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things**; That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well. So when they were dismissed, they came to Antioch: and when they had gathered the multitude together, they delivered the epistle: *Which* when they had read, they rejoiced for the consolation.

Mark Bullen's understanding of this event is as follows:

The Law of Moses was in full force when Jesus gave the Sermon on the Mount and continued to be the church standard for all believers for the first twelve years after Pentecost. Cornelius was the first to be baptized without coming under the ceremonial law. No Gentile could be baptized without coming under circumcision and the Law of Moses for twelve years after Pentecost! Jesus did not liberate his disciples from obeying Moses' Law (Matt 23); but allowed Gentile converts to start being accepted without the ceremonial law and circumcision **after** Peter's vision concerning Cornelius...Do Gentile converts like Cornelius now have to obey God's **moral laws** or are they free from these also? The events of Acts 21 are about 29 years after Pentecost, and we find the believing Jews, including Paul, still being faithful to the Law of Moses — and they continued so until at least AD 70 when Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed. After reading Acts 21:25 some assume the Gentiles only had to observe "the necessary things" decided on in Acts 15; but these were only "entrance requirements" to be sure the newly converted Gentiles made a clean break with old pagan idolatrous practices. These entrance requirements took the place of the Jewish entrance requirements of circumcision and submission to Moses' Law concerning all the ceremonies, diets, holy days, temple service, etc. The converted Gentiles still had to follow Christ, obey the moral laws of God, obey the apostle's decisions, and obey the local bishop's teaching, etc. All Christians have to obey the "righteousness of the Law" which is also called the Moral Law.

So Mark Bullen teaches that the Jerusalem Council only applied to the "ceremonial law," not to the "moral law," and that the requirements were "only 'entrance requirements'". How well does this argument hold up to scrutiny? **(Very Good as we will see)** First, we must notice that the heresy of the Judaizers was not just that the Gentiles must be circumcised; it is that they taught that the Gentiles must keep the Law of Moses (which Mark Bullen also does). This was the heresy which they were facing, and which the Council decided against. **(poor guy)**

- The Judaizers were bringing Gentiles under Judaism which included the covenantal relationship of the Old Covenant necessary for salvation. YES, the Judaizers were unwilling to accept Peter's vision and Cornelius' baptism.
- BUT, WAS PAUL A JUDAIZER? O NO! Not at all, Yet Listen to Paul.
 - **Romans 2:25** For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. 26 Therefore if the uncircumcision **keep the righteousness of the law**, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? 27 And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, **if it fulfil the law**, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? 28 For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: 29 **But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God. (Col 2:11)**
 - **Romans 3:31** Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, **we establish the law.**
 - **Romans 8:3** For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: 4 **That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.** 5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. 6 For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. 7 **Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.** 8 So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God....13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.14 **For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.**
 - **Romans 13:8** Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: **(obligation!!)** for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. **(fulfillment of obligation)**9 For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there **be any other commandment**, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 10 Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.
 - **What relevance would this have if Ste. Marie was right? NONE – it would actually be inconsistent with Jesus' supposed “antithesis”.**
 - **Deut 24 works NO ILL when done God's way!!**
 - **Protecting the weak against the criminal works NO ILL to society, but works GOOD – Romans 13 says, “minister of God to thee for good.” God's definitions are important!**
 - **James 1:22** But be ye doers of the word (*what is that in the context?*), and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. 23 For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: 24 For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. 25 But whoso looketh into the **perfect law of liberty**, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.
 - **What is he talking about?**

- James 2:8 If ye fulfil the **royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself**, ye do well: 9 But if ye have respect to persons, **ye commit sin**, and are **convinced of the law as transgressors**. 10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law (*who could that be?*), and yet offend in one point, **he is guilty of all**. 11 For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, **thou art become a transgressor of the law**. 12 So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be **judged by the law of liberty**.
- James 4:11 Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but **if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge**. 12 **There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?**

■ Paul and James clearly believe Christians must be fulfilling the Moral Laws of God given through Moses. James says there is ONE LAWGIVER – ONE LAW – LOVE -- Gnostics and their heretical doctrines will end up in Hell!

■ The Law of Liberty, the Royal Law, the Word – all the same thing – Living under God’s moral law with a proper understanding of GRACE in the Gospel leaves us to walk in Liberty! When you look to the law for justification it then becomes condemnation and debt! The opposite of Bible Liberty – free from debt while in Christ.

■ What about JOHN?

- **1Jo 2:3** And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments.
- **1Jo 2:4** He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.
- **1Jo 3:4** Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: **for sin is the transgression of the law....**10 In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, **neither he that loveth not his brother**. 11 For **this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another**. 12 Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and **his brother's righteous....**22 And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we **keep his commandments**, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight.
- **1Jo 3:24** And he that **keepeth his commandments** dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.
- **1Jo 5:2** By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and **keep his commandments**.
- **1Jo 5:3** For this is the love of God, that we **keep his commandments**: and his commandments are not grievous.
- **2Jo 1:5** And now I beseech thee, lady, not as though I wrote a new commandment unto thee, but that which we had **from the beginning, that we love one another**.6 And **this is love, that we walk after his commandments**. This is the commandment, That, as ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it.
- **Re 12:17** And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the **commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ**.

- **Re 14:12** Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that **keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.**
- **Re 22:14** Blessed are they that **do his commandments**, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

■ What about Peter?

- **I Peter 1:22** Seeing ye have purified your souls in **obeying the truth through the Spirit (Romans 8)** unto **unfeigned love of the brethren (Law is LOVE)**, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently **(fulfill the Law)**: 23 Being born again, **not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible**, by the **word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever (God's word is immutable – unchanging – cannot be broken-Jn10:35)** . 24 For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: 25 **But the word of the Lord endureth for ever.** And **this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.**
- **VS. 24** and 25 are quoting the Old Testament prophet Isaiah so the context demands we include the Old Testament Scriptures – “every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God”. It cannot change or be improved or modified in it’s character or intention or moral judgments.
- This is the **SAME** Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you – The **SAME** basic message/gospel preached to those in the Old Testament –
 - **Ga 3:8** And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the **gospel unto Abraham**, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.
 - **Heb 4:2** For unto us was **the gospel preached**, as well as unto them **(Israel)**: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it.
 - **1Pe 4:6** For for this cause was the **gospel preached also to them that are dead**, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.
 - **Re 14:6** And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the **everlasting gospel** to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people,

■ What was the New Covenant?

- **Heb 8:8** 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: 9 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. 10 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:
- In spite of what our Marcionite says, “MY Laws” **MUST** include all those HE had already given – thus all NT believers have God’s Spirit writing God’s laws in our hearts through the ministry of the local bishop who preaches the TRUTH.

It decided to “lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things”. Now, are we to suppose that these are the only moral/ethical requirements for Gentile Christians? Of course not – we know God requires more of us than these four things. Rather, these were the only “necessary things” included in the Law of Moses which the Council decided to transfer to the Gentiles. The entire rest of the Mosaic

Law was not required of the Gentile converts! These four commandments were not, as Mark Bullen claims, “entrance requirements.” An “entrance requirement” is a one-time act, like circumcision or baptism. It is not an ongoing obligation, like the requirement to abstain from fornication.

- **What a fella.** He tells us that Jesus expanded and “raised the bar”; then he says the righteousness of God in the OT is opposite to that of the NT; then says that everything from Moses’ Law **repeated** in the NT is obligatory on Christians, then he tells us that we should preach Moses’ Law to the lost; and now he says that only four commandments are expected from Gentiles; but the **entire rest of the Mosaic Law was not required of the Gentile converts!???** I think his cheese done slipped from his sandwich ☹
- Entrance requirements – yeah, like REPENT – must be maintained and are not a one time act. Is this too hard to understand? The things mentioned were characteristic of pagan idolatrous activity, and they had to separate from that.

These were the only commandments from the Law of Moses required of the Gentiles. All other moral/ethical instruction was to come from the teaching of Christ and the Apostles (**Duh, where did this moral/ethical instruction come from?**). That this is the correct interpretation is confirmed from the words of James, who proposed the solution of the council and thus understood it.

- In order to establish the conclusion at the Council, James quoted the OT Scriptures – knowing that God is immutable, and thus He could make correct judgment calls based on God’s former judgment calls. Listen: Acts 15:15 And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, 16 After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: 17 That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. 18 **Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. 19 Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God:**
- Gentiles were turned to GOD, but didn’t have to come under Judaism – - What then does, “turn to God” mean? Read Romans 2:25-29. They obeyed the holiness of God – II Cor 6:17-7:1.

He told Paul:

Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise *their* children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave *their* heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but *that* thou thyself also **walkest orderly, and keepest the law. As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only** that they keep themselves from *things* offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication (Acts 21:20b- 25).

The Gentiles were not required to observe the Law of Moses, except for four commandments!

- Just because you don’t know what they were talking about, doesn’t mean NOBODY does. It is clear from the study of ALL the WORD that they were speaking about Judaism – being a

Jew outwardly VS being only a Jew inwardly – a Gentile who must still be taught to LOVE, which is what God’s Law was teaching from the beginning of time! **GOD IS LOVE.**

- EVERY PART OF HIS REVELATION TO MAN IS MANIFESTING HIS LOVE as He cannot manifest anything else without destroying His holiness.
- You used to be a *cloaked* Gnostic, but now you have manifested what you are – simply a Gnostic!

Paul and the Ceremonial/Moral Divide

Another of Mark Bullen’s arguments concerns Romans 2:25-29:

For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he *is* a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men, but of God.

Regarding this passage, Bullen writes:

These very arguments which show that New Testament Gentile converts had to obey God’s Moral Law also prove beyond doubt that **there is a difference between the moral and ceremonial aspects of God’s Law**, and, furthermore, that a New Testament Gentile convert could be fulfilling the moral law and be pleasing to God while still considered as an uncircumcised Gentile — not keeping the ceremonial law. So... can it be said that the “uncircumcised” or “man who does not obey the ceremonial law” is at the same time keeping “the righteousness of the law” (moral law)? Yes, the whole point here is that one can keep the moral law and be a Jew inwardly while not keeping the ceremonial law and being a Jew outwardly. Can anything be clearer? This means he was not circumcised, did not obey the dietary laws, washings, temple service, Sabbaths, feasts, etc. The New Covenant Gentile convert had the circumcision of the heart, but not the outward circumcision of the flesh. (Col. 2:11)

To this we reply and repeat: Of course there are some laws in the Mosaic Law which are ceremonial, and some which are moral. However, to use this fact to claim that the Law is divided into two or three separate and distinct entities, which can be split up and obeyed or disobeyed based on where one arbitrarily decides to draw the line, is a huge leap of logic. See again our discussion above for the difficulties of dividing the Mosaic Law into two or three separate entities.

- A huge leap of logic for this guy would be tough, I admit. However, he is conveniently avoiding the issue! This passage **PROVES** that Gentile converts who were grafted into the covenant with Israel **MUST** fulfill the righteousness of the Law and be a Jew inwardly to be acceptable to God! This is the point!
- This proves that there is a simple division which divides the Law in **TWO** - the inward righteousness and the outward Judaism – Is this sooo hard? **FACE IT!** Repent and forsake your Gnostic heresy!

The Righteousness of the Law Fulfilled

The first part of Romans 8 is another passage which Bullen uses to prove his position:

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law

could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded *is* death; but to be spiritually minded *is* life and peace. Because the carnal mind *is* enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his (Romans 8:1-9).

Bullen writes:

Romans 8:4 states that when a New Testament believer walks in the Spirit, they are fulfilling the righteousness or “original intent” of God’s Moral Law through Moses. God’s Moral Law is eternal, and Jesus didn’t change it. (Resist Not Evil Book)

Grammatical construction demands that the goal and purpose of God was to accomplish this task — “That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us” - It was not just an incidental by-product...The word “righteousness of the law” is a phrase that has important doctrinal connotations, and is what refers to the moral law as opposed to the ceremonial law, WHICH IS NOT FULFILLED IN US WHEN WE WALK IN THE SPIRIT. Was Jesus bringing a new and different righteousness than that of God’s Law through Moses and the Prophets???...What are the requirements of the Law???...The law required those who heard the damsel cry out to deliver her! The law required that when there was moral uncleanness in the marriage that the man could write a bill of divorce and put the woman away and when done correctly remarriage was not adultery. The law required that men swear only by God’s name and by no other oath. Did Jesus teach a righteousness different than this?? NO! (2nd Letter to Geiser)

So does Romans 8 really demand that, if “the righteousness of the law” is “fulfilled in us,” we must keep the details of the so-called “moral law” of Moses? Certainly not.

- YOU owe every man LOVE – the details of God’s moral laws teach us HOW to Love God’s way.
- Did Jesus say of the “golden rule” “This is the Law and the Prophets”? -- Then you are to learn the details of this from God’s Laws.

First, notice that the passage is talking about those who are walking after the Spirit. We know from Galatians 5:18 that “if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.” So by definition, those who are the subject of Paul’s discussion in Romans 8 *are not under the Law*.

- Sorry Charlie, missed it again. Galatians is speaking about being under the Law for justification as opposed to Grace, not about being obligated to the righteousness of the Law (LOVE) as we already explained; but will quote it again:
- Gal. 5:4 Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are **justified by the law**; ye are **fallen from grace**. 5 For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness (**justification**) by faith. 6 For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision (**For justification**); but faith which worketh by love (**imputed to us as righteousness**). 7 Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? 8 This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you. 9 A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. 10 I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be. 11 And I, brethren, if I yet **preach circumcision (justification by the law – Judaism)**, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross (**for justification**) ceased. 12 I would they were even cut off which trouble you. 13 For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty (**justification by grace through faith**); only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by **love** serve one another. 14 For **all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou**

shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 15 But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. 16 This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. 17 For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. 18 But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law **(for justification).**

- But those who walk in the Spirit DO fulfill the moral aspects of the Law, which is summed up by Jesus as LOVE to God and man appropriately and defined by God’s revelation of his LOVE in “the law and the prophets”.
- Remember what James said about the Law of liberty? This is the proper view of God’s Law – LOVE – and His commandments are not grievous when we are not trying to be saved by our works, but by faith living in LOVE. YOU cannot take the moral law of God out of the definition and description of LOVE without denying Christ and God’s immutable holiness – and then going to hell.

So what is the passage saying? Romans 8 tells us that the Law was weak through the flesh and could not accomplish the goal of making man righteous (see Romans 7). “What the law could not do” – make man into a righteous being – “God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh” *did* accomplish!

■ **Was the Law the problem? NO, Listen:**

- Rom 7: 7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. 8 But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. 9 For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. 10 And the commandment, **which was ordained to life**, I found to be unto death. 11 For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. 12 Wherefore **the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.** 13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me **by that which is good**; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. 14 **For we know that the law is spiritual:** but I am carnal, sold under sin.
- Now compare this with Romans 8:1-13 and the truth is clear.
- The idea of Mr. Marcionite’s NEW, “fulfilled”, “expanded” “antithesis” to God’s Law is simply not acceptable in this passage or anywhere else.

The New Covenant is able to transform man into a righteous being, so that “the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.” How is this done? It is not done by paying attention to what Moses said and striving to obey him. Rather, it is fulfilled by keeping the fulfilled, extended, and augmented Law of Jesus Christ (**What a nut**). If we never lust (according to the Law of Christ), we will never commit adultery (forbidden by Moses). If we do not resist evil (according to the Law of Christ), then we will never have to worry about exacting too much punishment from an offender (regulated by Moses). In fact, the Greek word for “fulfilled” in Romans 8 is the same Greek word as used by Jesus in Matthew 5 – He came to *fulfill* the Law. See our discussion above for a discussion of the word “fulfilled.” Put some of those meanings into Romans 8, and you will get an idea of how the righteousness of the Law can be fulfilled in us.

- What a mess. By setting yourself up as a teacher, you are bringing “the greater condemnation upon yourself” as you are twisting, wresting and abusing God’s Word like no other I’ve seen.
- Your definition of “fulfilled”, “extended”, and “augmented” is an “antithesis” to God’s holy and spiritual Law! What is the **opposite** of that which is “**holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good**”? What is the **antithesis of the “golden rule”**? What is the antithesis? SIN! Transgression and destruction of God’s Law – not the fulfillment of it.
 - **Lusting is forbidden by Moses too – Thou shalt not covet**
 - **Self vengeance is forbidden by Moses too** – This is what the apostles quoted to teach the subject – **Romans 12:19-20**
- HOW COULD THE ANTITHESIS OF GOD’S LAW BEING PRESENTED MAKE US FULFILL THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD’S LAW??? This is **moronic**, folks.
- How could even a higher standard presented to the same people who couldn’t keep the lower standard cause them to fulfill the righteousness of the lower standard or the higher one?
- How could the Spirit that inspired God’s Law dwelling within us cause us to fulfill the anti-thesis to God’s Law?
- The righteousness of God’s Law through Moses – the context demands this – is able to be fulfilled in us:
 - 1. Because we are under Grace and not under the law for justification – as that would leave us condemned by ONE sin and not able to get up and grow. Instead we can grow in grace.
 - Romans 6:14 For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace (**for justification**). 15 What then? shall we sin (**transgression of the law**), because we are not under the law, but under grace (**for justification**)? God forbid. 16 Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin (**transgression of the law**) unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?
 - 2. Because God’s indwelling Holy Spirit that inspired God’s Law to begin with helps us see and appreciate the Spirit of the Law, which is LOVE, and with the Spirit putting God’s Love in our hearts, we are empowered, if we cooperate, to fulfill the righteousness of God’s Law, which is LOVE to God and man.

We Establish the Law

Paul wrote: “Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law” (Romans 3:31). Regarding this verse, Bullen writes:

How does faith establish the law? The Ceremonial Law taught us about Christ’s atonement, and when we believe in Him, we are establishing the truth of what the law foreshadowed. God’s eternal Moral Law is established by those who believe in him and take his prescription for living — holiness — the law of love. Salvation by faith also establishes the righteousness of the Law by confessing our guilt and just condemnation

for not keeping the Law perfectly; by confessing we need a Savior to redeem us; and thereby confessing, “God was right, we were wrong, and our humble submission now is reasonable service.”⁷⁰

Paul’s statement that he “established the law” is hardly evidence that Christians need to submit to the details of the “moral law” of Moses today. Rather, Paul was establishing the Law because he showed that it was a true, valid revelation from God, but not something in which justification could be found (I wish everyone could see how much ignorance is in this statement). In fact, he derived his arguments in the next chapter (Romans 4) from the Law! This verse proves nothing regarding the relative ethical standards of the two covenants.

Michael Lewis put it very well:

When we come to faith in Christ we are doing precisely what the Law was intended to bring about. The Law of Moses was to lead us to Christ so that we may be justified by faith. Having done exactly what the Law intended we obviously establish the Law calling it good and holy even if we no longer obey it. Obedience to the Law was not the point of the Law, rather that it would multiply sin showing that...no one could keep the Law thereby leading us to Christ.⁷¹

- “God gave the Law just to show us we could not obey it” – anyone who believes that only shows how ignorant they are of the Old Testament and New Testament Scriptures. This is shameful! According to Jesus (as you teach), “we shouldn’t have obeyed the law anyway” - right? So the Law that Ste. Marie says was “suited to their hard hearts” was just to show they couldn’t obey it?? So, how was it suited? So why not just give them the “expanded” Law? Wouldn’t that have even shown better that they couldn’t obey it?? Did Jesus give us to “expanded law” to show us we could not obey it – or are we justified by obeying it? Is the “expanded law” NOT suited to us, is that why we **can** obey it? These guys are babbling fools devoid of Bible knowledge.
- **Obedience to the Law was not the point of the Law** – HA! Have you EVER read the Old Testament?
- HOW can the Law lead us to the teacher of the ANTITHESIS of the Law?
- God **did** expect people to obey His laws and they could, which is proven by..
 - The Bible declares that some did
 - The Bible declares that God commands men to obey it and is angry when they don’t and punishes them when they don’t.
 - God promises blessings to those who obey, and many received those blessings for obeying God’s Laws.
 - YOU **can** honor your parents, be a faithful witness, not commit adultery, etc. – and many lived a holy and upright life.
 - NONE of this is in conflict with that fact that nobody can offer to God a perfect **record as earning heaven** as a **debt** God owes by their obedience in the NT or the OT. We are not speaking of sinless perfection; but of a life characterized by loving obedience – THIS IS ALL WE CAN OFFER IN THE NT AS WELL! Grace means we do our best and God accepts this faith and imputes it to us for righteousness by Christ’s atonement and priesthood.
- To call the Law good and right and holy – “even though we no longer obey it” – IS STUPID when we are speaking of moral precepts –“Jas 4:17 Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.”

- **Mt 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.**
 - **DID JESUS EXPECT MEN TO OBEY THAT?? DO WE HAVE TO OBEY THAT? THEN HOW CAN YOU SAY WE DON'T HAVE TO OBEY THE LAW – “THIS IS THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS”** That can ONLY mean that all the precepts of the Law TEACH US HOW TO DO THIS.
 - Jesus’ teaching CANNOT be an antithesis to **this** or He is **not** the Son of **God!**

Definition of Sin

The Apostle John wrote: “Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law” (I John 3:4). Bullen comments:

If we can still SIN while we are under Grace, and SIN is the transgression of the Law (I John 3:4); then we are still under obligation to God’s Moral Law while under Grace.⁷²

However, Bullen himself provides an excellent counter-explanation of this verse:

Sin has to do with the violation of God’s Law from whatever source you have received it — either from Moses, a prophet, John the Baptist, the Lord Jesus, an apostle, or your God given conscience. The Scriptures which manifest God’s moral judgments and opinions are to us a law, and to disobey the Scriptural revelation of God’s will and way is SIN.⁷³

What John is saying is very simple: Sin is transgressing Law! Bullen’s argument reaches too far. He could just as well be referring to the law of Christ (Galatians 6:2) as the Law of Moses!

- What a pity!
- First, my two statements are perfectly consistent, because we are talking about the violations of the revelations of an unchanging God! ALL GOD’S WORD is to us a plumb line for moral obligation – Moses’ Law is as much a part as any other part of God’s Word to man. His moral judgments are immutable, because His moral Character and viewpoint is unchanging. This is Christianity 101, and if you don’t accept this, then you are a non-Christian cultist.
- Did John mean “Law” or “the Law”? Did Peter sin when he transgressed the law of the Sanhedrin that said, “speak no more in the name of Jesus”? NO. Sin is transgressing GOD’S LAW – THE LAW. Follow the context in John’s letters:
 - 1: 1 That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the **Word of life**;
 - 2:3 And hereby we do know that we know him, if we **keep his commandments**. 4 He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not **his commandments**, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. 5 But whoso **keepeth his word**, in him verily is the **love of God perfected**: hereby know we that we are in him. (**Love fulfills the Law- remember?**)
 - 3: 4 Whosoever committeth **sin** transgresseth also **the law**: for **sin is the transgression of the law**. 5 And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.

- **Remember James 2:8** If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well: 9 But if ye have respect to persons, **ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.** 10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. 11 For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of **the law.**
 - **SIN is still the transgression of God’s moral laws.**
- SIN is the transgression of God’s Law – Jesus came to make atonement and deliver us from the condemnation of God’s Law – not just any law. “He was wounded for our transgressions” --- OF WHAT?
- Paul had not known sin, but by **THE LAW**, and SIN is the transgression of God’s Moral Law.
- NOTICE how **I** say, “the Law of God” and **he** insists on saying “the Law of Moses” in contrast to the Law of Christ; but Christ **is** God, Christ **is** the WORD, Christ **is** the author of “Moses’ Law”. What a deceiver this guy is!
- IF the golden rule IS the Law, then EVERY part of the “Law of Christ” is the Law too! Christ is the WORD who inspired the OT Laws, and He is the SAME YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND FOREVER! LOVE fulfills both the OT Law and the Law of Christ, because there is NO difference in the moral character or person who gave both laws – They are the same!
- Romans 8 says that carnal mind cannot please God, because it is not subject to HIS LAW.
- NOWHERE do the apostles teach that Jesus changed God’s moral standards.

Case Studies on Specific Ethical Issues

We have now demonstrated and shown from the Scriptures that there is a distinct difference between the ethical standards in the Mosaic and the New Covenants (**You failed**). However, we have not yet delved deeply into the main subjects of contention between Mark Bullen and the Anabaptists – namely, divorce and remarriage (The true Anabaptists agreed with me), nonresistance and nonparticipation in civil government, and the swearing of oaths. We will here delve into these issues and examine what the Scriptures teach.

Divorce and Also Remarriage

Brief Position Statement – Andrew Ste. Marie

God originally designed marriage to be between one man and one woman, with no separation, for any reason, ever. Sin entered the world, and sinful man invented an escape from the duties of marriage known as divorce, and an opportunity for man to remarry after divorcing his first wife and destroying his first family. Because of the hardness of their hearts, God through Moses gave a limited allowance to the Israelites for divorce and remarriage in the Old Covenant. Jesus revealed the cause of this allowance, and He restricted this “right,” restoring marriage to God’s original intent. Under the New Covenant, a man may divorce his wife if she persists in adultery; however, remarriage is never given as an option in the New Testament.

- What a dreamer. If God's original design for marriage was one man and one woman [with no separation, for any reason, ever](#). Then if Jesus [restricted this "right,"](#) He **did not** restore [God's original intent](#). Can't YOU SEE THIS?? A restriction and a complete repeal are not the same. You speak in circles with no logical connection and expect others to overlook your deception?
- YOU are an unbeliever when it comes to God's view and Jesus' view of the Law; because you are too stubborn in defending your [ism idolatry](#) – What was God's view and Jesus' view of the Law?
 - Mt 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.
 - LOVE fulfills the Law and the end of the Law is charity out of a pure heart.....
 - These principles stated numerous times in the Bible, especially in the NT, prove your view of the Law to be heretical.
 - Your [ism](#) falls flat when God's view of His Law is adopted; because we see the Laws – all of them – as remedial precepts for the maintenance of godliness in society. With this view of God's Law, which is the Biblical view, your whole case is destroyed.

[If a man or woman finds him/herself divorced or abandoned, the only two options, according to the New Testament, are to remain unmarried or be reconciled.](#) (This had to do only with two believers, and ignores the time when reconciliation may be impossible)

[Brief Position Statement – Mark Bullen](#)

The Jews understood that according to God's Law a lawful divorce meant you could lawfully remarry, and that is why the question was about what constituted lawful divorce. Jesus simply told them that remarriage after an unlawful divorce was an act of adultery in unlawfully breaking a marriage covenant and establishing another. He interpreted Deut. 24 as referring to some sort of immorality, not just any cause. Jesus never said anything contrary to His own inspired Word, so we can understand all the issues that Jesus didn't cover by referring back to JESUS in His inspired Word in the OT. Paul does this very thing in I Cor. 7 and also in Romans 7, though in Romans he is only using marriage as an example. In I Cor. 7 he clearly states that the wife is bound by the LAW to her husband in the NT. Jesus is doing exactly what Malachi said He would do which was consistent with Moses' Law. So anything that legitimately broke the marriage covenant according to the Word of God would leave a person eligible for marriage again.⁷⁴

[Introduction](#)

[The issue of divorce and remarriage is clearly quite important to Mark Bullen; he wrote an entire book on the topic.](#)⁷⁵

- This is a subtle slam toward me; but the reason it is so important to me and JESUS is because there are jerks in the world who abuse God's Word in this area which can greatly damage the innocent victims. When churches tell repentant seeking souls who are trying to walk the narrow path after a past of sin they are met with a devastating blow. I've seen many! They are humble repentant sinners with a string of little children. They are coming out of mainline denominational apostasy and trying to find a godly congregation for their family. When they come to the Mennonites they are often asked **in the first conversation** if either of them has had a previous marriage. If they have, then they are told they are living in

adultery and must break up their home – the worse blow they could receive. IT IS THE DEVIL’S WILL AND NOT GOD’S FOR THEM TO BREAK UP THEIR HOME!

Given these positions, we will delve into the Scriptures regarding divorce and remarriage. My section heading may seem awkward, but I made it so on purpose to highlight something about which there is a persistent misconception – namely, the ethics of remarriage are often confused with those of divorce. The two are spoken of in the same breath as if to legitimize one is to allow the other. However, divorce and remarriage are two different acts, and an allowance of divorce is not necessarily an allowance of remarriage. The right to remarry must never be assumed.

- The privilege of remarrying once the obligations to the first covenant or over is not assumed, but clearly stated in the Word of God.

Personal Note to Mark Bullen

Dear Mark,

You accuse modern Mennonites of pride, ignorance, and lack of compassion in their treatment of the divorced and remarried. You cannot accuse me of such. To me, divorced and remarried people are not a doctrine, an intellectual debate, or a hobby horse. To me, divorced and remarried couples are real people – people I know, have known, and love – even many in my own extended family. I care deeply about this issue and the people involved. With that prelude, let us begin.

Andrew Ste. Marie

- Dear Ste. Marie, your statement or your feelings do not deliver you from the same pride and ignorance concerning this situation. You have displayed more pride and ignorance in this treatise than I have ever seen in one place. With all your concern, you do the same thing to these people as the Mennonites do – contrary to God’s Word.

The Old Testament on Divorce and Remarriage

Originally, God made marriage to be absolutely permanent, with no reason for separation, ever, period.

Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh (Genesis 2:24).

Later in earth’s history, men in wickedness invented a way out of keeping their marital bonds, and a way to start over with a new woman (or man) after failing. We call this divorce and remarriage. The King James Bible normally calls divorce “putting away.” Because of the hardness of their hearts, God gave a limited concession to this wickedness in the Mosaic Law.

- So, wicked men violated God’s Command, so God compromised and allowed them to keep doing it, and actually called it righteousness, LOVE, and holiness for 1500 years!?????
- So Shameful!
- Those same hard hearts have **always** existed since the fall and exist just the same today – and one of the most important principles of Scripture is “GOD IS NO RESPECTER OF PERSONS” HE IS THE “JUST ONE”. In HIM is light and no darkness at all!!
- What an insult to God when they slander Him thus! Ste. Marie states that this same hardness of heart was in Jesus’ own disciples; but yet He gave a different Law – go figure.

While Bullen – and most other expositors – focus on Deuteronomy 24:1-4 as the premier Mosaic passage on divorce, he has ignored another passage which gave an even more liberal allowance for divorce under certain circumstances.

■ **READ MY BOOK!** I went through each of these passages.

When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the LORD thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive, And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife; Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife. **And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will;** but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her (Deuteronomy 21:10-14).

So in the case of a prisoner-of-war turned wife, a man was simply allowed to let her leave his house, if for any reason he “have no delight in her.” This is an extremely liberal allowance for divorce, although only in the case of a captive bride.

■ You are without excuse **IF** you really read my writings, as you said. **NONE** of these transactions were without the **oversight of city judges and elders** who were commanded to judge righteously and with God’s judgment. My books teach this! Did you read them?

■ “Letting her go” does not mean they didn’t use the bill of divorce and have a legitimate reason for “having no delight” in her. Abuse of these laws was supposed to be punished by the judges God set up. Because of your pride, you continually assume the worst about God’s Law and God’s people. If the **END** of the commandment was charity out of a pure heart, etc. **AND LOVE** fulfills the Law, etc. etc. **YOU** should by God’s own testimony assume these precepts were for the intentions God **SAID!** A law that was intended for the maintenance of a godly society when used for any other purpose is an **ABUSE** of that Law and not a **FAULT** of that Law. The Jews abused God’s Laws **IF EVER** they used them for selfish ends and not for the ends God created them for! **GOD is LOVE** and cannot make Laws contrary to His own nature, goals, intentions, etc. ...without ceasing to be holy!

Deuteronomy 24:1-4 is the main Mosaic passage on divorce and remarriage (quoted here from Young’s Literal Translation):

When a man doth take a wife, and hath married her, and it hath been, if she doth not find grace in his eyes (for he hath found in her nakedness of anything), and he hath written for her a writing of divorce, and given *it* into her hand, and sent her out of his house, and she hath gone out of his house, and hath gone and been another man’s, and the latter man hath hated her, and written for her a writing of divorce, and given *it* into her hand, and sent her out of his house, or when the latter man dieth, who hath taken her to himself for a wife: Her former husband who sent her away is not able to turn back to take her to be to him for a wife, after that she hath become defiled; for an abomination it *is* before Jehovah, and thou dost not cause the land to sin which Jehovah thy God is giving to thee—an inheritance.

So according to this passage, there is a limited permission for a man to divorce his wife using proper legal procedure if he has “found in her nakedness of anything”. This woman may then remarry; but she may never return to her first husband after she has been remarried, for this would be an abomination before God. Even having made this limited permission for divorce and remarriage, God clearly proclaimed his hatred of divorce through the prophet Malachi:

And this have ye done again, covering the altar of the LORD with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, insomuch that he regardeth not the offering any more, or receiveth *it* with good will at your hand. Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because the LORD hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet *is* she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And

wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth. For the LORD, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away: for *one* covereth violence with his garment, saith the LORD of hosts: therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously (Malachi 2:13-16).

- OK Bozo, Was God hating his LAW? Or, was God hating the ABUSE of HIS LAW?
 - Mal 2:7 For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the LORD of hosts. 8 But **ye are departed out of the way**; ye have **caused many to stumble at the law**; ye have **corrupted the covenant of Levi**, saith the LORD of hosts. 9 Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as **ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law...** 11 Judah hath dealt treacherously, and an abomination is committed in Israel and in Jerusalem; for **Judah hath profaned the holiness of the LORD which he love**.
- Ste. Marie KNOWS THIS, because he read it in my books – so why is he trying to sell something else? Because he is not sincere; but a Gnostic deceiver.

The New Testament Texts

Mark Bullen, led by his central assumption that the morality and ethics of the two covenants are the same (SAME GOD), has to try to reconcile the New Testament texts on divorce with the Old Testament texts to find one system of morality. If we reject that assumption, however, we are free to follow the evidence where it leads – even if that means that we come to the conclusion that Jesus changed the rules regarding divorce.

Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from *her* husband committeth adultery (Luke 16:18).

Just one verse, seemingly dropped in with no extended context – but what a revolutionary verse! All of a sudden, *whosoever* divorces his wife and remarries is an adulterer! This verse gives no exception and no allowances for extenuating circumstances; the remarried man is an adulterer.

- Luke 16:17 happens to say: “it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” Which is the POINT of the next statement AND the story afterwards.
- The Scriptures were never meant to be read and interpreted by fools. Even Tertullian could see clearly by studying the WHOLE chapter that Jesus was speaking consistent with MOSES and therefore saying, “whoever puts away his wife for the **express reason** of marrying another, commits adultery” – this is the **abuse** of Gods’ Law. BUT, you say, how can we know this?? Glad you asked. Jesus made this statement based on his previous conversations with the Jews on the subject, and then gave an illustration – The rich man and Lazarus – in the very next verses! YES, and as the rich man cried for someone to witness to his brethren on earth – which would represent these Jews Jesus was preaching to – the rich man is told “They have MOSES and the PROPHETS let them hear them”. Then when he cries for someone to go unto them from the dead, he is told “if they hear not MOSES and the PROPHETS neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead”. JESUS COULD NOT SAY THIS IF HE WERE NOT HIMSELF LISTENING TO MOSES AND THE PROPHETS. On the contrary Jesus was **known** for preaching MOSES and the PROPHETS – MT 7:12!

Furthermore – and this goes far beyond the Law of Moses – the man, even if himself free to marry (as a virgin or widower), who marries a divorced woman, is an adulterer!

- Intelligent students of Scripture know that the marriage to the divorced woman is in the context of this particular transaction and not any divorced woman anywhere for any reason.

The Law of Moses allowed men to marry divorced women, but Jesus makes no allowance for such *ever* in His ministry. In fact, He calls it adultery. The Pharisees, on one or more occasions, came and asked Jesus about His teaching regarding divorce. In Mark 10:1-12, we read:

And he arose from thence, and cometh into the coasts of Judaea by the farther side of Jordan: and the people resort unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again. And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away *his* wife? tempting him. And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put *her* away. And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same *matter*. And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

Notice that the Pharisees were “tempting him” – they probably wanted, as on other occasions, to trick Jesus into saying something which they could use against Him. Jesus saw through their hypocrisy, and asked them what Moses had commanded. “Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put *her* away.” Jesus then gives His teaching, which certainly had some high shock value – that allowance was made only because of the hardness of the hearts of the Jews. That was not God’s original intent for marriage. Let not man separate what God has joined. That was the end of His teaching to the Pharisees on this occasion; but later, in the house, his disciples asked Him for more details, and He told them some more: The man who divorces his wife and remarries is an adulterer. Likewise, the woman who divorces her husband and remarries is an adulterer.

- There is a built-in exception clause in this passage which makes it perfectly fit every other teaching on the subject. Listen close: IT is impossible for me to commit adultery against my wife in divorcing her and remarrying **unless** she is innocent and undeserving of the divorce. If she had already committed some immoral act that justified me putting her away, then my doing so is not committing adultery against her, as adultery in Scriptural usage is the unlawful breaking of a marriage covenant. The marriage to another woman **was not** adultery according to God’s Word; but the unlawful violation of a marriage covenant WAS.
- The obvious import is then – that putting away an innocent wife or husband for the purpose of marrying another is adultery and an abuse of Gods’ precepts.
- This is what God rebuked them for in Malachi, calling it adultery and “dealing treacherously” against the bride of their youth. In the same book God says that the Messiah will preach against such and bring the people BACK to God’s Law. If you are a believer, then you believe that this is what Jesus did – because JESUS INSPIRED MALACHI’S PROPHECY ABOUT HIMSELF!

The Exception Clause

Of course, Jesus *did* give the famous “exception clause.” Two versions of the exception clause are given in two separate passages, in two different forms, in the book of Matthew. These shed more light on Jesus’ teaching on divorce. The first is found in the Sermon on the Mount.

It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery (Matthew 5:31-32).

Jesus contrasts the teaching of Moses with His own teaching.

- Ste. Marie must begin with this assumption or he cannot propagate his deception.

Since the exception clause is an exception, let us look at the first part of His teaching without it, and see what Jesus says about the non-exceptional case, when the clause does not apply: “whosoever shall put away his wife causeth her to commit adultery.” Thus, not only is the divorced and remarried man an adulterer, but even the man who divorces his wife is said to be *the cause of his wife’s adultery*. Thus, a man who divorces his wife is held responsible for her future, adulterous, remarriage. Furthermore, the man who marries a divorced woman is once again said to be an adulterer. So what of the exception clause? Well, remember again what the passage says without the exception – the man who divorces his wife is guilty of his wife’s adultery. Thus, when the exception clause *does* apply, he is *not* guilty of his wife’s adultery should she remarry. This makes perfect sense, because if she is in unrepentant fornication/adultery,⁷⁶ she is already an adulteress, and thus, if her husband divorces her for that cause, he has not caused her adultery.

- Jesus is speaking to Jews bound to obey Moses Law – JESUS tells them as much in *Mt 23:1* *Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, 2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: 3 All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.*
- Moses Law clearly gave the remedial precept for divorce and remarriage under certain circumstances. The abuse of this law would be a man putting away an innocent woman which left them both bound to reconcile and not free to break the covenant they were in. Breaking this covenant unlawfully was “man putting asunder what God had joined”. Breaking this covenant unlawfully was committing adultery through legal loopholes – the abuse of the Law.
- When the covenant was broken by an unlawful bill of divorce – neither were free to remarry in principle but legally the wife was able to do so – But Jesus tells them that this marriage was adulterous (It actually was the breaking point of the covenant) and it was the husband’s fault this happened. **JESUS IS NOT TEACHING CONTRARY TO THE LAW; BUT AGAINST THE ABUSE OF THE LAW.**

Thus we see that in the Sermon on the Mount, an exception is given for a husband to divorce his wife because of her adultery. If he does so, he is not guilty of causing her to commit adultery.

- Hey, what about Jesus “restoring marriage to God’s original intent.” It hasn’t been that long ago that you said, “God originally designed marriage to be between one man and one woman, with no separation, for any reason, ever.”
- Can’t you be consistent for even one section and one topic? You contradict yourself regularly and just go on your way?? Have you no fear of God?

Note that remarriage is not mentioned, so we cannot use this text to support remarriage after divorce – not even the exceptional divorce which Jesus sanctions. Clearly, this exception clause would also allow a man to escape marriages which are themselves forms of fornication, and thus forbidden by God – for instance, polygamy, incestuous marriages, or remarriages following divorce.

- Where is polygamy and remarriage forbidden by God as forms of fornication?? Do you really read your Bible or just write for the ism?

Let us summarize what we have learned so far before going on to the final teaching of Jesus regarding divorce.

1. For a man to divorce and remarry is adultery. We didn't learn this without the exceptions
2. If a man divorces his wife, he is guilty of her future adultery in the case of her remarriage. With exceptions
3. For a woman to divorce and remarry is adultery. With exceptions
4. For a man to marry a divorced woman is adultery. With exceptions
5. If a man divorces his wife because she is an adulteress, he is guiltless of the sin of causing her to commit adultery. Correct
6. There is no allowance given for a woman to divorce her husband. What about MARK 10:12 "... And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery." In the same breath as the law to the husband --- Where is the difference? There is no difference in the two statements in Mark, and in Moses' Law a woman could appeal to the authorities under certain situations for divorce.

The other occasion on which the "exception clause" was given is recorded in Matthew 19. The Pharisees had again come to Jesus questioning him about divorce. While the incident is similar to that in Mark 10, there are significant differences (only in circumstances – not precepts – Jesus was not a politician or ismite), and it was almost certainly a separate event.

The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made *them* at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except *it be* for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with *his* wife, it is not good to marry. But he said unto them, All *men* cannot receive this saying, save *they* to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from *their* mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive *it*, let him receive *it* (Matthew 19:3-12).

In this passage, once again, the Pharisees came testing Jesus with a question about divorce. Notice that this time, they do not ask whether it is lawful for a man to divorce his wife, but whether it was lawful to put her away *for every cause*. This time, Jesus immediately brings forward the Genesis passage (Moses' Law), pointing out the primacy of God's original plan for marriage (Moses' Law). He finished His answer exactly where He finished it in the Mark passage – what God has joined together (Moses' Law), let not man separate (Abuse of Moses' Law). The Pharisees were probably flabbergasted by this radical teaching, and asked, "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" It probably shocked them – as it does some today – to think that God would have allowed Moses to command something which was not His perfect will. Jesus replied, "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away..." Wait right there! Notice the difference in

perspectives – the Pharisees claimed that Moses *commanded* to give a writing of divorcement; Jesus said Moses *suffered* (allowed) divorce. Big difference!

- YES, the difference is that God’s command for marriage in Genesis and God’s remedial precept for man’s failures are different for different NEEDS and PURPOSES! God never “suffers” **sin** as a remedial precept in His Law! Sin is always the transgression of God’s Law. Again, this man is simply an unbeliever when it comes to God’s view of His own law expressed through Jesus, the apostles and the Scriptures as a whole – That God’s Law was always LOVE to God and man; is fulfilled by LOVE; and IS the golden rule, etc. Ste. Marie does not believe this. He CAN’T and still save the ism.
- “Not His perfect will” is deceptive. Was it originally God’s will for man to die? NO. After man sinned was it God’s will for man to die? YES – This is not a change in God, but the circumstances. Divorce and Remarriage ARE God’s will IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES; but NOT God’s original design or will for ANY marriage.

Again, Jesus points out that this allowance was given due to the hardness of the Israelites’ hearts, but it was not that way from the beginning. Then He gives His own ethical guidelines for divorce, this time including the exception clause: (is this for hard hearts? It is not the same as the original and Jesus is speaking to the same people who received the law)

“Whosoever shall put away his wife, except *it be* for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.”

Note again that only husbands are addressed. This is the only New Testament verse where the proponents of remarriage could possibly have a legitimate case. Mark Bullen and other proponents of remarriage say that the exception clause, which in this case is placed between “Whosoever shall put away his wife” and “shall marry another,” refers to both the preceding and succeeding clauses. In other words, if a man divorces and remarries, he commits adultery, unless his divorce has been for the cause of fornication. In that case, his remarriage is said to be permissible. However, this explanation meets with a number of problems.⁷⁷ According to Greek scholar Finny Kuruvilla:

According to the customs of Greek syntax, the positioning of the exception clause after the first verb (“divorce”) strongly implies that it is modifying only the first verb and not the combined pair (“divorce” and “marries another”). This represents how native Greek speakers of the early church understood the construction. This understanding is corroborated by the statements in Mark and Luke, and...by Paul’s understanding of Jesus’ teaching. By way of analogy, consider the following sentence: “Whoever captures endangered animals, except for approved scientific tracking, and sells them, breaks the law.” The “except for approved scientific tracking” modifies “captures endangered animals” and not “sells them.” Similarly, the exception clause (“except for *porneia*”) modifies the verb “divorce” and does not modify both verbs together. Thus even if a legitimate [sic] divorce occurs due to *porneia*, remarriage is still not allowed by the exception clause.⁷⁸

- Did you know the Mormon, JW’s, Catholics, and all cultists have their own “Greek Scholars”?
- What kind of Greek Scholar is this? The example he gives defeats his phony scholarship. PAY ATTENTION: Is it EVER Lawful to **sell** endangered animals captured for approved scientific tracking? That question is not answered for us, but in either case he defeats his own premise and reveals his sinister motives. Listen close:

- **If** we are speaking of selling to a science lab or zoo for scientific purposes which is legal, then the exception clause which tells us the reason for the capture **automatically modifies** the **guilt** or **innocence** of the **seller** as well. That is what an exception clause does!
- **But, If** the context of the statement regards the sell of such animals as **unlawful in either case**, then the **exception clause is illegitimate and means absolutely nothing, because there is no exception**; – because the sentence without it is: *“Whoever captures endangered animals and sells them breaks the law”*; and **if there is no exception to this, then no exception clause is legitimate**. Then the truth would be *“Whoever captures endangered animals, even if for approved scientific tracking, and sells them, breaks the law.”*
- **ALERT: THIS is how they want to use the exception clause in Matthew**; but that would actually make the exception clause Jesus used *illegitimate* and the **interpretation would be the exact opposite of what Jesus said!**
- So what these guys want is for Jesus to be saying, “Whosoever shall put away his wife, **even if it be for fornication**, and marries another, committeth adultery:” That is what they believe! They want the interpretation of Jesus’ Words to be the exact **OPPOSITE** of what He actually said.
 - “Whosoever shall put away his wife, **except it be** for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery:”
 - **IS THE OPPOSITE OF**
 - “Whosoever shall put away his wife, **even if it be** for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery:”
 - What sense does “whosoever puts away his wife, except it be for fornication” mean??? It means **nothing** without the conclusion (commits adultery), and the conclusion **is not even true** without the second phrase – “and marries another”. Ste. Marie doesn’t believe, ““Whosoever shall put away his wife, except *it be* for fornication, committeth adultery:” ...But why else would we be modifying the first clause, except to avoid the conclusion – committeth adultery? The only way for the second marriage to avoid the charge of adultery is to modify the cause for divorce, which is what Jesus is doing!
- NO matter where you put an exception clause in a sentence, it modifies the entire sentence:
 - “Whosoever shall put away his wife, **except it be for fornication**, and shall marry another, committeth adultery:”
 - “**Except it be for fornication**, whosoever shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery:”

- “Whosoever shall put away his wife and shall marry another, **except it be for fornication**, committeth adultery:”

It all means the same thing in English or Greek – The Greek Scholars who translated the Scriptures knew this.

■ Did Paul understand Jesus this way?

- I Cor. 7:27 Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed (*by divorce, not death*). Art thou loosed from a wife (*SAME reasons*)? seek not a wife. 28 **But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned;**

■ Did “native Greek speakers” understand Jesus this way?

The oldest translation of the Greek NT is the Peshitta – the Syriac Bible. *Syriac (Aramaic)* was the language Jesus actually spoke – it was the “*Hebrew*” of the day. It makes sense that the first translation would be into this local common language. Scholars believe the translation was second century. Here are three translations of the Peshitta into English by three different Scholars:

- *Matthew 19:9 - And I say to you that whosoever shall forsake his wife who is not adulterous, and take another, committeth adultery; and whosoever taketh the deserted one, committeth adultery*
- *Matthew 19:9 - And I say to you, That whoever leaveth his wife not being an adulteress, and taketh another, committeth adultery. And whoever taketh her that is divorced, committeth adultery.*
- *Matthew 19:9 - But I say to you, Whoever leaves his wife without a charge of adultery and marries another commits adultery; and he who marries a woman thus separated commits adultery.*

Obviously Jesus is preaching against the abuse of His Law, not changing it

- The ones who were against remarriage are those who propagated the spirit of anti-Christ which was prophesied as “Forbidding to marry”, and led to the celibate priest and nuns; but these men were also over 100 years removed from Christ and taught other major heresies. They taught that it was adulterous for a widower to remarry! Even then, Tertullian, who was biased against remarriage due to the spirit of the age, could see that Jesus wasn’t giving an antithesis to Moses Law – Marcion taught that! Tertullian against Marcion: *“But, observe, if this Christ be yours when he teaches contrary to Moses and the Creator, on the same principle must He be mine if I can show that His teaching is not contrary to them. I maintain, then, that there was a condition in the prohibition which he now made of divorce; the case supposed being, that a man put away his wife for the express purpose of marrying another. His words are: “Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, also committeth adultery,” -- “put away,” that is, for the reason wherefore a woman ought not to be dismissed, that another wife may be obtained. For he who marries a woman who is unlawfully put away is as much of an adulterer as the man*

who marries one who is undivorced. Permanent is the marriage which is not rightly dissolved; to marry, therefore, whilst matrimony is undissolved, is to commit adultery. Since, therefore, His prohibition of divorce was a conditional one, He did not prohibit absolutely; and what He did not absolutely forbid, that He permitted on some occasions, when there is an absence of the cause why He gave the prohibition. In very deed His teaching is not contrary to Moses, whose precept he partially defends, I will not say confirms. If, however, you deny that divorce is in any way permitted by Christ, how is it that you on your side destroy marriage, not uniting man and woman, nor admitting to the sacrament of baptism and of the eucharist those who have been united in marriage anywhere else, unless they should agree together to repudiate the fruit of their marriage, and so the very Creator Himself? Well, then, what is a husband to do in your sect, if his wife commit adultery? Shall he keep her? But your own apostle, you know, does not permit "the members of Christ to be joined to a harlot." Divorce, therefore, when justly deserved, has even in Christ a defender. So that Moses for the future must be considered as being confirmed by Him, since he allows divorce in the same sense as Christ does, if any unchastity should occur in the wife.

- All the early church writers, except Marcionites, taught that Moses' words were Jesus' words and Jesus was not teaching an antithesis to God's Law given by Moses.

Of course, some other scholars might contradict this statement based on the Greek syntax, but there are other reasons to conclude that the exception clause refers only to the divorce, not the remarriage, in Matthew 19:9. Accepting the common view that the exception clause includes the remarriage:⁷⁹

1. Makes Matthew 19:9 hard to harmonize with the absolute language of the other teachings of Jesus on the subject.

- NOT at all – we just did it for you! It is hard for the blind to see, but you can open your eyes!

2. Ignores the disciples' surprise. If Jesus was simply agreeing with one rabbinic school of thought (the school of Shammai) on the issue of divorce and remarriage, why would they be surprised at His teaching?

- The surprise was in Jesus calling the common abuse of the Law ADULTERY

3. Ignores the Eunuch discourse immediately following, which Jesus gave as a clarification to His teaching on divorce and remarriage. In answer to the disciples' surprise, Jesus gives His teaching on eunuchs – clearly a reference to those who will accept His teachings and live in celibacy to obey Jesus in avoiding an adulterous remarriage.

- Not at all – Jesus was responding to **“it is not good to marry”** at all – not giving a requirement for the divorced people. Paul gives the same teaching -- Listen to them both in a very important aspect of their teaching:

- **Jesus:** Mt 19:11 But he said unto them, **All men cannot receive this saying**, save they to whom it is given.
- **Paul:** 7 For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. 8 I say therefore to the

unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. 9 **But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.**

- There is only one place where the Bible speaks of forced celibacy LISTEN CLOSE:
 - 1Ti 4:1 Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; 2 Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;3 **Forbidding to marry,**

Furthermore, Jesus' teaching on divorce and remarriage completely contradicts the modern view that the "innocent party" in a divorce is allowed to remarry. This is because Jesus declared that the man who divorces his wife is guilty of her future adultery, if the exception clause does not apply. If the exception clause is not applicable in a particular situation, then obviously the woman is the "innocent party" who was wrongfully divorced. But Jesus teaches that for her to remarry would be adultery, and the man is (at least partly) responsible!

- You again fail in logic class – F. If the man puts away an innocent wife, he causes her to commit adultery in remarriage – WHY? Because the first is not lawfully broken – any intelligent reader knows this. However, if the first marriage covenant IS broken by her or him, then the divorced woman does not commit adultery in the second marriage covenant; because she is not thereby breaking the first. Simple common sense and logic of the Scripture.

Furthermore, Jesus teaches that for a man to marry a divorced woman is adultery; He does not give any "exception clause" to this teaching. Thus, for the "innocent party" of a divorce to remarry is adultery.

- Failed again. The charge of adultery in marrying a divorced woman is only in the scenario presented of a woman divorced unlawfully which leaves her still bound to a covenant.
 - Remember Tertullian? (*a native Greek speaker*) "I maintain, then, that there was a condition in the prohibition which he now made of divorce; the case supposed being, that a man put away his wife for the express purpose of marrying another. His words are: "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, also committeth adultery," -- "put away," that is, for the reason wherefore a woman ought not to be dismissed, that another wife may be obtained. For he who marries a woman who is unlawfully put away is as much of an adulterer as the man who marries one who is undivorced."

Therefore, Jesus' "exception clause" in Matthew 19:9 refers only to the divorce – if a woman has committed (or is committing) adultery, her husband may divorce her, but neither one is ever allowed to remarry another spouse. Mark Bullen's teaching, that Jesus' teachings on the adultery of a remarried woman are only applicable until the remarriage of her "ex" husband, is a human addition to the Scriptures and is found nowhere in the teachings of Jesus. It is always adultery to marry a divorced woman, with the *possible* exception of when her husband dies and she can be considered a widow (although since that is not contained in Scripture, we cannot be dogmatic on this point). (What a dunce)

- How foolish! This is the same mentality of third and fourth century churchmen who said that for a widower to remarry is “cloaked adultery” completely contrary to Paul who says they can marry and also says, “the wife is bound by...WHAT? THE LAW! Yes, the Law was still regulating marriage in Paul’s doctrine! These guys have thoroughly exposed their lack of biblical understanding as well as their lack of common sense and logic – What a pity.
- These guys do not even know WHY a divorced woman could not marry? What is the difference between a widow who was married and a divorced woman who is widowed? BUT THEY CANNOT BE DOGMATIC, because they are shooting from the hip without any real direction.

Paul, Divorce, and Remarriage

The Apostle Paul gave an inspired interpretation and application of Jesus’ words on divorce and remarriage, and he agrees perfectly with Jesus.

And unto the married I command, *yet* not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from *her* husband: But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to *her* husband: and let not the husband put away *his* wife. But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such *cases*: but God hath called us to peace. For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save *thy* husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save *thy* wife?...The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord. But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also that I have the Spirit of God. (I Corinthians 7:10-16, 39-40).

The apostle Paul commands that separation should not occur; but if it does, he gives only two righteous courses of action. The parties are to remain unmarried or be reconciled. He never once mentions what Mark Bullen teaches, that the obligation to remain unmarried ends when one party wickedly remarries.

- Simpletons can sure confuse the issues, can’t they. NOTICE: he gives only two **righteous** courses of action. The parties are to remain unmarried or be reconciled --- DUH! What if one doesn’t follow it? THEN what?? Then he is excommunicated and considered to be an unbeliever by a functional judgment of the church – Something Ste. Marie doesn’t comprehend. So, now they are not in the “married believers” bracket, but in a different situation where if the unbeliever departs the believer is NOT bound to the covenant as they were to a believing spouse with whom they were having trouble. If the unbeliever remarries, then the forsaken believer is not bound to any covenant and is free to marry in the LORD – HIS LAW.

(As if the first party’s remarriage is wicked, but the second’s is somehow righteous.)

- I’m sorry this is so hard for you. The first marriage is in rebellion, the second is with permission. The first broke a covenant, the second did not.

However, if an unbeliever deserts a believer, the believer is to allow the unbeliever to depart; he/she is not under “bondage” to keep the unbeliever.

- Not under bondage to KEEP? How stupid. How can a wife or husband KEEP someone who has departed? They just wish to avoid the obvious – They are not under bondage to the covenant! They are not bound to reconciliation to a departed unbeliever!

However, no mention is ever made of remarriage (LIE – I Cor 7:27,28). At the end of the chapter, Paul again states that a woman is at liberty to be remarried *once her husband is dead* (YES, according to the LAW of God!! NOTICE he skipped that point!) Finally, two points in opposition to Mark Bullen must be made before we hasten to the next topic.

1. Paul's teaching on the spiritual gift of celibacy, and that it is better to marry than to burn in lust, is given for people who are free to marry (Duh!). That passage is no permission to commit adultery by wicked remarriage. It is quite possible that a divorced man or woman did not previously have the spiritual gift of celibacy – in fact, it is likely so – but this is no argument that this passage and its encouragement to marry belong to them. Rather, God always gives His children sufficient grace to fulfill His commandments. He will enable the sincere, divorced person to maintain holiness in the fear of God in a pure, celibate state.

- Forbidding to marry is a wicked doctrine of devils as Paul said. Who is FREE to Marry? Why does Paul say, “unmarried and widows”? Why doesn't he say “virgins and widows”? Why doesn't he clarify “NO divorced people” -- If Ste. Marry had written this chapter it would read much different. HOW DOES IT START?

- “2 Nevertheless, to **avoid fornication**, **let every man** have his own wife, and **let every woman** have her own husband.”

- **The Bible gives grave warnings to church leaders to force celibacy on anyone!!!** IT is never OK to force celibacy on those desiring to marry according to God's Law.

2. Mark Bullen, as so many others do, asks:

“What attitudes should we have toward remarried people? If they repent and are trying to follow Jesus, does God forgive them? Can Jesus' blood cleanse them? Let me ask you another question. What attitudes should we have toward repentant drunkards and liars? Does God forgive them? Can Jesus' blood cleanse them? Only our pride would cause us not to love, help, respect, and befriend any sinner who sincerely repents and wants to follow Jesus.”

To this, I would give a hearty “amen”! Any sinner who “sincerely repents and wants to follow Jesus” is accepted by God. But repentance means ceasing from sin! In the case of the liar or the drunkard, if they went on lying or drinking, we would have no right to comfort them by telling them that God accepts them in their refusal to stop sinning (How does he know lying and drunkenness is sin?). The analogy is a very good one, and it goes directly contrary to what Bullen wants to prove. The divorced and remarried person who wants to follow Jesus must be told the cost – they must live singly, because as Jesus told the Samaritan woman at the well, *she had no husband* (John 4:17-18).

- The sin is unlawfully breaking a covenant to make another – the sin is not maintaining a covenant you are IN. They must repent of any sin they were involved in concerning divorcing unlawfully for the express reason of getting another – IF THAT IS EVEN PART OF IT. They could be ONLY victims of other's sins! BUT this doesn't matter to Ste. Marie and his fellow amateurs who declare even the innocent victims who have remarried – to be living in adultery. This is simple stupidity – I'm sorry, but that is all it is.

- Glad you mentioned the woman of Samaria – Jesus said she had had five husbands and the one she was now with was not her husband – based on what? The “enlarged fulfilled law” of Ste. Marie? How could that be? It couldn’t; but according to Moses’ Law it could be the case. Jesus here proves He is not operating on some different Law – or He is being deceptive – which do you believe?

Conclusion

The New Testament gives a much higher ethic of divorce and remarriage than the Mosaic Covenant. Under the New Covenant, a man may divorce his wife for adultery, and a believing spouse may submit to a divorce from an unbelieving spouse, but remarriage is never permitted for any reason whatsoever.

I realize that it is impossible, in these brief pages, to go into the necessary depth on this topic – but I hope that this is a sufficient answer to Mark Bullen, and will be a catalyst for further study to those interested in the topic. I recommend Roger Hertzler’s *Dear Pastor*, Dean Taylor’s *Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage*, and Finny Kuruvilla’s article “Until death do us part” for further reading.

- Thus you admit that Jesus is not taking us back to the original intent of marriage; but also gave laws for the hardness of men’s hearts in allowing divorce at all – Can’t you see it? If you were not a “company man” working for the “ism” you could see it. WHAT HAPPENED TO THE “DAYS OF SOFT HEARTS” you so confidently told us about? Why are they needing direction concerning divorce at all?? I thought it was just those bad Jews under Moses who needed such teaching?? What a pitiful waste of paper to print this man’s foolishness.

Swearing of Oaths

Mark Bullen criticizes the historic Anabaptist position of abstaining from the swearing of oaths under any circumstances.

Brief Position Statement – Andrew Ste. Marie

Although commanded under the Old Covenant, oaths are absolutely forbidden in the New Covenant.

Brief Position Statement – Mark Bullen

Jesus came to preach against false swearers – the Sermon on the Mount is vindicating the Moral Law -- preaching the Spirit and righteousness of the Law against the abuse of the letter of the Law. Jesus never taught against lawful swearing; but against man’s innovations...It seems clear to me that Jesus is saying, ***“Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself*** (Don’t take God’s name in vain by perjuring yourself), ***but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths; but I say unto you beyond this to not use any vain or man-made oaths, such as swearing by heaven; for it is God’s throne: nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black...etc.”*** Or more simply, ***“Ye have heard by them of old time not to perjure yourself; but I say beyond that don’t use any common oaths such as swearing by heaven...etc.”*** He declares that simply performing the promise of man-made oaths was not enough, but that we should not use them at all – “Swear not at all with man-made oaths”...He is speaking about their common conversations, and not about the special and sacred use of lawful swearing as used in the New Testament inspired Scriptures several times... (Emphasis added)

Oaths in the Old Testament

The Mosaic Law has plenty to say about oaths, and it is essential to understand exactly what the Law allowed and did not allow when we are discussing the subject of oaths. Under the Law of Moses, oaths were permitted, and the children of Israel made extensive use of them in Old Testament times. In fact, under certain circumstances, the Law actually commanded the use of oaths. In Exodus 22:10-12, we read:

If a man deliver unto his neighbour an ass, or an ox, or a sheep, or any beast, to keep; and it die, or be hurt, or driven away, no man seeing *it*: *Then* shall an oath of the LORD be between them both, that he hath not put his hand unto his neighbour's goods; and the owner of it shall accept *thereof*, and he shall not make *it* good. And if it be stolen from him, he shall make restitution unto the owner thereof.

In this passage, we learn that if the animal was lost to the owner in some way, the man who was keeping it was to swear an oath that he was not guilty of stealing or destroying his neighbor's animal. This oath released him from being required to replace the animal for his neighbor. The neighbor was required to accept the oath as confirmation that his neighbor was innocent.

- Missed something important! It says, *Then* shall an oath of the LORD be between them both – The Oath of Jehovah is calling God to be the witness and just avenger if any crime had taken place. Calling God to witness and judge is the essence of a Lawful oath. This Paul does 9 times in the NT inspired writings.

In the book of Deuteronomy, God includes swearing by His Name as part of the service which He desired from the Israelites and mentions it in the context of a rejection of idolatry.

Thou shalt fear the LORD thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name. Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which *are* round about you; (For the LORD thy God *is* a jealous God among you) lest the anger of the LORD thy God be kindled against thee, and destroy thee from off the face of the earth (Deuteronomy 6:13-15). Thou shalt fear the LORD thy God; him shalt thou serve, and to him shalt thou cleave, and swear by his name. He *is* thy praise,

and he *is* thy God, that hath done for thee these great and terrible things, which thine eyes have seen (Deuteronomy 10:20-21).

Oaths were also required in the service of the priests. Numbers 5 records what was to be done with a woman who was suspected by her husband of unfaithfulness. She was to be brought to the priest, who was to perform a ceremony to allow the Lord to reveal whether she was guilty or innocent. Part of this ceremony involved an oath:

And the priest shall charge her by an oath, and say unto the woman, If no man have lain with thee, and if thou hast not gone aside to uncleanness *with another* instead of thy husband, be thou free from this bitter water that causeth the curse: But if thou hast gone aside *to another* instead of thy husband, and if thou be defiled, and some man have lain with thee beside thine husband: Then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of cursing, and the priest shall say unto the woman, The LORD make thee a curse and an oath among thy people, when the LORD doth make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell; And this water that causeth the curse shall go into thy bowels, to make *thy* belly to swell, and *thy* thigh to rot: And the woman shall say, Amen, amen (Numbers 5:19-22).

Not only were oaths permitted and commanded in the Mosaic Law, God Himself made use of oaths on more than one occasion. For instance, in Jeremiah 22:5, God declares: "But if ye will not hear these words, I swear by myself, saith the LORD, that this house shall become a desolation." In Exodus 17, after a battle between the Israelites and the Amalekites, Moses built an altar and called it Jehovahnissi, "Because the LORD hath sworn that the LORD will have war with Amalek from generation to generation" (Exodus 17:16). (See also Deuteronomy 7:8; Psalm 110:4; Isaiah 45:23; Hebrews 6:13, 16).

- NOTE: The subtle injection of Hebrews 6:13-14? What about the rest?

- Heb 6: 13 For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, 14 Saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. 15 And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. 16 **For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife.** 17 Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: 18 That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, **we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us:** 19 Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil;
 - This oath of God is part of our hope – Does this “COME OF EVIL”? Jesus was preaching against oaths that “come of evil” Right? Right.
- Jesus was made high priest with an oath Heb 7:21 – did that come of evil????

So we see that not only were oaths permitted under the Law of Moses, they were actually required in some circumstances, and God Himself swore. Nevertheless, there were restrictions which were applied even under the Mosaic Law which are important to understand. The Law of Moses strictly forbade false oaths – swearing to something which was not true, or swearing that a person would do something and then not doing it. If a man swore to do something and was unable to perform it, the Law considered it sin and required that he bring a trespass offering to the priest.

Or if a soul swear, pronouncing with *his* lips to do evil, or to do good, whatsoever *it be* that a man shall pronounce with an oath, and it be hid from him; when he knoweth *of it*, then he shall be guilty in one of these. And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these *things*, that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that *thing*: And he shall bring his trespass offering unto the LORD for his sin which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin (Leviticus 5:4-6).

Numbers 30:1-2 also commands that oaths were to be kept:

And Moses spake unto the heads of the tribes concerning the children of Israel, saying, This *is* the thing which the LORD hath commanded. If a man vow a vow unto the LORD, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.

Swearing falsely was also forbidden. Leviticus 6:2a, 3-5 says:

If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the LORD...Or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein: Then it shall be, because he hath sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he found, Or all that about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, *and* give it unto him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass offering.

God further declared in Leviticus 19:12:

And ye shall not swear by my name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: *I am* the LORD.

Another restriction was given by Joshua near the end of his life. He warned against swearing by the names of false gods. Be ye therefore very courageous to keep and to do all that is written in the book of the law of Moses, that ye turn not aside therefrom *to* the right hand or *to* the left; That ye come not among these nations, these that remain among you; neither make mention of the name of their gods, nor cause to swear *by them*, neither serve them, nor bow yourselves unto them: But cleave unto the LORD your God, as ye have done unto this day (Joshua 23:6-8).

So we see that with some important exceptions, oaths were permitted and even required under the Old Covenant.

Oaths in the New Covenant

The two main texts on oaths in the New Covenant are Matthew 5:33-37 and James 5:12:

Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and *your* nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation.

Jesus made clear the radical new standard which He was requiring of those in His Kingdom – no oaths at all, for any purpose, in any way. “Swear not at all,” He said. There is nothing unclear about this instruction.

- Jesus did not stop the sentence until He had qualified his meaning concerning man-made oaths which were not of the Law at all.
- For Jesus to say, “Swear not at all; neither by heaven ...Nor by the earth... “ is the SAME as saying, “Swear not at all by heaven...nor by the earth...” It is the same thing! The same is true for James, “swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth” is the same as saying, “swear not by heaven, neither by the earth” Otherwise why would he have to add “neither by any other oath” – didn't he already say that? Why did he have to give any illustrations at all of what he was saying if he meant “swear not at all” without qualification?? THINK! They both were speaking about a certain kind of swearing – FALSE SWEARING as Malachi told us.
 - Similarly, Listen to Jesus:
 - 5:39 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: --- **Does that need qualified??? Is the preaching of the gospel resisting evil?**
 - 6:3 But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth:
 - **Is that possible? What if I need them both to open my wallet?**
 - 6:6 But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret;
 - **Did Jesus always do this? Was there a closet on the mountain?**
 - 6:25 Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on.
 - **Does Ste. Marie obey this literally? Does his wife?**
 - 6:34 Take therefore no thought for the morrow:
 - Really?
 - 7:1 Judge not, that ye be not judged. **Does that need qualifying statements**
 - **Right after this Jesus says, “Don't cast your pearls to swine” ???**
 - Joh 6:27 Labour not for the meat which perisheth -- **Does this need qualifying statements? Should be go on welfare?**

- OK folks, this is common knowledge – We must listen to the qualifying statements.
- Paul used Lawful oaths 9 times while writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost – Think about it!
- Malachi said the Messiah would preach against “false swearers” not lawful swearers! This alone proves the case if you are a believer.

In James’s admonition on oaths, we again find the answer to the question “does God want His children to swear oaths?” James tells us “swear not,” and then instructs us to avoid swearing by heaven, earth, or “by any other oath.” “Any other” would include swearing by God Himself.

- NOT in the context of his admonition! James was the pastor of Jerusalem where thousands of Jews believed and were all zealous of the Law! James was concerned because they had heard that Paul was teaching people like Ste. Marie – for “forsake Moses”; but they both agreed in the fact that THIS WAS NOT SO. Then told him to WHAT? To join in the VOW of the nazarite with some other young men. Think about it.
- Listen to James: 17 Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is **no variableness, neither shadow of turning**. 18 Of his own will begat he us with the **word of truth**, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures. 22 **But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves**. 23 For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: 24 For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. 25 But whoso looketh into the **perfect law of liberty**, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed... 8 If ye **fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well**: 9 But if ye have respect to persons, **ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors**. 10 **For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all**. 11 **For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law**. 12 **So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty....** 11 Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, **speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge**. 12 **There is one lawgiver**, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?”
- When God’s moral laws are observed with the proper understanding of Salvation by Grace, then it is the Law of Liberty and not of condemnation. There is no doubt that James believed Christians were to be obeying God’s moral laws.
- Only ismites insist on twisting the Scriptures, ignoring context, and sweeping the facts under the rug to support the “blessed ism”. Shame on them!

This verse also gives us the answer to the question “is the subject of swearing really all that important?” The Book of James discusses many topics – responding to the trials of life, partiality, the relationship of faith and works, controlling our tongues, strife, separation from the world, wealth, etc.

- NOTICE what he left out? Read the quotations above – he left out obeying God’s Law

These are undoubtedly important issues. Nevertheless, when he arrives at the topic of swearing, he begins with “But above all things, my brethren” – in other words, this one topic is more important than anything else discussed in the entire book! (That expression doesn’t go that far)

To Bullen, however, things do not seem nearly so clear and simple. His foundational assumption of the unchanging nature of moral/ethical standards keeps him from seeing that Jesus restored the rules here.

- **Restored what rules?** According to you, Jesus condemned his own Father, his inauguration as priest, His own speech (verily, verily – is the language of an oath); and His own laws. He condemned the one who inspired the law – himself – IF He was preaching against swearing as commanded by Moses’ Law – He said it, “cometh of evil” – What does that mean guys???

He sets forth several arguments trying to show that what Jesus and James *really* meant was that we should avoid “manmade oaths” in our “common conversations.”

Bullen’s Arguments

One of Bullen’s arguments is that Jesus answered under oath while on trial before the high priest. This is based on Matthew 26:63-64:

But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, **I adjure thee by the living God**, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

The Greek word for “adjure” in verse 63 is defined by Strong’s as “to exact an oath, i.e. conjure.” Since Jesus responded to the high priest’s adjuration, it is alleged by Bullen (and others as well) that Jesus was perfectly fine with court swearing, and His words against swearing oaths do not apply to swearing before a court. However, a close look at the passage in question will reveal that it does not give any such permission. Who was it that gave the “oath” in the passage? It was the high priest. Jesus did not swear at all. Just because Jesus responded to the high priest’s adjuring question does not mean that He was making an exception to His own teaching on oaths. Jesus Himself did not swear.

- YOU just defined the term as “to exact an oath” – for Jesus to answer immediately was to speak under oath – to speak with the authority of an oath – it is all the same thing! The priest adjured Him BY GOD, -- Jesus spoke with “God as witness” -- this was understood by the Jews – sorry you are out of touch.

According to Mark 5:6-8:

But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him, And cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, *thou* Son of the most high God? **I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not.** For he said unto him, Come out of the man, *thou* unclean spirit.

Notice that the demons adjured Jesus, just as the high priest later did.

- The High Priest commanded Jesus to answer under oath to God, which He did; but the demons **besought** him to swear or promise not to torment them before the time – **two different Greek words with two different meanings. They were saying, “Please swear by God that you will not torment us before the time...”**

Did Jesus then swear, because He did not “torment” the demons? Jesus ignored the demons’ adjuration and did what His Father’s will was in the situation. He did not break His own law by ignoring every adjuration which might come His way. Another of Bullen’s arguments is that the Apostle Paul swore at least nine times in his epistles. These are his proof texts:

For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers (Romans 1:9).

I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost (Romans 9:1).

Moreover I call God for a record upon my soul, that to spare you I came not as yet unto Corinth (II Corinthians 1:23).

As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia (II Corinthians 11:10).

The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not (II Corinthians 11:31).

Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not (Galatians 1:20).

For God is my record, how greatly I long after you all in the bowels of Jesus Christ (Philippians 1:8).

For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloke of covetousness; God *is* witness (I Thessalonians 2:5).

Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, (I speak the truth in Christ, *and* lie not;) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity (I Timothy 2:7).

What is it in these verses which lead some to believe that the Apostle Paul swore oaths? Bullen, like other defenders of oaths, claims that “calling God to witness” is an oath. If this is the true definition of an oath, then Paul obviously did swear in these verses. But is this the true definition of an oath? Let us look at what Jesus said about the hypocritical oaths of the Pharisees:

Woe unto you, *ye* blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! *Ye* fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. *Ye* fools and blind: for whether *is* greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon (Matthew 23:16-22).

Here we see Jesus rebuking the Pharisees for their rules concerning which oaths could be broken without guilt and which ones had to be kept inviolable. Notice that these oaths were composed of two parts: 1) the swearing, and 2) the confirmation (what was being sworn by). Of course, one can use just half (say “I swear”, or just “by __,”) and it would still be an oath. Nevertheless, look again at the verses of Paul, and notice that he did not use either half of this formula. He did not use a “by-word,” nor did he say “I swear.” He affirmed the truth of what He was saying, and yes, called God to witness to it, but he did not swear. Bullen, however, claims:

How can you deny what I proved from the Scriptures, i.e. that calling God to witness was swearing in God’s definition?...You reject the Bible definition of swearing to maintain your ism, how shameful.⁸²

Bullen claims that he had “proved” that calling God to witness was a form of swearing. This “proof” we find in the following passage of *The Alien Exposed*:

Let’s see what is considered as swearing from the Scriptures.

Nu 32:10 *And the LORD'S anger was kindled the same time, and he sware, saying, Surely none of the men that came up out of Egypt, from twenty years old and upward, shall see the land which I sware unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob; because they have not wholly followed me: (also Deut. 1:34,35)*

Jer 51:14 *The LORD of hosts hath sworn by himself, saying, Surely I will fill thee with men, as with caterpillers; and they shall lift up a shout against thee.*

This is similar to Jesus using, “verily” or “verily, verily” which means, “surely, surely”. Next see that calling God to be witness is swearing.

Jg 11:10 *And the elders of Gilead said unto Jephthah, The LORD be witness between us, if we do not so according to thy words.*

ISa 20:42 And Jonathan said to David, Go in peace, forasmuch as we have **sworn** both of us in the name of the LORD, saying, **The LORD be (witness) between me and thee**, and between my seed and thy seed for ever. And he arose and departed: and Jonathan went into the city.

Compare with Paul's swearing:

Romans 1:9 For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers;

1 Thessalonians 2:5 For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloke of covetousness; **God is witness:** (Emphasis his)⁸³

This passage of Bullen's book shows that he has little understanding of how oaths are recorded in the Old Testament. But before I demonstrate that, I wish to dismantle his interpretation of the two texts "proving" that calling God to witness is swearing. First, Judges 11:10, while certainly an example of calling God to witness, does not say anything about swearing. There is no evidence that the author of Judges (or the people making the statement) considered it to be an oath.

- What an arrogant buffoon. Judges 11:10 is the form of OT oaths – they swore by God that he would be their leader if he went and fought for them. Ask any Bible Scholar or Rabbi if this was an oath for confirmation for not.

Secondly, the proof text I Samuel 20:42 certainly records an oath, but it suffers from the same lack of understanding shown by Bullen in claiming that to say "Surely" is an oath. When the Old Testament records an oath, it normally 1) records that an oath was made, 2) says "saying," and 3) records what the oath was meant to confirm. The words written after "saying" *record what the oath confirmed, not the oath itself.* (How pitiful)

- Who says? YOU? How arrogant! YOU are simply wrong, buddy! Listen: And Jonathan said to David, Go in peace, forasmuch as **we have sworn** both of us **in the name of the LORD**, saying, **"The LORD be (witness) between me and thee**, and between my seed and thy seed for ever" **THAT WAS THE OATH!**
- Direct denial of the obvious without any basis is the work of arrogant fools – you are a deceiver and don't know what you are talking about.

We would find ourselves with a very strange view of oaths if we were to do for every text below what Mark Bullen did for the texts he cited in assuming they recorded the actual oath:

And Joseph took an oath of the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence (Genesis 50:25).

So is it swearing to say "God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence"? No, obviously not.

- This is different than David and Jonathan's oath as any reader can see; **but the basis is the same** – calling upon God to hold people accountable where man cannot. **This is the essence of lawful swearing** – Sorry, you are wrong again and only showing your ignorance.

This was what Joseph made the children of Israel swear to. Here are more examples:

Then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of cursing, and the priest shall **say unto the woman, The LORD make thee a curse and an oath among thy people**, when the LORD doth make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell; And this water that causeth the curse shall go into thy bowels, to make *thy* belly to swell, and *thy* thigh to rot: And the woman shall say, Amen, amen (Numbers 5:21-22).

- The words of the Priest comprise the curse IF SHE IS GUILTY – He is cursing/swearing by **calling God to be the Judge and witness of the situation.** Clear as day!

And the children of Israel said, Who *is there* among all the tribes of Israel that came not up with the congregation unto the LORD? For they had made a great oath concerning him that came not up to the LORD to Mizpeh, **saying, He shall surely be put to death** (Judges 21:5).

- The oath again – **As God as our witness, “He shall surely be put to death”** The oath was appealing to God as Judge.

Then answered one of the people, and said, Thy father straitly charged the people with an oath, **saying, Cursed be the man** that eateth *any* food this day. And the people were faint (I Samuel 14:28).

- You continually prove me right! Saul called God to be the witness and judge of any who would disobey his command as King – **and God did show him the man!**

In that day shall he swear, **saying, I will not be an healer;** for in my house *is* neither bread nor clothing: make me not a ruler of the people (Isaiah 3:7).

- The swearing was simply making a sure statement with God as witness – The Jews understood this; and just because Ste. Marie cannot, doesn’t make it any less true. The man probably held his hand up when making such a statement and added “Before God, I will not be a healer” or “As God is my witness, I will not be a healer” **THIS IS WHAT THEY DID!** Paul did **THIS.**

So in the texts which Bullen quotes, the “calling God to witness” and the “surely” are part of what the oath was confirming, not the oath itself. At the very best (for Bullen), it is unclear that “calling God to witness” is swearing; however, the weight of the evidence seems to be against him. Paul did not swear.

- Sorry, but you are sadly wrong and God will humble your pride in due time. To call God to witness was the essence of the oath – **IT COULD NOT BE WHAT THE OATH WAS CONFIRMING** – what a statement! So, “I swear I am calling God to witness” is what you call an oath? What a guy! Go asks a rabbi! Paul did swear – as every educated commentator will tell you!

Bullen claims that Jesus’ prohibition against oaths was only for “common oaths” in common conversation, or “man-made oaths.” Swearing by God and swearing a judicial oath are, according to him, still righteous. This suffers from a very serious difficulty: It fails to take into account the very absolute wording of James’s prohibition against oaths. “But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, **neither by any other oath:** but let your yea be yea; and *your* nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation” (James 5:12). Not only does James tell us to “swear not,” he adds, “neither by any other oath” – which would include swearing by God! Oaths are never allowed by James!

- This is proved wrong above; but when someone has an ax to grind, they will stop at nothing to force their moronic beliefs on the Scriptures.
- So, James, the pastor of Jerusalem with thousands of Jews all zealous of the Law is telling people that if they obey a very important command in the law they will fall into condemnation? If you call God to be judge or witness you are falling into condemnation? Well, if you do it frivolously, you surely will; but that is not what James is saying – He is obviously speaking in the context **HE HIMSELF MADE WITH HIS QUALIFYING STATEMENTS!**

- James is the one who says if we break one command of God’s Law, we are guilty of all! Is he senile? Jas 2:11 “For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.” God also said to swear by His name!

Finally, Bullen’s prize witness for the righteousness of swearing is Matthew 5:37: “But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.” Bullen writes:

Is Jesus saying that God is evil??? God’s law commanded them to swear by God’s name — Jesus said “whatsoever is more than this **cometh** of evil” -- Are you so bold as to deny the obvious that Jesus is not including lawful swearing here, or will you believe that Jesus is calling God evil???⁸⁴

Notice closely what Jesus says: “whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.” The source of swearing is seen as evil, which is the reason why Jesus is forbidding oaths in His kingdom.

- NOT SO FAST you snake – Listen to Jesus again: *But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.* **What are “these”?** **YEA and NAY are THESE.** Lawful swearing IS more than these – yea and nay; but Jesus must be kept in the context HE established – “false swearing” YES – due to dishonesty. Marriage vows, nazirite vows (like Paul took), and even promises are “more than these”. Is Jesus forbidding vows? Could James be forbidding vows when he told Paul to join in one with two other church members?
- But lawful swearing was far more than just a necessity due to dishonesty! Sorry you didn’t know that! Lawful swearing was binding people for the sake of establishing law and justice and truth which ONLY God could do and thus acknowledging HIM as God and ruler and judge!! This is different!

So what is the source of oaths? Is it the Law of God, as Bullen seems to think? A moment’s thought will show us that the Law of Moses could not possibly be said to be the source, or point of origin, of oaths.

- Thank YOU – YES, Moses Law was not the origin of the oaths Jesus was speaking against – man’s dishonesty was. AND Moses Law was not the origin of Lawful Swearing --- JESUS WAS!!

The mere fact that there are laws made regarding righteous swearing in the Law of Moses shows that oaths must have existed before the Law of Moses was given (Yah turkey, you quoted God swearing to Abraham!) Thus, the Law of Moses is not the origin of swearing, and God is not calling Moses’ Law evil in this verse. Rather, the evil source of swearing is *man’s dishonesty*. Oaths are necessary to ensure that one will tell the truth, or fulfill what he is saying he will do, because fallen, sinful men are so often dishonest.

- Jesus said that “*whatsoever is more than these (yea and nay) cometh of evil*” in our common conversations - YES; but God swore to Abraham – God swore that he wouldn’t let the children of Israel enter Canaan – God swore to make Jesus a priest forever – DID THIS COME FROM DISHONESTY? WAS THIS INCLUDED IN BEING “MORE THAN YEA AND NAY”? COULD THIS LEAD TO CONDEMNATION?
- Heb 3:11 So I swear in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest.

- Heb 3:18 And to whom swore he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not?
- Heb 6:13 For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself,
- Heb 7:21 (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord swore and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:)
- Re 10:6 And swore by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer:

WAS JESUS CONDEMNING THIS????? THAT IS THE QUESTION!

Mal 3:5 And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against **false swearers**, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, **saith the LORD of hosts**.

IF JESUS WAS THE MESSIAH, THEN THIS IS WHAT HE DID --- PERIOD!

Oaths were thus a way to control man's dishonesty. Because of this, and because Jesus was establishing a kingdom of men who were totally honest in all things and in all ways, He eliminated swearing from His kingdom (**O, but He still does it in heaven – right?**). If I swear an oath to confirm that I am telling the truth, does not that imply that on other occasions, when not under oath, I may not be perfectly honest?

- This is the idea with man-made oaths that Jesus was speaking about – YES. SO, did you have marriage vows?? Why not just say YEA or NAY? Some take your foolish doctrine to that extreme; but Vows before God are indeed practiced by the apostles in the NT, and are very similar to an oath and sometimes spoken of interchangeably – same idea.
- Vows and lawful swearing was before GOD's throne – Acknowledging HIM as our LORD, JUDGE, etc. This is still important and lawful!
 - Nu 30:2 If a man vow a vow unto the LORD, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.

Thus there is one standard of truth for Jesus' kingdom citizens on all occasions: absolute honesty. And if God in any situation is "willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel," and thus "confirm[s] it by an oath" (Hebrews 6:17), that is *His* prerogative. He has not given His children under the New Covenant that prerogative.

- That just blows your whole case! YOU said the source of lawful swearing was dishonesty – so what are you now saying about God? So, what is not righteous for Christians because IT cometh of evil and leads to condemnation is righteous for God who says, "be ye holy, for I am holy". What confusion you cause by not believing God's Word through Malachi.

Nonresistance and Nonparticipation in Government

Like divorce and remarriage, Bullen has devoted an entire book to the subject of nonresistance (read it!) .85 Nonresistance was also one of the main themes of his correspondence with Joshua Geiser and Caneyville Christian Community. A complete refutation of Bullen on this subject is impossible within the limits of this article’s format, but in the refutation of his argument that “moral standards have never changed” we have knocked the main foundation out from under his polemic. As with divorce and remarriage and the swearing of oaths, when robbed of that main foundation, the rest of his argument can collapse under its own weight. Nevertheless, I wish to briefly deal with a few of Bullen’s main arguments against the Anabaptist view of nonresistance, and to point out the Scriptural basis of nonparticipation in civil government. A complete defense of these subjects can be found in many excellent books. (What a farce)

First, Bullen quotes Deuteronomy 22:23-27:

If a damsel *that is* a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; Then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, *being* in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour’s wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you. But if a man find a betrothed damsel in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her: then the man only that lay with her shall die: But unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; *there is* in the damsel no sin *worthy* of death: for as when a man riseth against his neighbour, and slayeth him, even so *is* this matter: For he found her in the field, *and* the betrothed damsel cried, and *there was* none to save her.

He argues that the “righteousness of the law” requires that a man deliver a damsel about to be raped, and that we should still do so today. To that I respond, yes, we should do what we can to prevent such a thing from happening if possible. Nevertheless, that does not require that we kill the would-be rapist.

- HA! What a flaky answer! Since when does your doctrine only limit you from KILLING???
- **So, big boy, you’ll take him alive, will yah? Put him in a head-lock and haul him to the police!** HA HA HA Is this OK with your pacifist ideas? HUH? I’ve read your ism books! Where young men would not even mow the grass in the military camp!! Remember YOUR choice of pictures on the front! The guy wouldn’t even RUN when told to by his pursuer! Maybe you’d better start swearing so we can know when to believe you?

Second, Bullen quotes Matthew 5:41 (“And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain”) and comments:

The Word “compel” refers to the government’s practice of “commandeering” service for government’s causes. This is referring to government and military service. There are those who take the “resist not evil” teaching to an extreme which says a Christian can never serve in the government or military; but this verse could be taken to the opposite extreme to show they can and must serve when asked in whatever the military does — even to the second mile! **Extremes are dangerous things, and Christians cannot afford to be so rash with Jesus’ words...**Jesus had no problem with military and government service as a principle. Was it serving two masters? No! Was it compromising with evil? No! Jesus was telling his disciples that if a Roman soldier commandeered their service for the extent the law allowed, they should render more service than required for a testimony. Jesus would have done what He was teaching others to do. (Emphasis his)⁸⁷

I do not have the resources to confirm or refute that this is the situation which Jesus is referring to, so for the sake of discussion, we will accept it. Does this prove that Jesus “had no problem with military and government service”? Let us think carefully about the situation: Jesus was telling *Jews* to walk an extra mile for a *Roman* soldier. The Romans were the enemies of the Jews! This is a testimony of love

and submission to a foreign, hated, enemy government. This was not the same as service for their *own* military (the Jews did not even have an official standing military at the time). It does not prove that Jesus would affirm military service for one's own country, killing other human beings.

- So, what is OK to do for the enemy's military is not OK to do for our own? Wow. Where is your proof that Jesus was against military or police service at all?? There is none! John baptized military men with a baptism to prepare them for their Messiah – would this be contrary to the Messiah? Only a fool would think so.
- So, were those *Gentile* soldiers who were baptized by John the Baptist??? Go figure! Herod was even a Jew by religion! John baptized **Jewish soldiers** and the temple guards/police/officers were Jews – or they couldn't go into the temple, etc.

Finally, Bullen argues: **(Finally? So this is all you want to deal with?? I wrote a whole book!)**

Jesus clearly says that people like the centurion who had greater faith than what He witnessed in Israel would be in Heaven. The apostles unhesitatingly baptized soldiers, governors, centurions, Jailers, chamberlains, tax collectors, and other state officials and received them into communion. **Would your church?** Do you remember Cornelius, Zaccheus, Sergius Paulus, Erastus, the Philippian Jailer, the publicans, and the Ethiopian Eunuch? (Emphasis his)

This is the same argument given against the Anabaptist position *ad nauseam* by war-defending professing Christians. It is an argument from silence.

- Poor foolish man. Jesus declared that centurion to be heaven-bound without him ever stepping down or implying he should! John Baptized Soldiers! YOU are the ones arguing from silence! YOU have no examples of YOUR doctrine! WE KNOW Cornelius was called righteous BEFORE his conversion – yah, it's in the book, but he doesn't want to touch it! Zaccheus continued as a tax collector; The philippian Jailer was still the Keeper of the prison the next day; The Ethiopian Eunuch didn't step down; ---HOW LOUD DOES IT HAVE TO GET TO NOT BE SILENCE?? OPEN YOUR EARS!
- Wanna see a hypocrite? Ask this guy if he would baptize the government officials John the Baptist and the Apostles baptized without FIRST MAKING SURE they had stepped down or soon would? Would he or his fellows ever baptize a soldier or governer AND THEN LATER tell them to step down? NO they would not. SO, they are hypocrites because they are implying that they agree with the baptism *as long as they later told them to step down* – BUT THIS IS A LIE. Once a person is baptized, they are IN COMMUNION – Would Ste. Marie and friends take communion with a Centurion, Jailer, Treasurer, Tax Collector, or Governor? NO, that's why they wouldn't baptize them either!

The simple facts are these: 1) Regarding the faith of the centurion, the context was healing for the centurion's servant; there is no discussion of baptism, church membership, or the centurion becoming a Christian. We have no information about the centurion's future career. We could just as easily conclude that Jesus would not have disapproved if the centurion continued in the pagan worship required of Roman centurions, since after all, Jesus did not mention it. This incident proves nothing regarding military service for Christians (Matthew 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10).

- This man acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah – He had greater faith IN JESUS than what Jesus had seen in ISRAEL, and you cannot figure it out that he wasn't a pagan idolater?? The Roman centurions were NOT required to Worship pagan god's at this time – YOU ARE

DISPLAYING YOUR IGNORANCE AGAIN! HEROD was a JEW, and worshipping the Jewish God was fully within the Laws of Rome at that time! This incident proves along with everything else the Bible says on the subject that God, Jesus, the apostles, the church, and the Christians had NO problem with government and military service as a principle! YOU have NO proof for your pacifism at all – NONE.

2) We do not know what Cornelius did after he was baptized; did he abandon his career? Did he go out as a missionary? There is good evidence that indicates that no Christian could remain as a centurion in the Roman military due to the pagan worship required of centurions.

- **WRONG: SHOW your evidence!** The Bible is the best evidence – Listen to what is said about Cornelius BEFORE CONVERSION as a Roman Centurion: Acts 10:1 There was a certain man in Caesarea called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band, 2 **A devout man,** and one that **feared God with all his house,** which **gave much alms to the people,** and **prayed to God alway.** 3 He saw in a vision evidently about the **ninth hour of the day** (Jewish prayer time) an angel of God coming in to him, and saying unto him, Cornelius. 4 And when he looked on him, he was afraid, and said, What is it, Lord? And he said unto him, **Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God.....** 34 Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a **truth** I perceive that **God is no respecter of persons:** 35 But in every nation he that **feareth him, and worketh righteousness,** is **accepted with him.**
- God poured out the HOLY GHOST on him and those with him before Peter could say anything about circumcision to show God accepted him JUST AS HE WAS – which means he was still a centurion!
- THIS IS ARGUING FROM SILENCE?? **THEN READ IT OUT LOUD!!** WHERE IS YOUR EVIDENCE??
- Do you want to know where the SILENCE is? When you argue that Jesus and the apostles separated remarried couples and told men to step down from government offices – THIS IS WHERE THE SILENCE IS!

Furthermore, just because the text does not state that Peter taught Cornelius about loving his enemies, does not mean that he did not do so – especially since he stayed two days with him and must have taught him many things beyond what is recorded (Acts 10).

- GOD poured out the spirit before Peter could say any more about anything to show that nothing else was necessary in this man's devout life! From this the apostles concluded He did not need circumcision/Judaism – Why would they think he needed pacifism??? Jesus never even taught it!!
- He already knew about loving his enemies, but not by your pacifist definition! He loved His enemies the way GOD does from Genesis to Revelation!! HE KNEW the Scriptures Paul quoted to establish what he taught in Romans 12. He loved his enemies the way I strive to do – by taking my time to teach knuckleheads who arrogantly abuse the Scriptures so maybe they will repent and be saved.

3) Similarly, there is no record of Zaccheus's career following his encounter with Jesus. It is an argument from silence.

- Zaccheus tells Jesus what his plans are as a future tax collector - read it! His sin was never being part of the government in the first place!

4) We are told that Sergius Paulus believed the message brought by Paul, but we are not told that he was “baptized...and received...into communion.” And again, we do not know whether he continued as the governor or not.

- When an ismite is in denial, they won’t hear Moses and the Prophets even if one comes from the dead to tell them!
- Listen: Acts 13:7 Which was with the deputy of the country, Sergius Paulus, **a prudent man**; who called for Barnabas and Saul, and **desired to hear the word of God.** 8 But Elymas the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them, **seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith.**

- **What is the context of them speaking to the governor? THE FAITH**

...12 Then the deputy, when he saw what was done, **believed**, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord.

- What did he believe? THE FAITH. Does this mean he was baptized? Of course, what do you think Paul, who baptized the jailer at midnight, would do when the governor believed? He was already a “prudent man” who was probably visiting the synagogues there and that is probably where he heard of Paul. After he believed, he continued in the synagogue with the other Jewish believers until they had to separate from Jewish persecution. This is to be expected – Luke assumed he was writing to an informed audience, not ismites.

5) While we know that Erastus was a government official at one time (Romans 16:23), we are not told that he was “a brother” at the time. We know that later, he had left his government post to minister with Paul (Acts 19:22; II Timothy 4:20). 6) Again, for the Philippian jailor, the publicans, and the Ethiopian eunuch, we do not know their career choices following their conversion to Christianity.

- **HOW UNINFORMED!** Career choices??? HA! The Ethiopian Eunuch did not have the position as a career choice that he could just leave, neither was this the case with Centurions, Governors, Jailors, etc. IT wasn’t America! WE know what these men did after conversion – **THE SAME WORK THEY DID BEFORE!** What did John tell the soldiers and publicans??? He was preparing the way of the Messiah and knew him personally as his cousin – Do you think he was telling them the **opposite** of what Jesus would say???

These are all ridiculous arguments from silence that prove nothing (wow). We might just as well think that prostitutes and others who were converted – but for whom there is no record of them being told by Jesus or the apostles that they must stop their prostitution – continued their sinful lifestyles after conversion, in peace with the church.

- If this isn’t buffoonery I don’t know what could be? OK picture John telling the harlots to give a fair deal and not charge too much????? Oh pity! We have us a real winner here!
- What was the definition of SIN? The transgression of God’s Law. Was government service ever a sin? Was prostitution? Can’t this yo-yo see any difference?? NO, because his ism is his Bible! Marcion couldn’t see this either. What a pity!

Bullen asks if we remember Cornelius, Zaccheus, etc., but does he remember Matthew? We *do* know what he did! When called to follow Jesus, he abandoned his government post!

And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him (Matthew 9:9).

- **Next verse:** 10 And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples.

And after these things he went forth, and saw a publican, named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he said unto him, Follow me. And he left all, rose up, and followed him (Luke 5:27-28).

- **YES**, Jesus walked to his house for dinner that day – like He did with Zaccheus. Does that mean Matthew completely stopped his work that moment?? Could he just up and walk away irresponsibly? Did he not have obligations? Did he have a contract? Talk about arguing from silence – or better yet, ignorance. Jesus called Peter, James and John at one time; but then at another time he called them to go with him continually. They still fished at times too – probably between preaching trips. Luke was called the beloved physician; but he was also a disciple. You don't know much about the times do you. Blunder after blunder – all to be the hero of the ismites. What a pity.

Finally, regarding government service, we believe that as representatives of a different kingdom – the kingdom of God – we have no business intermeddling with the affairs of the kingdoms of this world. “No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of *this* life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier” (II Timothy 2:4). Serving as a government official would indeed be serving two masters. God has set up the governments of the world to create peace and order *for the church to operate*. “For he is the minister of God **to thee** for good” (Romans 13:4). The government is the servant of the church! Its job is to create some level of peace and order so that the church can fulfill its commission from God.

- OK bozo is at it again. *The government is the servant of the church!* SO, if I **serve the church** as a **minister of God** in the state office then I am **not serving God's kingdom or God**, but serving two masters???. What logic! If the kingdoms of this world are ordained as servants of the church for the commission given to the church, then **HOW** is serving as a minister of God in the state serving two masters or another kingdom??
- AS representative of God's coming kingdom we are **AMBASSADORS** to this world to present Christ's coming Kingdom – which means **JESUS** will **BE** the government of this world someday and **WE** will rule with **HIM** on the **SAME** earth. We then are now presenting the beauty of **THESE PRINCIPLES** so the present world will **FOLLOW THEM** now.
- **Romans 13:1** Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. **For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.** 2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the **ordinance of God:** and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. 3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: 4 For he is the **minister of God to thee for good.** But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for **he is the minister of God,** a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. 5 Wherefore ye

must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. 6 For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are **God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing**.

- **What thing?** God's business or an opposing interest? IF they are doing what they are supposed to be doing, they will serve God's interests, God's kingdom, God's people, God's church, and will not be an opposing force – obviously this should be our message to them, NOT THAT THEY CANNOT BE SAVED or ARE SERVING TWO MASTERS.

Being a doctor, mechanic, or farmer is serving two masters and being entangled in the affairs of this world if serving in the government is! Pacifists are blind leaders – Don't be a blind follower and end up in their ditch!

When it has overstepped these boundaries, it becomes an evil power attempting to usurp the authority of God Himself in taking more authority than it has been given.

- SO, is it NOT EVIL when NOT overstepping God's boundaries?
- SO, did God give them authority? Then they are part of His Kingdom authority!

And when has there ever been a government which has confined itself to the activities mentioned in Romans 13 (THE powers that **BE ARE** ordained of God – Nero was on the throne when Paul wrote)? Governments essentially always look out for themselves, seeking more wealth and power. We must separate from this present evil world as taught by the Apostle Paul: (This verse doesn't apply to honest employment in any legitimate office or career)

Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in *them*; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean *thing*; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (II Corinthians 6:14-7:1).

Now ask yourself – can your conscience allow you to believe that you can obey this passage, and still be a part of the civil government?

OF COURSE! I'd be just like Cornelius – who was much godlier than Ste. Marie! When is the last time God sent an angel to YOU? Can you do this and work at the grocery store, hardware store, farm, ranch, construction site, doctor, lawyer, etc. etc.? Where does the Bible call them the "ministers of God"? So to be a godly police officer is just as much in line with Christianity! AND we have proved that from the lives of the apostles as well as the teaching of Jesus! IF you are saved, you will be a part of civil government in Jesus kingdom and will rule the nations with a rod of iron!

- REV 2:26 And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: 27 And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father.
- NO pacifists or Marcionites allowed!! **Repent before it is too late!**

Conclusion

We have examined the Scriptural evidence and weighed Bullen's thesis in the balances, and found it wanting. There is a unique, defensible New Covenant ethic, higher and better than the ethic of the Old Covenant, which believers must now abide by. This includes a rejection of remarriage after divorce, swearing of oaths, war, killing, etc. The Scriptures clearly support this conclusion, and as we will see in Part 2, what we have explained here is the historic Christian faith.

- We will be there to annihilate that buffoonery as well. ☺ We have already dealt with the "early church" writings in our answers to other ismites. READ it on our website – www.thefaithoncedelivered.info

Produced and Distributed by

Sermon on the Mount Publishing

P.O. Box 246

Manchester, MI 48158

the-witness@sbcglobal.net

www.kingdomreading.com

Contact us for a free catalog of excellent books and resources!

Originally produced – January 2016