

The Greeson- Zecca & Mastropalo Debate on “What Law are We Under Today?”



The Old Testament Law or the New Testament Law?

**A radio debate between Wayne Greeson
and John Zecca and Michael Mastropalo**

**held on
January 15, 16, 17 & 19, 2001**

© 2001 Wayne Greeson • All Rights Reserved



*Mike Mastropalo, John Zecca and Wayne Greeson
inside the KURM radio station in downtown Rogers, Arkansas*

Monday, January 15, 2001

Introduction

Wayne Greeson, a preacher for the church of Christ, hosted a Bible call-in radio program called *Searching Daily* four days a week in Northwest Arkansas. John Zecca and Michael Mastropalo, are members of the Assembly of Yahweh.

Mr. Zecca contacted Mr. Greeson on the program and they discussed whether we are bound to keep the Sabbath law. Mr. Greeson soon discovered that Mr. Zecca was not just a Sabbatarian, but believed that we are bound today by all of the law of the Old Testament. Mr. Greeson takes the position that we are not under the law of the Old Testament, but under the law of Christ found in the New Testament.

Mr. Greeson proposed to debate Mr. Zecca on the radio program on the question of “What law are we under today?” Mr. Zecca agreed and requested that Mr. Mastropalo assist him in such a debate.

The debate was held on January 15, 16, 17 and 19, 2001, on KURM radio which broadcasts to the northwest corner of Arkansas and reaches into northeastern Oklahoma and southwestern Missouri.

The proposition for the first two days was: “The New Testament scriptures teach that men today are under the Law given by the Almighty to Moses at Mt. Sinai.”

Affirm

John Zecca & Michael Mastropalo
members of the Assembly of Yahweh

Deny

Wayne Greeson,
preacher for the church of Christ

First Affirmative—John Zecca

Okay, thank you. I’m going to, I’m going to be moving real quick here. The first thing I want to do is read Psalm 19:7-11 and then I’m going to jump into the New Testament. It says, “The law of the Yahweh (I’m going to be referring to the Almighty as Yahweh. That’s what we believe His name is.) The law of the Yahweh is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Yahweh is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Yahweh are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Yahweh is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Yahweh is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the Yahweh are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward.”

Okay, and there are many other scriptures in the Old Testament that talk like this, but I’m going to, I’m not going to do that, I’m going to go to the New Testament.

But first I want to mention that many people have this concept that Yahweh’s laws are burdensome and against us. I can’t imagine a loving father giving us laws and instructions that would be bad for us. He knows, just like the Psalmist wrote that in keeping them, not in abolishing, not abolishing them, there is great reward. I cannot think of one law that is against us. The problem arises when we disobey or break Yahweh’s commandments and laws. That’s the problem.

Okay and now I’m to move real quickly here in the New Testament. I want to speak the words of the Messiah, himself, in Mat-

thew chapter five. Many of you are probably familiar with this scripture. It starts off in verse, seventeen, Matthew chapter five. It says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. 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."

Now people are saying, I think, today the opposite of what the Messiah was telling us not to think. He was saying, 'Don't think that I've come to abolish the Law. I haven't come to abolish it, but to fulfill.' Now, fulfill doesn't mean to abolish, otherwise that scripture would make no sense. He came to do the Law. He was perfect in keeping the Father's Law. He was obedient in every point of the Law. Without sin, the Scripture says.

In Luke 16:17 says, "it's easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail." Paul also confirms Yahweh's Law as good and to be kept. I'm going to read a couple of scriptures in Romans here. In Romans 3:31, if you read the whole chapter, Paul is talking about faith and he ends it here with "Do we then make void the law through faith? (And he says) Yahweh forbid: (Like, no, way) yes, we establish the law." Paul's being pretty emphatic here that faith does not do away with the Law. But it establishes the Law.

In Romans 2:13, it says, "the doers ... will be justified," "the doers of the Law will be justified." Not just hearing the Law, but the doers, those who keep Yahweh's commandments and obey His Laws.

Romans 6:1-2 says, "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? Yahweh forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Now the definition of sin, according to 1 John 3:4 is a transgression of the Law. Now the law that John was referring to was Yahweh's Law. Sin is the breaking of Yahweh's Law and Paul is saying here, "Shall we continue breaking Yahweh's Law, that grace may abound? By no means." Okay and...

In Romans 7:12 Paul says, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." And down in verse seven in Romans chapter eight, let's see here, I'm going to skip that one.

I'm going to move on to what I mentioned before, First John chapter three, what is sin? Okay, sin is a transgression of the Law and that's the Law of Yahweh. I'll read here beginning in verse four, First John chapter three, it says "Whoever commits sin transgresses also the law, for sin is a transgression of the law. And you know that He was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin." Now the "He" there is talking about the Messiah, Yahshua. And you notice how it says, the reason he was manifested was to take away our sins. He was not manifested to take away the Law, to abolish the Law. Okay, in verse six it says, "Whoever so abides in Him sinneth not. Whoever sinneth has not seen Him nor known Him. Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous." Okay, he didn't come to take the Law, he came to pay the penalty for sin for breaking Yahweh's Law.

In 1 John 5:2, it says, "By this we know that we love the children of Yahweh, when we love Yahweh, and keep his commandments." See, that's an identification of lov-

ing Yahweh, is keeping His commandments. “So this is the love of Yahweh” in verse three, “that we keep His commandments and His commandments are not grievous.” Yahweh’s commandments are not burdensome, another translation says. It’s only because our lives are not right with Him that His commandments become burdensome or a misapplication of His Law. That’s something also that needs to be discussed.

In Revelation 14:12, I’ll read that real quick here, it says, “Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of Yahweh, and the faith of Yahshua.” Okay, so there was two things for the saints, one was to keep the commandments of Yahweh, and the other was faith in Yahshua, the Messiah.

In 2 Timothy 3:15, I’m going to begin there and read a couple scriptures, in 2 Timothy chapter three, it says, “And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in the Messiah Yahshua.” And verse sixteen says, “All scripture is given by inspiration of Yahweh and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of Yahweh may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

Now at the time, (many people attribute this to Paul), at the time Paul wrote this, he was referring to the scriptures, which at that time was only the Old Testament. The New Testament was not compiled then, there was no such thing as the New Testament, at the time Paul was writing this. So the Scripture he was referring to was the Old Testament. In verse fifteen, notice how it says, “from a child, thou hast known the holy scriptures.” So, if you wanted to know, what was right and wrong

and how we ought to live, it says, “for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness” we would go to what is known as the Old Testament and read that.

In Acts 17:11, it talks about the Bereans were “more noble than... (others, because they)... searched the Scriptures” to see if what Paul was saying was true. They didn’t just take Paul’s word for it, they searched the Scriptures. What scriptures did they search? They were looking in the Old Testament. That’s how they can tell if Paul was telling the truth or not.

Okay, Yahweh has already given us his Law. He already gave us His Laws in the Old Testament, why does He need to repeat himself? Many people want to know why isn’t the Sabbath talked about? Well the reason, I believe, the Sabbath was not debated was because everybody was keeping it. There wasn’t a dispute over whether or not we need to keep the Sabbath. It was how we are to keep the Sabbath, is what Yahshua, the Messiah had disputes over.

Now I want to look at one more scripture here, 2 Peter 3:16, I’m just going to paraphrase it. Peter, himself a pillar of the church, was saying that Paul’s writings are hard to understand and people twist them to their own destruction. So we need to be careful when we go to Paul’s writings that we don’t just take a surface reading of them or pull one or two scriptures out of context. Paul is consistent with the rest of the Scripture and we need to keep that in mind that Peter himself was warning us against that. And if you read Acts 21:18-24, which I’m not going to have time to read, but there was this rumor going around that Paul was teaching contrary to the Law and he was not keeping the Law. And Paul took a vow, with these other men, and he did this, it says, so that he could show that what the

rumors were not true. That he, himself walks orderly and keeps the Law. And if you read that, verses eighteen to twenty-four, you'll see that.

I've got thirty seconds here. One thing I do want to point out is that, I believe that Yahweh has one Law for all of us. I don't believe he has two separate Laws, one for Jewish people or Israelites and one for, what the scripture refers to as, Gentiles. I believe that today we are to keep one law. Okay, I'm going to it over to Wayne, thank you.

First Negative-Wayne Greeson

Thank you very much, John. I appreciate John's comments and the fact that he went to the Scriptures. There are a number of things that we want to look at what John had to say.

First of all let's understand, I have no disagreement that we are to keep God's laws. The question we are discussing here is, and there are a number of passages that he gave with respect to the fact that we are to keep His commandments, that His commandments are not a burden, that sin is a transgression of the law. John, I agree with all of those passages. The question that we need to focus on is "What Law are we under?"

Now, a part of what he described he says he believes there is but one Law and we want to go to the Scriptures and understand that God gave us a Law through the Messiah, Jesus Christ, that is contained within the New Testament. And that Law is the Law that we're under, not the Law that was given by God to Moses at Mt. Sinai.

Let me begin by looking at a passage that I think that he began with that deals with this issue or question. It's found at Matthew the fifth chapter in verse seventeen

through nineteen. There Jesus is talking about the fact, and John emphasized, that he did not come to destroy the Law or the prophets. Instead, what he does, he tells us that the Law and the prophets were going to be fulfilled and he came to fulfill them. The Law and the prophets were going to pass, they were going to expire, when they were fulfilled.

Notice the words of Jesus, "For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass, from the Law **till** all is fulfilled." The question that we have is "Did Jesus fulfill the Law and the prophets?" And I believe what John stated there was, yes, Jesus did fulfill the Law and the prophets and that's exactly what he said in Luke the twenty-four chapter and verse forty-four. There is a time element that Jesus gives us. That the Law and the prophets will not pass, til they were fulfilled.

In Luke the twenty-four chapter and verse forty-four, Jesus clearly came, the Messiah clearly came for the purpose to fulfill. "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms concerning Me." Jesus fulfilled those scripture. Since Jesus fulfilled those scripture, then we need to understand that what that means is, is that the Law and the Prophets have passed.

Now he goes to Romans the third chapter, the second chapter talking about the establishment of the Law. We need to understand very clearly and very simply that as Paul was writing he was explaining to the Jew and to the Gentile the difference between the Law that was given to the Jews and the faith which came through Jesus Christ.

In Romans the sixth chapter, there is a very important point to understand. In

Romans the sixth chapter, he explains to us, and let me get the proper verse here, he tells us that we are no longer under the Law. It says in Romans six and verse fourteen, “for you are not under law but under grace.” And then he goes on and explains, “Shall we sin because we are not under the Law but under grace? Certainly not!” And so, certainly we are not to sin, but we are not under the Law of Moses and that was plainly revealed to us here in Romans six.

Faith establishes the law of God, but then the question comes up, but what law does it establish? Does it establish the law that was given through Moses or does it establish the law that was given through Jesus Christ?

Again, there are a number of passages he returns to, he went to Romans the seventh chapter and I thought it was very interesting where he talks about the Law is holy and the commandment is holy, just and good. But I want you to notice, there in Romans the seventh chapter at the beginning of the chapter, that the apostle Paul clearly tells us that the Law is compared to a dead spouse or a dead husband that we are no longer bound to. Notice with me in Romans seven and verse one: “Do you not know, brethren (for I speak to those who know the law), that the law has dominion over a man as long as he lives? For the woman who has a husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he lives. But if the husband dies, she is released from the law of her husband”

And he goes on in verse four and explains, “my brethren, you also have become dead to the law through the body of Christ, that you may be married to another – to Him who was raised from the dead, that we should bear fruit to God. For when we were in the flesh, the sinful passions which were aroused by the law were

at work in our members to bear fruit to death. But now we have been delivered from the law...” Paul very clearly tells us, yes, the Law was holy and righteous and good, but the Law that was given to Moses we are no longer bound by, we are not under the Law, Romans 6:14. In fact, Paul says, we are “dead to the Law.” That means it has no more dominion over us.

And so that basically answers the main points that he made with respect to the Law. Like I said, there were a number of other passages that he gave, that sin is a transgression of the Law, that we are to keep His commandments and His commandments are not burdensome, we have agreement with all that.

There was one point towards the end that I think goes to the issue. He mentioned the fact that in Acts the twenty first chapter Paul kept the Law. And we want to turn and examine that particular passage with respect to what the apostles of Jesus Christ had determined. We really need to go back in Acts to put this in the proper context.

There was a controversy and the controversy is described in Acts 15:5. And at that controversy there were those who were Jews who had become Christians and this is what they taught, “they rose up” and this is Acts 15:5, “It is necessary to circumcise (those Gentiles who believed) and to command them to keep the Law of Moses.”

Now the apostles of Jesus Christ and the elders at Jerusalem came together for the purpose to discuss this very question, “Are we to teach disciples to keep the Law of Moses?” And as they came together to consider this, Peter spoke, and he says, in verse ten, “Why do you test God by putting a yoke on the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?” Now John, the apostle Peter de-

scribed the Law of Moses as a yoke which they were not able to bear. "But we believe that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved in the same manner as they," speaking of the Gentiles.

The apostle James spoke in verse twenty and this is what he said, in Acts 15:20, "But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from sexual immorality, from things strangled, and from blood." Those were the instructions that were given to disciples of Christ, the Messiah.

We can go on and they wrote a letter. And they wrote a letter to this fact, it's found in verse twenty-three, "The apostles, the elders and the brethren; to the brethren who are Gentiles in Antioch... we have heard, that some who went out from us have troubled you with words, unsettling your souls, saying, You must be circumcised, and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment: It seemed good unto us, being assembled" and they described their assembly. And it says in verse twenty-eight, "to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; ... to abstain from things offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from sexual immorality: if you keep yourselves from these, you do well."

Now, John and Paul, pardon me, John and Mike, the fact is the apostles specifically said we are not to keep the Law of Moses. And they gave us what we are to keep.

Now when we come to Acts the twenty-first chapter, you know what we find? We find that Paul keeps a principle and that principle is found in 1 Corinthians 9:21. That when he was with the Jews he acted as one who was under the Law of the Jews so that he might win the Jews. And that's what

he did in Acts the twenty-first chapter. As a matter of fact, he was given instructions by the apostles and those instructions were (repeated to) remind the apostle Paul: now we gave no instructions to the Gentiles that they were to keep the Law. And that's found in Acts the twenty-first chapter and I believe it is about verse twenty-four or twenty-five. He (James) says we want you (Paul) to do this because of some of the things that the Jews are saying about you, but we gave no such instructions to the Gentiles. And that's found again in Acts the twenty-first chapter and that repeats their instructions that are found back there in Acts the fifteenth chapter.

Well, I understand that my time is up.

Second Affirmative-Michael Mastropalo

Three minutes is not very long. What Law are we under? This is the basic question as I understand it. Yahshua did come as Matthew five says to fulfill the Law and the Prophets. And he did indeed fulfill prophecies that were made and kept the Law perfectly. Until when? Well, he said "until all" is come to be. Well, all has not yet come to be. Yahshua has not returned yet as King of the Planet. And so, you see, he has not finished all that he came to do. He came to be a propitiation for our sins and indeed he did that back then.

As far as no longer, in Romans 6, no longer being under the Law, and we're told of two possible aspects of the Law here, the Law of Moses versus the Law of the Christ. I don't believe that this is the proper division to at.... The two aspects of the Law, are the Law given by Yahweh to his people, even aspects of which were in existence way before Mt. Sinai. What happened at Mt. Sinai, was that there was a law that pertained to the mediation by the Aaronic priesthood. If you recall, the people of Israel

told the Almighty that he was not, that they didn't want to hear it directly from Him anymore. It was too frightful and too much for them. And so, Yahweh honored their request and appointed Moses and Aaron as mediators.

Well, there's mention in the New Testament, I can't pull up the verse immediately, maybe I will get it tomorrow for you, but you can find it with Strong's, it's mentioned that there was a change in the priesthood, therefore, there need be a change in the law. And I believe that this is where the problem arises here, understanding just what aspects of the law, it was the law regarding the Aaronic priesthood that was changed, and in fact, in effect done a way, as far as no longer required to be kept.

The controversy in Acts over circumcision that was for new Gentile converts and that was indeed a yoke. Much of this Aaronic priesthood mediatorship was a yoke and it does mention, that they were to abstain from idolatry, certainly that was in the Law, immorality and blood. Well, the blood thing wasn't in the Ten Commandments. So, it goes back to that. Also, you have to read on and find out that they had Moses taught to them.

Now, 1 Corinthians will have to be addressed tomorrow. I don't have any time to rebut anything there.

Second Negative-Wayne Greeson

The fact is that all of the Law and the Prophets according to Jesus in Luke 24:44 were fulfilled in Him. All of the Law was looking forward to Him. That's the same argument that the apostle Paul makes in the book of Galatians (3) where he says, that the promises were fulfilled through and in Jesus Christ. He came and he fulfilled it. When he fulfilled it, that Law was then

taken out of the way.

The important point, and I think Mike pointed it out is “What Law are we under?” That's the question really that we are examining, when we come down to it. And the question is, is there a Law of Christ, the Messiah. I would point out in Galatians 6:2 it specifically refers to the fact we are to keep the “Law of Christ” and this would be in distinction to the Law that was given by God through Moses. Jesus is the Lawgiver, in fact, Hebrew 1:2, it says, God has spoken to us through His Son. That Son is Jesus Christ. He is the one we are to listen to, not the Law that was given through Moses.

Now, in 1 Corinthians 9:21, I'm sorry that Mike did not have time to deal with that, but let me, that really points out the difference in the fact that the law that was given through Jesus Christ, under Jesus Christ, versus the Law that was given to the Jews. In 1 Corinthians 9, the apostle Paul writes in verse 19, “For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a servant to all, that I might win the more; and to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might win Jews; to those who are under the law.” The Jews were under the Law, not the Gentiles and not any of those who became Christians. “...As those under the law, that I might win those who are under the law; to those who are without law, as without law (not being without law toward God, but under law toward Christ), that I might win those who are without law.” The fact is that the Law of Moses, the Law that was given through Moses, was given to the Jews and it was given to them for a time, until the Messiah came and fulfilled that Law and that Law was taken out of the way.

It is interesting in Romans 6:14, it very clearly says that we are no longer under the Law, we are under the grace that came through Jesus Christ. That passage contin-

ues to stand.

And, I agree with him that there was a change in the priesthood and a change in the Law. That change in the Law was not only a change in the Law, but in the Law-giver. And that included, and I guess we need to deal with it, was it just a change in the priesthood or was it all aspects of the Law?

Well, I understand that our time is up.

Tuesday, January 16, 2001

Third Affirmative—Michael Mastropalo

Thank you Wayne. I thought it might be of use to give a little explanation by way of background, so the listeners could understand where we're coming from on this. We don't belong to any group other than the body of the Messiah, our Savior and Sovereign.

We cannot keep the commandments of Yahweh to earn salvation. I want to emphasize that because we get accused of that quite often as doing works in order to be saved.

Basically, we try to avoid the same mistake that Eve made back in the Garden and that is to take to ourselves prerogative of deciding what is good and what is evil. Our Creator, having created us, knows what's good for us. And we're willing to take that at face value and try to do it as best we can.

Salvation is a gift made possible only through the perfect life, death and resurrection of Yahshua, the Messiah. Or if you like to use the Greek, for "the Anointed," then, Yahshua, the Christ.

The way to reach out and receive this

free gift, given by the grace of Yahweh, is outlined by Peter in Acts 2:38, where he says, (for those who ask the question, "What do we do?"), he says, "Repent," "be baptized in Yahshua's name for the remission of sins" as we are called. In Acts 4:12, It shows that there is no, "there is salvation in no other name...than Yahshua." Which means, "Yahweh is salvation" or "Yahweh saves." You won't understand or accept this revelation unless you are called.

The first step, in response to this offer of eternal life is repentance. This is turning from a life of lawlessness or sin or iniquity, to a lawful life, as obedient servants of the Christ. Yahshua's death takes out from under the condemnation of the Law and gives us a fresh start. Baptism buries the old sinful man. The new man, having received grace, becomes one bought with a price, commanded to live a life as a living sacrifice.

We obey because we are His and heirs to the promise of everlasting life and must avoid throwing away such a wonderful, loving gift, by turning back to a life of sin. Which, we said yesterday, was the transgressing of the Law. Because, if we do, we're told in Hebrew 6:6, that it's not possible to be renewed again and we would impale our Savior again, if we did that.

Now, let's just take as a premise that we are to keep the law of the Christ. Of what does this law consist? James 4:12 asserts "there is one Lawgiver." This is obviously not James and it's not Paul. Did Yahshua claim to be a Lawgiver? In John 7:16-19, Yahshua says his doctrine was not his, but Yahweh's and that was presented through Moses.

If that prophet was to be raised up, like unto Moses, if that prophet is indeed Yahshua, then I would suggest that

Yahshua was like Moses in that he spoke his Father’s words, including a command to be obedient and was a mediator of a covenant. Although this covenant was a better one. But it’s the same Law. Only now it’s written on Israel’s heart, instead of on stone. So we don’t have to go to the literature to reference it. It’s, it’s, we make it within us, He makes it within us.

And it also is a covenant with a better promise; everlasting life, instead of a piece of real estate. John 8:28, reaffirms that Yahshua did nothing of himself, but spoke as his Father taught him. Verse thirty-two says, that this, that’s the Father’s words, spoken through Yahshua, is truth and it makes us free. It is disobedience and adding to the Word of Truth that brings bondage and burdens hard to bear; not the Word of Truth, which includes the command given through Moses and Yahshua.

Yahshua as our example kept his Father’s perfect commands perfectly. No one can change something that is perfect, just, right and good and make it better. One of the commands, Yahshua kept, since he kept them all, was the command in Deuteronomy 4:2 and repeated in Deuteronomy 12:32, which asserts, “You shall not add to the Word or take away from it.”

Now, if there is a law of the Christ, it would be something given him by the Father. We can discern it in Galatians two, I mean 6:2. And if we go there and put it all in context, it is to bear one another’s burdens, as a humble servant, which Yahshua did as an example for us. It has nothing to do with annulling his Father’s orders or substituting his own.

Failure to follow sound biblical study principles, such as praying for wisdom and not just trying to defend an organizational

doctrine, or our father’s or what we were taught by our parents, that’s one thing we must do. Pray for the wisdom and the guidance of His spirit. And then, we let many clear verses shed light on few apparent contradictory or difficult verses. And then we make sure that all is understood in context. Now this...if we don’t do this it can result into falling into the trap that Peter warns us of in 2 Peter 3:14-18 where he cautions us not to twist Paul’s difficult writings and other scriptures to our own destruction.

I’d like to take the little time that’s left, to go to Colossians 2:14-16. Many have used this as showing how things were done away with. It says, “having wiped out the handwriting of requirements that against us, which was contrary to us and he has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross.” No where can I ever find that the commands that He gave: to keep His Sabbath day, to not murder, to not commit adultery, and so forth, were in any way contrary to us. What was contrary to us was the penalty for breaking them.

“Having disarmed principalities and powers, he made public spectacle of them, triumphing over them in it.” This is basically the Romans and the Jews at that time, wanted him in the grave, but he triumphed over them by not staying in the grave.

Now the next verse is the problem and there’s problems in the translation. I’d like to point just a couple of them out. It says, “So let no one judge you except the body of Yahshua.” That’s basically what that verse says. Now, how do I know this? Well, the word “is” that’s in many of your King James Versions, is not there. The word “but” does mean except; and in many cases where the translation gives “substance of, is of the Messiah” or “of the Christ” or “of Christ,” that word “substance” is the same word

that's translated "body" in Colossians one, verse eighteen, where it says, "And he is head of the body, the *ecclesia*, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead" etcetera.

So, if we just use that word consistently, it's clear that what is being said here is a warning against outsiders coming into the body of the Messiah and making judgments against us. We have been given the authority to judge our own.

And the things in which, are mentioned here, in food or in drink or regarding of festival, a new moon or Sabbaths, those things are announced by Paul as still in existence at his time. Paul knew how to use the language and he chose the present tense there, "which are" a shadow of things to come. That means at the time Paul wrote this, many years after Yahshua's death, these are still in existence as pointing forward and they also as explained, in the older writings, the purpose of the things like the feast of days, the annual feast days and the Sabbath, are to look back on things in the past, that remind us, that remind us of what has happened to Israel as an example and that Yahweh is the Creator and rules over time. Therefore, the Sabbath day is sign between Him and His people.

Looks like I'm out of time.

Third Negative-Wayne Greeson

Thank you very much Michael.

Much of what Michael said I do not disagree with. I agree with, that we have salvation through Jesus Christ, that we need to repent and that we need to be baptized and that there is no other name under heaven whereby we must be saved. And I believe we should obey as following the laws and the commandments of the Lord.

The question we are asking and we are examining and we want to focus in, like a laser beam, we want to examine, what Law are we under?

Now the suggestion was given that there is only the Law that was given through Moses and the argument was made that "if" and I wrote down this specifically, "if there is a Law of Christ" and of course, we have pointed out that the scriptures very clearly teach that there is the Law of Christ and that the Law of Christ is in contrast to the Law that was given by Moses. Mike, himself, referred to Galatians 6:2 where it does refer to us and tells us to "fulfill the Law of Christ." Very clearly, throughout the entire book of Galatians, there is a contrast between the Law of Moses and the Law of Christ. This contrast is clear throughout the scriptures.

Yes, Michael and John, I do agree that there is only one Lawgiver as James 4:12 says and that the doctrine that Christ gave was a doctrine that came from the heavenly Father as John 7:16-19 states. There is no disagreement with that. The question is whether or not, the Christ, the Messiah, brought another Law. Galatians 6:2 says that he did. It is the Law of Christ, in contrast to the Law of Moses. This theme runs throughout the scriptures.

Let me give you another passage which refers to the Law of Christ in contrast to the Law of Moses. We referred to this passage yesterday. It is found in 1 Corinthians 9:21. In this particular passage the apostle Paul explains the contrast between the Law of the Jews and the Law that was given through Jesus Christ. I want you to pay close attention, there is a difference between the Law of Moses and the Law of Christ. It is not "if there is a Law of Christ," there is clearly a Law of Christ. Paul wrote, "...to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might win Jews; to

those who are under the law.” Mike and John make a very simple mistake and that is they try as Gentiles to go back and keep the Law that was given to the Jews. Paul said that Law was to the Jews. They were the ones under that Law, the Law that was given to Moses. So he acted “...as those under the law, that I might win those who are under the law; to those who are without law” (speaking of that they are not under the Law of Moses) “(I acted) as (one) without law.” But he says I was not acting as one “(without law toward God, but under law toward Christ), that I might win those who are without law.” Now that passage makes no sense whatsoever if we do not understand that there is a difference between the Law that the Jews observed and kept versus the Law that was given through Jesus Christ.

Now, Mike tried to suggest that the idea was that Jesus was just simply repeating or simply giving the same Law that what was given through Moses. And yet very clearly the contrast, again is made in Hebrews 1:1-2 and notice what that contrast is. It is a contrast to what was given by the Law and the Prophets that came before Jesus and Jesus as the Son of God. In Hebrews 1:1, “God, who at various times and in different ways spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things, through whom also He made the worlds.” So there is a contrast between God who spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets versus how He has spoken to us by His own Son, whom He has appointed heir.

The contrast is made particularly in chapter two and verses one through four. It is a contrast to the word, that he says, “that was spoken through angels” the idea of messengers, the prophets that came before, “the word spoken through angels proved

steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed to us by those who heard Him.” So the word, the salvation that the Lord spoke was a message which was a Law and was given for the purpose of teaching us and providing for us the Law of Christ.

The prophet that is like Moses, Jesus Christ, the Messiah, the Son of God, is greater than Moses. He is greater than Moses as Moses gave the Law to the Jewish people, the Messiah gave the Law, His Law through the Father, received from the Father, to, not just the Jewish people, but to men of all nations. And that Law completely set aside the middle wall of partition, is what is described, so that they could be one body, Jew and Gentile alike. The reason that Christ did come and continue (keeping) the Law that was given through Moses is because that Law was specifically given to the Jews until the coming of Jesus Christ.

Now I want to turn to a passage that we talked about and I thought it was a very important passage. And it’s found in Matthew the fifth chapter. It was one of the first passages that John referred to and I think that it was important to understand as far as a time element with respect to the doing away with the Law. In Matthew 5:17, John said that this passage asserted that the Law was not done away with and Jesus said that he did not come to abolish it. But I want you to understand exactly what it does say. Jesus said, Matthew 5:17, “Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill.” The purpose Jesus came for was to fulfill the Law and the Prophets. And then he goes on and says the certainty of that fulfillment. “For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by

no means pass from the Law till all is fulfilled."

Did Jesus fulfill the Law and the Prophets? John said he did. Jesus said he did. Jesus said, I came to fulfill. Now, did he or did he not do what the Law and the Prophets said he was going to do? And that he said he was going to do? Luke 24:44 he said that exactly "all things must be fulfilled."

Now what's interesting is Mike and John agreed with me yesterday that Jesus came to fulfill the Law and the Prophets. And we agree, I believe from what they said, that when all of the Law and the Prophets are fulfilled they will pass away. But where we disagree is, is whether Jesus fulfilled all the Law and the Prophets when he came the first time. Their argument was that that has not happened yet. But I want you to turn to Galatians 3:19. That passage clearly tells us that Jesus, the Seed and the Promise did fulfill. In fact it says, "What purpose did the Law serve? It was added because of (sin or) transgressions, **TIL** the Seed should come." Now that "until the Seed should come to whom the promise was made," the Law was "until the Seed should come." Jesus said it was not going to pass "til it was fulfilled." When Jesus came that Law was up. It was done with.

In fact, Paul goes on Galatians 3:23-25 and he says, "But before faith came, we were kept under guard by the law, kept for the faith which would afterward be revealed. (Our) law was (a) tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor." The Law was our tutor to bring us to Christ and Paul says very clearly we are not under the tutor. Guess what? That exactly agrees with what Paul wrote in Romans 6:14, "We are no longer under Law, we are under grace."

The Law that was given through Moses was put away, we are no longer under it, it was "til the Seed should come." Did the Seed come? Were the promises fulfilled? Did he fulfill the Law and the Prophets? Yes! Yes! Yes! The Law has been done away with.

We very much appreciate the passages and the verses and this opportunity to talk about this very important subject. And the reason, in the last few seconds that I have, is it is important because if we turn back to the Law, Christ is of no effect to us, Galatians 5:4. And we very much appreciate this opportunity to point out that we need to follow Jesus Christ, the Son through whom God has spoken and we need to follow His Law and what he has spoken to us.

Fourth Affirmative—John Zecca

Now thanks. I'm going to move real quick here. I'm going to comment on a few things that Wayne said here. For one, the Law being our tutor, you see, when your under a tutor, what do you do when you are no longer under the tutor? Do you forget everything that you were instructed by that tutor? No. Absolutely not. And, I might talk about that tomorrow, Galatians three.

Funny how Yahshua, he died for something he was going to abolish. You see he died for the penalty of our sin, but yet Wayne is asserting here that he came to abolish the Law. So he, did he die for something that he was going to abolish, that we would not longer have to keep?

I want to be like the Bereans, who searched daily. They searched the scriptures. If Yahshua's fulfilling the Law and the Prophets, meant he would abolish His Father's law and reinstate a new one, please show me where this is found in the scripture. I'd like to see in the Old Testament,

because this is what we’re claiming he fulfilled, where it says, when the Messiah would come, he would abolish his Father’s Law. I don’t think you can find it.

You know what you see instead in Hebrews eight it reiterates what’s in Jeremiah thirty-one that Yahweh was going to make a new covenant. And what was this new covenant? He was going to write the laws in their hearts. What laws was he going to write in their hearts? He didn’t say the laws of the Messiah. It’s obvious, it’s the laws of Yahweh that were going to be written in their hearts.

He said it was only for the Jews. Well, I have a question, were the Ninevites Jews? Yahweh sent a prophet, Jonah, to go speak to the Ninevites to tell them to repent. Well what were they supposed to repent of, if the laws were only for the Jews? Were they supposed to repent of what? That’s the question I have.

Let’s see here. I don’t have a contrast with Hebrews one. I agree with Wayne here. There’s no argument there for me. I don’t think it’s a contradiction. He did speak through His son Yahshua the Messiah and I believe that Yahshua the Messiah reaffirmed His Father’s commands.

And one other thing, what is the purpose of the Law? We need to keep that in mind. 2 Timothy 3:16, the Law is for instruction. Okay. It tells us the right way to live. It’s not for justification. If we could keep the Law perfectly we would have no need for a Savior. All of us have sinned and broken Yahweh’s Law. Therefore the Law cannot justify us like Paul affirmed. We are under grace. We’re under Yahweh’s grace. He’s had mercy on us because we’ve been law breakers. That doesn’t mean we turn around and break his law now because he’s pardoned us. No, we should be more eager to

keep his laws and honor him and not abolish them. So we are under grace, I’m not arguing with that either. The Law’s purpose was not to justify us. It shows us sin and Paul talks about that. If it wasn’t for the Law we wouldn’t know that we’re sinners. But the Law shows us sin, it brings us to the Messiah cause we see our need for a savior. We see the penalty of the Law hanging over our heads and we cry out to Yahweh for mercy.

Thank you very much.

Fourth Negative-Wayne Greeson

I’d like to go to Galatians 3:25 and there John’s response says that we still remember (the lessons of our tutor). It’s very obvious throughout the New Testament that we are told that we (are) to receive instruction. There is a far different thing in receiving instruction by way of the examples and the illustrations that the Old Testament serves for us and being under that Law! The difference is that I can learn from the examples, for example, the instructions that were given to Adam in the Garden of Eden. But John, that law doesn’t apply to me, because I wasn’t in the Garden of Eden. And I can learn from the examples and the law that was given to Noah to build an ark, but I’m not under that instruction, because that wasn’t given to me.

And the Law that was given to the Jews was given to the Jews and not to you and me. You’re not a Jew John! And neither am I. God said, when he gave it through Moses, He said, I’m giving it to those I delivered out of Egypt. And that law included the fact that they were not to associate with Gentiles. They were not have any type of association. Now when we come to the New Testament we find out that that Law was put aside. And specifically in Galatians three, Jesus, in his flesh abolished that

middle wall of partition and took away (the Law) so that he might make them one body. He took it by taking away the Law that was given for separation.

But, you mentioned the fact of the New Covenant. It's very interesting that you would mention the New Covenant because the Law was a part of that Covenant. And we are told specifically in Hebrews 10:9 that "he took away the first covenant to establish the second." Now where does it say that the Law was a part of the first covenant? In Hebrews 9:15, it says "He is the mediator of a new covenant by means of death for redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant." And he goes on in verse eighteen and he says, "the first covenant was dedicated (with) blood" and that first covenant was done away with. In Hebrews 8:13, he says, "a new covenant, he made the first obsolete. What is becoming obsolete, is growing old and ready to vanish away."

What purpose did that Law serve? Remember Galatians 3:19? "It was added because of transgressions, until the Seed should come." Jesus said, it would not pass until all was fulfilled. It was very interesting in your comments yesterday, that the comment was made that you agreed that there was a change in the Law. In fact you cited the scripture for it. Guess what? Jesus said not one part of the Law would pass away till all be fulfilled. John and Mike, if any part of the Law has passed away, Jesus said it's all passed away! And he came to establish his Law.

Wednesday, January 17, 2001

The proposition for the second two days was: "The New Testament scriptures teach that men today are under the Law of Christ and not under the Law of Moses."

Affirm

Wayne Greeson,
preacher for the church of Christ

Deny

John Zecca & Michael Mastropalo
members of the Assembly of Yahweh

First Affirmative-Wayne Greeson

Jesus said in Matthew 28:18 "All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth. Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age."

This passage clearly establishes Jesus has all authority today! He now rules as "Lord of lords and King of kings," Revelation 17:14. He is King of the kingdom of God. Acts 2:36 clearly establishes he ascended to the throne and he sits on the throne. He is head over the body, which is his church, Ephesians 1:22-23.

The extent of Jesus' authority is absolute. The "government (of the kingdom) is upon his shoulder," Isaiah 9:6. Jesus said "For the Father judges no one, but has committed all judgment to the Son," John 5:22. In fact, in John 17:2 Jesus said to the Father that he had been given authority, that is Jesus had been given "authority over all flesh."

Now Jesus, as Lord and King, John, has

all authority. And with that authority he gave his disciples commandments to observe or keep. Now these commandments were not the Law of Moses. Clearly, because he says teach them “all things that I have commanded you!” Christ’s commandments were given by his authority, his command! They were not given through Moses.

Christ’s disciples were to be taught to observe, “all things whatsoever (Christ) ...commanded” them. Christ’s commands were to be followed “even to the end of the world.”

Now I have a very important series of questions:

Is Christ Ruler without His Rules?

Is Christ Lord without His Law?

Is Christ King without His commandments to His Kingdom?

John and Mike have argued this week that there is no Law of Christ, yet their argument and position denies plain scripture! Galatians 6:2 says we are to “fulfill the Law of Christ.” John, you can’t fulfill the Law of Christ, if there is not such Law.

John and Mike have argued, on the other hand or in alternative, that the Law of Christ is simply the Law of Moses, yet Paul clearly denies this in 1 Corinthians 9:20-21. “[T]o the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might win the Jews; to those who are under the Law...” He goes on and says, “...to those who are (not under the Law or) without (the) Law,” he says I became “as without (the) Law (not being without law toward God, but under law toward Christ).” The Law of Christ cannot be the Law of Moses for Paul said, when he was among the Gentiles, who are without the Law, he lived without the Law of Moses, but he was still

under the Law of Christ!

Now the Law of Christ is taught in the New Testament by the teaching of the apostles and prophets of Jesus Christ. Did they do what Christ commanded them to do? Well certainly.

This is why the apostle Paul said, “...the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord,” 1 Corinthians 14:37. And again, “For ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus,” 1 Thessalonians 4:2. “And we have confidence in the Lord touching you, that ye both do and will do the things which we command you,” 2 Thessalonians 3:4.

Now the apostle John wrote repeatedly about the commandments of the Lord Jesus Christ and this is what he said, “hereby... we know him, if we keep his commandments” (1 Jn. 2:3). Now John, on Monday you said that apostle John was telling us to keep the commandments of God given in the Law of Moses. John, you better go back and reread that passage. The apostle John identifies whose commandments we are to keep, in verses one and two. He calls, before that, He says the one we are to know is Jesus Christ the righteous, the propitiation for our sins! If we keep His commandments, the commandments of Jesus Christ then we know Him and have the truth.

Now since the apostles were clearly charged with teaching us “to observe all things whatsoever (the Christ, the Lord) commanded” Matthew 28:20. Did they teach us that we are under and that we’re to observe the Law of Moses?

Well that very question came up in the early church! And we have already talked about this passage. In Acts 15:5, “some of the sect of the Pharisees who believed rose up, saying, ‘It is necessary to circumcise

them, and to keep (the command) ...the Law of Moses" (Acts 15:5).

What was the answer of the apostles of Jesus Christ the Messiah? "Since we have heard that some who went out from us have troubled you with words, unsettling your souls, saying, "You must be circumcised and keep the law," to whom we gave no such commandment" They were charged with teaching the commandments of Jesus Christ and yet they said, we didn't give you any such commandment. That's found in Acts 15:28. Now they went on and said these are what we are going to tell you to do.

Now while the New Testament teaches us that we are to observe all of Christ's commandments, the apostles plainly taught that we not to keep the Law of Moses! In fact, they said "we gave (you) no such commandment." John, they were charged by Christ to teach all of His commands and yet not one command did they ever gave which charged us with keeping the Law of Moses! And this was by the guidance of the Holy Spirit. They said, "this was good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than" these certain few things that they made mention of there in Acts 15:28. Notice: No circumcision! No Jewish feasts! No clean and unclean animals! No Sabbaths! They did not bind or command the Law of Moses upon Christians!

The rest of the New Testament confirms this truth! We are not under the Law of Moses. Romans 6:14 "...for you are not under the Law, but under grace."

Romans seven, tells us and compares the Law to a dead spouse that you are no longer bound to. In Romans 7:2, Paul says a "woman which hath a husband is bound to the law to her husband as long as he lives; if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband." In verse four he

says, "brethren, you...are... dead to the Law." We're not bound by the Law, we're dead to the Law "by the body of Christ... (to) be married to another." In verse six he says, "we are delivered from the Law... (and) being dead wherein we were held." John, that passage is so plain. You can't misunderstand it.

It reminds me of the man who looking for gold and keeps finding big nuggets and puts them down and says, "Who put that there?" "Why is it there?"

The Law was a schoolmaster that we're no longer under. In Galatians 3:19, "What purpose then does the Law serve? It was added because of transgressions, *till the Seed come....*" Did the Seed come John? Yes it did. In Galatians 3:24-25, "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."

The Law was changed. In Hebrews 7:11, "if perfection were through the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest?" In verse twelve he says, "For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there is also a change of the Law."

Now, Mike and John have already told us that we are not under or to keep the whole Law because parts of it have changed; parts of it are obsolete; parts of it are passed away. John don't shake your head because Mike used Hebrews 7:12 to make this point. He said that parts of the Law have passed away that we're no longer the Levitical or Aaronical priesthood. Now, I want you to notice what parts of the Law do they say have passed away?

The Levitical priesthood. The animal sacrifices for sin. Boy, when you eliminate

those two parts of the Law alone you virtually eliminate the book of Leviticus, one fifth of the five books of the Law of Moses. We're no longer bound by (the Law concerning) the tabernacle or the temple and all its ordinances. This would eliminate a large portion of Exodus and Numbers. The laws of separation between Jew and Gentiles. John, this was a part of the Law. And including any, the forbidding (of) social interaction and intermarriage. All the penalties for breaking the Law of Moses have passed away.

John, by the time you are finished with your version of the Law of Moses, most of it we're not under today, according to your own position. Now there's a problem with your partial version of the Law. John, you can't remove or keep just part of the Law of Moses. To keep the Law of Moses, you must keep all the commandments or be guilty of breaking the Law!

Moses said, Deuteronomy 12:28, "Observe and obey all these words which I command you." But John, you come along and say, no, there are certain portions of it that we're no longer bound by.

Now the fact is, we're not bound by any of it. We're under all the commands that the Lord and King Jesus Christ, our Lawgiver, our Lord today (gave). John, does our Lord have a Law? Are we to follow His commandments or are we to follow the commandments given through Moses?

And thank you very much and now we're going to turn over (the discussion) to John Zecca.

First Negative—John Zecca

Okay, thank you. I agreed with a lot of what Wayne said. I think there's some misunderstanding here. But, I don't say we

don't have to follow the laws of the Messiah. I just don't believe the laws of the Messiah contradict the laws of Yahweh.

Now, he talked about Acts fifteen. He brought this up Monday and I thought today would be a good day to go into this. I'm going to spend a little time in Acts fifteen 'cause I think it's very important, that we understand what's going on here. 'Cause this is what Wayne is claiming that these are apostles of Yahshua the Messiah and what are they telling, what's going on here in Acts fifteen.

So let's begin here and start down here in verse four it says "when they came to Jerusalem and they were welcomed by the church, the apostles and the elders, and they declared all that Yahweh had done with them. But some believers, who belonged to the party of the Pharisees, rose up and said, 'It is necessary to circumcise them to charge them to keep the Law of Moses.'"

"And the apostles and elders were gathered together to consider this matter." And keep in mind here, this was something so serious that they came "together to consider this matter." And verse seven says, "And when there had been much debate...." Now, we're not told what was all in this debate, but after there had been much debate, it says, "Peter rose up, and said unto them, brethren, you know how that in the early days Yahweh made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And Yahweh, who knows the hearts, bore witness to them, giving them the Holy Spirit, just as he did to us; And He made no distinction between us and them, but cleansed their hearts by faith. Now therefore why do you make trial of Yahweh by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?"

Now let's stop there and think about this. Now, I believe it was on Monday, Wayne said that this "yoke" that they were talking about was the Law of Moses, if I understood him right. Let's think about this for a minute. If this was circumcision, Peter said this was something he was not able to bear. Now, was Peter circumcised? He absolutely was. Was his forefathers circumcised? Absolutely. So it makes no sense whatsoever that this yoke was circumcision.

Was this "yoke" the Sabbath day? Well did Peter keep the Sabbath? Did the apostles keep the Sabbath? Well there's every indication that they absolutely did.

How about the feast days? Where were they when they received the Spirit? They were celebrating the Feast of Pentecost. It couldn't be the feast days they were talking about.

How about the food laws? Well, in Acts chapter ten, I believe it is, Peter said he had never eaten anything common or unclean.

So obviously this "yoke" here could not have been the Law of Moses. And if it was, what part of the Law of Moses was it that they weren't able to care, take care of?

Now keep in mind, we've got to keep this in context. Who are these people who came down and were saying these things? It was the Pharisees. Verse five, "But some believers that belonged to party of the Pharisees...." Remember who the Pharisees were? Well I'll remind you. In Mark chapter seven, the Pharisees were the ones who laid these heavy burdens upon people. Yahshua himself said that. In Matthew 7:4, he said, Mark 7:4, "and when they come from the market place, they do not eat unless they purify themselves; and ...many other traditions which they observe, the washing of cups and pots and vessels of bronze." And

Yahshua called these "of the tradition of the elders" in verse five there. "Why do your disciples not live according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with hands defiled?" And then Yahshua said "You leave the commandment of Yahweh and hold fast the tradition of men."

What I believe was being placed upon these Gentile believers was not the Law of Moses, that was the problem, they were trying to put these traditions of men upon them. That was the "yoke."

We're going to keep reading on in Acts chapter fifteen, see if this makes any sense. Verse eleven says, "But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Master Yahshua, just as they will." That's, that's, no problem there.

And then we'll skip down here in verse nineteen. "Therefore my judgment is that we should not trouble those of the Gentiles who turn to God, but should write to them to abstain from the pollutions of idols and from unchastity and from what is strangled and from blood." Okay, let's stop right there for a minute. Where do we find these prohibitions? Well we find them in the Old Testament. Where's the blood prohibited? It's in the Old Testament. How about idols and fornication? In the Old Testament. Why were they apostles of the Christ placing these Old Testament laws on these Gentile converts? It doesn't make any sense.

Notice that there's no mention that they couldn't steal; they couldn't murder. Were they allowed to bear false witness? No. These were things that they had to stop immediately. I'll give you an example. Okay, if someone came to me and they were in an adulterous affair, they were stealing from their boss and they were slandering people by bearing false witness against them. I would tell them that what they

needed to do was stop those things immediately. Right away. There are other things they will learn as they fellowship in Yahweh’s assembly. They will learn the rest of the Law of Moses. But these things needed to be stopped right away. These were things that were common practices among the pagans.

Okay, in verse twenty-one, this is key, I believe, to the whole chapter here. It says, “For from early generations Moses ... had in every city those who preach him, for he is read every sabbath in the synagogues.” Now why would James even bring this up? Who cares if they were going to read Moses in the synagogues? The Gentiles wouldn’t be there, they’d be celebrating the first day of the week, according to some. No! They would be going to the Sabbath, on the synagogue, and they would be hearing the Law of Moses read, otherwise this verse, means absol..., makes absolutely no sense. So from early generations, Moses had those who preach him.

Let’s skip down to verse twenty-four, ‘cause Wayne brought this up, and this is where you need to check with different translations. I’m reading from the Revised Standard Version. The King James Version is very different. Now if you compare the Kings James to the Revised Standard, you’ll see what I mean. Verse twenty-four says, “Since we have heard that some persons from us have troubled you with words, unsettling your minds, although we gave them no instructions ...” Notice it doesn’t say anything in here about the Law of Moses here or circumcision, that’s in the King James version. I think it’s very important there.

Okay, I’m going to leave Acts fifteen right now and go back to Acts twenty-one real quick. When Paul, when he was being, there were rumors going around that Paul

was teaching contrary to the Law of Moses. Okay, if Paul was actually teaching that, this would have been a perfect time for Paul to say, listen, you zealous brethren, okay, we are no longer under the Law of Moses. That has been done away with. We’re just under the Law of the Christ. Why in the world are you guys having to do this stuff? No, what did Paul do? He took a vow, okay, with these others who had taken a vow. He did things according to the Law of Moses to show them that these rumors were not truth.

Now I’m asking you, why did not Paul clear up the misunderstanding that was being reported about him. This would have been a perfect opportunity for Paul to do that and yet he did not do that. Because I think that they were taking Paul’s words and they were twisting them.

Remember, we have to go back, to understand the New Testament, this is very key, this is why I keep bringing up 1 Timothy 3:16, “All scripture is inspired by Yahweh.” In order to understand the New Testament, we need to understand the Old Testament. It’s like you cannot go to a book and read the last chapter and expect to understand what the whole book was about. We cannot do that. It’s taking things out of context. We have to understand. The New Testament’s very life depends on the Old Testament. All these prophecies fulfilled; all the things talked about in the Old Testament and the New Testament. It’s very important to understand the Old Testament is the foundation to which the New Testament claims to fulfill.

I’ve two minutes here I believe. It doesn’t give me much time here. I want to read a chapter in Zechariah 14, which I’m not going to have time to do. But if you read in Zechariah 14 it talks about that the, all nations who came against Jerusalem shall be required to keep the Feast of Taber-

nacles, the Feast of Booths. And if they didn't there would be a punishment upon them.

Now I have one question, okay, this is future. If Yahweh abolished those feasts, like Wayne is claiming, why in the world does he bring them back again? It makes no sense to me. I see the feasts in the past, I see them in the future. These are non-Israelite nations that are required to keep the Feast of Booths. Read Zechariah fourteen the whole chapter. Okay. And there's punishment for not doing so. Now why would Yahweh put that in his Word? That is a question I have, if the feasts no longer apply and were only a shadow of things that were no longer required anymore. If I see the feasts in the past and I see them in the future, isn't logical to assume that they would be in the present also. Zechariah fifteen has not been past and done away with. You have to read the whole chapter. There's no way, that you can say that, in my opinion.

Anyway, my time is up. Thank you. I'll hand it over to Wayne.

Second Affirmative-Wayne Greeson

Thank you John. Let's go the Zechariah fourteen. John, you need to understand that that is prophetic language and as prophetic language it is simply talking about the fact that all nations, not only the Jew, but also the Gentile are going to come and serve the Lord. Now it also says there that they're going to come to Jerusalem and yet you do not keep and go to Jerusalem for the observance of that feast. So you would be in violation of that passage. Now what you want to do is keep part of the Law. You want to say that you keep the feasts, but you don't really keep the feasts because that passage says you got to go to Jerusalem to keep the feasts.

Now what it is talking about is the fact that all nations are going to serve Him. Jesus Christ not only replaced the priesthood and the blood sacrifices, but he also replaced the feasts. In 1 Corinthians five, "Christ is our Passover." If he is our Passover, we don't keep the Feast of the Passover that was given under the Law of Moses. He is our Passover. That's so very important to understand John.

Now let's talk about some of the other things. You said in Acts 21, about Paul teaching, if Paul was teaching we are not under the Law of Moses? John that's exactly what I read to you in 1 Corinthians 9. Paul said that he was trying to win all men and that when he was among the Jews that he acted as though he was under the Law. But when he was with the Gentiles, he acted as one who was without law. Why? Because he was not bound by that Law. He said he was still under the Law of Christ. That tells you what Paul was doing in Acts 21.

You made mention of the fact of the "yoke." You spent a great deal of time talking about Acts 15 and the "yoke." It's very clear what the apostle Peter is identifying there as the "yoke." He says nothing about the traditions of the Pharisees. This is what the Pharisees said, "It is necessary to circumcise and to command them to keep the Law of Moses." That's Acts 15:5. John, it doesn't say anything about their traditions. They said, you got to keep the Law of Moses. The apostle Peter said, "why tempt you God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither we or our fathers were able to bear?"

Now you suggested that that had nothing to do with circumcision. But yet the apostle Paul said in Galatians five, "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith that Christ have made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Now was that

“yoke of bondage” the traditions of the Pharisees? No. Because Paul goes on says, “behold I Paul say to you that if you be circumcised...” Circumcision was the yoke of bondage, John. “...Christ shall profit you nothing. And I testify again that every man that is circumcised he is a debtor to do the whole Law.” But John, you say we only do part of the Law! “Christ is become of no effect unto you whosoever of you are justified by the Law, you are fallen from grace.” The yoke of bondage, Paul clearly identifies in Galatians 5:1 is circumcision and Peter identifies it in Acts 15:10. Now that is not bound upon us today. And the apostles, very clearly there in Acts fifteen, said we’re not bound by that. John...

Second Negative—John Zecca

Well, I don’t believe Paul contradicted himself and this is why we need to heed the warning again that Peter said, be careful of Paul’s hard sayings that we don’t twist them to our own destruction.

Another thing he mentioned here about 1 Corinthians five about Christ being our Passover. Well if you read that, it says “therefore let us keep the feast(s).” And read that, I’m not going to read that right now.

I want to go to Colossians two because he mentioned the feasts again. In verse sixteen, Colossians two, Mike spent a little bit of time on this, but he didn’t have much time, “Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a sabbath. These are only a shadow of what is to come....” Okay now, to me that sounds like present tense, not past tense, “what is to come.” So when did they come? That would be my question, when did these things come?

Alright, a yoke again. I want to ask this question, how was circumcision a yoke if they were all circumcised. Peter said he was not able to bear this. It does not make any sense to me. How can it be circumcision if he wasn’t able to...Peter was circumcised! Absolutely, so it couldn’t have been, it doesn’t fit the context Wayne, that’s what I’m saying.

Bondage, if you read in the New Testament just a few passages, it talks about bondage. In Colossians it talks about don’t let any one take you captive through what? Colossians 2:8 through the philosophies and traditions of men. There we go, we have the philosophies and traditions of men, not Yahweh’s Law. Yahweh’s Law is not bondage.

Then we go to another passage where it talks about, in Galatians, about “the elements of this world” that brings bondage, not Yahweh’s Law. I still can’t understand if circumcision was the yoke of bondage, why Peter would say that.

In Galatians, he was talking about, I think it’s key to understand that Galatians is, what were they talking about? Were they talking about justification of the Law? If that’s what they were talking about, which I believe they were, I have no disagreement with Wayne. I am not justified by keeping the Law. Only if I kept it perfectly could I be and I have not. Neither Mike or myself is claiming that, I think he made that perfectly clear yesterday, that we’re not justified by keeping the Law. And I think that’s what Paul was talking about when he said these things in Galatians. And if you read the whole book of Galatians, I think he brings that out. This is why we need to be careful to take all the scripture and not just one or two verses. Is this consistent from Genesis to Revelation.

Again, I had a question yesterday, if the Messiah was to come and abolish his Father's Law and set up a new Law contrary to His Father's Law, where is this found? Where is this prophecy found? Wouldn't Yahweh make it clear to the Israelites that when the Messiah came, you're no longer to keep these laws, just for a time period. I don't see it Wayne. Please show me in the scripture where this passage is, where this prophecy is, where these Israelites were no longer required to keep everything they were taught from when they were a child that was all gone and done away with. Now they have a new law contrary to the Law they were taught.

Anyway, I think I'm out of time again. Thank you very much.

Friday, January 19, 2001

Third Affirmative-Wayne Greeson

Are we under the Law of Moses today or under the Law of Christ?

John and Mike have told us all week that we are under the Law of Moses. But the apostle Paul said "...for you are not under the Law, but under grace," Romans 6:14. That passage alone would be sufficient to prove the very point that I have made all week, we are not under (the) Law. That's what the apostle Paul said.

John and Mike have told us that we are bound by the Law of Moses, but again, the apostle of Jesus Christ said, "you are dead to the Law by the body of Christ...But now we are delivered from the Law, that being dead wherein we were held," we are no longer held or bound to the Law, Romans 7:4-6.

John and Mike have asserted that the Law of Moses has not passed away as Christ

said, because Christ has not yet fulfilled all the Law and the Prophets. Yet again, the apostle of Jesus Christ, the apostle Paul denies this and asserts, "For Christ is the end (or completion) of the Law..." (Rom. 10:4).

But even John and Mike do not believe we are under all of the Law of Moses! Even they believe that part of the Law of Moses has passed away! Mike pointed out on Monday Hebrews 7:12, "For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there is also a change of the Law."

Why is issue important? Because it goes to the very heart of the authority of Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God, as the "blessed and only Potentate...King of kings, and Lord of lords" (1 Timothy 6:15). Jesus said, "All authority has been given ...Me in heaven and on earth." Therefore we are to go and teach all things whatsoever "I have commanded you" (Matthew 28:18-20).

John, on Wednesday said, I agree with you. No John, you don't. You don't believe in the absolute authority of Jesus as King. You say we are under the authority of the Law of Moses! Oh, you said that we are to obey the "commandments" of the Christ in addition to Law of Moses. John, Christ has "all authority" not just some authority. We are to obey "all things that (Christ has) commanded" not just some things in addition to the Law of Moses.

Why is that? Because "He (Christ) is the head of the body, the church, (He) is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He may have the preeminence. For it pleased the Father that in (Christ) all the fullness should dwell" (Col. 1:18-19). The reason we are under the Law of Christ, with Christ as King, and not under the Law of Moses is because the authority of Christ is absolute in all things, including over the

Law, so that he may have preeminence. John wants to remove the preeminence of Christ and put the Law of Moses there. John, when you go back to the Law of Moses you are dethroning the King, you are voiding his absolute authority and you are diminishing his preeminence!

Is Christ a Ruler without His Rules? No. Is Christ Lord without His Law? No. Is Christ King without His commandments to His Kingdom? Certainly not! We need to respect and obey the Law of Christ, not the Law of Moses.

What’s interesting is not even John and Mike believe that we’re under all of the Law of Moses. Even they have said that part of the Law of Moses has passed away. Mike pointed out on Monday Hebrews 7:12, “For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there is also a change of the Law.”

What parts of the Law have they admitted have changed and/or have passed away. They have admitted that the Levitical priesthood has changed and passed away and that we are no longer under it. They have admitted that the animal sacrifices for sin have changed, they’ve passed away, we’re no longer bound to offer animal sacrifices. They have admitted that the tabernacle and/or temple and all its ordinances have been done away with. The laws of separation between Jew and Gentile forbidding social interaction and intermarriage, those are no longer bound upon us as provided by the Law of Moses. And even all the penalties for breaking the Law of Moses have passed away, have been put away and we are no longer under those penalties.

By the time they’re finished, with their version of the Law of Moses, most of it we’re not under today. But the problem is their partial version of the Law of Moses.

You can’t change or just keep part of the Law of Moses. To keep the Law of Moses, you must keep all the commandments or be guilty of breaking the Law!

This is what the Lawgiver Moses said, “Observe and obey all these words which I command you...(and) Whatever I command you, be careful to observe it; (and) you shall not add to it nor take away from it” (Deut. 12:28; 13:18; Lev. 19:37).

John, do you obey all the words which Moses commanded? No, certainly not. You’ve admitted you don’t. You don’t separate yourself from all Gentiles, as Moses commanded, in fact, you are a Gentile and you’re excluded from the Law of Moses! You don’t obey the command to offer sacrifices upon the altar before the tabernacle or temple in Jerusalem, as Moses commanded. You don’t offer any worship through the mediatorship of the Levitical priests, as Moses commanded. You do not observe the feasts by going to Jerusalem and offering the sacrifices, as Moses commanded. You do not keep the Sabbath as Moses commanded either for Moses commanded the penalty of death for anyone who broke the Sabbath! John, you not only don’t obey all the words of the Law of Moses, you don’t even obey most of the Law of Moses!

John, do you add or take away from the Law of Moses? Most certainly you do. You have taken away the Levitical priesthood, which Moses commanded and you have added another priesthood and a different high priest from the tribe of Judah, “of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning the priesthood” (Hebrew 7:14).

You have taken away all the sacrifices that Moses commanded to be offered and you have added a different sacrifice that Moses said nothing about. You have taken

away the tabernacle and temple and all its articles of worship, which God warned Moses "See that you make all things according to the pattern" (Hebrews 8:5). And you have added something you call "the assembly of Yahweh" of which Moses said nothing about.

You have taken away all the penalties of the Law of Moses. You have taken away the full and proper observance of the all the feasts commanded by Moses, by removing their animal sacrifices and their proper place of observance, Jerusalem, and their proper people of observance, the people of Israel, and you have added or substituted feasts which Moses never commanded.

John, you have taken away the observance of the Sabbath law, which included sacrifices on the altar in the tabernacle and penalties for breaking the Sabbath, that Moses commanded and you've added your own Sabbath law which Moses never spoke of.

You can't just keep just a piece or part of the Law of Moses. Moses said, you obey all and do not add or take away from the Law. And Paul said in Galatians 5:3, if one tries to keep one part of the Law "he is a debtor to do the whole Law."

John, neither you nor the Jews nor anyone is under the Law of Moses today, because God has made it impossible for anyone to keep the Law of Moses! God through Jesus Christ took away all of the Law, not just parts of the Law. God took away the priesthood of the Law, the sacrifices of the Law, the tabernacle and temple of the Law, the separations of the Law, the penalties of the Law, the food (laws) of the Law, the feasts of the Law, the Sabbaths of the Law, all of the Law!

How did he do this? By sending His

Son, Jesus Christ. Jesus took away the Law by fulfilling all the Law and the Prophets and receiving all authority as (the) Law-giver, the King, the High Priest and the Prophet. He is the Prophet, not Moses any longer.

Now, did the Law and the Prophets foretell their passing away? Certainly they did! The Old Testament Law, Prophets and Psalms foretold the coming of the Messiah that he would be the Lord's Prophet, the Prophet, the Priest and the King. And Moses said in Deuteronomy 18:15-19, that that Prophet was the one that we should hear and that we will hear his words or God will require it of (us).

God also told us in Jeremiah thirty-one, a passage that you're very well familiar with, that that covenant which was given through and by and in the Law of Moses, that covenant was going to pass away. The reason is Romans 10:4 "For Christ is the end (or the completion) of the Law. The whole purpose of the Law and the Prophets was to bring Christ into the world to save the world. And Christ said, "all things must be fulfilled which were written (of me) in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms" (Luke 24:44).

Now why is this important? Because once the Law and the Prophets fulfilled their purpose in bringing Christ into the world they passed away. That's exactly what Jesus said in Matthew 5:17. Jesus said, "Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill." Did Jesus fulfill what he said (he would)? Yes, he did. And he said, "(not) one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the Law till all is fulfilled." Jesus said the Law would not pass until it was all fulfilled! And Jesus fulfilled it all. Paul said Christ is the completion of the Law. Therefore the Law has been fulfilled and has

passed away!

Now who are we to listen to today: Moses and the Prophets or Christ? Jesus took his disciples up to the mount of transfiguration and there appeared with him, Moses and Elijah. And Peter said, “Lord, it is good for us to be here” ‘cause we’re going to make “three tabernacles: one for You, one for Moses, and one for Elijah.” The voice of God came from heaven and said, “This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Hear Him!”

Moses and Elijah are not who we are to listen to. Moses and Elijah have been put away and they foretold the coming of the Son of God. “This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Hear Him!” Let’s not go back to the Law of Moses.

Thank you and please give your attention to John.

Third Negative—John Zecca

Thank you. I want to just point out one thing, Wayne keeps saying “the Law of Moses.” My question is, who gave that Law to Moses? Did he make that up in his own mind? Was that Moses’ laws? Was it Moses’ commands or did they come from Yahweh? They came from Yahweh.

But I’m going to begin now... Wayne mentioned the other day that Yahshua was given all authority on heaven and earth and he mentioned it again today and that implied that this authority allowed him to give us commands, which in effect, undermine what his Father, Yahweh, had clearly laid out in the Law. Well, I to have been given authority as a husband and father by Yahweh. But it would be silly for me to think that my commands undo or undermine the One who gave me that authority in the first place. Remember, if Yahshua was

given authority, then he had a superior who gave him this authority. The Messiah would never go against the commands of his superior Yahweh.

First John 2:6, it says “to walk as he did.” Well, did Yahshua keep the Law of Moses? He absolutely did. He kept the Sabbath; he kept the feasts days; he kept the food laws; etcetera. He was even circumcised, according to one of the gospels. Funny thing that he kept all this Law, only to do away with it later on.

He said the “Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath.” Well, I agree. Did Yahweh need a day of rest? Was he tired? No, he made the Sabbath for man, so that we can take aside one day to honor our Creator, Yahweh. And that’s..., he hallowed it from Creation that’s what it says in Genesis. And you don’t have to go to Jerusalem to keep the Sabbath. There’s not one scripture that ever tells us to stop keeping the Sabbath.

In Revelation 12:17, it says, “the dragon made war against whoever didn’t keep the commandments of Yahweh and bear testimony to Yahshua.” Now what commandments of Yahweh is he talking about here? It’d be hard to prove that these commandments are different than the ones found in the Old Testament. How said these saints were being persecuted for commandments they were no longer bound to keep.

In Matthew 19:16-19, I’m going to read that here real quick, it says, “And behold, one came up to him, saying, “Teacher, what good deed must I do, to have eternal life?” And he said to him, “Why do you ask me about what is good? One there is who is good. If you would enter life, keep the commandments.” He said to him, “Which?” And Yahshua said, “You shall not kill, You shall not commit adultery, You shall not

steal, You shall not bear false witness, Honor your father and mother, and, You shall love your neighbor as yourself." Where did Yahshua get these commandments from? He got these commandments found in the Old Testament, from the Law of Moses. He didn't say only my commandments are to be kept. He quoted right from the Old Testament.

We're not saying only part of the Law is to be obeyed, but only part of it that applies to us. For example, in this country there are many laws for businesses but those laws don't apply to me if I don't have a business, yet they still exist. We need to keep that in mind, it's a very important concept here.

I'm going to attempt to show that there are many scriptures which show the Law of Moses is still around and future tense, even the priesthood. If you read Ezekiel forty-four and forty-five, of course I don't have time to do, you can read that on your own, that is talking about future things. I already mentioned Zechariah fourteen about the nations required to keep the feast of tabernacles, in the future. Isaiah 66:23 says, "From one new moon, from new moon to new moon, from Sabbath to Sabbath shall all flesh come to worship me." Sounds like the Sabbath is still in effect.

And I want to read Jeremiah 33:14, it says here, "Behold the days are coming says Yahweh when I will fulfill promise I made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah. In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous branch to spring forth for David and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In those days Judah will be saved and Jerusalem will dwell securely." Now is Jerusalem dwelling securely today? Absolutely not. "And this is the name by which it will be called, "Yahweh is our righteousness."

Thus says Yahweh, David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel and the Levitical priests" listen to this, "shall never lack a man in my presence to offer burnt offerings, to burn cereal offerings and to make sacrifices forever. The word of Yahweh came to Jeremiah, 'Thus says Yahweh, if you can break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, so that day and night will not come at their appointed time then also my covenant with David my servant may be broken, so that he shall not have a son to reign on his throne, and my covenant with the Levitical priests, my ministers. That the hosts of heaven cannot be numbered and the sand of the sea cannot be measured so I will multiply the descendants of David My servant and the Levitical priests who minister to Me.'" Now has the covenant of night and day been broken? Of course not. Why does Yahweh put this in here? That's a good question.

You see, just like Yahshua said, "it's easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the Law to fail" Luke 16:17. All has not been fulfilled and Yahshua said even the least of the commandments are important.

Now I want to go to Galatians chapters four and five here, 'cause Wayne has brought that up a few times. First thing I want to read is Galatians 4:8-11. It says, "Formerly, when you did not know Yahweh, you were in bondage to beings that by nature are no gods; but now that you have come to know Yahweh, or rather to be known by Yahweh, how can you turn back again to the weak and beggarly elemental spirits, whose slaves you want to be once more? You observe days, and months, and seasons, and years! I am afraid I have labored over you in vain."

Now I want to point this out, this is

very important here. We were talking about bondage the other day this is Galatians 4:8-11. Notice what they were in bondage to. Were they in bondage to the Law of Moses? Is that what it says here? It says no, they were in bondage to beings that by nature are no gods.

Notice what they're turning back to. Was it the Law of Moses they were turning back to that concerned Paul? No, it was "the weak and beggarly elemental spirits, whose slaves you want to be once more." This implies that they were formerly slaves to these things and that they were going back that. Was this talking to the Jews? No, Paul was not talking to the Jews, he could not have been because he says, "formerly when you did not know Yahweh." The Jews knew Yahweh.

So Paul is talking to these Galatian Gentiles who are back into their idolatry. That's the only way you can understand this scripture. It makes no other sense if it's the Law of Moses. And verse ten cannot be referring to the feast days, but rather festivals in honor of their deities of earth and sky. And how do we know this? Cause this was something they were going back to. These Gentiles never kept the feast before. How can they go back to it?

And Paul says in verse eight, like I just mentioned, "formerly, when you did not know Yahweh" they could not have kept the feasts if they did not know Yahweh. This is why context is so important, along with reading all scripture and putting it together.

In Galatians 5:1, "For freedom Messiah has set us free; stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery. Now I, Paul, say to you that if you receive circumcision, Messiah will be of no advantage to you. I testify again to every man who receives circumcision that he is bound to

keep the whole law. You are severed from Messiah, you who would be justified by the law; you have fallen away from grace."

Now Wayne has emphasized this time and time again. I just want to talk about it for a minute. Notice that it says that those who seek to be justified by the Law. Yes, if you were depending upon the Law to justify you, you are required to keep it all perfectly. But we are not relying upon the Law to justify us. Paul says in Romans 2:25, "Circumcision (profits)...if you (keep) the law; but if you break the law, (it is made) uncircumcision." Absolutely true.

Baptism is very similar in this sense. Baptism is a physical thing that avails you nothing if you continue to sin. Yet many agree that baptism is necessary for salvation. You see just like circumcision it is a physical thing to represent a deeper meaning, yet we still do the physical. Baptism without repentance means nothing. So let us rightly understand what Paul is saying. If you seek to be justified by circumcision, indeed you have fallen from grace. Paul is not double minded but just misunderstood by those who would say that Yahweh's perfect Law has been abolished.

So we see that the bondage in Galatians four was the idolatry that these pagans were going, these former pagans, were going back to.

Okay, I have one minute left? Okay, I want to read First Corinthians 15:28, because Wayne mentioned something today. And it talks about...Okay it says, "When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that Yahweh may be everything to every one." You see Yahweh is his superior. He gave that authority to Yahshua the Messiah, not so that Messiah can turn around and change all his

laws and abolish them.

And I just want you to keep in mind here that we're not saying that we're justified by the Law. We're justified by the grace of Yahweh through the blood of the Messiah Yahshua.

Thank you very much.

Fourth Affirmative-Wayne Greeson

Hebrews 10:1 says, "For the Law, having a shadow of the good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with these same sacrifices, which they offer continually year by year, make those who approach perfect." Hebrews 7:19 says, "For the Law made nothing perfect" or complete. That's the very point that we've been saying. The Law and the Prophets foretell their passing away at the coming of Christ by the very fact of their incompleteness or imperfection. When Jesus came he brought the perfection. He fulfilled it. He completed it. That's why they have passed away.

Now it's very interesting what John said with respect to the matter of the completion. He says all has not been fulfilled. Jesus said, if any jot or tittle has passed away then it has all been fulfilled. And John and Mike have continually asserted that there are certain portions of that Law that have passed away.

Now there are a number of arguments that have been made. First of all he said, Did Jesus keep the Law? John, we're not disagreeing with whether or not Jesus kept the Law because he was under the Law. Galatians 4:4 says that he was "born under the Law." "God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law, to redeem those" (or buy them back) "who were under the Law."

Now, you say Jesus kept the Law then you referred to the Sabbath. But you forgot to mention that Jesus, while he was born and lived under the Law, he also was subject to the high priest, the Levitical priesthood, which you say we're no longer under. He also offered sacrifices, which you say are no longer to be offered. He also went to the temple and to Jerusalem.

Now you said we don't have to go the Jerusalem to keep the Sabbath. John, I never said that. The Law of Moses never says that. The Law of Moses says that you have got to go to Jerusalem to keep the feasts of the Law! You avoided that.

Now you spoke a lot about the various prophecies of the Old Testament. And the prophecies which spoke of the coming kingdom of the Messiah. That coming kingdom of the Messiah we have because the Messiah has come. In Hebrews 12:22, we have come to that Zion, that heavenly Jerusalem. We are now a part of that.

In Galatians five it says very clearly there that we are not, that we are either a debtor if we keep part of the Law, we are debtor to keep all of the Law. But that is not referring to the fact, John says, to circumcision, and yet very specifically there in Galatians 5:1 the apostle Paul says, we are not to be circumcised or Christ is of no effect.

Well, my time is up. We'll turn the mike over to Mike.

Fourth Negative-Michael Mastropalo

Thank you. Some of the listeners may wish to look more deeply into the matters we debated this week get a pen and paper and I'll give John and my home phone numbers in a couple minutes.

Let's not be deceived or twist scriptures to our own destruction. Wayne, much of what John and I assert has been misrepresented by you; by putting words in our mouth we did not speak and by giving wrong explanations and motives.

Throughout the scriptures from Genesis to Revelation the theme has been that it is not in man to guide his steps. Yahweh's thoughts are far above ours, he is the Potter, we are the clay. Man has consistently wanted to do what is right in his own eyes and not be ruled over by Yahweh.

Yahshua brought a message concerning the kingdom of Yahweh. And the good news that though we have gone astray, disobeyed, practiced iniquity (which is self will) and sinned, (which the Law defines) that we have an Advocate, a Mediator, a High Priest of the order of Melchizedek. Yahshua is the king of the kingdom of Yahweh. We are the subjects. A kingdom must have laws. The law of Yahshua is the same as the Law of Yahweh.

What is changed is that they are to be written on our hearts. We want to do them, because we love Him, not for fear of punishment. Although if we are unrepentant, punishment still awaits us for sure.

The Law remains. It is the manner in which the Law is applied and administered that has changed. What we are not under is the condemnation that comes from breaking the Law. That is what being under the Law usually means in the scriptures and most of those references.

Sabbath breaking was, is and will continue to be sin until all is fulfilled. We are not all yet spirit beings. The Sabbath was made for man, not just Jews and will be valid until there are no more men or that heaven and earth pass away.

Just one last comment. I believe when John mentioned keeping Sabbath in Jerusalem, the annual feast days are referred as Sabbaths also. And where ever two or three are gathered in his name, there he is. So we can keep these feasts now, under an application, where we do not need to go to Jerusalem.

y

Other Debates & Study Material
by Wayne Greeson

Greeson-Clarke Debate on Church Benevolence
(on audio tape, video tape & printed charts)

Greeson-Looper Debate on the Godhead & Baptismal Formula
(on audio tape & charts & audio on CD format)

Greeson-Shields Debate on the Godhead & Miracles Today
(on audio tape, video tape, charts & audio on CD format)

Greeson-Rutland Radio Debate on the Bible Only or Catholic Tradition #1
(on audio tape & transcript in booklet form)

Greeson-Rutland Public Debate on the Bible Only or Catholic Tradition #2
(on audio tape, video tape, charts & audio on CD format)

The Christian & Sin
(book & charts on sin, repentance, cleansing & forgiveness)

Sowing The Seed & Sowing The Seed II
(sermon outlines with charts)

Contact Wayne Greeson at waynegr@dslmyway.com

Copyright Notice

This booklet is protected by Federal copyright law. This booklet is **not** in the public domain.

A limited license to reprint this booklet is granted to you on the following conditions:

1. You may not print more than 1,000 copies of this booklet (either on a printing press, a copy machine or computer printer) unless you obtain written permission from the author.
2. The copyright notice on the booklet (© 2001 Wayne Greeson) must be included on every booklet you print, along with the name of the author on the front of the booklet.
3. Copies of this booklet may not be sold under any circumstances.
4. You are granted permission to include the name and/or address of the church or contact person on the back of the booklet, providing neither the copyright notice or the author's name is not covered or obscured in any way.
5. Electronic copies of this booklet may not be placed on any Web site without the express written consent of the author.

If you have any questions you may contact the author at:

Wayne Greeson
208 Regency Place
Connersville, IN 47331
waynegr@dslmyway.com