

## **MOSIAC LAW UNIVERSAL - GOD MEANT IT FOR EVERYBODY ON EARTH AND ITS MEANT TO BE KEPT TODAY**

We might be told by some that the Mosaic Law, composed by God and contained in the first five books of the Bible, was always and only for the Jews and that non-Jews weren't bound to keep it then and certainly aren't now. It is untrue that the New Testament teaches that God meant the Law for the Jews and that Christians are exempt from it as are Jews that convert.

Jesus said that not a dot of the law would pass away meaning none of its laws would be abolished. Jesus claimed to fulfil the law not abolish it. There is nothing in the New Testament saying that he abolished the laws about stoning people to death. Christians just guess that he did but as Jesus said the Jewish law will stand forever they generally assume he will have his own way of executing them.

In Acts 15 the apostles had a debate over getting non-Jews to follow the Jewish law. This alone says that Jesus did not clearly abolish it. They considered four rules from the law but we must remember that the law provided for people who were not Jews to become Jews as in religion. The four rules in question such as the ban on eating blood were required before admission. The apostles of course upheld the rules and thus affirmed the validity of the Jewish law. Circumcision was a problem so they said it was okay as long as it was not seen as necessary for entry into Heaven. They merely clarified the laws teaching on this subject for it never made circumcision a condition for being with God in eternal life.

Nothing in the Law itself says that it is meant only for the people of Israel in principle.

Many Christians hold that when Jesus returns he will return to a world or many nations that will be mainly Christian and which will be run by the Old Testament Law. The parts of the Law that have been changed and fulfilled by Jesus will of course be excluded. Reconstructionists will maintain that we have to pave the way for the second coming by persuading governments to adopt the Old Testament Law now. They want to reconstruct the political world in accordance with the Mosaic Law which is why it is called Reconstructionism. Reconstructionism is often called Dominion Theology. Its big leaders are in the USA. David Chilton, Greg Bahnsen and Gary North are three of them.

Paul at Romans 3:19, 20 states that everything the Law of Moses states is stated to those who are under its authority and that therefore the whole world stands convicted of sin before God for nobody in the world is justified by obeying the Law for all it does is point out sin. This clearly states that the authority of the Law applies to the whole world. Even those such as children who know only a little Law cannot be saved by obeying it. He also indicates that the Law is supported by right reason and by divine inspiration which is why even those who don't have the written Law of Moses are still bound by it and condemned by it.

He says in Romans 2:12-16 that the Gentiles who have never been educated in the Law of Moses are in fact aware of its teaching for it is written by God in their instincts and in their consciences. So it is clear. The rule that if you catch a man in bed with another man you should drag them out and stone them to death is regarded as what a conscience that isn't twisted and perverted by sin will see as correct. By implication, you will see that homosexuality is wrong. If you don't you must be guilty of grave sin and are blinding yourself to the light of the Holy Spirit.

St Paul wrote that people who were circumcised were bound to keep the entire law of Moses and he gave no hint that he meant this applied to only Jews. He wrote this in Galatians 5:2,3. If the people he had been writing to had all been Jews they would have been circumcised before he came along. So clearly Paul was acknowledging that the Jewish law was for all for if it wasn't then even circumcision couldn't bind the Galatians to keep the law. Abraham circumcised all his slaves, people of a different race (Genesis 17). He was putting them into the covenant at God's behest as Genesis 17:23 tells us.

It is stated that the Bible never promises that the Law will be restored. If it is silent on this problem it is safer to assume that it will be. The bits of Old Testament prophecy that say that the world will obey the Lord are taken to mean the period after Jesus comes back. By obey these prophecies meant the Law and so Christians should not be teaching that Jesus has done away with the Law and certainly will not be restoring in when he comes again.

Many of the things the people of Israel were not allowed to do by the Law were things the Law permitted non-Israelites to do. This is supposed to disprove Reconstructionism. The Hebrews could not eat an animal that died naturally but could give it to an alien to eat it (Deuteronomy 14:21). The Hebrews could not eat the animal that died by itself in case it was infected. It did not matter to them as much if its meat sickened or killed an outsider. Christians would argue that it is better for the person who is pleasing to God to be alive and well than for a sinner to be. The Law interprets itself and it is said that Israel

was a chosen and holy nation so that was the logic behind the precept. The Law is saying that the holy and enlightened come first. The Law forbidding the meat to Israelites really means: “Don’t poison the holy” or “Don’t eat an animal that died by itself as a reminder that you are holy to me”, and it just singles out the Israelites because they were the only sanctified people at that time. The rule does not disprove Reconstructionism. In fact when the Hebrews were allowed to lead the non-Jews into defilement though it must be bad for the non-Jews in some way it shows that God’s law allows harm to be done to non-Jews. The Law was pronouncing them inferior in such a way that it could only do it if it had authority over them or moral legal authority if not actual legal authority.

It is thought that the diet laws show that the Law was intended only for Israel because when the banned animals were sacred among the surrounding nations that it would have been too much to expect them to adopt the same taboos. That is like saying that belief in one God was intended only for Jews for other nations preferred a crowd of different Gods. It makes no sense. The diet laws were everlasting so even if the nations stopped having sacred animals the laws could be retained as a reminder of the evil of idolatry. And it could be that the animals were banned not just because the neighbours disliked them but because they really were dirty.

Israelites were prohibited from charging interest on loans given to other Israelites but were permitted to charge other nations (Deuteronomy 23). This was a precaution against greed that would divide the people. It did not matter if it upset aliens. But aliens who joined God’s people so as to become a part of them would have been excepted. Taking interest in itself is not concerned which is why it was permitted to take it from outsiders – it is only forbidden for some other reason.

If another nation made the Law of Moses its own it would merely cease to charge interest except when it is a foreign nation it is dealing with. Maybe God just banned charging your own countrymen interest and the reason Israel is mentioned is because it was the only country hearing the Law.

Israel was not allowed by God to sow two kinds of seed in a field (Deuteronomy 22:9). This is for some symbolic reason. Those who oppose Reconstructionism claim that the symbolism is that Israel is to have different laws from other nations. But it could simply mean that God’s people are to be separate from sinners. Anyway, what has seed got to do with people?

1 Corinthians 10:23 is alleged to oppose Reconstructionism. There it is written by Paul that all things which are allowed are not necessarily the best. This is supposed to mean that certain things are not wrong if done by those who are not God’s people but are wrong if they are. As an example, he says that eating meat that was consecrated to idols is permitted but is sinful and not beneficial if it makes those who feel that it is sinful sin. Paul is saying that we must obey our conscience even if it is wrong and is certainly not saying that certain kinds of mistakes are not mistakes when done by Gentiles. All he means is that we should avoid what is permitted if it is a stumbling block to another person.

Romans 2 and especially verse 14 are thrown at those who say that the Laws of goodness were meant to be observed by all nations as refutation. It just says that non-Jews don’t have the Law of Moses which is hardly the same as saying that they aren’t supposed to follow it or that they don’t know it by some sixth sense.

Read Ezekiel 5 in which God complains that the Law of Moses “my statutes” was kept better by non-Jewish nations than by the Jews. The Amplified Bible says that these were heathen nations and puts heathen in [ ] and admits in the Introduction that words in these brackets are not in the original text so don’t make the mistake of reading pagan into the reference to nations for pagans don’t keep the Law. Some say that God is being sarcastic and not serious. But the Law itself says that segments of people from other nations would practice it. These are the nations Ezekiel’s god means. Even if it meant the Jews in other nations it would prove that the Law had to be kept everywhere and just wasn’t restricted to Israel alone.

The Lord revealed that other nations would be envious of the wisdom of his Law as lived in Israel and would moan that theirs wasn’t as clever (Deuteronomy 4:6,8). If it is wise then they should follow it. God could not criticise non-Israelites for practicing his Law if it is wise. It is obvious that it was not for Israelites alone. The pagans would not find it wise if God changed the Law of right and wrong for them. He would be saying that even if right and wrong exist they should be put aside for only what he commands should be obeyed.

Aliens who lived among the children of Israel had to live by its laws (Leviticus 24:17-22). It would be hypocrisy to say that they were lucky to be under the Law and that the Law was not intended to be adopted by other nations. The aliens could have been confined to ghettos and put under surveillance so that they could have been exempt from the Law. But God wanted them to follow it so he wants the world to do the same.

In Galatians 3, Paul tells the Galatians, this people were Greeks not Jews, that if they are going to get circumcised and obey the Law they have to obey all of it. The Law was binding on non-Jews who knew of it and were circumcised. If it had been cancelled it wouldn’t matter. He said in Galatians 4 that the non-Jewish Galatians had to be redeemed from the Law by the death of Jesus meaning that the Law was binding on them despite them not being Jews. By redeemed he meant that they were delivered from needing to keep the Law for salvation. Any breaks of the Law were atoned by Jesus and so the believer

didn't have to worry about them and so the Law was not a burden or a punishment for him. He was redeemed from it.

Paul wrote in Romans 15:4 that everything that was written in the Old Testament was written to teach the Church. He was writing to Gentiles as well as converted Jews in Rome. This tells us that the Law of Moses is still relevant even to non-Jews and he wanted it taken seriously (page 11, Not Under Law). He had to for it is the Old Testament and not the New that tells us that going to spiritual mediums and marrying cousins is wrong (page 11) which is one example out of many. The implication is that if we want to stone homosexuals and adulterers to death we should. You can't say that these laws are irrelevant even if you say they are not obligatory. Even then you cannot condemn anybody who carries them out. You can't condemn Jack the Ripper for slaughtering prostitutes. The doctrine that the Old Testament is relevant today is called Theonomy. It has been popularised in the book, Not Under Law and is growing among Christian fundamentalists and that should give us all much concern. It's bad news. We know what the Catholic Church did when it was able to practice Theonomy.

It is hard for some to believe that the Law was meant for all when not all could get to the Temple to have the prescribed rites of worship and sacrifices for sin performed. But God says that he understands and will accept the person's good intentions instead. Non-Jews had no right to try and establish a line of priests for God decreed that his only priests were to be the Levites, a Jewish tribe.

Religion says that Jesus had to obey the entire Law of God to make up for our disobedience to the Law. Jesus esteemed the Law greatly when he did that meaning we ought to do likewise and obey it in thanksgiving. If Jesus was God then we have God obeying his own Law - a sure sign of how permanent and essential he considers it. Jesus was after all to be the demonstration of the perfect man.

The Church says that Jesus had made full atonement when still a child the first time he obeyed the Law for one act of Jesus' is reckoned to have infinite value and therefore merits our redemption from sin for he is God. That means we should obey the Law ourselves. If as the Church claims, Jesus atoned by obeying more than he needed to then that accentuates that we should keep the Law despite being non-Jews for he obeyed it for us. If we are saved we should obey it not because we are bound to but because we want to.

Deuteronomy 31:12: "Assemble the people - men, women, and children, and the stranger and the sojourner within your towns - that they may hear and learn [reverently] to fear the Lord your God and be watchful to do all the words of this law." Even alien visitors or strangers had to be commanded to keep the Law. They could have been told to respect the Law without being asked to keep all of it. It could just have been just like a pagan being asked to not interfere with the Christians in a Christian country but allowed to do what they liked in private. But God wanted pagans to obey the Law entirely and to believe what it said should be believed.

The Law permitted the chosen people to buy other members of their nation as slaves and to buy slaves from other nations. The former had an easier time legally than the latter. The latter were not as well protected. This seems to imply that the Law is not for all. But the slaves had to believe in the Hebrew religion first before they could be bought for Yahweh was afraid that the Israelites would find the pagan influence irresistible. If a law authorises racism that does not mean that the law claims no authority over the hated race. The Law of Moses proved it thought it had authority over other nations when it dictated them what to believe.

Some Christians believe that the Saturday Sabbath was a sign between God and Israel (Exodus 31) so Gentiles cannot be bound to keep it. It can be asked that since the discussion was between God and Israel here what would he mention Gentiles for when there were none there? But I say there were some there who were made part of Israel too. Gentiles are bound to keep the Law. It is also thought that since the Lord told Israel that they should keep the Sabbath because he brought them up out of Egypt (Deuteronomy 5:15) that this was the purpose of the Sabbath and since Gentiles were not saved from Egypt they cannot have a duty to keep the Sabbath. But the verse could not mean that when the Jews believed God rested on the seventh day of creation to sanctify the seventh day. What it means is that the day God hallowed by rest is to be hallowed by them in gratitude for his rescuing them from Egypt. The Sabbath was always to be respected even though God could only reveal this as a duty to Israel at the time of Moses. This is the explanation for Deuteronomy 5:2-12 which says that the Sabbath law was not given to the fathers of Israel. It shows that this text cannot be used to establish a case for the Sabbath being a temporary and non-essential law.

There is no biblical evidence that the ethical or religious rules of the Law were for the people of Israel alone. Incidentally, the ceremonies of the Law are ethical laws for God would not make these demands unless they were the best. The fact that the Law says all pagan nations and other races will find it sagacious and that God wants all to be use proves that God would be evil if he didn't want all to accept its code of ethics. The Law is for enforcing morality for it can't very well enforce immorality can it?

Civil law decrees that nobody has the right to command murder for murder is a great and intolerable wrong. Jesus,

repeating what God decreed through Moses, said that the greatest commandment was not the one to avoid murder. The greatest commandment was the one to love God alone and do it with all your heart and soul and mind. So nobody has the right to say there is no God or to criticise this commandment of absolute love for God meaning the law should not tolerate it. The Law of Moses was perfectly logical in trying to set up a religious dictatorship in which religion and civil law were fused. This commandment was the reason why Moses' law ruled Palestine and to say God's law today should not control the state is to oppose the commandment. God says that all people whatever their race have a duty to love him alone so the Law is for all. To stone a homosexual to death is to love God alone and that is what he wants. When God wanted that done to Israelite homosexuals he would have wanted it done to pagan ones too for they were worse and had gay sex in honour of false gods.

## CONCLUSION

The Bible has it that the Mosiac Law is valid today and needs to be obeyed by everyone. It might be added that the Law is brutal and declares that religious faith comes before all. If you hope it at least makes the Law optional you need to discard that hope. It is obligatory and even if it were optional that would mean the Churches have to let people stone "sinners" to death in accordance with the Law.