

Should Christians Consider God's Law for Human Behavior Obsolete?

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Let's try to be clear on what we believe about God's Law.

-Let's clear up our concepts.....	1
-Private, previous questionnaire to clear up the reader's concepts about the law.....	2
-Summary of Chapter 1.....	14

Chapter 2 Summary of this books' content and its thesis.

-What the book is about and the author's religion.....	15
-What are the affirmations and concepts of those who think that God's Law for human behavior is abolished?.....	16
-Why is it wrong to believe that God's laws are abolished?.....	22
-What steps will I follow to present my thesis about the validity of God's Law?.....	23
-Why I number the lines.....	24
-Summary of Chapter 2.....	25

Chapter 3 Let us imitate the first Christians, who argued their doctrinal differences in a friendly manner.

-Proof that the friendly discussion of doctrinal differences between brothers is correct.....	26
-The first century Christians discussed passionately, but with love and justice, their doctrinal differences.....	27
-Why many don't want to discuss.....	28

-Several passages where we see that the first Christians discussed their beliefs.....	29
-Summary of chapter 3.....	31

Chapter 4 How to discuss efficiently.

-We must delimit the issue we are going to talk about, and define the words and phrases to use in the conversation when asked for.....	32
-Why delimit the issue?.....	32
-Why is it important to define and clear up the meaning of phrases, words, and concepts?.....	33
-What being “legalist” means.....	34
-What does “ not being a legalist” mean?.....	36
-What do we understand in the Bible by the word “law”?.....	37
-What does it mean to “be under the Law”?.....	38
-What does “not being under the Law” mean?.....	39
-What does “being in the Spirit” mean?.....	39
-Summary of Chapter 4.....	41

Chapter 5 Are we Christians or Saintpaulians?

-Why Christianity became Saintpaulianity.....	41
-It is sensible to interpret very carefully what Paul seems to say.....	43
-Paul <u>seems</u> to contradict Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the twelve apostles in regards to what was offered to the idols.....	45
-Paul talked and wrote in a way that was not a model of simplicity and clarity.....	47
-Paul was also inspired.....	48
-What did Paul say in I Corinthians 8:4-13?.....	49
-Christ contradicts what Paul seems to say.....	53
-Saint Paul contradicts Saint Paul.....	55
-Now then, what is my opinion about what Paul meant to say?.....	57

-Summary of chapter 5.....	61
----------------------------	----

Chapter 6 Christ never said what many confused people believe he said in regards to the law.

-Did Christ say what you believe he said?.....	63
-In order to save us, Christ obeyed <u>every one</u> of God's laws, from birth to death.....	63
-The only mission Christ had received was that of saving us, anything other would be a sin.....	65
-The error of believing that anyone who keeps the laws today must keep them as the Pharisees did.....	69
-God made his laws as easy as possible.....	73
-Christ did <u>not</u> abolish God's laws, he confirmed them.....	75
-What is God's law?.....	76
-If Christ would have thought that the behavior laws would be suppressed, he would not have used them in his reaching.....	83
-If you love me, keep my commandments. Which ones?.....	85
-Pray that your escape is not on the Sabbath.....	89
-Did Christ make <u>all</u> meats clean? Did he speak <u>against</u> the law?.....	92
-Eat what is put in front of you. An old woman's brain? Soup of defeated warrior's blood?.....	98
-What does "Ye have heard that it hath been said" mean?.....	100
-What does "the law and the prophets until John" mean?.....	103
-The Sabbath was made for man, not for the Jews.....	105
-Summary of Chapter 6.....	107

**Chapter 7 None of the apostles ever said that
God's laws had been abolished.**

-Authority of the twelve apostles.....	108
-The Holy Spirit and all of the apostles, including Paul, approved the apostolic letter.....	109
-Analyzing Acts 15, let's prove all that I have said.....	114
-Does "eating" or "not eating" make us more or less accepted by God?.....	120
-Transgression of God's law is sin; death penalty and prison.....	121
-If James uses the law to prove his point, it is because he considers it valid, he would not use it deceitfully.....	125
-The yoke that neither Peter nor their fathers had been able to bear was the ritual law.....	129
-Summary of chapter 7.....	132

**Chapter 8 Saint Paul never really said what
many believe he did.**

-Paul was not the Pope, nor did he ever pretend to be.....	134
-Careful how we understand what Paul said.....	135
-They entered the Holiest of all every day, not once a year, as Paul <u>seems</u> to say.....	136
-Saint Paul was well aware that it was difficult for some to understand him.....	142
-Paul <u>seems</u> to say that he had been blameless when it came to God's law, which is not true.....	142
-Paul <u>seems</u> to say that if we did away with money there would be no evil.....	146

-Paul would rather go to Hell and be eternally separated from God for his countrymen to be saved.....	147
-Is Paul saying he had to provide the afflictions Jesus missed to get our salvation?.....	150
-Paul seems to say that in order to be saved, a woman must, in addition to believing in Christ, give birth and raise children.....	151
-Paul seems to say that all men get saved.....	152
-Different meanings of the term “law”.....	153
-In the book of Galatians Paul <u>only</u> talks about the ritual laws, not the behavioral laws.....	160
-Let’s analyze now the letter to the Galatians.....	165
-What Paul authorized to eat here, is what the apostasy would later prohibit.....	178
-The “laws” that Paul challenges here are doctrines based on philosophical subtleties and human traditions, not on God’s laws.....	181
-Christ annulled in his body <u>only</u> the ritual laws, that is why Paul makes the differentiation.....	189
-Does Paul say stealing is right if it is convenient to our purposes?.....	195
-The Sabbaths that Paul considered obsolete.....	199
-One man makes a difference between one day and the other, another man considers every day the same.....	204
-Proof that Paul continued guiding his behavior according to God’s laws. Paul thought that the law was good and must be obeyed.....	207

-Paul says that he who keeps the law does well.....	208
-Paul says that not obeying the law is to dishonor God.....	209
-Paul uses the law to prohibit women from holding leadership positions in Church....	211
-Paul used the law to reprimand the incestuous Corinthian; therefore he did not consider it obsolete.....	212
-Paul uses the law to exhort the children.....	216
-Saint Paul did not work on Saturdays.....	217
-Paul followed the law so not to curse the High Priest.....	219
-Paul, a sincere man, says he believed in the law, therefore he did not consider it obsolete...	219
-According to Paul's words, first Christians did not go to church on Sunday.....	220
-The issue of the two witnesses are taken from the law.....	222
-Paul says it is not enough to hear God's law, it has to be obeyed.....	222
-Did Paul ever say we must rest on Sunday instead of Saturday?.....	224
-Summary of Chapter 8.....	227

Chapter 9 What is, and for what is God's law?

-What is God's law.....	230
-What God's laws are for?.....	231
-The auto manufacturer.....	232
-Decisions based on God's laws are the right decisions.....	234
-Ignorance of the law is no excuse to sin against God. The servant who ignored the will of his lord will be flogged with few stripes, but will be flogged.....	235

-Today's Perez-Uzzah Christianity and the "unimportant" laws for the "people of old"	237
-We suffer much by disobeying God's law. Would Solomon think those commandments were not important?.....	239
-The usefulness of obeying God.....	242
-Do we obey the law merely by doing unto others as we want others do unto us? Many unbelievers do unto others what they want others to do unto them.....	245
-“Improving” on God's laws is as much a sin as not obeying them. Saul “improved” on God's commandment.....	247
-Reason to obey the commandments we don't understand.....	251
-The Pharisees also “improved” on God's commandments.....	253
-What would be our habits if instead of being dead to the ceremonial laws we were dead to the behavioral laws?.....	254
-Reason to be and temporariness of certain ritual laws.....	258
-Summary of chapter 9.....	262

Chapter 10 The behavioral laws have existed since the creation of man.

-Before Sinai it was known that idolatry and adultery were serious sins.....	264
-It seems as if Paul said that sin did not exist before the advent of the law, but that is not what he means.....	265
-Before the handing down of the law in Mount Sinai, they kept the Sabbath.....	272
-It was known before Christ that salvation was through grace, not works.....	276

-Now Paul himself testifies that salvation through grace and not works was known in the Old Testament times.....	277
-Summary of chapter 10.....	278

Chapter 11 The mistake of believing that God's laws were only for the Jews and not for the Gentiles.

-The fact that the Gentiles knew and obeyed God's laws is an indication that they were not established just for the Jews.....	279
-Gods law was known and obeyed during the time of the flood, when there were still no Jews, because Shem and Japheth walked backwards.....	281
-Some animals were considered forbidden since creation, and it was not allowed to eat blood.....	283
-Jesus Christ himself affirms that Saturday was made for man.....	285
-The Old Testament promises.....	285
-The tithe of the Gentiles.....	286
-Paul considered that God's law should rule over the churches of the Gentiles.....	288
-According to Isaiah, Saturday was also for the Gentiles, as well as the other nine commandments.....	289
-Several passages show that God wanted the Gentiles to obey the law as well.....	291
-Paul tells <u>the Gentiles</u> that what is important is to obey the commandments.....	295
-Summary of Chapter 11.....	296

Chapter 12 Unknowingly, Christians admit to and obey the law.

- Here are several of the Old Testament laws that Christians accept without knowledge.....298
- Why do Christians unknowingly accept some of God's laws and not the others?.....300
- Witchcraft, spiritualism, and the first Christians.....302
- Could we tear off the Old Testament from the Bible without altering our faith?.....303
- Summary of Chapter 12.....305

Chapter 13 Let's talk specifically about Saturday.

- Saturday and the graven images.....307
- The only thing God commanded was not to work on Saturday, not to worship Him on Saturdays, or not go to synagogue on Saturday.....309
- There is no place in the Bible where it was ordained or customary not to work on Sunday. The day that was made holy was Saturday, not any other.....311
- Saturday and marriage.....313
- Honor your parents and keep Saturday, which in turns honors God our Father.....314
- Sunday and the Lord's apparitions.....314
- The eight mentions of the first day of the week.....318
- The disciples met any day.....325

-The error of believing that today's Saturday is not the same weekday of the creation.....	325
-Exaggerations and foolishness while keeping Saturday. You may leave the house on Saturdays.....	328
-You can light a fire and make war on Saturday.....	331
-The ridiculous Saturday of Adventists and Jews.....	335
-The religion of the "Ifeel" and the Saturday.....	337
-If Satan can't get us to disobey a commandment, then he tries to get us to obey it in a hurtful, ridiculous and exaggerated way.....	341
-How should we keep Saturday? Should we imitate the Pharisees or Christ?.....	345
-The unexpected tasks.....	346
-Electricity, hospitals, police, and the automobile.....	346
-Jehoiada, the army and Saturday.....	348
-We must keep Saturday even if the work is for God.....	349
-Summary of chapter 13.....	351

Chapter 14 Let's talk specifically about the edible foods.

-The tactics used by the serpent in Eden are the same today.....	353
-Peter's vision and the supposed cleanliness of <u>all</u> animals.....	354
-The authorization to eat <u>everything</u> , cannibalism and vegetarians.....	365

-To the clean everything is clean: the commandments of men and the Jewish fables.....	373
-Is everything edible or is everything useful for our life?.....	376
-Summary of chapter 14.....	378

Chapter 15 Is love a substitute for God's law?

-Only God's law teaches us which type of love God approves.....	380
-Those Who Are Better Than God.....	385
-The error and heresy of being Neo-Testamentarian.....	391
-Summary of chapter 15.....	393

Chapter 16 Discordances in the beliefs of those who think that God's law is abolished.

-Compartmentalizing of the human mind: it retains two contradictory concepts without realizing it.....	395
-God doesn't contradict himself and Christ does not contradict him either. Why do they refuse to discuss his doctrines?.....	396
-Some examples of contradictions in the minds of those who believe that God's laws are abolished.....	398
-Summary of chapter 16.....	410

Chapter 17 The supposedly "harshness" of God's law.

-Was God "harsh" and Christ "merciful?".....	412
-Mercy, love, compassion, etc., were not "invented" in the New Testament.....	413
-Charity towards the poor and the foreigner.....	413

-The law against the oppression of the poor and the unlawfulness of holding out salaries.....	414
-Why do some brothers think that the Old Testament is basically a teaching of hate and harshness, but the New Testament is of love and forgiveness?.....	416
-The right to asylum for the foreigner. The elderly, the orphan and the widow.....	418
-It is not stealing if it is for food.....	421
-Ruth and Naomi were beneficiaries of God's merciful laws.....	423
-“An eye for an eye” was a standard for the judges, not a commandment for the common citizen.....	424
-A comparison of the Old Testament charity and the modern church.....	427
-Summary of chapter 17.....	431

Chapter 18 Advise and suggestions for those who wish to obey God's law.

-God's laws were made to be obeyed.....	433
-How to know which commandments are valid and which are obsolete.....	434
-How to obey God's laws.....	437
-Summary of chapter 18.....	438

Appendix “A”

-Entering the Holy of Holies, supplement.....	439
---	-----

Appendix “B”

Paul's speaking style, supplement

-He was not perfect, but he was perfect.....	441
-He who knows doesn't know.....	443
-Let's not send our kids to college, because this is foolishness.....	445

-God's weakness, according to Paul.....	445
-Nothing is unclean, but yes some are.....	446
-Is Paul of the opinion that if we lust after something it is because we do not belong to Christ?.....	447
-Paul's speech is rather confusing, let's see other examples.....	448

Appendix "C"

-The Pharisees were not faithful keepers of God's law as people think.....	455
---	-----

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Chapter 1

Let's try to be clear on what we believe about God's Law

Let's clear up our concepts

Sometimes we don't have clear concepts in our minds **because we have never categorically answered the questions that come up.** To help in this task of clearing up concepts, I present the following questionnaire.

Normally we have made-up phrases or words with which we try to express a cloudy issue that we have in our mind, which, in spite of not having it clearly established, we expect others to understand it and accept it **without defining it or proving it.**

Prior to reading this book, it would be wise for the reader to answer to himself the questions in the questionnaire. This is so the reader can have his own ideas and concepts about God's law clear and well defined.

Since this questionnaire is not going to leave your hands, you may answer honestly, which will later help you in your reasoning. **Here is the questionnaire.**

Check off the answer that best describes your current concepts, or write it down, if required. You may have to check more than one answer in any given question.

*

35 **Private, previous questionnaire to clear up the**
36 **reader's concepts about the law**

37

38 **1-What is God's law:**

39

40 ___It is the set of laws that God established to
41 regulate the life of human beings.

42

43 ___It is the Old Testament.

44

45 ___It is the Ten Commandments.

46

47 ___It is the first five books of the Bible.

48

49 ___I don't know what God's law is.

50

51 **2-Are there behavior laws, that regulate a**
52 **human being's conduct, toward God and others?**

53 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

54

55 **3-Are there ritual laws that only regulated such**
56 **practices like circumcision, ceremonies and other**
57 **rituals having to do with sacrifices and other**
58 **acts, which were symbolic of Jesus Christ's**
59 **future sacrifice?**

60 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

61

62 **4-Are the behavioral laws that God established**
63 **to regulate human behavior toward God**
64 **abolished for all?**

65 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

66

67 **5-Are the behavioral laws that God established**
68 **to regulate man's conduct towards others now**
69 **abolished for everyone?**

70 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105

6- Are the behavioral laws that God established to regulate man’s conduct towards God now abolished only for Christians?

Yes___ No___ I don’t know___

7- Are the behavioral laws that God established to regulate man’s conduct towards others now abolished only for Christians?

Yes___ No___ I don’t know___

8-Are the laws that God established to regulate the lamb sacrifices and other Jewish rituals now abolished? Yes___ No___ I don’t know___

9-Is circumcision abolished for Christians?

Yes___ No___ I don’t know___

10-Do you believe that our Lord Jesus Christ, in any of his teachings, abolished God’s laws regarding human behavior?

Yes___ No___ I don’t know___

11-If you answered “Yes” in question # 10, can you name three passages where, to your understanding, Jesus abolished God’s laws regarding human behavior? Write them below.

12-Do you believe that any of Jesus’ twelve disciples abolished, or considered abolished, God’s laws regarding human behavior

Yes___ No___ I don’t know___

106 **13-If you answered “Yes” in question # 12, can**
107 **you name three passages where, to your**
108 **understanding, any one of the twelve apostles**
109 **abolished or considered abolished God’s laws**
110 **regarding human behavior? Write them below.**

111 _____
112 _____
113 _____

114 **14-Do you believe that Paul himself, by his**
115 **apostolic authority abolished God’s laws for**
116 **human behavior?**

117 Yes____ No____ I don’t know____
118

119 **15-If you answered “Yes” in question # 14, can**
120 **you name three passages where, to your**
121 **understanding, the Apostle Paul himself**
122 **abolished God’s laws regarding human**
123 **behavior? Write them below.**

124 _____
125 _____
126 _____

127 **16- Do you believe that Paul considered God’s**
128 **laws for human behavior abolished because**
129 **someone else abolished them?**

130 Yes____ No____ I don’t know____
131

132 **17- If you answered “Yes” in question # 16, can**
133 **you name three passages where, to your**
134 **understanding, Paul, considered God’s laws for**
135 **human behavior abolished because someone else**
136 **abolished them? Write them below.**

137 _____
138 _____
139 _____

140 **18-Do you believe that our Lord Jesus Christ, in**
141 **any of his teachings, abolished or considered**
142 **abolished the ritual law?**

143 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

144
145 **19-If you answered “Yes” in question # 18, can**
146 **you name three passages where, to your**
147 **understanding, our Lord Jesus Christ abolished**
148 **or considered abolished the ritual laws? Write**
149 **them below.**

150
151 _____
152

153 **20-Do you believe that any of the twelve disciples**
154 **abolished or considered abolished the ritual law**
155 **before the Lord's resurrection?**

156 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

157
158 **21-Is it true that under the law that God gave**
159 **Moses, it was a sin to talk against the law? In**
160 **other words, if someone talked against the law,**
161 **he sinned?**

162 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

163
164 **22-Below is a list of the Ten Commandments.**
165 **Check “yes” if Christians are required to obey**
166 **the commandment, and “no” if Christians are**
167 **not required to obey the commandment.**

168
169 Yes___ No___ You shall not have other Gods.
170 Yes ___ No___ You shall not bow before graven
171 images.
172 Yes ___ No___ You shall not take God's name
173 in vain.
174 Yes ___ No___ You shall not work on the
175 seventh day.

176 Yes ___ No ___ Honor your father and mother.
177 Yes ___ No ___ You shall not kill.
178 Yes ___ No ___ You shall not commit adultery.
179 Yes ___ No ___ You shall not steal.
180 Yes ___ No ___ You shall not bear false
181 witness.
182 Yes ___ No ___ You will not covet that which is
183 not yours.
184

185 **23-Once you become a Christian you must guide**
186 **your actions according to:**

187 ___Your country's traditions.
188 ___Your church's traditions.
189 ___Your conscience.
190 ___What the Bible says.
191 ___The opinion of the majority of the pastors.
192 ___Other _____
193

194 **24-Which of these must a Christian do to find**
195 **out God's truth:**

196 ___Wait for someone to teach him.
197 ___Read the Bible himself.
198 ___Go to church to learn from others as well.
199 ___Have friendly discussions with brothers on those
200 issues that he does not understand or with which
201 he disagrees.
202

203 **25-Do you believe a Christian should have**
204 **friendly discussions with other brothers on those**
205 **doctrines that he considers an error?**

206 Yes___ No___ I don't know___
207
208
209

210 **26-If you answered “no” to question # 25, can**
211 **you name three passages that serve as the basis**
212 **for your opinion? Write them down.**

213

214 _____

215

216 **27-What does the phrase “walk in the Spirit”**
217 **mean to you?**

218 ____To have revelations or spiritual phenomena that
219 indicate that everything we think or decide is
220 divinely inspired.

221 ____To be guided by our feelings, believing that
222 those feelings were put in us by the Holy Spirit.

223 ____To employ our time in those things we **know**
224 were put in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.

225 ____To act in the way that, as we learned in the
226 Bible, is pleasing to God.

227

228 **28-Have you ever had a revelation or**
229 **experienced a spiritual phenomenon that**
230 **empowers you to know right from wrong,**
231 **without basing it on the Bible?**

232 Yes____ No____

233

234 **29-Do you consider logical that the Holy Spirit**
235 **would reveal to you a way to interpret a specific**
236 **Bible passage, and then not give you the wisdom**
237 **needed to defend such interpretation with those**
238 **who contradict it?**

239 Yes____ No____ I don’t know____

240

241 **30-Has anyone ever been able to obey**
242 **throughout his life all the behavioral laws that**
243 **God established?**

244 Yes____ No____ I don’t know____

245

246 **31-Does everyone break any of God's laws, at**
247 **least once in their life?**

248 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

249
250 **32-Does everyone always break all of God's**
251 **laws?**

252 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

253
254 **33-Has anyone ever been able to obey all of**
255 **God's behavioral laws for some time**

256 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

257
258 **34-What is your basis for knowing that you are**
259 **"walking in the Spirit?"**

260 ___Only what the New Testament says.

261 ___Only what the Old Testament says.

262 ___What the entire Bible says.

263 ___What the Bible says and what the leaders of my
264 sect say when they interpret it.

265 ___The customs of where I live, plus what the Bible
266 and the leaders of my sect say.

267 ___What I feel in my heart that God tells me, or
268 what the Holy Spirit reveals to me.

269
270 **35-Which of the following do you consider**
271 **"walking in the flesh?"**

272 ___Going to the Opera

273 ___Using make-up

274 ___Drinking a glass of wine with dinner

275 ___Smoking

276 ___Going to the gym

277 ___Watching movies

278 ___Going dancing

279 ___Going on vacation

280 ___Using expensive Jewelry

281 ___Using cheap Jewelry

- 282 ___ Using expensive clothing
283 ___ Drinking alcoholic beverages
284 ___ Having a job or a business that requires working
285 seven days a week
286 ___ Living in a luxury home
287 ___ Driving a Porsche, BMW, or similar automobile
288 ___ Participating in local or national politics
289 ___ Actively participating in sports
290 ___ Watching TV two to three hours daily

291

292 **36-Many claim that “God spoke to their heart”,**
293 **or that “the Holy Spirit put something in their**
294 **heart”, or that they had a “heavenly**
295 **inspiration”. Have you ever had a similar**
296 **experience? Yes___ No___**

297

298 **37-If you answered “Yes” to # 36, has that**
299 **experience which you considered a divine**
300 **inspiration resulted 100% accurate?**

301 Yes ___ No___

302

303 **38-If you answered “No” to # 37, have you**
304 **developed a method to know beforehand which**
305 **inspiration or feeling is divinely originated and**
306 **which one is not?**

307 Yes ___ No___

308

309 **39-If you answered “No” to # 38, would you trust**
310 **in the future which doctrine to follow to those**
311 **“feelings” of your heart, or would you rather**
312 **reason and discuss in a friendly manner what the**
313 **Bible says?**

314 ___ I would continue to trust what I feel in my heart.

315 ___ I would read the Bible more and discuss with

316 my brothers the different doctrines to see which

317 one is solidly backed by the Bible.

318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352

40-What does being a legalist mean to you?

- ___ Trying to obey the ritual laws, like circumcision.
- ___ Obeying God’s behavioral laws, just as they were established, without adding or taking away, but not the ritual laws.
- ___ Trying to emulate the traditional ways the Pharisees had of obeying God’s laws.
- ___ Being legalist means the following:

41-What does not being a legalist mean to you?

- ___ Changing God’s commandments and adjust them to what I understand as “love”.
- ___ Changing God’s commandments according to the modern customs of our society.
- ___ Changing God’s commandments according to what our sect understands must be interpreted today.
- ___ Obeying only those commandments that **my heart tells me** I should obey.
- ___ Obeying only those commandments that **I consider** the Holy Spirit dictates, even when I can’t prove they are in agreement with what the Bible says.
- ___ Not being legalist means the following:

353 **42-Do you agree with the death sentence applied**
354 **to the Nazi genocides that murdered six million**
355 **Jews?**

356 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

357

358 **43-If you answered "No" to # 42, what other**
359 **punishment do you think should have been**
360 **applied?**

361 ___Life in prison, dying in jail.

362 ___Twenty to thirty years in jail.

363 ___Less than twenty years in jail.

364 ___No punishment, humans should not judge other
365 humans; that belongs to God.

366

367 **44-Can you name three Bible passages on which**
368 **to base your opinion for questions 42 and 43?**

369

370 _____

371

372 **45-Do you consider possible that the Holy Spirit**
373 **will reveal doctrine "A" to one sect, and doctrine**
374 **"B" to another, contrary to "A"?**

375 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

376

377 **46-Do you believe that the Ten Commandments**
378 **were given only for the Jews and not for the**
379 **Gentiles?**

380 ___Only for the Jews

381 ___For Jews and Gentiles

382 ___I don't know

383

384 **47-Were the Old Testament promises only for**
385 **the Jews or do they reach the Gentiles as well?**

386 ___Only for the Jews

387 ___Also for Gentiles

388 ___I don't know

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

48-If you believed that God's laws for human behavior were abolished, and a new Christian would ask you if he could do any of the following, what would you answer?

Can I love God above everything, but worship also the gods of my tribe?

Yes___ No___ I don't know___

Can I buy a picture or a statue of God and another one of Christ, and worship them and light candles?

Yes___ No___ I don't know___

If I saw that by telling a lie I could benefit another brother, could I swear by God that it is true, or call on God's name to make them believe that it is true?

Yes___ No___ I don't know___

If I work Monday through Friday, but I'm offered to work Saturdays if I want to, does the Bible authorize me to accept?

Yes, ___ No ___ I don't know___

If I work Monday through Friday, but I'm offered to work Sundays if I want to, does the Bible authorize me to accept?

Yes ___ No ___ I don't know___

If my mother is going through financial difficulties, but the church is raising funds for a new building, should I cut my mother's allowance to give to the church?

Yes___ No___ I don't know___

424 I know I should not kill, but if in a moment of rage I
425 unjustly kill a non-Christian, am I free of sin, since I
426 am not under the law, but under grace?

427 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

428

429 If because of a woman that tempts me I commit
430 adultery, am I free of sin, since I am not under the
431 law but under grace?

432 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

433

434 I am overworked and underpaid; can I steal a few
435 things to get even with the exploitation, since I am
436 not under the law but under grace?

437 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

438

439 I witnessed a collision and my friend was at fault.
440 The policeman, who saw me there, marked me as an
441 eye witness. Can I lie to help my friend, who is a
442 Christian, since we are not under the law but under
443 grace?

444 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

445

446 Sometimes I covet what others have. Being under
447 grace and not under the law, am I free of sin?

448 Yes___ No___ I don't know___

449

450 **49- If you answered "Yes" to any of the**
451 **statements in question # 48, do you believe that**
452 **the commandment that regulates such thing**
453 **expired and has not value?**

454 Yes___ No___

455

456

457

458

459 **50-If you answered “Yes” to any of the**
460 **statements in question # 48, can you name three**
461 **Bible passages on which you base your opinion?**
462 **Write them below.**

463 _____
464 _____
465 _____

466
467 **51-Moses was in Sinai several centuries after the**
468 **Flood. Do you believe that the people that lived**
469 **before Moses, since they didn’t have Moses’ law,**
470 **were without sin?**

471 They had sin____ They were without sin____
472 I don’t know____
473

474 **52-Do you believe that God established any law,**
475 **without it being motivated, for one or more**
476 **spiritual or physical benefits to human beings?**

477 Yes____ No____ I don’t know____
478

479 **53-Do you believe that God forbid eating certain**
480 **animals, without that law being motivated, for**
481 **one or more reasons, that benefits for human**
482 **beings** Yes____ No____ I don’t know____

483 *

484

485

486 **Summary of Chapter 1:** We must be sure of the
487 doctrine we believe, detail by detail, in order to
488 know, when a brother points to something he
489 considers an error, if in fact he is correct in his
490 reasoning, and be able to analyze it clearly. That is
491 why you should answer the questionnaire.

492

493

494

495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529

Chapter 2

Summary of this books' content and its thesis

What the book is about and the author's religion

The purpose of this book is only and exclusively, to show that **God's laws for human behavior are still current and will continue being current until heaven and Earth pass away.** Please take note, I am **not** saying that the ritual laws, such as circumcision, lamb sacrifices, cup washing, pharisaic traditions, etc., are still in place. **I am clearly saying that God's laws for human behavior are the ones still valid and will continue so for Christians and non-Christians alike.**

I am aware of many passages which many interpret in error, thinking that what Christ and Paul said means that God's laws are abolished. That is why we have to talk on this important subject. Later, in chapters six, seven and eight, I will show why it is not true that these passages mean that God's laws for human behavior are abolished.

Something else to clear up is that God's laws is not what the Pharisees imposed, rather what God established for the physical and spiritual wellbeing of his children.

The fact that I believe in the validity of God's laws for human behavior **does not mean I am an Adventist.** They, even though they are right in accepting the validity of the Law, **they also hold several errors which I do not share, such as: a)** the non-existence of the soul as a spiritual being aside from the body, **b)** the mistaken interpretation of Daniel 7, thinking it represents Babylon, Persia, Greek and Rome, instead of England, Russia, China

530 and European Union, c) vegetarianism, d) banning
531 drinking wine, which the Bible does not prohibit, e)
532 submitting to the erred writings of Helen White, f)
533 the mistaken interpretation that the United States is
534 the second beast of Revelation, and some others.

535 **Neither do I belong to any denomination,** for
536 even though I share with them many things, there
537 are others, like the validity of the Law of God,
538 which they do not accept.

539 *

540

541

542 **What are the affirmations and concepts of those**
543 **who think that God's Law for human behavior is**
544 **abolished?**

545 Below are the affirmations and concepts I have
546 heard from brothers who believe that God's Law for
547 human behavior are abolished. All these
548 affirmations are cleared up and answered, showing
549 their error, throughout this book. Let's see.

550

551 1-Many Christians think arguing about religion with
552 those who hold a different opinion is useless, and
553 sinful. The first Christians did not do it, they think.

554 (Chapter 3)

555

556 2-One problem the author sees in this is that on the
557 very few instances in which brothers engage in a
558 friendly discussion about their beliefs, they do not
559 limit themselves to one issue, rather they mix
560 several issues and get nowhere. (Chapter 4)

561

562 3-I also see that in their conversations and
563 allegations, most of the time they use concepts,
564 words and phrases to which they give one meaning
565 in one issue, and another meaning in another issue.

566 Many of them are not conscious of the value of the
567 words, phrases and concepts they use.
568 (Chapter 4)
569
570 4-Many affirm that everything a Christian needs to
571 know is found in Paul's letters. (Chapter 5)
572
573 5-Some affirm Christ nailed on the cross God's
574 laws for human behavior. (Chapter 6)
575
576 6-Many think that since Jesus did not condemn the
577 adulterous woman about to be stoned, that means he
578 abolished the Law. (Chapter 6)
579
580 7-Also some believe that anyone who wants to
581 follow God's laws for human behavior must do it as
582 the Pharisees did. (Chapter 6)
583
584 8-Mistakenly some believe God made the behavior
585 laws **very difficult**, so that nobody could be saved
586 without Jesus Christ. (Chapter 6)
587
588 9-Some think, erroneously, Christ cleansed all
589 foods. According to them, Christians can eat
590 anything. (Chapter 6)
591
592 10-Christ said: Eat whatever is set before you.
593 Therefore, they conclude, mistakenly, nothing is
594 forbidden, we may eat any thing. (Chapter 6)
595
596 11-Others think God's law only lasted up to John
597 the Baptist, according to what they interpret from
598 what Jesus said. (Chapter 6)
599
600 12-The Sabbath was created for man; we don't need
601 to keep the Sabbath, some believe. (Chapter 6)

602
603 13-Is it true that the twelve disciples abolished the
604 Law? (Chapter 7)
605
606 14-Some allege Paul said that whether we eat or not
607 doesn't make us any more accepted by God. That
608 means Christians can eat anything. (Chapter 7)
609
610 15-Some claim we can eat of any animal, because
611 all animals come from God. (Chapter 7)
612
613 16-There are those who declare God doesn't worry
614 about the Christians' diet, we can eat anything,
615 nothing is forbidden. (Chapter 7)
616
617 17-Too many Christians think that what Paul said is
618 **above** anything said by all other apostle together or
619 any other biblical character. (Chapter 8)
620
621 18-Others think Paul used to speak "very clearly",
622 and he said that God's law for human behavior is
623 obsolete. (Chapter 8 and Appendixes A and B)
624
625 19-Some believe the letter to the Galatians is where
626 most clearly Paul says that God's law for human
627 behavior is abolished. (Chapter 8)
628
629 20-There are some who think Paul abolished the
630 Sabbath, because he says that some regard one day
631 to the other as different while others consider all
632 days the same. (Chapter 8)
633
634 21-Others are of the opinion that The Golden Rule:
635 "Do unto others as you want others do unto you", is
636 better than following God's law for human
637 behavior. (Chapter 9)

638
639 22-Some consider Christ “improved” God’s law,
640 because it was part of another covenant in another
641 time. (Chapter 9)
642
643 23-Some claim Christians are dead to God’s laws
644 for human behavior, which is why we don’t have to
645 obey them. (Chapter 9)
646
647 24-Many believe erroneously, that before Sinai
648 God’s laws were unknown. (Chapter 10)
649
650 25-Some believe Paul said that before God’s Law
651 was given by Moses, there was no sin.
652 (Chapter 10)
653
654 26-A number of brothers assert that before Christ,
655 salvation was by works, and after Christ salvation is
656 by grace. (Chapter 10)
657
658 27-Many believe God’s law for human behavior
659 was only for the Jews. (Chapter 11)
660
661 28-Others suppose Paul says that God’s law for
662 human behavior has nothing to do with the Gentiles.
663 (Chapter 11)
664
665 29-Some brag: I am a New Testamentarian
666 Christian; I can live without the Old Testament.
667 (Chapter 12)
668
669 30-Others more specifically say: I don’t accept, nor
670 do I have to obey any of the Old Testament laws,
671 only those that are repeated in the New Testament.
672 (Chapter 12)
673

674 31-Some brethren state: The Old Testament is
675 completely obsolete, null and lacks all religious
676 value. (Chapter 12)
677
678 32-Because Jesus rose on Sunday, (many allege)
679 that is why the day of rest was changed from
680 Saturday to Sunday. (Chapter 13)
681
682 33-The apostles met on Sunday, which is “proof”
683 (many think) that they changed Saturday for
684 Sunday. (Chapter 13)
685
686 34-A few brothers suppose that today’s Saturday is
687 not the same weekday as the Saturday of Moses’
688 time. (Chapter 13)
689
690 35-Some brag saying: I worship God every day, not
691 just on the Saturday. (Chapter 13)
692
693 36-Others justify themselves saying: I don’t keep
694 any day because that was all abolished.
695 (Chapter 13)
696
697 37-The opinion of others is that any day of the week
698 can be kept, what’s important is to rest one of every
699 seven days. (Chapter 13)
700
701 38-There exist those who think that Jesus’
702 apparitions “**always**” happened on Sunday; that is
703 why they keep Sunday. (Chapter 13)
704
705 39-Others misinterpret that if a person rest on
706 Saturday he cannot light the fire in the fireplace
707 even though it is cold. (Chapter 13)
708

709 40-Some think that to keep the Sabbath you must do
710 what the Pharisees did. (Chapter 13)
711
712 41-Because Christ said that what comes into a
713 man's mouth is not what contaminates man, many
714 think we can eat anything. (Chapter 14)
715
716 42-Those who misunderstand Peter's vision think
717 that it was the green light for Christians to eat any
718 kind of animal. (Chapter 14)
719
720 43-Others think that in Romans 14:1-2 Paul
721 authorizes us to eat anything. (Chapter 14)
722
723 44-Some think that in Titus 1:13-15 Paul says that
724 everything is clean to those who are clean; so if
725 anyone considers anything unclean, it is because he
726 himself is not clean. (Chapter 14)
727
728 45-Many believe that what's important is love, not
729 the Law. For them "love" is the substitute for the
730 Law of God. (Chapter 15)
731
732 46-Also many believe that today Christians are not
733 guided by the Law of God, but by "love".
734 (Chapter 15)
735
736 47-Some assert that in the Old Testament the Law
737 was harsh and merciless, but in the New Testament
738 we see the law of love. (Chapter 17)
739
740 48-Many believe that if you keep God's laws for
741 human behavior, as written in the Old Testament,
742 you must do it as the Pharisees did.
743 (Chapter 18 and Appendix C)
744 *

745

746

747

748

**Why is it wrong to believe that God's laws are
abolished?**

749

750

751

752

753

First, because truth is of God and falsehood is a scheme of Satan. So to begin with, by just considering this reality, we can conclude that to believe a lie will hurt our soul and our relationship with God.

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

Another reason why it is harmful to believe that God's laws are abolished is that, even though we can be sincere in our belief, we sin by doing the opposite of what God wants us to do. We may be very sincere in believing that an electric cable, even though it says "high voltage", is not alive. Nevertheless, if touch it, we would receive an electrical shock equivalent to the one we would receive if we touched it knowing that we shouldn't.

763

764

765

766

That is why there are so many uncertainties and questions in the minds of many Christians. They don't pay attention to what Jesus said in Luke 12:47-48. Let's see.

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

"⁴⁷ And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. ⁴⁸ But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required, and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more".

777

(Lk 12:47-48)

778

779

780

As we've just seen, the one who sinned knowingly will be beaten much, and the one **who**

781 **sinned by ignorance will be beaten less, but will**
782 **be beaten nevertheless.** He who sincerely does not
783 keep God's laws because he thinks they have been
784 abolished, will be beaten less, but will be beaten
785 anyway in this life. **Our duty is to make an effort to**
786 **find the truth.**

787 *

788
789

790 **What steps will I follow to present my thesis**
791 **about the validity of God's Law?**

792 I want to take the following steps to develop my
793 thesis. **a)** I want to prove first that the first century
794 Christians discussed their doctrinal differences
795 amicably. They did it as to reach a consensus on the
796 correct one. Therefore, modern day Christians
797 should be willing to discuss amicably our doctrinal
798 differences, in order to arrive at the truth. Let's not
799 think of ourselves as better than them, and hide in
800 an ivory tower.

801 Once convinced that discussing our differences of
802 opinion is useful, the following step will be to **b)**
803 learn how to efficiently discuss an issue: 1) limiting
804 the issue to be discussed, 2) explaining the meaning
805 of the words and phrases that are used, if they are
806 not clear, as to avoid misunderstandings, etc..

807 After understanding each other, the next step is **c)**
808 to define ourselves as Christians or Saintpaulians,
809 showing the error of the latter. Also, **d)** learn what
810 Jesus said in regards to God's law for human
811 behavior, so to show that those places where many
812 believe Jesus abolished the Law, he was really
813 saying no such thing. **e)** We will also see what the
814 twelve apostles said, with which I'll prove that they
815 never abolished the Law. **f)** It is important also to
816 clear up what Paul said, to show that those who

817 believe that the Apostle to the Gentiles abolished
818 the Law of God for human behavior are tragically
819 and completely mistaken.

820 Then we will study the following:

821 **g)** What is the Law, and what is it good for. **h)**
822 Prove that those laws existed since creation, and it
823 wasn't something "invented" when Moses went to
824 Mount Sinai. **i)** We must also prove that God's
825 laws for human behavior were not established only
826 for the Jews, but for all human beings. **j)** We will
827 also show how today's Christians, unknowingly,
828 recognize and keep almost all the laws, while
829 rejecting others. **k)** Later we will speak specifically
830 about the validity of the Saturday. **L)** We will also
831 talk specifically about what Christians should or
832 should not eat, in other words, God's diet for His
833 children. **m)** We will show how love is not the
834 substitute for the Law of God. Many think so
835 because they do not understand what is said to
836 them. **n)** We will show the discordance within the
837 minds of those who consider that God's laws are
838 obsolete. **o)** It is also necessary to help to
839 understand, those who believe that God's law is
840 "harsh", but that the Gospel is "soft and easy", that
841 they have an error of perspective. **Finally, p)** there
842 will be some advice for those who wish to keep
843 God's laws, so they don't fall in gross
844 exaggerations or ridiculous things that God does
845 **not** demand from them.

846 *

847

848

849

Why I number the lines

850 I consider that every author that sustains a thesis
851 must be accessible to discuss it with those who
852 disagree with him on the subject, and not hide in an

853 ivory tower not to be contradicted. Therefore I
854 number every line, so that if anyone wishes to
855 object anything I say here, can easily point to the
856 place where it is said, by just mentioning the
857 numbers of the lines in question. For example, this
858 explanation goes from line 849 to line 858.

859 *

860

861

862 **Summary of Chapter 2:** My only allegation in
863 this book is that the behavioral laws that God has
864 established are still in effect for all, including
865 Christians; and that the only laws that are obsolete
866 are the ritual laws. I also explain the manner in
867 which I will present the issue.

868 *

869

870

871 **“To clearly understand a biblical truth**
872 **takes a child; to complicate it, obscure it,**
873 **and twist it, takes a theologian”.**

874

875 ***

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919

Chapter 3

Let us imitate the first Christians, who discussed their doctrinal differences in a friendly manner

Proof that the friendly discussion of doctrinal differences between brothers is correct

Throughout the New Testament we see the apostles, especially Paul, vehemently but amicably arguing their doctrinal differences. So not to burden themselves with the grave responsibility of preaching an incorrect doctrine, even though he believed it so.

Paul commands Christians to argue with those in error. Today Christians think that in order to be a “good Christian” you can’t discuss religion. What we shouldn’t do is fight, insult or offend. The true Christian doesn’t do such things when he discusses. Paul always advised his disciples and brothers to discuss religion. He did it himself all the time in the synagogues, at the Aeropagus, and any place anyone would contradict the true doctrine. While talking about the way pastors should be, Paul said this:

*“⁹ Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. ¹⁰ For there are many *unruly and vain talkers and deceivers*, specially they of the circumcision. ¹¹ Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake”.*

(Tit 1:9-11)

920 There are many today that contradict this teaching
921 of Paul, whom they say they are imitating, and
922 insist that the only thing they need to do is “talk”,
923 without using arguments or try convincing anyone.

924 Paul argued with Jews and Gentiles, he used
925 arguments, tried to convince others, etc., **because**
926 **he knew he had the truth**, that he had the correct
927 doctrine. Because he had it, he lacked neither
928 arguments **nor the help of the Holy Spirit**.

929 *

930

931

932 **The first century Christians argued passionately,**
933 **but with love and justice, their doctrinal**
934 **differences**

935 Therefore, it is not wrong to discuss, as some
936 think. In my opinion it is all right to discuss as long
937 as the one who discusses has with him the spirit of
938 convincing the other of something he sincerely
939 believes. There is nothing wrong in discussing, as
940 long as he leaves open the door of understanding in
941 his own spirit, so to allow himself to be convinced,
942 should the other person have good arguments.

943

944 *“When therefore Paul and Barnabas **had no***
945 ***small dissension and disputation** with them,*
946 *they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and*
947 *certain other of them, should go up to*
948 *Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about*
949 *this question”*. (Act 15:2)

950

951 What happens often is that people don’t discuss,
952 they fight with words, they try to offend, to enrage,
953 to humiliate and mock their opponent. But a true
954 Christian does not discuss like that. Those who
955 argue in such manner are not arguing, they are

956 fighting, trying to win a just cause with unworthy
957 weapons. To wield your own arguments, even
958 passionately (though never offensively), I don't
959 consider wrong.

960 *

961
962

963 **Why many don't want to discuss**

964 There are several reasons why many brothers
965 don't discuss doctrinal differences. **The main one is**
966 **lack of faith.** Some believe that God, Christ, or the
967 Holy Spirit was who inspired in them the doctrine
968 they now believe; others just pretend. However,
969 they dare not discuss with those who think
970 differently because they feel insecure. **They have**
971 **no faith** that if his doctrine is divinely inspired,
972 God, Christ, or the Holy Spirit is going to enlighten
973 them with arguments and words to defend the truth.
974 **They have no faith** in what the Lord Jesus
975 promised in Luke 21:15 when He said:

976

977 ***"For I will give you a mouth and wisdom,***
978 ***which all your adversaries shall not be able***
979 ***to gainsay nor resist". (Lk 21:15)***

980

981 **Others simply don't really believe the doctrine**
982 **they teach,** but they teach it for material gain. They
983 know it is false, that they can't defend it, and so
984 they find any pretext to not have to discuss their
985 doctrinal differences.

986 There are still those who believe what they
987 preach, but are not sure. They know they can't
988 defend their beliefs, and **their puffed up ego stops**
989 **them from discussing, if they think they can be**
990 **proved wrong.** In a few words, they love
991 themselves more than they love God and His truth.

992 They rather hide behind the pretext that all they
993 have to do is “say and flee”. That way they save
994 their egos, for no one will know they are wrong.

995 None of them is going to admit that they don’t
996 discuss because of one of these questionable
997 reasons. They are going to put forth their best
998 pretexts.

999 *

1000

1001

1002 **Several passages where we see that the first**
1003 **Christians discussed their beliefs**

1004 There are believers who hold erroneous and even
1005 heretical doctrines, which they absorbed at the
1006 moment of conversion, when they could not reason
1007 on the Bible by themselves. Even though they have
1008 no basis for them, they hold on to them no matter
1009 what, for fear of who knows what, if they lose it.
1010 Therefore they do not discuss them. The healthy
1011 habit on the validity of discusses among believers is
1012 best appreciated in the following passages.

1013

1014 “¹⁷ Therefore **disputed** **he** in the synagogue
1015 with the Jews, and with the devout persons,
1016 and in the market daily with them that met
1017 with him. ¹⁸ Then certain philosophers of the
1018 Epicureans, and of the Stoicks, **encountered**
1019 **him**. And some said: What will this babbler
1020 say? Other some: He seemeth to be a setter
1021 forth of strange gods, because he preached
1022 unto them Jesus, and the resurrection”.

1023 (Act 17:17-18)

1024

1025 “And **he reasoned** in the synagogue every
1026 sabbath, and **persuaded** the Jews and the
1027 Greeks”.

(Act 18:4)

“And he came to Ephesus, and left them there, but he himself entered into the synagogue, and **reasoned with the Jews**”.
 (Act 18:19)

1034 *“For he mightily convinced the Jews, and*
1035 *that publickly, shewing by the scriptures that*
1036 *Jesus was Christ”.* (Act 18:28)

1038 *“And he went into the synagogue, and spake*
1039 *boldly for the space of three months,*
1040 *disputing and persuading the things*
1041 *concerning the kingdom of God”.*
1042 *(Act 19:8)*

1044 ***“Prove all things; hold fast that which is***
1045 ***good”.*** (I Ths 5:21)

1047 “¹⁶ All scripture is given by inspiration of
1048 God, and is **profitable for doctrine, for**
1049 **reproof, for correction**, for instruction in
1050 righteousness; ¹⁷ that the man of God may be
1051 perfect, **thoroughly furnished unto all good**
1052 **works”**. (II Tim 3:16-17)

1054 *“But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts,*
1055 *and **be ready** always to give an answer to*
1056 ***every man that asketh** you a reason of the*
1057 *hope that is in you with meekness and fear”*
1058 *(I Pet 3:15)*

1060 In all these passages we see that **it was the**
1061 **custom of all the apostles to discuss religion with**
1062 **believers and non-believers as well.** I don't know
1063 why so many brothers now feel such disgust for the

1064 friendly discussion of our beliefs, except the fear of
1065 having their ego hurt if their arguments are wrong.
1066 There are, however, those whom their sect has
1067 forbidden them to discuss, so the errors and heresies
1068 they sustain are not brought to light.

1069 *

1070

1071

1072 **“Discussion is like light, it bothers**
1073 **only those who prefer darkness”**

1074

1075 *

1076

1077

1078 **Summary of chapter 3.** There is no valid reason
1079 for Christians today not to want to discuss their
1080 doctrinal differences, since not only Paul advised to
1081 do so, but all the other apostles did. Not doing it
1082 shows lack of faith in Jesus’ promise to give a
1083 mouth and wisdom to his servants. Only he who
1084 knows he is not defending the doctrines that a
1085 servant of Christ must have, runs from friendly
1086 discussion.

1087

1088 ***

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131

Chapter 4

How to discuss efficiently

We must delimit the issue we are going to talk about, and define the words and phrases we use in the conversation when asked for

I believe we must define the concepts we believe, and the words and phrases to use, so not to fall in a constant gobbledegook. I also believe we must set limits to the issue to be discussed, to avoid arguing about a lot of things without really clearing up anything.

Once we define the issue to be discussed, we must make a mental list of the arguments we believe support it, which is something like the columns that support that large horizontal stone that is the issue at hand.

Before beginning to discuss, we must state ourselves why we believe this argument helps prove our thesis is right.

*

Why delimit the issue?

Some people enter a discussion thinking they are right, or thinking that even they are not, they can fend false arguments and get away with it. As soon as they realize that their opponent has a good rebuttal, they suddenly try to bring into the discussion other issues that are not being discussed.

As a result they get away from the main issue, tangling up others in unrelated subjects that are not being discussed at the time. That way they avoid reaching a conclusion that will leave them in a bad

1132 light. That is why we must define what to discuss
1133 and limit the scope of the discussion.

1134 That is why in our case (in this book) we are
1135 going to discuss **only and exclusively if God's**
1136 **laws for human behavior** are still in effect for
1137 Christians and non-Christians, Jews and Gentiles, or
1138 if it is abolished for some or for all. To try to
1139 introduce another subject in this discussion would
1140 be trying to steer away from it because they have no
1141 biblical basis.

1142 *

1143
1144
1145 **Why is it important to define and clear up the**
1146 **meaning of phrases, words, and concepts?**

1147 Many use phrases like a wild card or a joker in a
1148 deck of cards. In the game of Poker the wild card is
1149 used to represent any card the player wants.

1150 In conversations, 'wild card' words and phrases
1151 are used by some to give them the meaning that is
1152 convenient at that moment. Nevertheless, they
1153 change their meaning when used another time,
1154 when they find themselves cornered dialectically.
1155 They are not honest in their debate.

1156 In some cases, **even those who discuss honestly**
1157 don't have in their minds a clear meaning of many
1158 of the words and phrases they use. For them, these
1159 phrases represent cloudy concepts that those who
1160 use them refuse to define clearly, or to answer
1161 questions about their meaning. Some do it because
1162 they expect you to accept this cloudy concept they
1163 have in their mind, in the same cloudy way they
1164 have it. Others do it because they don't want to
1165 clear up something that can be negative to the thesis
1166 they keep. Some of these phrases are: "being in the
1167 Spirit", "being legalist", "being under the Law",

1168 “being under grace”, “love is the fulfillment of the
1169 Law”, and many others. That is why it is good to
1170 define the concepts and phrases used in this type of
1171 discussion.

1172 **In every conversation**, a person will say words
1173 and phrases whose meaning he have never defined
1174 to himself. He uses these words and phrases as a
1175 way to say “something” he wants the listener to
1176 accept in the same cloudy way that he has them in
1177 his mind, without definition. This inadequate
1178 manner of expression gives way to an endless
1179 number of errors and twisting that we must avoid in
1180 any subject we discuss, but more so when we are
1181 talking about the holy truths of God.

1182 That is why it will be good, before talking about
1183 the Law, to define each one of the words and
1184 phrases commonly used, even though they are never
1185 defined or contrasted. Not only do we need to know
1186 what a word means, but sometimes we also need to
1187 specify what it does not mean.

1188 *

1189
1190

1191 **What being “legalist” means**

1192 In many occasions I have heard someone label as
1193 “legalist” those who believe that God’s laws for
1194 human behavior are **not** obsolete. What does the
1195 word “legalist” mean? If we look up its meaning in
1196 the dictionary we see that a “legalist” is one who
1197 considers above everything else the literal
1198 application of the law. I agree that such is the
1199 meaning of the word in our language.

1200 Well, so what is wrong with obeying God’s laws
1201 just as He expressed them? **If we were talking**
1202 **about human laws it is possible that we would**
1203 **not want to interpret them literally at all times,**

1204 because the person that wrote it may not have
1205 expressed them correctly. But when we are talking
1206 about God's law, that scenario is completely
1207 impossible. Therefore, who dares to judge God's
1208 laws, or modifies them so not to be called a
1209 "legalist"?

1210 The problem does not lie in obeying God's law
1211 faithfully, but in obeying literally only one verse or
1212 one passage, or one section of the Bible, **as**
1213 **opposed** to others; but not in faithfully obeying
1214 God's commandments interpreted from the whole
1215 Bible. Not only does the Bible present the
1216 commandments, like "Thou shalt not kill", but it
1217 gives examples as to what the commandments
1218 mean. Let's see some of these examples.

1219 **When we see the different biblical episodes**
1220 **where killing is involved**, we realize what the
1221 commandment "thou shalt not kill" means. When
1222 we read the rest of the Bible we see that God
1223 ordered Saul to kill the Amalekites. Therefore, the
1224 Decalogue's "thou shalt not kill" could not be
1225 applied correctly by taking just one verse. But it can
1226 be applied **correctly** taking into account the **entire**
1227 **Bible**. In it we realize that the "thou shalt not kill"
1228 means that we should not kill out of our own whim,
1229 for personal issues.

1230 The same goes for the death penalty for the
1231 murderer. The murderer can be killed. "Thou shalt
1232 not kill" does not apply to not executing him. There
1233 are several laws in the Bible where God commands
1234 the killing of those who have committed certain
1235 crimes. Therefore, "*Thou shalt not kill*" has to be
1236 understood in light of the entire Scripture, and not
1237 just one verse.

1238 **The Decalogue says not to make graven**
1239 **images**. However, if we read the rest of the Bible

1240 we see that when the Tabernacle and the Temple
1241 were being built, there were images of vegetables,
1242 animals and cherubim.

1243 From there we learn that what the commandment
1244 says is that we should not make images to worship
1245 them, but we can take pictures of ourselves. So we
1246 **can obey the commandment literally just as it is**
1247 **presented through the entire Bible, not as we**
1248 **read it in just one verse**. If it weren't because we
1249 apply the commandment as the Bible shows it, in an
1250 integral manner, we could not take photos.

1251 **Therefore, being a legalist is not faithfully**
1252 **obeying God's commandments**, but holding on to
1253 certain isolated words, verses or passages in order
1254 to give them the meaning that we want them to
1255 have, willfully forgetting the rest of the Bible.

1256 *

1257

1258

1259 **What does "not being a legalist" mean?**

1260 Is not being a legalist that we "adapt" God's
1261 commandments to our culture, our times, the
1262 doctrine of our sect, or our personal convenience?
1263 In other words, that in order for us not to be labeled
1264 as legalists, would we have to interpret each one of
1265 God's commandments as we wish? Yes, because if
1266 one person interprets that he can worship Jesus'
1267 statue, while another one interprets it as idolatry,
1268 **the latter would be labeled by the first as**
1269 **"legalist"**. In that case the non-legalist would
1270 defend himself by saying that it was for the Jews, or
1271 that it was "for those times", or that it was for those
1272 who worshiped pagan idols, but not for people
1273 "under grace". Are there not now-a-days millions of
1274 professed Christians that worship graven images?

1275 In other words, in order for us not to be labeled as
1276 “legalists” we would have to quietly accept
1277 whatever heresy and error we hear, because if we
1278 allege what the Bible says as a whole, we would be
1279 called “legalists”.

1280 *

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

**What do we understand in the Bible by the word
“law”?**

In biblical conversations the word “law” is referred to as God’s laws. Let’s remember that Moses did not originate the Law, neither did Noah or any of the prophets, but God personally.

In the Bible there are two main groups of laws.

There are ritual laws, and behavior laws. The ritual laws, as indicated by their name, referred to the rituals. It referred to the sacrifices, and the ceremonies that served as a prefigure to Jesus’ mission, when He came to die for us. Also they referred to the coming of the Holy Spirit, the Second Coming, etc.. The main ritual laws were those that referred to the Temple, and the sacrifices that would take place there. Other ritual laws included circumcision, the washing of the body so not to contaminate the Earthly sanctuary, which was a simile of the heavenly sanctuary, the presentation of the human first born, the sacrifice of the animal first born, etc..

Behavioral laws are those that God established for human beings to know how they were to behave towards God and their neighbor. Examples of these are the Ten Commandments, the laws that teach us how to act with foreigners, with our enemies, with the widows and the orphans, with the poor, with those things others have lost and we find, what if

1311 we injure others without intention, or out of
1312 irresponsibility, etc..

1313

1314 **What does it mean to “be under the Law”?**

1315 The phrase, “being under the Law” is one of those
1316 that act as a wild card. Most of the time nobody
1317 defines them, they only pronounce them. It is
1318 regularly applied to those persons that consider that
1319 the sins that in the Old Testament were described as
1320 forbidden are also forbidden for Christians.

1321 However, in the Bible, “not being under Law”
1322 generally means that **to be saved we don’t have to**
1323 **comply with circumcision, lamb sacrifices or**
1324 **other rituals.**

1325 **But there are Christians who erroneously**
1326 believe that this phrase means that Christians don’t
1327 have to obey God’s commandments. Is that true?
1328 Does that mean that all of us are not under the
1329 behavior laws that God established? **Does that**
1330 **mean that we can now lie, worship images,**
1331 **commit adultery, steal, kill, consult the dead,**
1332 **etc.?** Of course not! Then, why do they say we are
1333 not under the Law?

1334 **If by saying that we are not under the Law,**
1335 **they refer to not being under the ritual law, that**
1336 **is correct.** In other words, if it means that to be
1337 saved we don’t have to be circumcised, or sacrifice
1338 animals, or any of the sort, then the phrase is
1339 correctly used. But if they give it the meaning that
1340 we can do all kind of sin without being accountable
1341 for it, then it is a terrible lie, a horrible and satanic
1342 heresy.

1343

*

1344

1345

1346

1382 say: *“The heart is deceitful above all things and*
1383 *desperately wicked, who can know it?”*

1384 These brothers think they have a direct connection
1385 with a Heavenly Department of Orthodox Christian
1386 Doctrines. They do not discuss their beliefs; they
1387 only affirm them dogmatically, because they “feel”
1388 it is a message from Heaven.

1389 The problem is that I have talked with Methodists,
1390 Baptists, Presbyterians, Pentecostals, etc., and all
1391 believe they are “in the Spirit” and believe the right
1392 doctrines. They believe that the Holy Spirit revealed
1393 to them or their sect leaders the doctrines that they
1394 have adopted. But I see two very weak points to that
1395 belief.

1396 **First**, I don’t believe that the Holy Spirit would
1397 reveal to one group that the correct doctrine is to
1398 baptize through immersion, while revealing to
1399 others that the correct doctrine is to baptize by
1400 sprinkling. Therefore, I would rather believe that
1401 one of these brothers adopted the doctrine he liked
1402 best, and then looked through the Bible for a verse
1403 to back it up. Or maybe they started to “pray” for
1404 God’s approval and...zap... they “felt” in their heart
1405 they received that approval.

1406 When I ask them if every time they’ve prayed and
1407 “felt” that God has revealed something to them, has
1408 it been accurate 100% of the times, they say no.
1409 How, then, can they know when that which they
1410 “feel” is correct?

1411 **Second**, I see that none of them is willing to
1412 discuss their doctrines, evidence that they really do
1413 not feel backed by the Holy Spirit. The Apostles,
1414 who were backed by the Holy Spirit, were not afraid
1415 to discuss their doctrinal differences with any
1416 brother, and even with the enemies of the Gospel.

1417 That is why that **phrase of “being in the Spirit”**
1418 **tells me very little about the one who says it.**
1419 Nevertheless, I will believe it from anyone that will
1420 prove it with valid assurance.

*

Summary of Chapter 4. What are we going to discuss? As I said in the beginning the only thing we will analyze in this book is whether God's laws for human behavior are still in effect. For any other subject anyone wants to discuss I will gladly accept the challenge, but that will be a separate discussion, **after we finish** this one.

Let's try to use only those words or phrases that we have previously defined to ourselves, and whose meaning we have contrasted with similar ones. **But if other words or phrases slip away, we need to be capable of defining them and contrast them if asked to.**

Chapter 5

Are we Christians or Saintpaulians?

Why Christianity became Saintpaulianity

1447 More than 16 centuries ago many Christians
1448 became Saintpaulians. **This is a rather idolatrous**
1449 **form of Christianity.** Yes, because while it
1450 remains true to Jesus Christ, it takes away the
1451 authority of his word, and that of his twelve

1452 Apostles, transferring such authority to Paul, **going**
1453 **above the authority of Christ and God himself.**

1454 Sure enough, nowadays most Christians are
1455 Saintpaulians. If Christ says that the grass is green
1456 and the Saintpaulians misunderstand that Paul said
1457 it is red, they insist it is red, because “Paul said so”.

1458 If the twelve apostles say the sky is blue and the
1459 believers think they understood Paul say it was
1460 yellow, the Saintpaulians will insist that the sky is
1461 yellow, “because Paul said so”.

1462 **They don’t care what God says, what Jesus**
1463 **says, or what the Holy Spirit says;** neither do they
1464 care what the twelve apostles say. The “new
1465 doctrine” is what the believers think Paul has said.

1466 **Some believe that in I Corinthians 8:1-13, Paul,**
1467 **in his “sacred authority” changed the Christian**
1468 **doctrine,** contradicting everything that had been
1469 legislated so far in regards to not eating what was
1470 sacrificed to the idols. Not just that, but according
1471 to these brothers, Paul, in his “divine authority”, as
1472 if he were the protestant pope, changed God’s law,
1473 and decided that from then on, **it would** be
1474 acceptable to eat what was sacrificed to idols. They
1475 think like that regardless of what Christ, the Holy
1476 Spirit, and the twelve apostles said. They believe
1477 that Paul went over all of that, and all of them.

1478 **Nothing was farther from Paul’s intentions.**
1479 What Paul was doing in this passage was taking
1480 away the panic that apparently some felt, for having
1481 carelessly eaten from something previously offered
1482 to the idols. But in spite of that reality, many are the
1483 Christians who understand from this passage that
1484 indeed **we can** eat what has been sacrificed to idols,
1485 because “Paul authorized it”. Later in this same
1486 chapter, I will clear this up and will prove this issue.

1487 *

1488 **It is sensible to interpret very carefully what**
1489 **Paul seems to say**

1490 Peter was a man inspired by God, and he knew
1491 Paul personally. Thanks to Peter's witness, we
1492 know that our brother Paul, spoke and wrote in a
1493 style and form, that was open to be twisted. Of
1494 course, to be twisted by the unstable (of bad
1495 spiritual quality) and the unlearned (ignorant of the
1496 word and God's things). Peter had indisputable
1497 authority to say it about the no lesser or inspired
1498 brother Paul.

1499 This doesn't mean that Paul's writings could not
1500 be read because of possible confusion. They had to
1501 be read carefully and sensibly so not to err. Above
1502 all, if what Paul seems to say is in contradiction
1503 with what other biblical authors affirm.

1504 **In no other place in the Bible there is a**
1505 **warning like this one, about any Bible author.**
1506 Never has anything like this been said of anyone,
1507 especially by someone with such authority as the
1508 Apostle Peter. Let's remember that **what the Bible**
1509 **authors wrote was inspired by the Holy Spirit,**
1510 therefore, it would be sensible for us to take
1511 seriously such inspired counsel from Peter, and
1512 keep it in mind.

1513
1514 *"¹⁵ And account that the longsuffering of our*
1515 *Lord is salvation; even as our beloved*
1516 *brother Paul also according to the wisdom*
1517 *given unto him hath written unto you; ¹⁶ as*
1518 *also in all his epistles, speaking in them of*
1519 *these things; in which are some things hard*
1520 *to be understood, which they that are*
1521 *unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do*
1522 *also the other scriptures, unto their own*
1523 *destruction".* (II Pet 3:15-16)

1524 **We must understand that if the Holy Spirit**
1525 **inspired Paul to write something, He also**
1526 **inspired Peter to write what we just read.** Neither
1527 inspiration is less valuable than the other. If the
1528 Holy Spirit who inspired Paul to write, found it
1529 right to inspire Peter to give us this warning, it must
1530 be so that we would not err.

1531 **See that the Holy Spirit inspired Peter to give**
1532 **this warning about Paul,** but He didn't inspire
1533 Paul to give this warning about Peter. Therefore, the
1534 least that a sensible Christian can do is to keep this
1535 warning in mind when he reads Paul's writings.
1536 **Especially the problematic ones,** the ones that go
1537 head to head to what Jesus said, what the twelve
1538 apostles said, and what the rest of the Bible writers
1539 and the old prophets said.

1540 Let this serve as a warning to all; but especially to
1541 the **Saintpaulians, those who like to make up**
1542 **doctrines out of Paul's obscure verses. Also to**
1543 **those who believe that Paul establishes doctrines**
1544 **that contradict those of Christ, the Holy Spirit,**
1545 **the rest of the apostles, or the rest of the Bible.**
1546 We need to realize that we are Christians, not
1547 Saintpaulians.

1548 Those who think they see in Paul's writings the
1549 abolition of God's laws for human behavior would
1550 not lose much reviewing those writings in the light
1551 of what the Holy Spirit reveals and warns them
1552 through Peter. After all, the sincere ones, the ones
1553 who want to find the truth wherever it is, will find
1554 it.

1555 **Let's see now an alleged statement of Paul, that**
1556 **seems to contradict what the Lord Jesus Christ**
1557 **said,** what the Holy Spirit said, and what the twelve
1558 apostles ordained. Let's also see what the

1559 explanation is to that **apparent contradiction** or
1560 discordance of Paul and the others.

1561 *

1562

1563

1564 **Paul seems to contradict Christ, the Holy Spirit,**
1565 **and the twelve apostles in regards to what was**
1566 **offered to the idols**

1567 There are brothers that more than Christians are
1568 Saintpaulians. **They do with Paul something**
1569 **similar to what Catholics do with the Virgin**
1570 **Mary.** Let me explain. Christ is the son of God, He
1571 thinks just like his father. What was said by Paul
1572 has the same value to both of them, as what was
1573 said by Peter, Isaiah, Samuel, Jacob, Jude, Mathew,
1574 Jeremiah, Daniel, or any other servant. **The Holy**
1575 **Spirit inspired them all.** Yet there are Christians
1576 that believe that the Bible is St. Paul, and St. Paul is
1577 the Bible. If they understand that Paul says that the
1578 sand is green, and the rest of the apostles say it is
1579 white, they insist it is green. Paul said so!

1580 **Even if our Lord Jesus Christ himself said the**
1581 **sand is white,** and they think they understand that
1582 Paul said it was green, they will affirm that the sand
1583 is green, because “Paul said so”. **Do you think this**
1584 **is a bit of an exaggeration? Keep on reading and**
1585 **you will see later, when we study I Corinthians 8.**

1586 The fact that Paul has written little more than a
1587 quarter of the New Testament doesn’t give him the
1588 authority to abolish the rest of the Bible, including
1589 the rest of the New Testament, **something he did**
1590 **not try to do, but that many brothers in Christ**
1591 **attribute to him.**

1592 If indeed it is true that he wrote more than any
1593 other writer in the New Testament, we need to
1594 understand that the others wrote almost three

1595 quarters of it. In other words, that the others wrote
1596 almost three times as much as Paul. He was not the
1597 most fruitful of the sacred writers, Moses alone
1598 wrote more than twice of what Paul did.

1599 I say this, not to take away the merit due the
1600 apostle to the Gentiles, because he has plenty of
1601 merit. But rather so that nobody, due to an
1602 appreciation error, enlarge him irresponsibly,
1603 something that he always tried to avoid, as we see
1604 in the verses below. And sadly, they would enlarge
1605 him to the point of thinking of him as the sole
1606 teacher of religion, or at least the greatest.

1607
1608 *“For though I would desire to glory, I shall*
1609 *not be a fool; for I will say the truth, but now*
1610 *I forbear, lest any man should think of me*
1611 *above that which he seeth me to be, or that*
1612 *he heareth of me”* (II Co 12:6)

1613
1614 *“¹² Now this I say, that every one of you*
1615 *saith: I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of*
1616 *Cephas, and I of Christ. ¹³ Is Christ divided?*
1617 ***Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye***
1618 ***baptized in the name of Paul?”***
1619 (I Co 1:12-13)

1620
1621 As we saw in these two passages, it wasn't in
1622 Paul's will to be so enthroned, like the Saintpaulian
1623 brothers have done.

1624 *

1625
1626
1627
1628

1629 **Paul talked and wrote in a way that was not a**
1630 **model of simplicity and clarity**
1631 It is not that I dare to say it, I who have no
1632 apostolic authority. It is another apostle who says it.
1633 According to that other apostle, even around that
1634 time Paul's writings were easily causing
1635 **misrepresentations among the unstable and**
1636 **unlearned.** It is Peter himself, **who was as inspired**
1637 **by the Holy Spirit as Paul,** who very clearly says
1638 that Paul was very wise and that **some of his**
1639 **writings were hard to understand, and their**
1640 **meanings had been twisted,** as we read in 2 Peter
1641 3:15-17.

1642 If from the beginning, and **by Holy Spirit**
1643 **inspiration, Peter warns** us that some of the things
1644 Paul wrote are hard to understand, the most basic
1645 and prudent honesty, the love of divine truth,
1646 encourages us to analyze carefully everything he
1647 wrote; **but very carefully however, those writings**
1648 **in which Paul seems to contradict what other**
1649 **sacred writers have said.** Yes, writers who were
1650 just as inspired by the Holy Spirit as Paul. God does
1651 not contradict himself. **The Holy Spirit isn't going**
1652 **to inspire one thing to Paul, and another totally**
1653 **antagonistic thing to another sacred writer.**

1654 One good example of the above preamble is Acts
1655 15:28-29. In both verses, but more clearly in verse
1656 29, **the elders, the apostles, and more so, the Holy**
1657 **Spirit, affirm that a Christian should abstain**
1658 **from everything sacrificed to idols.** It isn't so-and-
1659 so's interpretation; it is a concise and clear
1660 declaration. It isn't just the twelve apostles that say
1661 it, although that in itself would be enough; it is also
1662 supported by the Holy Spirit.
1663

1664 “²⁸ *For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost,*
1665 *and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden*
1666 *than these necessary things: ²⁹ **That ye***
1667 ***abstain from meats offered to idols,** and from*
1668 *blood, and from things strangled, and from*
1669 *fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves,*
1670 *ye shall do well. Fare ye well”.*

(Act 15:28-29)

1673 **Had it been only one of the apostles who would**
1674 **have made this statement, or even any one of the**
1675 **Bible writers, and not necessarily an apostle, it**
1676 would have been enough to doubt what both parties
1677 had said, and try to see which one **do the rest of the**
1678 **apostles and the rest of the Bible support.**

1679 Once done, we would try to understand what that
1680 writer wanted to say that seemed to contradict the
1681 others, because obviously, the Holy Spirit inspires
1682 them all, and will not contradict himself.

1683 But luckily, in this case there can be no doubt as
1684 to who is right, because what Paul seems to affirm
1685 in I Corinthians 8:1-13 is clearly denied by the Holy
1686 Spirit in Acts 15:29. **It is clear that what people**
1687 **understand Paul to say is wrong. There is no**
1688 **possible argument.**

*

1692 **Paul was also inspired**

1693 However, we need to understand that Paul was
1694 also inspired by the Holy Spirit, and therefore, even
1695 when for one brief moment it would **seem** as if what
1696 he says goes against what is in other part of
1697 Scripture, maybe what causes that mistake was his
1698 way of saying it, his concise way of speaking, or
1699 our inability to understand the way they talked then.

1700 A good proof of this is that **this very discordance**
1701 **that Paul apparently presents in the**
1702 **aforementioned verse, can be solved**, if only we
1703 analyzed carefully what Paul said in the second
1704 passage, in I Corinthians 10:20-21.

1705 **The roots of Saintpaulianism** can be found in
1706 that Christians, almost always, what few times they
1707 read the Bible, only read the New Testament. But
1708 then they exclude the gospels, since they think they
1709 know it by memory, because after all, “they all say
1710 the same thing”. They also don’t read Revelation,
1711 because it’s a strange book. Therefore they limit
1712 themselves to read the epistles, a vast majority of
1713 them, by number and volume, are Paul’s.

1714 Logically, **if their Bible reading is limited to**
1715 **Paul, they will ultimately believe that Paul**
1716 **created Christianity all by himself**, and he is the
1717 sole master of religion, or at least the most
1718 important one. Those brothers think like that
1719 without understanding that Bible writers are all
1720 equal, by virtue of all being equally inspired, both
1721 in the Old and the New Testament.

1722 The lesson to take from all this is that we can’t set
1723 the basis for doctrine on passages written by one
1724 Bible writer, **if that passage contradicts the rest of**
1725 **Scripture**, because we may find ourselves twisting
1726 them to our own damnation, like Peter said.

1727 *

1730 **What did Paul say in I Corinthians 8:4-13?**

1731 Paul, a man of great culture and wisdom, often
1732 spoke in philosophical terms, explaining deep
1733 concepts in a way that he considered easier to
1734 understand. That is why to the superficial reader,
1735 Paul was the one who modified God’s law and

1736 founded Christianity. If we analyze this passage
1737 superficially, we come to the conclusion that **Paul**
1738 **says that indeed we can eat that which was**
1739 **sacrificed to idols.** Since Paul was inspired by God,
1740 those who hold fast to one passage to form their
1741 doctrine, affirm that it is God's word.
1742

1743 *“⁴ As concerning therefore the eating of*
1744 *those things that are offered in sacrifice unto*
1745 *idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the*
1746 *world, and that there is none other God but*
1747 *one. ⁵ For though there be that are called*
1748 *gods, whether in heaven or in Earth, (as there*
1749 *be gods many, and lords many,) ⁶ but to us*
1750 *there is but one God, the Father, of whom are*
1751 *all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus*
1752 *Christ, by whom are all things, and we by*
1753 *him. ⁷ Howbeit there is not in every man that*
1754 *knowledge, for some with conscience of the*
1755 *idol unto this hour eat it as a thing offered*
1756 *unto an idol; and their conscience being weak*
1757 *is defiled. ⁸ But meat commendeth us not to*
1758 *God, for neither, if we eat, are we the better;*
1759 *neither, if we eat not, are we the worse. ⁹ But*
1760 *take heed lest by any means **this liberty of***
1761 *yours become a stumblingblock to them that*
1762 *are weak. ¹⁰ For if any man see **thee which***
1763 ***hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's***
1764 ***temple,** shall not the conscience of him which*
1765 *is weak be emboldened to eat those things*
1766 *which are offered to idols; ¹¹ **And through***
1767 ***thy knowledge** shall the weak brother perish,*
1768 *for whom Christ died? ¹² But when ye sin so*
1769 *against the brethren, and wound their weak*
1770 *conscience, ye sin against Christ. ¹³*
1771 *Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend,*

1772 *I will eat no flesh while the world standeth,*
1773 *lest I make my brother to offend”.*
1774 (I Co 8:4-13)
1775

1776 If we read this passage only, it would seem to us
1777 that, absolutely, **Paul is saying that Christians can**
1778 **eat that which has been sacrificed to idols**, and
1779 that the only restriction applied to such license that
1780 “he gives” in his “papal” authority is when there is
1781 a brother present who believes we should not eat.
1782 In such case, according to that erred interpretation,
1783 the “**stronger**” **Christian** must abstain himself
1784 from eating so not to embarrass the “**weaker**”
1785 **brother**. But if there is no other brother present, or
1786 if the ones present are “strong”, then it was all right
1787 to eat from the sacrificed meat. This is the
1788 interpretation of the Saintpaulians

1789 In other words, **according to them, Paul went**
1790 **over the head of all the other apostles, over the**
1791 **opinion of the Holy Spirit, and even the opinion**
1792 **of Jesus Christ himself**. He gives us permission to
1793 eat anything, because “Paul said so”, and he seems
1794 to be the sole master of Christianity, sort of like the
1795 protestant Pope.

1796 Of course, this interpretation is very welcomed by
1797 those who want to eat everything, because not only
1798 do they eat what they like, but they believe to be
1799 part of the group of “strong” Christians, not the
1800 **weaklings** who “**dare not**” eat that which had been
1801 sacrificed to idols, because “their faith is small”.

1802 However, if we read Acts 15:28-29 we see that it
1803 wasn’t just one apostle like Paul, but **the Holy**
1804 **Spirit who deemed it right to have them tell the**
1805 **Gentile brothers to abstain from meats that had**
1806 **been sacrificed to idols”.**

1807 **Whose word then should we use to form**
1808 **doctrine, Paul's or the Holy Spirit's?** Who is the
1809 brother that doesn't have faith to believe the Holy
1810 Spirit, the one who eats or the one who doesn't eat?

1812 “²⁸ For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost,
1813 and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden
1814 than these necessary things; ²⁹ that ye abstain
1815 from meats offered to idols, and from blood,
1816 and from things strangled, and from
1817 fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves,
1818 ye shall do well. Fare ye well”.

1819 (Acts 15:28-29)

Logically, what Paul said in I Corinthians 8:4-13, **or better yet, what we think he** said, should not be our foundation. Only a very confused Saintpaulian would do such a foolish and heretic thing. It is excessively naïve to follow only what Paul says when his affirmation or “command” was antagonistic: **a)** with the rest of the Bible, **b)** with what the other apostles and sacred writers say, **c)** with what the Holy Spirit says, and **d)** with what the Lord Jesus Christ himself says. More foolish yet, if we do such thing after being advised by Peter in 2 Peter 3:15-16, and after seeing the **blazing contradictions between what Paul seems to teach and what the Holy Spirit clearly teaches.**

Does that mean that Paul was not inspired by the Holy Spirit? No; what it means is that the highly philosophical and hyperbolic manner in which Paul speaks creates these confusions in those who read his letters with narrow sight and superficial eyes. Thank God that he did not leave us without the correct testimony, and if it can't be seen in its

1842 entirety in one passage, it is seen in another, or
1843 another.

1844 *

1846
1847 **Christ contradicts what Paul seems to say**

1848 I don't want to bring in to play here everything
1849 that is said in the Old Testament about what is
1850 sacrificed to idols because there will always be
1851 someone that will say that those are for "those
1852 times", or for the "Jews, not the Gentiles", or that
1853 "God changed his mind". I want to mention,
1854 however, some passages in the New Testament,
1855 where it is very clearly understood, **since it is Jesus**
1856 **himself who says it, that it is a sin to eat that**
1857 **which has been sacrificed to idols.** Do we need
1858 anything else to understand that these trouble
1859 making statements of Paul have to be read very
1860 carefully? Let's take a look at Revelation 2:12-14,
1861 and 18-20.

1862
1863 *"¹² And to the angel of the church in*
1864 *Pergamos write: These things saith **he which***
1865 ***hath the sharp sword with two edges;** ¹³ I*
1866 *know thy works, and where thou dwellest,*
1867 *even where Satan's seat is; and thou holdest*
1868 *fast my name, and hast not denied my faith,*
1869 *even in those days wherein Antipas was my*
1870 *faithful martyr, who was slain among you,*
1871 *where Satan dwelleth. ¹⁴ **But I have a few***
1872 ***things against thee,** because thou hast there*
1873 *them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who*
1874 *taught Balac to cast a stumblingblock before*
1875 *the children of Israel, **to eat things sacrificed***
1876 ***unto idols, and to commit fornication"**.*

1877 (Rev 2:12-14)

1878

1879

1880

1881

1882

1883

1884

1885

1886

1887

1888

1889

1890

1891

1892

1893

1894

1895

1896

1897

1898

1899

1900

1901

1902

1903

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913

*“¹⁸ And unto the angel of the church in Thyatira write: **These things saith the Son of God**, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet are like fine brass: ¹⁹ I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works; and the last to be more than the first. ²⁰ Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and **to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols**”.*

(Rev 2:18-20)

It is very clearly said **by the Lord Jesus himself**, that we should not eat what was sacrificed to idols. Therefore what we previously thought our brother Paul said is the wrong interpretation. We have to find an explanation to that apparent mistake of Paul.

Paul’s writing style lends itself to confusion. That same confusion is the one created by his affirmations about the apparent obsolescence of God’s law. Sure enough, while Paul is referring to the ritual laws, the great majority believes he is referring to God’s laws for human behavior, including the Ten Commandments. From these examples we can learn that when Paul says something **that seems** to go against the rest of the Bible, we must pay special attention and try to interpret what he wanted to say. It is not wise run to say that Paul altered, modified, discontinued, modernized or inverted God’s laws.

If the Holy Spirit approved telling the disciples in the apostolic letter to abstain from things sacrificed to idols, no hyperbole (exaggeration) or

1914 other of Paul's figures of speech is going to
1915 convince me to do the contrary, although
1916 unfortunately, the thought has crossed the minds of
1917 the Saintpaulians.

1918 *

1920 1921 **Saint Paul contradicts Saint Paul**

1922 But it is not just the Holy Spirit, our Lord Jesus
1923 Christ, and the other apostles who contradict Paul in
1924 this issue of eating things sacrificed to idols; it is
1925 Paul himself who contradicts Saint Paul. Later, in I
1926 Corinthians 10:16-22, he says the opposite of what
1927 he said in Chapter 8, and then, in I Corinthians
1928 10:25-29, he apparently comes back to defend his
1929 permission to eat from the sacrifices. Let's see.

1930
1931 *"¹⁶ The cup of blessing which we bless, is it*
1932 *not the communion of the blood of Christ?*
1933 *The bread which we break, is it not the*
1934 *communion of the body of Christ? ¹⁷ For we*
1935 *being many are one bread, and one body, for*
1936 *we are all partakers of that one bread. ¹⁸*
1937 *Behold Israel after the flesh, **are not they***
1938 ***which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the***
1939 ***altar?** ¹⁹ What say I then? That the idol is any*
1940 *thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to*
1941 *idols is any thing? ²⁰ But I say, that **the things***
1942 ***which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to***
1943 ***devils, and not to God, and I would not that***
1944 ***ye should have fellowship with devils.** ²¹ **Ye***
1945 ***cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the***
1946 ***cup of devils, ye cannot be partakers of the***
1947 ***Lord's table, and of the table of devils.** ²² Do*
1948 *we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we*
1949 *stronger than he? ²³ All things are lawful for*

1950 *me, but all things are not expedient; all things*
1951 *are lawful for me, but all things edify not.* ²⁴
1952 *Let no man seek his own, but every man*
1953 *another's wealth.* ²⁵ ***Whatsoever is sold in the***
1954 ***shambles, that eat, asking no question for***
1955 ***conscience sake,*** ²⁶ ***for the Earth is the***
1956 ***Lord's, and the fulness thereof.*** ²⁷ *If any of*
1957 *them that believe not, bid you to a feast, and*
1958 *ye be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before*
1959 *you, eat, asking no question for conscience*
1960 *sake.* ²⁸ ***But if any man say unto you: This is***
1961 ***offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his***
1962 ***sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake;***
1963 ***for the Earth is the Lord's, and the fullness***
1964 ***thereof.*** ²⁹ ***Conscience, I say, not thine own,***
1965 ***but of the other; for why is my liberty judged***
1966 ***of another man's conscience?"***
1967 (I Co 10:16-29)

1968
1969 When we read this passage, it is clear that Paul is
1970 saying that we should not eat what was sacrificed to
1971 idols, **because it would be to take part in the**
1972 **table of demons.** But since he says it with examples
1973 full of hyperbole, he confuses the superficial reader,
1974 especially, since two chapters ago the reader
1975 thought he understood that Paul authorized eating
1976 what was sacrificed to idols.

1977 Even when we go to I Corinthians 8:10-11 we see
1978 how **Paul lamented that the conscience of the**
1979 **weak would be pushed to eat what was sacrificed**
1980 **to idols,** saying later on in verse 11, that **because of**
1981 **it the weaker brother could be lost.** In other
1982 words, Paul himself admits the danger in eating
1983 what was sacrificed to idols. If Paul believed it
1984 wasn't a sin to eat what was sacrificed to idols, he

1985 had no reason to think that the weaker brother could
1986 be lost by eating of those sacrifices.

1987 We see here that when Paul talks about **eating in**
1988 **the place of idols**, he is not talking about eating
1989 what was sacrificed to idols, but referring to a place
1990 that was adjacent to the place where the idols were.
1991 I address this fact later on in the paragraph headed
1992 with “A second and more probable ...” (page 59)

1993
1994 *“¹⁰ For if any man see thee which hast*
1995 *knowledge sit at meat **in the idol's temple**,*
1996 *shall not the conscience of him which is weak*
1997 *be emboldened **to eat those things which are***
1998 ***offered to idols**; ¹¹ and through thy*
1999 *knowledge shall **the weak brother perish**, for*
2000 *whom Christ died?”* (I Co 8:10-11)

2001 *

2002
2003

2004 **Now then, what is my opinion about what Paul**
2005 **meant to say?**

2006 It could have been one or two things. **One of**
2007 **them seems to be** that there could have been in
2008 Corinth a few exaggerators that hyper exaggerated
2009 the commandment of not eating what had been
2010 sacrificed to idols. They exaggerated to the point of
2011 **making believe those who (whether out of**
2012 **ignorance from before their conversion or out of**
2013 **carelessness after) had eaten what was sacrificed**
2014 **to idols**, something to the effect of having lost their
2015 salvation, or that part of the idol was in their body,
2016 or that a demon had come into them, or who knows
2017 what.

2018 Perhaps motivated by this, or things of the sort,
2019 Paul found himself forced to emphasize the

2020 opposite theses, to the point of exaggeration, in his
2021 desire to erase such ideas from the fearful brothers.

2022 **This possibility is suggested** by the fact that at
2023 the end of his discourse on the subject, in 10:25, he
2024 says, “Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat,
2025 asking no questions for conscience sake” (Eat
2026 anything sold in the meat market, without raising
2027 questions). In other words, what you do know was
2028 offered to idols, don’t eat; but reject that foolish
2029 preoccupation and don’t live in fear, as if the idol
2030 were so powerful or effective that a simple careless
2031 ingestion of what was offered to it would ruin you
2032 for the rest of your life. Don’t worry, because that
2033 which was offered to the idol also belongs to God,
2034 and the Earth and everything in it is the Lord’s.

2035 **The same advice he gives to the Christian who**
2036 **wants to accept an invitation to dinner from a**
2037 **non-Christian.** Of those things naturally edible that
2038 you are served, eat and don’t ask whether or not it
2039 was offered to idols. However, if someone calls to
2040 your attention the spurious origin of the meat or the
2041 vegetable that they offer you, do not eat it.

2042 If someone invites me to eat goat, I will make
2043 sure it has been properly bled, and then go and eat
2044 it. But if I’m at the party and find out that had been
2045 sacrificed to Yemayá¹, I would immediately get up;
2046 I will not continue eating; and not because of the
2047 conscience of him who told me that, who probably
2048 worships Yemayá, but because of me. I will not
2049 participate in the table of a false idol, or the demon

1

(*) Yemaya is the name given to one of the deities of the Afro-Cuban pagan religion, Santería, and is often honored by extravagant feasts featuring among other things, goat meat.

2050 represented there, nor will I willingly disobey the
2051 clearly defined commandments of Christ, the Holy
2052 Spirit, and the rest of the apostles that wrote the
2053 apostolic letter. I will get up and leave, but I will
2054 not worry if I ate out of ignorance a part of that
2055 which had been sacrificed to idols, because it can't
2056 harm me, because the Earth and everything in it is
2057 the Lord's.

2058 **A second and more probable scenario is that**
2059 **there might have existed in Corinth a place of idols,**
2060 **with an adjacent marketplace that included a meat**
2061 **store that sold regular meat as well as meat offered**
2062 **to idols. Also, there might have been a restaurant**
2063 **or sort in that marketplace that sold both,**
2064 **regular meat and vegetables, as well as meat and**
2065 **vegetables offered to idols.**

2066 Perhaps Paul and other more mature brothers used
2067 to go eat at that market next to the idols place, **but**
2068 **to eat from that which had not been sacrificed to**
2069 **idols, which was also served there.**

2070 However, Paul was aware that if a weaker brother
2071 would see them from afar sitting there, eating
2072 regular meat, not offered to idols, or eating
2073 vegetables, not offered to idols, at a place where
2074 they also served meat offered to idols, **he could**
2075 **believe they were eating what had been offered**
2076 **to idols.** Motivated by that which he was seeing, he
2077 could conclude that it was not a sin to eat meat that
2078 had been sacrificed to idols.

2079 Then that brother, confused by their presence in
2080 that place, would go any other day, and eat what
2081 had been sacrificed to idols, with which he would
2082 then sin because of Paul or his friends.

2083 **This idea is suggested by what Paul says in**
2084 **8:10, where he says that a faithful Christian could**
2085 **be sitting at the table in the so-called "place of**

2086 **idols”**. If that had strictly been a place to go
2087 worship the idols, or to go eat of their sacrifice,
2088 instead of a public place of commerce, no Christian,
2089 and especially Paul, had to be there at all. That is
2090 why I think it had to be a public place of commerce,
2091 next to some place of idols, where was also
2092 something like a restaurant, that served both regular
2093 meat and consecrated meat for the idols.

2094 Given that neither Paul nor his friends was going
2095 to eat that which had been sacrificed to idols, since
2096 they had to know what the Holy Spirit had
2097 commanded in the apostolic letter, it is most likely
2098 they went there because they could eat other things
2099 too. That is why they felt confident they could eat
2100 regular meat at that place. However, they
2101 understood that their presence there could confuse
2102 some brothers.

2103 In verse 11 we see that **Paul states that by eating**
2104 **what had been offered to idols the weaker**
2105 **brother could be lost**. If Paul would have believed
2106 that eating what was sacrificed to idols had no
2107 consequence, would not be important, and those
2108 things could be freely eaten, he would not have
2109 warned of the possibility of the weaker brother
2110 being lost, because after all, he would have
2111 committed no sin eating that which had been
2112 sacrificed to idols.

2113 That is why Paul seems to advise that **if a brother**
2114 **is eating regular meat at some place, and another**
2115 **brother comes and tells him that what he is**
2116 **eating has been offered to the idols**, he must stop
2117 eating it. Not because of his own conscience, **for he**
2118 **knows it was not sacrificed to idols**, but because
2119 of his brother's conscience who does believe the
2120 meat had been offered.

It is not logical to think that if the Holy Spirit and the Lord Jesus Christ himself disapproved of eating something that had been offered to idols, Paul would not know it and would be wrongly advising the brethren; or that, if knowing it, he would want to go against what Christ and the Holy Spirit had said.

*“10 For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat **in the idol's temple**, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols; 11 and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?” (I Co 8:10-11)*

(I Co 8:10-11)

*

Summary of chapter 5. We are Christians not Saintpaulians. Even though Paul, as an apostle of Christ, taught us many important things, it does not mean that when he says something that seems to contradict other Bible passage, we must think that it goes above what God, Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Twelve Apostles have said. Even Paul would seem to contradict himself, if we interpret it lightly.

A very clear case is that of not eating what had been sacrificed to idols. Also that of thinking that entrance in the Holy of Holies was once a year only. The same is true of the supposedly abolition of the behavioral laws, as we will later see.

The two hypotheses we present here, about what Paul was possibly trying to say, is the best explanation of his **apparently discordance** with Christ and the others.

2156 There is no doubt that our Lord Jesus Christ
2157 forbid eating that which had been sacrificed to
2158 idols; something that the Saintpaulians believe can
2159 be done because, “we are not under the law, but
2160 under grace”, blah, blah, blah.

2161 It is logical to think that such an inspired man as
2162 Paul, would not contradict the laws that the source
2163 of the inspiration had put in place.

2164 We should keep in mind, in this special case,
2165 four very important things:

2166 **a)** the one who validates the law about not eating
2167 that which was sacrificed to idols, whom
2168 **apparently** Paul abolished in one stroke of the pen,
2169 is the Lord Jesus Christ himself;

2170 **b)** he does it in two occasions, Revelation 2:14,
2171 and 2:20;

2172 c) this confirmation of the law by Jesus Christ,
2173 happens **many years after** Paul wrote First
2174 Corinthians, when he was probably already dead;
2175 and

2176 **d) Christ said this to two churches of Gentiles**
2177 from Turkey, not to the Jews; which means that this
2178 prohibition of not eating what God forbade, was
2179 true for all believers, both Jews and Gentiles.

2180 Paul received the task of expanding the
2181 Christian faith, not the task of changing it, alter
2182 it, “modernize” it, etc.

2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201
2202
2203
2204
2205
2206
2207
2208
2209
2210
2211
2212
2213
2214
2215
2216
2217
2218
2219
2220
2221
2222
2223

Chapter 6

Christ never said what many confused people believe he said in regards to the law

Did Christ say what you believe he said?

In this chapter I will present several passages where our brothers erroneously think that our Lord Jesus Christ abolished one or more laws. From that error has come the **heresy** of insisting that God's laws for human behavior are actually inoperative, that we don't have to follow them, and that Christians are free to do as they like, thinking that even though they are doing all these things they are not sinning.

Such horrible mistake can only have been put in the minds of the believers by our spiritual enemy. It is reasonable then to analyze those passages where our brothers think they see such heresy.

*

In order to save us, Christ obeyed every one of God's laws, from birth to death

Our Lord obeyed **every one** of God's laws, both the behavioral laws and the ritual laws **throughout** his life. He had to do so in order to save us. Only one fault would have resulted in his own damnation, and ours. That is why he never did anything that could have gone against God's laws.

In Hebrews 10:28 we see that Paul says that it is sinful to treat with contempt any of God's laws, therefore Jesus was not about to do such thing.

“He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy under two or three witnesses”

(Heb 10:28)

Being this so, it is totally unthinkable that our Lord Jesus Christ would despise, abolish, disobey, suppress, talk against, modify, etc., any of God's laws, **before his crucifixion.**

I say before his crucifixion, because if Christ would have wanted to abolish one or more of God's laws, he would have **never** done it while under the law, since doing it would be to sin, **he could have been lost, and so would we.**

Christ knew circumcision would be abolished, but he would have never done it, nor would he speak against such law before his crucifixion. He knew the sacrifices would be abolished, but he would have never abolish it, nor would he speak against them before his crucifixion. To do it would have been to sin, as Paul reminds us in Hebrews 10:28. If Christ would have sinned, he would have been lost, and we would not have been saved. Speaking against the sacrifices and circumcision before his crucifixion would have been a sin.

That is why Jesus Christ never spoke of abolishing any of God's laws. It was the Holy Spirit who, after the crucifixion, took on the task of telling us which laws would be abolished and which would continue in place.

Christ had to be very careful, because Satan was always looking for a way to make him sin. Satan knew that if he made Jesus sin in the least of things, his mission would have failed and Satan would have triumphed.

*

2260 **The only mission Christ had received was that of**
2261 **saving us, anything other would be a sin**

2262 Satan knew that God had given only one mission
2263 to His only son. He knew that Jesus could not stray
2264 away from it and that if he had altered that mission,
2265 or if he had taken upon his shoulders any other
2266 mission, he would have failed, he would have
2267 sinned.

2268 That is why several times Satan tried to trip the
2269 Lord, to make him get involved in judgments,
2270 politics, etc., like the time he tried to make him a
2271 judge, an executioner, or to proclaim himself king,
2272 and even punish those who deserved punishment.

2273 **Because his was only a salvation mission, Jesus**
2274 **rejected certain solutions.** Do you believe that it
2275 was through his own strength and virtues that Elijah
2276 made fire fall from heaven and burn two companies
2277 of soldiers? Do you believe that was Elijah's
2278 “mistake”? (2 Kings 1:10-12).

2279 It is evident that the one that gave Elijah the
2280 power to do that miracle was God; and it is evident
2281 that God also agreed with what Elijah was doing,
2282 otherwise he would not have backed him up.

2283 Do you believe that Jesus disagreed with God on
2284 what Elijah had done? Of course not! Christ
2285 approved of the same things God approved.
2286 Therefore, what Elijah had done was not a sin.

2287 Subsequently neither was a sin in itself for the
2288 disciples to want to do what Elijah had done before:
2289 let fire come down from heaven to punish the
2290 rebels. That is what James and John tried to do.
2291 What was sinful was to make it part of Christ's
2292 mission. That is why the Lord didn't let them do it.

2293
2294 *“⁵² And sent messengers before his face; and*
2295 *they went, and entered into a village of the*

2296 *Samaritans, to make ready for him.* ⁵³ *And*
2297 *they did not receive him, because his face was*
2298 *as though he would go to Jerusalem.* ⁵⁴ *And*
2299 *when his disciples James and John saw this,*
2300 *they said: **Lord, wilt thou that we command***
2301 ***fire to come down from heaven, and***
2302 ***consume them, even as Elias did?*** ⁵⁵ *But he*
2303 *turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye*
2304 *know not what manner of spirit ye are of.* ⁵⁶
2305 *For the Son of man is not come to destroy*
2306 *men's lives, but to save them.* *And they went*
2307 *to another village". (Lk 9:52-56)*
2308

2309 **The only difference in this case** was that Christ's
2310 mission was much different than Elijah's
2311 mission. It was much more specific and it required
2312 different methods. Jesus' mission was not to punish,
2313 destroy, judge, etc., but to save; and no one would
2314 distract him during the 33 years he would live here.

2315 That is why he would not offer his vote (or deny
2316 it) for the adulterous woman to be punished; that is
2317 why he would not judge on the case of the brother
2318 who would not share his inheritance; that is why he
2319 would not punish the Samaritan city. None of that
2320 was his mission at the moment of his First Coming,
2321 he had not come for any of it. He would not let
2322 others drag him into it; being whether those others
2323 were acting in bad faith, as in the case of the
2324 Pharisees who were agents of Satan, or in good
2325 faith, like the disciples.

2326 **It's not that Christ disapproved what Elijah**
2327 **had done**, since that had been done under God's
2328 authority and power. **Neither was Christ against**
2329 **punishing adultery**, since it had been established
2330 by his father God, and he was not going against
2331 Him or pretending to be "kinder" than God. It is

2332 simply that the mission that God gave him for that
2333 time was another one, as seen in John 3:17, **and he**
2334 **would not want to sin by straying away from the**
2335 **mission he was given and taking on another one.**

2336
2337 *“For God sent not his Son into the world to*
2338 *condemn the world; but that the world*
2339 *through him might be saved”.* (Jn 3:17)
2340

2341 We should not conclude from cases like these,
2342 that God was thinking one thing while Jesus, “more
2343 humane” and “generous” was going against him, or
2344 fixing up His messes. After all, our Lord Jesus
2345 Christ **agrees with sending the rebels to hell**, just
2346 like God. Therefore, when the Lord Jesus Christ
2347 opposed James and John when they wanted to bring
2348 fire from heaven to punish those rebellious
2349 Samaritans, he did it because that was not his
2350 mission then, and doing it would be a sin; but not
2351 because he thought they did not deserve it.

2352 **Neither should we understand that God**
2353 **thought one thing in Moses’ time** and then
2354 changed his mind two millenniums later, to fix
2355 things, to the point of sending his anointed to
2356 contradict what he had previously approved.

2357 Jesus Christ, and therefore God, is the same
2358 yesterday, today, and forever, as Hebrews 13:8
2359 declares. God is not going to think one way during
2360 Moses’ time and another way during Paul’s time.

2361 **Because it was not his mission, Jesus did not**
2362 **offer judgment.** It is evident that in John 3:17 is
2363 the explanation of why Christ would not let himself
2364 be dragged where the Pharisees and others wanted
2365 to take him. These, **incited by Satan, and not**
2366 **knowing why they were doing it, wanted to**

2367 **tempt Jesus to judge or condemn someone, to**
2368 **invalidate his mission of salvation.**

2369 God did not give Jesus the mission of judging or
2370 condemning on his first coming. He did not come to
2371 condemn but to save. If he had condemned someone
2372 he would have walked away from God's mission,
2373 which would have been sin. That is why the
2374 Pharisees and his other enemies kept tempting him
2375 to judge and condemn people. They did not realize
2376 the spiritual warfare that was taking place, and in
2377 which they were unconsciously participating, but
2378 since, after all, they were not serving God, the Devil
2379 used them to make Christ judge or condemn
2380 someone, and thus ruin his saving mission by
2381 making him to sin.

2382 That is why Christ did not condemn the
2383 adulterous woman in John 8:3-11. It is not that he
2384 was repealing God's laws, but he didn't want to
2385 make himself judge to apply them, because, as saw
2386 in John 3:17; **that was not his mission.** For judging
2387 crimes God had already established kings,
2388 governors and judges. Jesus was not going to usurp
2389 their functions. That is why he neither condemned
2390 nor acquitted the adulterous woman, but instead,
2391 after seeing that no one else condemned her, he
2392 simply said, "Go and sin no more".

2393 **That is why he would not go into litigation for**
2394 **the inheritance that** one of his listeners had in
2395 Luke 12:13-14. This listener had been cheated by
2396 his brother. It isn't that Jesus thought there
2397 shouldn't be a law against swindling. He didn't
2398 abolish the laws against swindling by not
2399 condemning the listener's brother. It isn't that Jesus
2400 had abolished all these laws. It's that his mission
2401 was one of salvation, not of condemnation or

2402 legislation; he came as a savior, not as a judge or a
2403 legislator.

2404

2405 *“¹³ And one of the company said unto him,*
2406 *Master, speak to my brother, that he divide*
2407 *the inheritance with me. ¹⁴ And he said unto*
2408 *him: Man, who made me a judge or a divider*
2409 *over you?”* (Lk 12:13-14)

2410

2411 **By not taking sides in this problem between**
2412 **brothers Jesus was not abolishing the laws of**
2413 **inheritance**, or the punishment of cheaters, or the
2414 right of every heir to claim his part. **He wasn’t**
2415 **approving of adultery, or abolishing God’s laws**
2416 **about adultery** just because he did not condemn
2417 the adulterous woman. He knew that the hand of
2418 Satan was behind all this, trying to distract him
2419 from the only mission that God had given him, and
2420 thus ruin his redemptive work and condemn
2421 himself.

2422 If Christ would have dedicated himself to solve
2423 arguments, not only would he have failed in his
2424 mission, but he would have had received so many
2425 litigants, that would have made his mission
2426 practically impossible.

2427

*

2428

2429

2430 **The error of believing that anyone who keeps the**
2431 **laws today must keep them as the Pharisees did**

2432 Some believe that the Pharisees were faithful
2433 keepers of God’s laws, who perfectly obeyed all the
2434 law. They think that their “only” sin was their lack
2435 of humility and having rejected Christ. It is not true.
2436 **They kept the traditions and the ceremonial**
2437 **laws, not the behavioral laws.** Later on we will see

2438 that Jesus tells them that they broke God's laws. In
2439 other words, they, in this case of Mr 7:9-13, **did not**
2440 **keep one of the Ten Commandments** (honor thy
2441 father and thy mother) while they continued
2442 keeping the traditions, ceremonies, rituals and
2443 sacrifices.

2444 That is why in several occasions Christ calls them
2445 hypocrites. However, many Christians are confused,
2446 and just because the Pharisees tithed the mint, the
2447 dill and the cumin, and just because they offered
2448 ritual sacrifices, they think they were
2449 irreproachable, blameless individuals.

2450
2451 *“9 And he said unto them: **Full well ye reject***
2452 ***the commandment of God, that ye may keep***
2453 ***your own tradition.** 10 For Moses said:*
2454 *Honour thy father and thy mother; and,*
2455 *Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die*
2456 *the death. 11 But ye say, If a man shall say to*
2457 *his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to*
2458 *say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be*
2459 *profited by me; he shall be free. 12 And ye*
2460 *suffer him no more to do ought for his father*
2461 *or his mother; 13 **making the word of God of***
2462 ***none effect through your tradition**, which ye*
2463 *have delivered; and many such like things do*
2464 *ye”.* (Mr 7:9-13)

2465
2466 Also, if we read Mathew 23, we see who the
2467 Pharisees were really. And the one who undresses
2468 them spiritually is the one who knew them inside:
2469 Jesus Christ. So to try to keep God's laws the same
2470 way that the Pharisees did is a monstrous mistake.

2471 **The Pharisees were liars and did not keep**
2472 **God's laws.** In this next passage we see that the
2473 Pharisees answered to Christ that what he was

2474 saying was not true in regards to them wanting to
2475 kill him. However, in verse 25 we see that it was the
2476 people of the town, without trying to contradict the
2477 Pharisees, who witnessed that they were looking for
2478 him to kill him.

2479

2480 *“¹⁹ Did not Moses give you the law, and yet*
2481 ***none of you keepeth the law?** Why go ye*
2482 ***about to kill me?** ²⁰ The people answered and*
2483 *said, Thou hast a devil: **who goeth about to***
2484 ***kill thee?**”* (Jn 7:19-20)

2485

2486 *“Then said some of them of Jerusalem: **Is not***
2487 ***this he, whom they seek to kill?**”*
2488 (Jn 7:25)

2489

2490 Many Christians believe that the Pharisees were
2491 strict keepers of the laws of God, but that is not so.
2492 **Here, the Lord himself denies it when he says**
2493 **that none of them obeyed the law.** The only law
2494 that they strictly obeyed was their rituals and
2495 sectarian set of traditions.

2496 **The law of God is not what the Pharisees say.**
2497 The ordinances that the Pharisees alleged must be
2498 kept, were not always God’s commandments. Most
2499 of the times they were **traditions from their**
2500 **ancestors, or twisted rabbinical interpretations,**
2501 **unjustifiable or disconnected from God’s law.**
2502 Such was the case of sayings like, “you heard it said
2503 to the elders..”. These things that were “said to the
2504 elders” were misinterpretations or twisting of the
2505 law. **Sometimes there were mere inventions**
2506 **completely foreign to the law.**

2507

2543 not established, and that therefore the believer was
2544 not obligated to keep them.

2545 **However, many Christians are confused and**
2546 **think that in order to obey God's law they have**
2547 **to do things the way the Pharisees said they**
2548 **should be done.** They don't realize that the
2549 Pharisees had twisted the laws, and had adapted
2550 them to their own lust and sectarian conveniences,
2551 adding other laws of their own as well. **They**
2552 **turned God's law into a burden that men could**
2553 **not bear.** Jesus himself said this in Luke 11:46
2554 when he reprimands the doctors of the law.

2555
2556 *“And he said: Woe unto you also, ye*
2557 *lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens*
2558 *grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch*
2559 *not the burdens with one of your fingers”*

(Lk 11:46)

2560 *

2561 2562 2563 2564 **God made his laws as easy as possible**

2565 God's law (the behavioral standards that he
2566 established) is logical, bearable, and humane. **God's**
2567 **laws were not made to be so difficult to obey that**
2568 **no one could.** On the contrary, it was the minimum
2569 that could be asked of a human being. What
2570 happens is that none of us has enough love for God
2571 and our neighbor to always abstain from evil and
2572 obey the divine precepts?

2573 There are, however, many people that instead of
2574 humbly recognizing this, they say, to justify
2575 themselves, that the law was made difficult, so that
2576 no one would be able to obey it, and therefore **force**
2577 everyone to appeal to grace. By saying such things
2578 in order to justify themselves, they become utterly

2579 arrogant and vane. They want to make it look like,
2580 if they don't obey the laws, it is because they were
2581 made so difficult that no one could. If it were not
2582 so, they could obey them.

2583 But that is not the truth. **The law is easy and**
2584 **simple, God's yoke is easy, and his burden light.**
2585 It is we who do not have the moral and spiritual
2586 texture needed to obey it. It is we who, because we
2587 don't love God above everything else, we love our
2588 pleasures more, even if they come wrapped in sin
2589 and lust. Of course, this way **we will not obey the**
2590 **conduct standards** that God established for human
2591 interrelations and for our relationship with the
2592 divine realm. These conduct standards are what is
2593 known as "behavioral laws". Not only is it wrong to
2594 disobey God's laws, **it is wrong to make God look**
2595 **guilty for making such a "difficult" law, as they**
2596 **say.**

2597 God doesn't have to make the law difficult or
2598 impossible to obey to make us opt for the grace
2599 found in Jesus Christ. God made the law as easy as
2600 it could have been made without compromising the
2601 heavenly things. But knowing that even then
2602 nobody would be able to obey them in their entire
2603 life, he asked for the voluntary sacrifice of his own
2604 Son, so he could carry our sins on him. Thanks to
2605 that, and only that, we can be saved.

2606 Anyone who would have wanted to do God's will,
2607 and didn't, has the opportunity to save himself by
2608 seeking refuge in the payment that through grace is
2609 made for his sins, by the sacrifice that Jesus made
2610 on the cross for us.

2611 **If anyone could do what is right always and in**
2612 **every circumstance during his entire life, God**
2613 **would not make him seek grace,** because there
2614 simply would not be any condemnation for that

2615 person. **But since that man does not exist,**
2616 automatically we all need Jesus. There is no
2617 alternative; and as far as I am concerned, I am very
2618 happy to base my salvation on something as solid as
2619 Jesus Christ's merits, and not on something as
2620 fragile as my possibilities of obeying without error.

2621 *

2622
2623

2624 **Christ did not abolish God's laws, he confirmed**
2625 **them**

2626 Many Christians that ignore, despise and even
2627 hate "God's law" have never defined themselves,
2628 they have never asked themselves what is that law
2629 that they hate, abominate, despise, or disdain. They
2630 are not aware that "The Law" is **God's, not the**
2631 **Devil's**. They hate it or despise it without knowing
2632 why; simply, that is what they were taught and they
2633 don't know how to leave that. **They are not aware**
2634 **that God's law was not established by the Devil**
2635 **but by God**. Thanks to the thorough reading of the
2636 Bible we can irrevocably conclude that in it are
2637 established two types of laws: **a) the ritual laws**
2638 **and b) the behavioral laws**. The ritual laws, which
2639 were the ones used to announce the future sacrifice
2640 of the Lamb of God, were made obsolete when
2641 Jesus Christ came to the world to be crucified. **The**
2642 **behavioral laws, however, are still in effect and**
2643 **will be until heaven and Earth pass away**. Let's
2644 see what the best Bible scholar that ever was, is and
2645 will be, our Lord Jesus Christ, has to say

2646

2647 *"¹⁷ Think not that I am come to destroy the*
2648 *law, or the prophets; I am not come to*
2649 *destroy, but to fulfil. ¹⁸ For verily I say unto*
2650 *you, Till heaven and Earth pass, one jot or*

2651 *one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,*
2652 *till all be fulfilled.* 19 *Whosoever therefore*
2653 *shall break one of these least*
2654 *commandments, and shall teach men so, he*
2655 *shall be called the least in the kingdom of*
2656 *heaven, but whosoever shall do and teach*
2657 *them, the same shall be called great in the*
2658 *kingdom of heaven”.* (Mt 5:17-19)
2659

2660 This passage expresses in an excessively clear
2661 way, that Jesus did not come to destroy the law.
2662 **Why, then, do so many brothers believe that**
2663 **Jesus did abolish the law?** What was the origin of
2664 that heretic idea? It could not have been the mind of
2665 someone who loves and obeys God. It had to come
2666 out of a perverse but astute mind, which knows how
2667 to fool God’s servants; a mind used to contradict
2668 Christ and God. And once that despicable being
2669 convinces any religious leader with great authority,
2670 of that astute and heretic doctrine, all who learn
2671 from that confused leader will continue being
2672 fooled and fooling others as long as they live, and
2673 through generations, unless they read and interpret
2674 God’s word by themselves; the clear word of God
2675 we just read.

2676 *

2677
2678

2679 **What is God’s law?**

2680 God’s law is the sum of the behavioral standards
2681 that God knows are good for man to follow in his
2682 life. God’s law is the behavioral standards ordained
2683 by God for man.

2684 God did not establish these conduct standards
2685 with the mere purpose of making it difficult for
2686 man, or to put obstacles in his life to see what he

2687 did, as some arrogantly claim. He established them
2688 because He, who is the creator of all that exists, and
2689 knows how everything works, knows that it is good
2690 for us to follow them. He knows it is good for us to
2691 obey; and that is both spiritually and physically.

2692 **If any human being would be virtuous enough**
2693 **to be able to obey everything God established,**
2694 **during his entire Earthly life,** he would not be
2695 lost. He would not need a savior. The problem is
2696 that **no** human being is virtuous enough to do such
2697 thing. That's why it doesn't matter what they allege,
2698 **no one can save himself by obeying the law.**
2699 **Simply because no one has been able to obey the**
2700 **entire law during his entire life.** We all fail many
2701 times.

2702 **It's not that God has made the behavioral laws**
2703 **particularly difficult** so that no one can save
2704 himself, and therefore force him to go to Jesus. No!
2705 I am sure that what was **established in God's law is**
2706 **the minimum** of the basic norms for human
2707 behavior, without making it difficult.

2708 **The problem is that our scarce virtue is not**
2709 **enough to even obey that minimum,** and that is
2710 why we have to appeal to Jesus. God's law is very
2711 simple, very easy; **it is us, the humans who are no**
2712 **good.** Unfortunately none has ever been good. Only
2713 Jesus in human form ever obeyed **the entire** law
2714 during his **entire** life. He obeyed it for us **during**
2715 **his lifetime,** and that's how he saved us.

2716 **It was never God's intention to raise up a**
2717 **"very difficult" law,** a law that no person, as good
2718 as he could be, could obey, which is what many
2719 mistaken brothers vainly seem to believe. God's
2720 intention was to establish a **minimum for human**
2721 **behavior, anything less than that would be**
2722 **unacceptable.**

2723 But the fact that we have not been able to obey
2724 God's law because of our lack of virtue, and the fact
2725 that we hold fast to Jesus' atoning sacrifice, **does**
2726 **not mean that the behavioral standards**
2727 **contained in God's law are bad, or obsolete.**

2728 Those standards of behavior are still valid, they
2729 are still good; they still carry the same purpose as
2730 they did when they were given to us. That purpose
2731 is to show us how to act; to give us direction on
2732 what to do and what not to do.

2733 **If God's law did not exist**, how would we know
2734 what is positive and what is negative in many
2735 circumstances? How would we know what incest is
2736 and what is not? Would we know the real meaning
2737 of the word fornication? How would we know that
2738 to enter into our neighbor's wheat field and eat
2739 there, is not stealing? If God's law did not exist, we
2740 would have to appeal to tradition, or to our
2741 country's customs to enlighten us about the
2742 meaning of such things. And we all know how
2743 impugnable tradition and customs have always been
2744 when it comes to religion.

2745 **For example, in American culture it is**
2746 **considered a crime to come into someone's sugar**
2747 **cane field and eat a cane.** It is punishable by law,
2748 even if the field is not fenced. However, in Cuba, to
2749 go into a cane field and eat a cane was not
2750 considered a crime. If we go by a country's customs
2751 or its traditions, and not by God's law, Christianity
2752 would be one big confusion. There would be things
2753 that would be sinful in one country and not sinful in
2754 another. In other words, there would be no sure
2755 standard for the relationship between Christians and
2756 God.

2757 **If we would go by the different denominations'**
2758 **customs and traditions**, we would have situations

2759 like that of drinking wine. In the United States
2760 certain denominations consider it sinful to drink
2761 wine. However, members of these same
2762 denominations in Argentina and Spain drink wine.
2763 There, those same denominations do not consider it
2764 a sin. What is the motive for this duality, this
2765 confusion? I bet they don't go by God's law
2766 displayed in both the Old and New Testaments.

2767 God's law says that a man should not marry
2768 certain relatives. **If only the New Testament was**
2769 **the conduct standard, how would a Christian**
2770 **know which relatives would make an incestuous**
2771 **and unacceptable marriage?** By not paying
2772 attention to God's law we have no guide. What
2773 happens is that many who say that God's law is
2774 obsolete, in reality obey it by pieces, and by pieces
2775 they reject it. They depend on what they have been
2776 taught by their sects, or the customs of the country
2777 in which they live.

2778 That is why Jesus makes it very clear in this
2779 passage: ***"Think not that I am come to destroy the***
2780 ***law***". And if Jesus says not to think he came to
2781 destroy the law, why it is that you insist in saying
2782 that Jesus or Paul abolished the law? Why do you
2783 think that? If Jesus says that till heaven and Earth
2784 pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from
2785 the law, **why is it that without heaven and Earth**
2786 **not yet passed, you insist that all of God's law is**
2787 **destroyed or obsolete?**

2788 It seems that Christ, knowing that there would be
2789 others that would rise up to affirm that God's law
2790 was obsolete, he hastened to categorically declare
2791 that as long as there would be heaven and Earth,
2792 God's law would never be obsolete. **He even**
2793 **warned the teachers not to teach such things, and**

2794 how shameful it would be if they would teach such
2795 a thing.

2796

2797 ***“Whosoever therefore shall break one of***
2798 ***these least commandments, and shall teach***
2799 ***men so, he shall be called the least in the***
2800 ***kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do***
2801 ***and teach them, the same shall be called great***
2802 ***in the kingdom of heaven”.*** (Mt 5:19)

2803

2804 Who was Jesus referring to when he said that
2805 those who taught that the law did not have to be
2806 obeyed would be the smallest in the kingdom of
2807 heaven? He could not be referring to the
2808 Pharisees, because they didn't refrain from
2809 teaching any commandment, small as it would
2810 be; and most of all because they would not enter
2811 the kingdom of heaven. He could not be referring
2812 to the non-believers either, because they will not
2813 be in the kingdom of heaven. He was referring to
2814 his own followers, the true Christians, those who
2815 were going to shun God's commandments,
2816 God's law. Especially, the teachers of
2817 Christianity.

2818 **The law was never good to save any one,**
2819 **because for lack of virtue no one obeyed it during**
2820 **his entire life, without ever failing. But it is good**
2821 **for what it has always been good for:** to guide our
2822 **conduct, to show us right from wrong.**

2823 **Besides, don't realize those who think that**
2824 **God's law is obsolete, that they had to take the**
2825 **prophets as obsolete, too?** Of course, in Mathew
2826 5:17 Jesus puts together the law and the prophets, as
2827 two things that would not be abolished until Earth
2828 and heaven pass away. But if even though heaven
2829 and Earth have not yet passed away, someone wants

2830 to make God's law obsolete, he would have to make
2831 the prophets obsolete. **How could he succeed in**
2832 **abolishing God's law while continuing to accept**
2833 **the prophets?** As we can see, this anti-God's law
2834 position is full of illogical affirmations.

2835 Not only did Jesus affirm that he had not come to
2836 destroy God's law. He also warned that any person
2837 that would break one of these commandments,
2838 perhaps because he considered it small, and he
2839 taught others to do so, even though he would not
2840 lose his salvation, he would be called "very small"
2841 in the kingdom of heaven. **As we can see this is a**
2842 **serious matter that deserves our most humble**
2843 **and dedicated consideration.**

2844 What was good before is still good, what was a
2845 sin before, is still a sin now. The God's standards
2846 for human behavior have not changed.

2847 **In some passages Paul says things that make**
2848 **some think that God's law is no good anymore as**
2849 **a behavior standard.** That is because **Paul is**
2850 **referring to ritual law, which is abolished,** never
2851 to the laws for human behavior. Later on in this
2852 book I will prove that Paul never said that God's
2853 laws for human behavior were abolished, as many
2854 brothers believe.

2855 But even those things said by Paul in his very
2856 special way of communicating, are contradicted by
2857 Paul himself, as we saw in the case of the idol
2858 sacrifices. In that instance Paul seems to say one
2859 thing in First Corinthians 8 and then another in First
2860 Corinthians 10:19-22. This is a hyperbolic way of
2861 talking that Paul had, which many twisted, as Peter
2862 witnessed even then in 2 Peter 3:15-16. He says that
2863 among the things that Paul said there were some
2864 that were hard to understand and many had twisted.

2865

2866 “*15 And account that the longsuffering of our*
2867 *Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother*
2868 *Paul also according to the wisdom given unto*
2869 *him hath written unto you; 16 As also in all his*
2870 *epistles, speaking in them of these things; in*
2871 *which are some things hard to be understood,*
2872 *which they that are unlearned and unstable*
2873 *wrest, as they do also the other scriptures,*
2874 *unto their own destruction”.*

(II P 3:15-16)

2877 **If this is so, it would be a bit insane to try to**
2878 **anathematize God's law** based on asseverations
2879 that can be confusing to the unlearned, as Peter said
2880 in the passage we just read. Remember that this is
2881 not the only things that Christians have twisted, as
2882 we can see in 2 Timothy 2:17-18, where we clearly
2883 see one of those old twistings.

2885 “¹⁷ And their word will eat as doth gangrene;
2886 of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; ¹⁸ who
2887 concerning the truth have erred, **saying that**
2888 **the resurrection is past already;** and
2889 **overthrow the faith of some”.**

(II Tim 2:17-18)

2892 But over all this, what most heavily contradicts
2893 what is mistakenly interpreted that Paul said, is
2894 what Jesus himself says in Mathew 5:17-19.

2895 If Jesus did not want to abolish God's law, I
2896 would advise you not to do it either, wait until
2897 heaven and Earth pass away. The behavior
2898 standards established by God's law are still in
2899 effect. The ritual laws that announced the events
2900 referring to Christ's sacrifice are not necessary, and
2901 they are obsolete, like Paul says. If something

2902 changed in the law, something that really is no
2903 change at all, is the fact that we now have the true
2904 Lamb of God, and that instead of the sacrificial
2905 rituals of lambs, crucifixion of The Lamb of God
2906 has already happened.

2907 What was right to do before, is still good now.
2908 What was a sin before is still a sin now. The divine
2909 standards for human behavior have not changed,
2910 and will not change because “Jesus Christ is the
2911 same yesterday, today, and forever”. (Hebrews
2912 13:8). If Jesus Christ is the same, do you think God
2913 will change his mind as to what is or is not sin?

2914 *

2915
2916

2917 **If Christ would have thought that the behavior**
2918 **laws would be suppressed, he would not have**
2919 **used them in his preaching**

2920 Many modern day Christians go through their life
2921 denigrating God’s law, saying it was cruel and
2922 merciless. They see it as something perverse,
2923 inhumane, without justice, without love, without
2924 faith, as if it had been written by the Devil instead
2925 of God.

2926

2927 *“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees,*
2928 *hypocrites, for ye pay tithe of mint and anise*
2929 *and cumin, and have omitted the weightier*
2930 *matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and*
2931 *faith; these ought ye to have done, and not to*
2932 *leave the other undone”*. (Mt 23:23)

2933

2934 As we can see, Christ’s attitude toward God’s law
2935 was not the same as the attitude these brothers have.
2936 Here, Jesus, when he comments on the way the
2937 scribes and the Pharisees used the law, he

2938 reproaches them that **they omitted from the law**
2939 **the most important part: justice, mercy and**
2940 **faith.** As we can see from Christ's commentary,
2941 God's law included those qualities that many
2942 Christians today think they didn't exist. In other
2943 words, many insist that the law did not have **the**
2944 **qualities that Christ said it did have,** and were the
2945 most important in the law.

2946 One of God's commandments, invalidated by
2947 man's traditions (in this case the Pharisees) was the
2948 law that condemned to death a dishonoring son that
2949 cursed his parents. **Yet Christ, when he mentioned**
2950 **this law, he approves of it and admits its validity.**

2951 It would be like thinking that Jesus used purposely
2952 an equivocal or misleading language to say this
2953 here, while at the same time he disapproved of the
2954 death penalty that Moses had established by divine
2955 mandate. In other words, to suppose that Jesus used
2956 against the Pharisees, as an argument, a law that in
2957 reality he considered invalid, would be to accuse
2958 him of insincerity, hypocrisy, and of intentionally
2959 using an amphibological language and dual
2960 dialectics. Therefore, we have to conclude that he
2961 considered the law, valid.

2962
2963 *“⁹ And he said unto them: Full well **ye reject***
2964 ***the commandment of God,** that ye may keep*
2965 *your own tradition. ¹⁰ For Moses said:*
2966 *Honour thy father and thy mother; and,*
2967 ***Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die***
2968 ***the death”*** (Mr 7:9-10)

2969
2970 So we have to conclude that if Christ considered
2971 this law about the dishonoring son valid, he didn't
2972 have a reason to change the one about adultery
2973 (John 8:3-11). Notwithstanding many think he did,

2974 and use it as a basis to say that the law was
2975 abolished by him. Jesus did not change or abolished
2976 the law, he simply didn't play judge to the
2977 adulterous woman because it was not his mission.
2978 And to do so would have been to stray away from
2979 the mission God gave him, and that would have
2980 been a sin.

2981 What's more, even if we suppose that Christ
2982 wanted to abolish the behavior laws with his
2983 sacrifice (which was not so), he never would have
2984 abolished that law until his sacrifice would have
2985 been finished. **Remember that talking against the**
2986 **law before it was abolished would have been a**
2987 **sin.** That's why all those passages in which many
2988 think that Christ said something by which he
2989 abolished the law, fall off their own base. The Lord
2990 would have never said anything against the law
2991 until it became obsolete. In other words, after his
2992 resurrection.

2993 *

2994
2995
2996 **If you love me, keep my commandments. Which**
2997 **ones?**

2998 In John 14:15 we see a statement that makes us
2999 think. Something similar happens when we read
3000 verse 21 in the same chapter, John 15:10; I John
3001 2:3-4 and 5:2-3.

3002
3003 ***“If ye love me, keep my commandments”.***
3004 *(Jn 14:15)*

3005
3006 ***“He that hath my commandments, and***
3007 ***keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he***
3008 ***that loveth me shall be loved of my Father,***

3009 *and I will love him, and will manifest myself*
3010 *to him”.* (Jn 14:21)

3011

3012 ***“If ye keep my commandments, ye shall***
3013 ***abide in my love; even as I have kept my***
3014 ***Father's commandments, and abide in his***
3015 ***love”.*** (Jn 15:10)

3016

3017 *“³ And hereby we do know that we know him,*
3018 ***if we keep his commandments.** ⁴ He that*
3019 *saith, **I know him, and keepeth not his***
3020 ***commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not***
3021 ***in him”.*** (I Jn 2:3-4)

3022

3023 *“² By this we know that we love the children*
3024 *of God, when we love God, **and keep his***
3025 ***commandments.** ³ For this is the love of God,*
3026 ***that we keep his commandments;** and his*
3027 *commandments are not grievous”.*

3028 (I Jn 5:2-3)

3029

3030 As we can see, Jesus does not say that it is about
3031 “saying” we love him. He says that **if that love is**
3032 **true, it compels us to keep his commandments,**
3033 because only he who keeps them is the one who
3034 loves him. And then he adds that his
3035 commandments are not burdensome, so no one
3036 could use the excuse that he can't keep God's
3037 commandments because they are very burdensome.

3038 Now, when Christ says “keep **my** command-
3039 ments”, is he referring only to his, and excluding
3040 his father's, or does the phrase, “my
3041 commandments” include his father's? Logically,
3042 they included his father's. So far we all agree.
3043 Where it starts diverging is when we try to specify
3044 which commandments Christ wants kept.

3045 **God gave us the Ten Commandments** through
3046 Moses. One of them says, “You will have no other
3047 god before me”. Could this be one of the
3048 commandments to which Christ is referring when
3049 he says, “keep my commandments?”, or are we to
3050 think that this is not one of the commandments that
3051 Christ want us to keep?

3052 What about, “you will have no graven image”, or
3053 “you will not take God’s name in vain”. Does Jesus
3054 reject those commandments, or are the three we
3055 mentioned, in what he calls “my commandments”?
3056 The same reasoning can be used with
3057 commandments like “honor your father and
3058 mother”, “you will not kill”, “you will not commit
3059 adultery”, “you will not steal”, “you will not bear
3060 false witness”, “you will not covet”. We all agree
3061 on keeping those commandments.

3062 **Is there any evidence or suspicion that Christ**
3063 **had rejected any of those commandments just**
3064 **mentioned? Can Christians do without scruple**
3065 **or without a guilty conscience what is prohibited**
3066 **therein?** Of course, there is no suspicion, and even
3067 less evidence, that such a thing has happened.
3068 **Therefore, if we love Christ we are going to keep**
3069 **those commandments.**

3070 But the thing is **that I have only cited nine of the**
3071 **Ten Commandments**, so I will cite the missing
3072 one, “you will not work on the seventh day”. This
3073 commandment tells us we should not work on
3074 Saturdays. Would this be one of the commandments
3075 Christ was referring to when he said, “If you love
3076 me, keep my commandments?” Of course it was;
3077 there is no evidence that Christ changed Saturday to
3078 Sunday, as I will prove in chapter 13, titled, “Let’s
3079 talk specifically about Saturday”.

3080 **If something as sacred as one of the Ten**
3081 **Commandments of God would have been**
3082 **changed by God's specific desire, it would have**
3083 **clearly been said so.** God would have not clearly
3084 given a commandment and then abolish it vaguely,
3085 diffusely, nebulously, obscurely and doubtfully; in a
3086 way that would provoke believers to uncertainty
3087 and controversy.

3088 **The Ten Commandments are not ritual laws,**
3089 **but behavior laws.** What Christ abolished when he
3090 died on the cross were the ritual laws as
3091 circumcision, not the behavior laws. The Sabbath is
3092 not a ritual law, because not only does it require us
3093 to rest, it requires us to let rest others who are under
3094 our authority. This is not a ritual; it is a law of love
3095 and mercy towards our neighbor and of
3096 acknowledgment of the divine authority of our
3097 Creator.

3098 **We also see Paul clearly saying that what was**
3099 **nailed to the cross, what was abolished, were the**
3100 **laws relative to ceremonies and rites.**

“¹⁵ Having abolished in his flesh the enmity,
even ***the law of commandments contained in
ordinances***; for to make in himself of twain
one new man, so making peace; ¹⁶ and that he
might reconcile both unto God in one body by
the cross, having slain the enmity thereby”
(Eph 2:15-16)

3110 **“Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances**
3111 **that was against us, which was contrary to us,**
3112 **and took it out of the way, nailing it to his**
3113 **cross”** (Col 2:14)

3115 As we can see, the apostle Paul himself, whom
3116 many mistakenly believe abolished God's Law,
3117 declares here that **what Christ abolished were the**
3118 **laws on rites and ceremonies.** In no way did Paul
3119 dare to change God's commandments. This is a
3120 confusion of those who do not read the Bible in its
3121 totality, or a wickedness of those who try to protect
3122 their erroneous sect, over God's truth.

3123 *

3124
3125

3126 **Pray that your escape is not on the Sabbath**

3127 Here Christ is talking to Christians. This warning,
3128 logically, is not for unbelievers, but for Christians.
3129 We can also say that he was not talking about
3130 "when we were under the law", but about a time
3131 when crucifixion would be a thing of the past, in
3132 other words, "under grace". If even then, he tells
3133 them to pray that their escape doesn't happen on
3134 Saturday, it is because he considers that Christians,
3135 who are under grace, should continue keeping the
3136 Sabbath.

3137 **Some say that if Christ would not want them to**
3138 **escape on Saturday,** he would not allow
3139 persecution to happen on Saturday, and would not
3140 have to tell them to pray. That argument is invalid,
3141 because he also advises them to pray that the escape
3142 is not in winter, when he also could avoid that the
3143 escape be in winter.

3144 If the Sabbath (as many think) was going to be
3145 abolished, **why did Jesus, knowing that these**
3146 **things were going to happen after his crucifixion,**
3147 worries about the brothers praying that it not happen
3148 on Saturday? This question is valid to both the
3149 Christians who consider that the prophecy was for

3150 the apostolic era, as well as those who consider that
3151 it is relevant for the future as well.

3152 It is logical for Jesus to worry about the escape
3153 not be in winter, because in this season the disciples
3154 would have to add the cold to their tribulations; but,
3155 why not Saturday? **Some might allege he did it**
3156 **fearing the disciples would not dare walk any**
3157 **more than what had been prescribed by the**
3158 **Pharisees for a Saturday.** That makes no sense,
3159 because to the same end, he just needed to teach
3160 them that they could travel all they needed to save a
3161 sheep, even though it was Saturday. Besides, that of
3162 not walking more than a certain distance on
3163 Saturday was a law invented by the Pharisees, not
3164 one of God's laws.

3165 **Someone else might allege that Jesus worried**
3166 **about Saturday because Christians** would not
3167 have the means of transportation in which to escape,
3168 since they would not be working on Saturday. But
3169 that supposition lacks basis for several reasons. **a)** If
3170 this prophecy was for the apostolic era, the
3171 argument is useless since at that time there weren't
3172 any means of public transportation (buses, trains,
3173 etc.) and most travel took place by foot, or donkey,
3174 horse, or camel in the best of circumstances. **b)** If
3175 the prophecy also applies to the future, or both, the
3176 argument is also inconsistent. It is illogical to think
3177 that if the Christians have to escape from the
3178 unbelievers and the authorities, that they could do it
3179 by public means of transportation, that the
3180 authorities own and do operate on Saturday. In
3181 order to escape from the rabble or from the
3182 authorities, they would have to do it using their own
3183 private methods: automobiles, foot, etc., whether on
3184 Saturday or any other day of the week. **c)** Besides,
3185 the Sabbath is not kept in Israel so strictly that

3186 someone who wants to move using his own
3187 transportation can't do it on Saturday. Even in the
3188 case where that would be so, it is logical to think
3189 that if Christians have to escape at any given
3190 moment, it is because something is happening. If
3191 everything is quiet and still on Saturday, what are
3192 they running from?

3193 **Others allege that Jesus exhorted** them to pray
3194 that the escape would not be on Saturday because
3195 he was referring to the Christian Jews of the last
3196 days. Others say he was referring to the 144,000.
3197 This has two arguments against it.

3198 **The first** is that **the 144,000 are all men**
3199 according to Revelation 14:4. **However, Jesus was**
3200 **also referring to women** when he told them to pray
3201 that their escape would not be on Saturday.
3202 Therefore, he could not have been talking only
3203 about the 144,000.

3204 **Second.** If the warning about praying that the
3205 escape would not happen on Saturday would be
3206 only about Jewish Christians, that would mean that
3207 the Jews would continue keeping the Sabbath even
3208 when they converted to Christianity. If the Jews
3209 must keep the Sabbath, then why not the Gentiles?
3210 **Are there two churches, two different gospels,**
3211 **one for Jews and one for Gentiles?** This would be
3212 in open contradiction with the rest of the New
3213 Testament, which tells us that there is only one
3214 gospel, that the gospel is unique, and not something
3215 that is adaptable to the races, nations or eras.

3216 **In summary,** I think that if Jesus exhorted them
3217 to pray that their escape would not be on Saturday,
3218 it is because Jesus was hoping that after his
3219 crucifixion Christians would continue keeping the
3220 Sabbath. I see no other reason except a religious one
3221 for such a warning of Jesus.

3222 As we can see, Jesus wished that Christians would
3223 not have to escape on Saturday. However, that does
3224 not mean that salvation for humans depends on
3225 keeping the Sabbath, but it doesn't mean either that
3226 we should work on the Sabbath.

3227 Neither does salvation for humans depends on
3228 attending church, getting baptized, preaching the
3229 gospel, or tithing; but that doesn't mean they should
3230 stop attending church or baptizing, or preaching the
3231 gospel, or tithing. **Salvation does not depends on**
3232 **resting on the Saturday, but that doesn't mean**
3233 **that we must work on Saturday.** If Jesus knew
3234 that the escape would happen after the writing of
3235 those epistles that some allege talk about not
3236 keeping Saturday, and Jesus didn't care about
3237 Saturday, why even mention it? Besides, **is the one**
3238 **about the Saturday the only of the Ten**
3239 **Commandments that has lost validity?** And if
3240 that were so, please explain to me, why just that
3241 one? **Should we call you The Church of the Nine**
3242 **Commandments?**

3243 *

3244

3245

3246 **Did Christ make all meats clean? Did he speak**
3247 **against the law?**

3248 Some use Mark 7:19 to believe that today we can
3249 eat everything. It is true that the verse lends itself to
3250 confusion, but only when we look at it from the
3251 erroneous point of view of one who does not apply
3252 the entire Bible to his interpretations. One who
3253 thinks that the law that God gave human beings to
3254 model their life after, has been abolished by His Son
3255 Jesus Christ.

3256 **This error remains only with those people who**
3257 **refuse to listen to biblical reasoning.** Or those

3258 brothers who step away from a friendly biblical
3259 discussion when they realize they don't have a valid
3260 argument with which to defend their hypothesis.
3261 They don't have arguments to defend their
3262 doctrines, but they **want** to continue "believing"
3263 what they learned from other brothers as mistaken
3264 as they.

3265 First of all, we need to realize that **this issue of**
3266 **the supposedly cleaning of all meats resulted**
3267 **from the criticism the Pharisees had made of the**
3268 **disciples, because they would not wash their**
3269 **hands before eating, and not because they ate**
3270 **forbidden animals.** What Christ is talking about
3271 here is not in regard to giving permit for eating
3272 forbidden animals. He is defending the truth that
3273 eating without washing your hands does not make
3274 unclean the food or the person who eats it. This
3275 argument is in Mark 7:15. Let's see.

3276
3277 *"¹ Then came together unto him the*
3278 *Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which*
3279 *came from Jerusalem. ² And when they saw*
3280 *some of his disciples eat bread with defiled,*
3281 *that is to say, with unwashen, hands, they*
3282 *found fault. ³ For the Pharisees, and all the*
3283 *Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat*
3284 *not, holding the tradition of the elders. ⁴ And*
3285 *when they come from the market, except they*
3286 *wash, they eat not. And many other things*
3287 *there be, which they have received to hold, as*
3288 *the washing of cups, and pots, brasen vessels,*
3289 *and of tables. ⁵ Then the Pharisees and*
3290 *scribes asked him, **Why walk not thy disciples***
3291 *according to the tradition of the elders, but*
3292 ***eat bread with unwashen hands?"***

3293 (Mr 7:1-5)

3329 **Let's get to the point.** If the hypothesis that
3330 God's laws for human behavior were abolished
3331 when Jesus was nailed to the cross was true, then
3332 we would have to come to the conclusion that, **at**
3333 **least up to Jesus' death they were valid.** In this
3334 case, **if Jesus would have wanted to abolish the**
3335 **law, or speak against it, he would have never**
3336 **done it before the crucifixion,** because that would
3337 have been to fail, to sin against God's law and he
3338 could not have saved us.

3339 **If Jesus would have wanted to speak against**
3340 **the law or declare it null, he would have waited**
3341 **until his resurrection** and then do it legally,
3342 without failing in anything. If Jesus would have
3343 talked against the law while it was still valid, he
3344 could not have saved us, because he would have
3345 sinned by despising the law, as we see in Hebrews
3346 10:28.

3348 ***“He that despised Moses’ law died without***
3349 ***mercy under two or three witnesses”***
3350 **(Heb 10:28)**

3352 To say it more clearly, if Jesus indeed would
3353 have abolished the law, he would not have done
3354 it before his death, but after his resurrection.
3355 However, we see that this kind of thing, where
3356 apparently Christ talks about abolishing the law was
3357 never discussed by him after his resurrection,
3358 which is precisely when he could have done it,
3359 and done it legally.

It is the twisting of his words during his Earthly
life that the challengers of the validity of the law
have always held on to. But all these **attacks and**
all these arguments based on words prior to his

3364 **crucifixion, fall from their own base in this last**
3365 **reasoning.**

3366 If in this passage, where Christ supposedly “made
3367 clean all meats” he would have been referring to
3368 those meats that God had said could not be eaten,
3369 **he would have broken the law. He would not do**
3370 **that. Absurd!**

3371 **The reason for all this confusion** is that the ones
3372 confused don’t realize that all that is said in this
3373 episode **is not** referring to which animals can or
3374 cannot be eaten. It is **referring to whether or not**
3375 **eating without washing our hands contaminates**
3376 **the believer or not.** In other words, it is referring to
3377 whether or not they should eat with washed hands
3378 or not, as the elders **tradition** required. It is
3379 significant that these words about the cleanliness of
3380 the foods that starts in verse 14, comes right after
3381 the conversation about the twisting, the corruption,
3382 the distortion, and invalidation that the Pharisees
3383 had made of God’s law, to honor their traditions, as
3384 you can read in verse 13.

3385 **Tradition required the washing of hands,**
3386 because apparently the Pharisees understood that by
3387 having touched unclean and unholy things in the
3388 marketplace, they would bring in their hands such
3389 uncleanness. Now, according to them, the
3390 uncleanness were transmitted through the foods
3391 they touched, even if those were clean and edible,
3392 like the bread mentioned in verse two. Then, if the
3393 believer swallowed these foods, that uncleanness
3394 would pass on to their bodies and they would be
3395 unclean. **This as per the ridiculous traditions of**
3396 **the Pharisees, not God’s laws.**

3397 As we can see, Pharisees broke all Olympic
3398 records when it came to foolishness and ridicule.
3399 According to their doctrine, when someone touched

3400 a food with not washed hands, he made that food
3401 “unclean” and could not eat it.

3402 **The issue of whether or not to wash their**
3403 **hands, was what Jesus wanted to challenge in**
3404 **this passage, making clean all foods that were**
3405 **touched with unclean hands.** In other words,
3406 freeing them from that ridiculous and fictitious
3407 uncleanness that the Pharisees wanted to make
3408 everyone believe happened when they touched food
3409 with unclean hands. By no means can we conclude
3410 here that Jesus gave a free hand to his disciples so
3411 from then on they could eat pork, crab, oysters, dog,
3412 cat, mouse, opossum, lizard, vulture, blood pudding,
3413 flies, roaches, ants and worms, which are favorite
3414 foods in many countries. I don’t think this part of
3415 the gospel was written to give license to filthiness in
3416 gluttony; and much less that this “supposed
3417 authorization” came before the resurrection.

3418 **Note that what the Pharisees were challenging**
3419 **was not that the disciples ate forbidden animals;**
3420 so that is not what Jesus authorized them to do. The
3421 Pharisees were challenging eating with unclean
3422 hands (7:5) and that is what Jesus authorized, not
3423 eating forbidden animals.

3424 **Christ never taught his disciples they could eat**
3425 **everything.** The proof is that Peter, after learning
3426 from Christ for three and one half years, and after
3427 being influenced by the Holy Spirit by about eight
3428 more years, he still didn’t believe he should eat
3429 forbidden animals. After eleven years of starting to
3430 learn from Jesus, when he saw the vision in Acts 10,
3431 he still believed he should not eat forbidden
3432 animals. That is the reason he tells the Lord that **he**
3433 **had never eaten anything unclean. It is then**
3434 **logical to think that Jesus never taught Peter he**
3435 **could eat everything.** That is why the wrong idea

3436 of Jesus making clean all foods cannot refer to the
3437 forbidden animals, but to eating with your hands
3438 dirty.

3439 **If Christ would have taught his disciples to eat**
3440 **everything, Peter would not have answered in**
3441 **such a way eleven years after.** The entire vision
3442 shows that it was given so they would not call the
3443 Gentiles unclean and that they could meet with
3444 them without fear. If Christ had taught his disciples
3445 to eat everything, the Holy Spirit would not have
3446 prohibited later, in the apostolic letter, the eating of
3447 blood.

3448 **Besides, I repeat, if Christ's purpose in this**
3449 **passage would have been to abolish God's law in**
3450 **regards to diet, he would have done it after the**
3451 **resurrection, never before the crucifixion.** Doing
3452 so would be to contradict God's law, which was in
3453 full force then, and doing this would mean sinning
3454 against God.

3455 Christ did not come to abolish the law, but to
3456 fulfill it. To attribute that meaning that many
3457 attribute to that passage, and others like it, would
3458 mean that he came to abolish it and not to fulfill it.
3459 God's law for human behavior will not be abolished
3460 until heaven and Earth pass away, as Christ himself
3461 said in Matthew 5:17-19.

3462 *

3463

3464

3465 **Eat what is put in front of you. An old woman's**
3466 **brain? Soup of defeated warrior's blood?**

3467 Talking against God's commandments, not keeping
3468 them, or teaching others not to keep them would be
3469 a sin. Therefore, we can be sure that Christ never
3470 would have taught his disciples not to keep the
3471 smallest of the commandments.

3472 Someone could allege that the law would have
3473 been obsolete. Even supposing it would be so,
3474 **Christ would have never talked against one of**
3475 **God’s commandments, until with his death and**
3476 **resurrection “it would have been obsolete”,**
3477 **according to the ones that think as such.**
3478 Therefore, he who wants to suppose that God’s law
3479 is obsolete, needs to admit that it would never
3480 happen before crucifixion.

3481 Analyzing this we can be sure that in the
3482 following passage Christ is not ordering his
3483 disciples not to keep the law, for if he had done it he
3484 would have sinned and could not have saved us.

3485
3486 *“⁷ And in the same house remain, eating and*
3487 *drinking such things as they give, for the*
3488 *laborer is worthy of his hire. Go not from*
3489 *house to house. ⁸ And into whatsoever city ye*
3490 *enter, and they receive you, **eat such things***
3491 ***as are set before you”** (Lk 10:7-8)*

3492
3493 It is reasonable then to think that Jesus is not
3494 ordering his disciples to eat whatever is put in front
3495 of them, in the sense that they should eat the meats
3496 that God had forbidden, **but rather to eat what**
3497 **was put in front of them in the sense of humility,**
3498 **of not expecting banquets of specialties.**

3499 Let’s remember that **at the beginning of**
3500 **Christianity, the disciples only preached to other**
3501 **Jews. Therefore, the food they would see in front**
3502 **of them would be Jewish food,** according to God’s
3503 law. That’s why he says, “eat what is put in front of
3504 you. The Lord was not ordering his disciples to eat
3505 the brains of an old lady who died in some cannibal
3506 tribe, just because someone put it in front of them.

3507 **A similar case**, and using almost the same words,
3508 is presented by Paul in I Corinthians 10:27. In this
3509 case one must realize that Paul, just like Christ, is
3510 not telling the disciples to eat human flesh if a
3511 cannibal put it in front of them. What Paul is saying
3512 is that from what God allows us to eat they could
3513 eat. A Christian missionary was not forced to drink
3514 a soup made with the eyes of the enemies that killed
3515 the tribe where he was preaching. Or drink a soup
3516 made with the blood of the decapitated enemies.

3517
3518 *“If any of them that believe not bid you to a*
3519 *feast, and ye be disposed to go; **whatsoever is***
3520 ***set before you, eat,** asking no question for*
3521 *conscience sake”.* (I Co 10:27)

3522 *

3523
3524
3525 **What does “Ye have heard that it hath been**
3526 **said” mean?**

3527 In Matthew 5:21 & 33 we see the expression “**Ye**
3528 **have heard that it hath been said**” and many
3529 brothers take this to mean, “**you heard God**
3530 **ordered through the law**”. That is why many get
3531 the wrong idea that “**before**”, God said something
3532 to the Jews, but “**now**” he changed his mind and
3533 tells Christians the opposite.

3534
3535 *“As saith **the proverb of the ancients,***
3536 ***Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked; but***
3537 ***mine hand shall not be upon thee**”.*
3538 (I Sam 24:13)

3539
3540 **Here in Samuel we see the same expression,**
3541 which clearly refers precisely to that, “someone”,
3542 and not to God’s law. From that error of

3543 appreciation comes the idea, in part, that the
3544 doctrine that God took for good, “**before**” is not
3545 good “**now**”.

3546 Equally, when in Matthew 5:43 Jesus said, “Ye
3547 have heard that it hath been said...”, it means just
3548 that, “has been said”. It means that someone before
3549 that time, said such things, it doesn’t mean that God
3550 said such thing in the law.

3551 **In the verse we just mentioned, Jesus said that**
3552 **“it was said” you should hate your enemy.** In my
3553 opinion Jesus is referring to some old saying or a
3554 proverb from Jewish **tradition**, which **for sure** had
3555 no scriptural basis. I say that, because Jesus didn’t
3556 say that God said it, but that “it was said”, just like
3557 that. Besides, there is **no verse whatsoever in the**
3558 **Old Testament that says such a thing.** The closest
3559 one is Deuteronomy 23:6, which doesn’t say to hate
3560 them, but it refers only to the Ammonites and the
3561 Moabites, as we will see later.

3562 **Besides, the spirit of the Scriptures in the Old**
3563 **Testament is always the opposite.** Always one of
3564 loving your neighbor, both, the national, the
3565 foreign, our friends, and our enemies, as we can see
3566 in Exodus 22:21; 23:4, 5 and 9; and Leviticus
3567 19:17-18. Let’s see.

3568
3569 *“Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou*
3570 *shalt love thy neighbour, and **hate thine***
3571 ***enemy**”.* (Mt 5:43)

3572
3573 *“³ **An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter***
3574 ***into the congregation of the LORD; even to***
3575 ***their tenth generation shall they not enter into***
3576 ***the congregation of the LORD for ever... ⁶***
3577 ***Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their***
3578 ***prosperity all thy days for ever”.** (Dt 23:3-6)*

3579 *“Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor*
3580 *oppress him, for ye were strangers in the land*
3581 *of Egypt”* (Ex 22:21)

3582
3583 *“⁴ If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass*
3584 *going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back*
3585 *to him again. ⁵ If thou see the ass of him that*
3586 *hateth thee lying under his burden, and*
3587 *wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt*
3588 *surely help with him”.* (Ex 23:4-5)

3589
3590 *“Also thou shalt not oppress a stranger, for*
3591 *ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye*
3592 *were strangers in the land of Egypt”.*
3593 (Ex 23:9)

3594
3595 *“¹⁷ Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine*
3596 *heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy*
3597 *neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him. ¹⁸*
3598 *Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge*
3599 *against the children of thy people, but thou*
3600 *shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the*
3601 *LORD”.* (Lev 19:17-18)

3602
3603 As we saw in these passages, what God's law said
3604 was very different than what the ancients said. Who
3605 knows who were the ones who said such things,
3606 maybe proverb writers.

3607 In my opinion, what happened in the case of the
3608 twisting that the Jews did in the time of Christ is
3609 that, as always, on one hand, the people, due to
3610 their wrongful intentions, and on the other, **the**
3611 **religious clicks, because of their own interests,**
3612 **deform and adapt the interpretation of the**
3613 **Scriptures, and in some cases the Scriptures**
3614 **themselves.**

3615 It is something similar to what happens today with
3616 Catholics and the Ten Commandments, in which
3617 even that one of them specifically talks against
3618 idolatry, they can't see it in spite of its clarity. Or in
3619 the case of Protestants with God's law in general,
3620 but particularly with the Sabbath.

3621 *

3622
3623

3624 **What does "the law and the prophets until John"**
3625 **mean?**

3626 Some believe that the verses that contain the
3627 phrase "the law and the prophets until John" put
3628 aside God's law. They think that these passages
3629 mean that the validity of God's law only reached up
3630 to the ministry of John the Baptist. Let us analyze
3631 these verses to show, first, that it cannot mean that,
3632 and second, to say what it does mean.

3633

3634 *"For all the prophets and the law prophesied*
3635 *until John". (Mt 11:13)*

3636

3637 *"¹⁶ The law and the prophets were until*
3638 *John; since that time the kingdom of God is*
3639 *preached, and every man presseth into it. ¹⁷*
3640 *And it is easier for heaven and Earth to pass,*
3641 *than one tittle of the law to fail".*

3642 (Lk 16:16-17)

3643

3644 If the phrase "until John" would mean that the
3645 law was only valid until the arrival of John the
3646 Baptist, then that same phrase would also mean that
3647 the prophecies of the prophets would be valid until
3648 the time of John, which is false. I say it is false
3649 because it is **obvious that Isaiah, Jeremiah,**
3650 **Ezekiel, Daniel, etc., prophesized on issues that**

3651 **went way past the time of John the Baptist,** since
3652 they talked about the end of the world.

3653 **Not only that,** but John the Baptist started his
3654 ministry before Jesus, and his death happened
3655 before Jesus'. If the law would have reached only
3656 until the time of John's ministry, then **that would**
3657 **mean that God's law wasn't valid during**
3658 **Christ's ministry.** The latter would be absurd,
3659 because Christ fulfilled it for us; something that
3660 would not be possible if it was not valid anymore.
3661 We would also have to ask ourselves, who, and with
3662 what authority, someone would abolish the law
3663 before Christ's crucifixion? Is it then that the
3664 alleged abolition of the law took place thanks to the
3665 merits of John the Baptist's ministry, **and not**
3666 **because of the merits of Jesus Christ's ministry?**

3667 **What in my opinion this verse means is that** up
3668 to the time of John the Baptist the ritual law and the
3669 prophets was used to bring people to the Kingdom
3670 of Heaven, **but that from then on the kingdom**
3671 **would be preached out loud, and anyone who**
3672 **wanted to come in, could.** It is to say that before,
3673 people needed to go to the Temple to get
3674 information on God and his law; but after John the
3675 Baptist the Gospel was preached to all four winds,
3676 and anyone could make an effort to come in.

3677 **In other words, up until John's coming, it was**
3678 **the ritual law and the prophets the channels to**
3679 **come into the Kingdom of Heaven.** It was not
3680 preached, people had to seek it there. From John on,
3681 however, the kingdom of God has been preached,
3682 and anyone that makes an effort to go in, can.
3683 Before, only those who went to Israel to get to the
3684 law and the prophets got in, now the kingdom is
3685 preached. However, whether before or now,
3686 salvation is by faith in the grace of the Lamb.

3687 Because the saying “*The law and the prophets*
3688 *were until John*” could make anyone believe that
3689 the law was abolished with the entrance of John the
3690 Baptist, it would be good to note that later, in Lk
3691 16:17, it is cleared up that not a jot or tittle of the
3692 law would pass. If we compare this to Matthew
3693 5:17-19, which is more explicit, we’ll see that,
3694 evidently, it means that the law will remain until
3695 heaven and Earth pass away, and not only until John
3696 the Baptist comes.

3697
3698 “¹⁶ *The law and the prophets were until*
3699 *John: since that time the kingdom of God is*
3700 *preached, and every man presseth into it. ¹⁷*
3701 *And it is easier for heaven and Earth to pass,*
3702 *than one tittle of the law to fail”.*

3703 (Lk 16:16-17)

3704
3705 “¹⁷ *Think not that I am come to destroy the*
3706 *law, or the prophets. I am not come to*
3707 *destroy, but to fulfil. ¹⁸ For verily I say unto*
3708 *you, Till heaven and Earth pass, one jot or*
3709 *one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,*
3710 *till all be fulfilled. ¹⁹ Whosoever therefore*
3711 *shall break one of these least commandments,*
3712 *and shall teach men so, he shall be called the*
3713 *least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever*
3714 *shall do and teach them, the same shall be*
3715 *called great in the kingdom of heaven”.*

3716 (Mt 5:17-19)

3717 *

3718 3719 3720 **The Sabbath was made for man, not for the Jews**

3721 Another passage out of Jesus’ mouth they twist to
3722 “prove” that God’s law is abolished is that of Mark

3723 2:27. This verse says that Saturday was made for
3724 man. So I ask myself, **has man ceased to exist that**
3725 **Saturday, which was made for man, has also**
3726 **ceased to exist?**

3727
3728 *“And he said unto them: **The sabbath was***
3729 ***made for man, and not man for the sabbath”***
3730 (Mr 2:27)
3731

3732 **If God considered that the existence of the**
3733 **Sabbath would be good for man, would he later**
3734 **change his mind?** What would be the original
3735 purpose of not working on Saturday, which was
3736 made for man, if later, according to some, it
3737 expired? Did that purpose or motive expire?

3738 In other words, God had a motive or purpose to
3739 make Saturday for man and give it validity with
3740 energy. If, indeed, there was no need to keep the
3741 Saturday anymore, that is a sign that this motive or
3742 purpose had expired. The question is, what was the
3743 motive or purpose that encouraged God to make a
3744 Saturday for man, and why is that motive or
3745 purpose not valid anymore?

3746 **If we read this passage** from Mark 2:23, we see
3747 that this answer of Jesus is motivated because the
3748 Pharisees, when they saw Jesus’ disciples pulling on
3749 some wheat ears to calm their hunger on a Saturday,
3750 reprimanded Jesus for it. **The Lord’s answer is**
3751 **limited to defending the right of the disciples to**
3752 **do such thing to calm their hunger.** He was not
3753 abolishing the Saturday rest, he was making the
3754 Pharisees see that the way they wanted the Saturday
3755 to be kept, was not the way that God had conceived
3756 it. The correct way to keep the commandments was
3757 the way exemplified by David. As we can see many

3758 take the dog by the tail, and by comparing speed to
3759 bacon reach irrational conclusions.

3760 **Something else to keep in mind is that when**
3761 **Jesus said that the Saturday was made for man,**
3762 **he shows us clearly that it was not only made**
3763 **because of the Jews,** as many believe today.
3764 Saturday was made because of the human race, not
3765 just because of one race. Even the slaves of the
3766 Jews had to be allowed to rest on the Sabbath, even
3767 if they were not Israelites.

3768 It is evident that when God sanctified the
3769 Saturday, when the Saturday was established in
3770 Genesis 2:1-3, the Jews did not yet exist. Therefore,
3771 if Christ, who knows more than all Bible
3772 interpreters put together, tells us that the Sabbath
3773 was made because of man, it is clear that it was
3774 made not only for the Jews, but for the entire human
3775 race, without respect to races.

3776 Besides, when did God “desanctified” the
3777 Saturday, that we now don’t want to keep it? Or
3778 when did he sanctify Sunday that we have to quit
3779 working Sundays?

3780 *

3781
3782
3783 **Summary of Chapter 6.** Those who attribute to
3784 Christ words that indicate that he abolished the law,
3785 are terribly mistaken, because **talking against**
3786 **God’s law is a sin.** If he had sinned, he could not
3787 have saved us. So therefore, no word of Jesus
3788 should be taken as an indicative that he abolished
3789 God’s law before his crucifixion.

3790 **The only mission that Christ could have**
3791 **fulfilled** during his first coming was salvation. He
3792 could not have let himself be dragged by Satan and
3793 his Earthly allies to judge, punish or forgive

3794 criminals. That would have been to fail in his
3795 mission and sin. That is why God had set up
3796 governments. Neither did he have to fix up abuses,
3797 or get into politics, or be crowned king, etc..

3798 **God's laws are not difficult.** What the Pharisees
3799 said were God's laws were nothing more than their
3800 own inventions and traditions. To obey the law is
3801 not to do what the Pharisees did; they were nothing
3802 but unrighteous liars.

3803 **The fact that Jesus used or alleged** to God's
3804 laws in his preaching lets us see that he considered
3805 that they were and would continue to be valid.

3806 Christ said, "If you love me, obey my
3807 commandments". It is evident that **Christ's**
3808 **commandments had to be the same as God's**, he
3809 was not going to go against his father, and God was
3810 not going to change his mind.

3811 No passage can be found to show any word of
3812 Christ abolishing God's law.

3813 ***
3814
3815
3816
3817
3818

3819 **Chapter 7**

3820 **None of the apostles ever said that God's** 3821 **laws had been abolished**

3822 **Authority of the twelve apostles**

3823 Christ's twelve apostles received direct teaching
3824 from the Lord for more than three years. After that
3825 they saw the risen Lord for 40 days, and received
3826 teaching from him, and during both periods they
3827 saw his miracles. Then they received the Holy Spirit
3828

3829 that Christ sent, with which they acquired authority,
3830 doctrine and word to found and direct the Church.
3831 Armed with all this they went on to spread the
3832 gospel throughout the world. They went to Spain,
3833 Italy, England, Switzerland, Austria, France,
3834 Germany, Libya, Egypt, Ethiopia, and all of North
3835 Africa. Towards the East they went to India and all
3836 the countries on the way like Iraq, Persia, and
3837 dozens of other Gentile nations.

3838 What I want to say with all of this is that **the**
3839 **Twelve Apostles had authority, and God had**
3840 **them in his hands. If God would have wanted to**
3841 **make doctrinal changes, he would have revealed**
3842 **it to them.**

3843 Paul preached in Turkey, Macedonia, Greece,
3844 Yugoslavia, and at the end of his life, in Rome. All
3845 did a great job. All were inspired by the Holy Spirit.
3846 **It isn't logical to think that he would make such**
3847 **alleged changes to Christian doctrine and not**
3848 **reveal it to all of them.**

3849 That is why it is so important to analyze the
3850 teachings of **all** of them, to see if any said
3851 something about the supposed abolition of God's
3852 law.

3853 *

3854
3855

3856 **The Holy Spirit and all of the apostles, including**
3857 **Paul, approved the apostolic letter**

3858 Before we start we should remember that **God's**
3859 **law is the behavioral norm that the Lord**
3860 **established for us to know right from wrong**, in
3861 order to know which things we can do, which we
3862 should do, and which we can't. We must also
3863 remember **that there were ritual laws** that served

3864 as symbolism of what Jesus had already fulfilled,
3865 and that, therefore, **are obsolete.**

3866 Neither must we forget that **God does not change**
3867 **his concepts,** and if he thinks that something is
3868 wrong today, it will be so tomorrow and he thought
3869 so yesterday.

3870 Something else to keep in mind is that **one thing**
3871 **is to believe that observing the law is what takes**
3872 **us to salvation, and another very different one is**
3873 **to know that we can be saved only by the grace**
3874 **of Jesus Christ.** However, once we are saved we
3875 have to continue living in this world, and acting in
3876 it. We have to continue making decisions, therefore,
3877 we have to be guided by God's law to know how to
3878 act well.

3879 If God's law would not define and exemplify the
3880 different kinds of fornication, we would not know
3881 what fornication was. The same could be said about
3882 idolatry, love, cruelty, incest, vanity, religiosity,
3883 homicide, etc.. There are facets of these things that
3884 cannot be discerned by man's natural ability, and in
3885 order to clear them up we need God's law.

3886 Furthermore, there are concepts represented in the
3887 New Testament by words and phrases whose
3888 meaning we take for granted. However, **they are**
3889 **not defined in the New Testament, but in God's**
3890 **law** for human behavior, which is mostly found in
3891 the Old Testament. **Who could have known what**
3892 **fornication is if God's law, which is in the Old**
3893 **Testament, would not explain it?** In the New
3894 Testament, fornication is not defined, only
3895 mentioned and condemned. Therefore, God's law is
3896 still valid as the norm for human behavior as it
3897 always was; not as a method for salvation, which **it**
3898 **never was.**

3899 **If anyone could have been able to fulfill all of**
3900 **God's laws** for human behavior, from cradle to
3901 grave, that person would not be damned, would not
3902 need Jesus Christ's salvation. But since there has
3903 never been such person, we all have to be saved by
3904 God's grace in Christ Jesus. But after coming to
3905 Christ, God's grace does not authorize us to disobey
3906 the laws of God for human behavior that we did not
3907 obey before.

3908 **Not as those who want to be saved through**
3909 **works believe.** They think that Christ can save us,
3910 but then we have to "add what is left" by obeying
3911 the law, or by preaching from house to house or
3912 attending church, or giving tithe. That is heresy.
3913 God's work of salvation was not lacking anything.
3914 Woe on us if we had to add something ourselves!

3915 The same way that **I learned** after my conversion,
3916 **thanks to the law**, that witchcraft is bad, I learned
3917 that keeping the Saturday and tithing is good, and I
3918 try to live my life like that. That is what God's law
3919 is good for. Ritual law doesn't do that.

3920 **Well then, some Christians that hate and**
3921 **despise God's law**, including the simple word
3922 "law", pretend to find support in the apostolic letter
3923 mentioned in Acts 15, in order to abolish God's law
3924 in regards to human behavior. **For that they argue**
3925 **the fact that such things as resting on Saturday**
3926 **and not eating forbidden animals are not**
3927 **mentioned at all in the apostolic letter.**

3928 Actually, these are the two things these brothers
3929 resist, since they have no problem with tithing, as
3930 established by the Old Testament law, as well as
3931 other aspect of the law that they support as well.

3932 The fact that the apostolic letter does not mention
3933 keeping Saturday and not eating forbidden animals
3934 is a fallacious argument to "prove" that the law is

3935 abolished. **The apostolic letter doesn't mention**
3936 **either theft, homicide, honoring father and**
3937 **mother, or swearing in vain, or bearing false**
3938 **witness, or coveting, and who can say from this,**
3939 **that all these laws are abolished?** The conduct
3940 norm for human beings is still God's law, the same
3941 as always; because God does not change his mind.
3942 It has been clearly established that the apostolic
3943 letter cannot be used to "prove" that God's law has
3944 been abolished.

3945 **The objective of the apostolic letter was to list a**
3946 **few things that the apostles believed the Gentiles**
3947 **would ignore, and that they thought were**
3948 **important to follow right away,** while the learning
3949 process and sanctification of the new Gentile
3950 believers lasted. The apostles weren't talking about
3951 murdering and stealing because they thought the
3952 Gentiles would know in their nature that these
3953 things were bad. But they do write about the idols
3954 and about not eating with blood, because they knew
3955 the Gentiles would not know about these.

3956 **Did this mean that the gentiles would have only**
3957 **four behavior norms?** Did that mean that the
3958 Gentiles could kill and steal? No; it's that the
3959 apostles thought that these are the most urgent and
3960 important ones that the Gentiles ignored totally. The
3961 other, less important and less urgent laws they
3962 would learn later. Where? At the synagogue, where,
3963 by keeping Saturday, they would later attend.

3964 Note that after saying in verses 19 and 20 what
3965 the most urgent things to obey were, it says in verse
3966 21, in an implicit way, **that the rest they could**
3967 **learn at the synagogue, where God's law was**
3968 **preached every Saturday.** What would be the
3969 purpose of verse 21, if not to let them see how the
3970 rest of the law could be learned at the synagogue?

3971 Therefore, the apostles hoped that the Gentiles
3972 would learn God's regulations, God's law, the Old
3973 Testament norms of behavior. **They hoped they**
3974 **kept Saturday, because, if not, they would not**
3975 **make any mention of going to the synagogue.**

3976 Let's remember that at the beginning the disciples
3977 did not separate themselves from the synagogue,
3978 nor they believed they had to abandon it, for they
3979 hoped to bring to it the new revelation they had:
3980 that the true lamb had come, that salvation was
3981 possible through the sacrifice of Christ, the Lamb of
3982 God.

3983 If you read Acts 15 from the beginning you'll see
3984 that **the issue that was being debated among the**
3985 **brothers was whether or not Gentiles should**
3986 **circumcise themselves, perform the sacrifices of**
3987 **the ritual laws, and take part in such ceremonies,**
3988 or if, on the other hand, it wasn't necessary for them
3989 to carry that ceremonial yoke on them. If you study
3990 consciously the entire chapter, you will see that
3991 **nowhere is the abolition of the Ten Command-**
3992 **ments mentioned,** nor any of the other laws for
3993 human behavior that God had established. They
3994 only talk about not imposing on the Gentiles an
3995 unnecessary ritual yoke, for all those symbolisms of
3996 the ritual law had been fulfilled in Christ.

3997 All twelve apostles, the elders **and Paul**
3998 participated in this **entire debate** about whether or
3999 not Christians should obey the rituals and
4000 ceremonies. When the letter was approved, it was
4001 the Holy Spirit that approved it, along with the
4002 apostles, the elders, **and Paul**. **What it says was**
4003 **approved by Paul,** including the part about not
4004 eating what had been offered to idols. As we can
4005 see, Paul did not "abolish" God's law for human

4006 behavior. In that letter, all of them considered the
4007 ritual laws abolished, not God's law in general.

4008 *

4009

4010

4011 **Analyzing Acts 15, let's prove all that I have said**

4012 **In verse 1** we see that the origin of all this was
4013 that there were some who came down from Judea
4014 who taught to the brethren in Antioch, Syria and
4015 Cilicia **that in order to be saved they had to be**
4016 **circumcised and obey the rituals.** Therefore, they
4017 were not talking about divine laws for human
4018 behavior, like the Ten Commandments.

4019 **In verse 2** we see that when Barnabas and Paul
4020 are going to see the apostles it is to talk about "this
4021 question", it means, if Gentiles had to be
4022 circumcised or not, or if they have to offer the lamb
4023 sacrifices and other rituals. What's more, we see **in**
4024 **verse 5** that when Barnabas and Paul arrive in
4025 Jerusalem, there were people there who also wanted
4026 to require circumcision for the Gentiles and the
4027 keeping of the rituals. **No one was talking about**
4028 **abolishing the Ten Commandments.**

4029

4030 *"¹ And certain men which came down from*
4031 *Judaea taught the brethren, and said, Except*
4032 *ye be circumcised after the manner of*
4033 *Moses, ye cannot be saved. ² When therefore*
4034 *Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension*
4035 *and disputation with them, they determined*
4036 *that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of*
4037 *them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the*
4038 *apostles and elders **about this question.** ³*
4039 *And being brought on their way by the*
4040 *church, they passed through Phenice and*
4041 *Samaria, declaring the conversion of the*

Gentiles; and they caused great joy unto all the brethren. 4 And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them. 5 But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying: That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses”.

(Act 15:1-5)

It is way too clear that the issue at hand was not the abolition of the Ten Commandments, and the rest of God's laws for human behavior, but only the abolition of the ritual law, including circumcision and lamb sacrifice, which is called in this passage, "Moses' law". That is why we see that **in verse 6**, it is said that the apostles and the elders got together to know about "this matter". What matter? The only one mentioned: the circumcision of the Gentiles and the abolition of the ritual law. In regards to this, Peter concludes **in verse 11** saying that it is through Christ's grace that we are saved, and it isn't necessary to be circumcised or to keep the other ritual laws.

“6 And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. 7 And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them: Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. 8 And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; 9 and put

4078 *no difference between us and them, purifying*
4079 *their hearts by faith. 10 Now therefore why*
4080 *tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of*
4081 *the disciples, which neither our fathers nor*
4082 *we were able to bear? 11 But we believe that*
4083 *through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ*
4084 *we shall be saved, even as they”.*

(Act 15:6-11)

4086
4087 The yoke that Peter says that neither they nor their
4088 fathers had been able to bear was the ritual law, as I
4089 will explain later on page 129.

4090 **Then Paul and Barnabas, both of whom**
4091 **accepted the authority of the twelve apostles,** tell
4092 their experiences, after which James, taking the
4093 floor, proposes in verse 20 that they tell the Gentiles
4094 to stay away from idols, fornication, strangled
4095 animals and blood. In verse 21 James implies that
4096 **the remaining things in reference to human**
4097 **behavior they can learn on Saturday at the**
4098 **synagogues.** Let’s see these verses.

4099
4100 *“12 Then all the multitude kept silence, and*
4101 *gave audience to Barnabas and Paul,*
4102 *declaring what miracles and wonders God*
4103 *had wrought among the Gentiles by them. 13*
4104 *And after they had held their peace, James*
4105 *answered, saying: Men and brethren, hearken*
4106 *unto me. 14 Simeon hath declared how God at*
4107 *the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of*
4108 *them a people for his name. 15 And to this*
4109 *agree the words of the prophets; as it is*
4110 *written: 16 After this I will return, and will*
4111 *build again the tabernacle of David, which is*
4112 *fallen down; and I will build again the ruins*
4113 *thereof, and I will set it up; 17 that the residue*

4114 *of men might seek after the Lord, and all the*
4115 *Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith*
4116 *the Lord, who doeth all these things. 18*
4117 *Known unto God are all his works from the*
4118 *beginning of the world. 19 Wherefore my*
4119 *sentence is that we trouble not them, which*
4120 *from among the Gentiles are turned to God,*
4121 *20 but that we write unto them, that they*
4122 *abstain from pollutions of idols, and from*
4123 *fornication, and from things strangled, and*
4124 *from blood. 21 For Moses of old time hath in*
4125 *every city them that preach him, being read*
4126 *in the synagogues every Sabbath day”.*

4127 (Act 15:12-21)

4128
4129 After the speeches of Peter and James, the
4130 apostles and the elders decide to write to the
4131 Gentiles telling them that according to their
4132 agreement, **and as approved by the Holy Spirit**,
4133 they did not have to get circumcised or to obey the
4134 ritual laws, and tells them to abstain from idols,
4135 fornication, strangled animals and blood.

4136
4137 “22 Then pleased it the apostles and elders,
4138 with the whole church, to send chosen men of
4139 their own company to Antioch with Paul and
4140 Barnabas; namely, Judas surnamed
4141 Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the
4142 brethren. 23 And they wrote letters by them
4143 after this manner: **The apostles and elders**
4144 **and brethren send greeting unto the**
4145 **brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch**
4146 **and Syria and Cilicia. 24 Forasmuch as we**
4147 **have heard, that certain which went out from**
4148 **us have troubled you with words, subverting**
4149 **your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised,**

4150 *and keep the law; to whom we gave no such*
4151 *commandment; 25 it seemed good unto us,*
4152 *being assembled with one accord, to send*
4153 *chosen men unto you with our beloved*
4154 *Barnabas and Paul, 26 men that have*
4155 *hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord*
4156 *Jesus Christ. 27 We have sent therefore Judas*
4157 *and Silas, who shall also tell you the same*
4158 *things by mouth. 28 For it seemed good to the*
4159 *Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no*
4160 *greater burden than these necessary things;*
4161 *29 that ye abstain from meats offered to idols,*
4162 *and from blood, and from things strangled,*
4163 *and from fornication; from which if ye keep*
4164 *yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well”.*
4165 (Act 15:22-29)

4166
4167 **Let’s analyze this passage again.** When we
4168 studied this matter, from verse one, we saw that all
4169 this started because there were Jews (Pharisees
4170 already converted to Christ) who wanted to impose
4171 on the Gentiles the obeying of the ritual laws;
4172 specifically the one on circumcision, sacrifices, etc.
4173 Not only that (as if it weren’t enough,) but they
4174 wanted to **condition salvation to the obeying of**
4175 **such rituals.**

4176 Referring to this and other such things, in 15:19 it
4177 says that the Gentile believers should not be
4178 burdened with such rituals, but they should be asked
4179 only to keep the most urgent, because the rest of the
4180 behavior laws they would learn in the synagogues
4181 where they were taught every Saturday.

4182 Let’s remember that back then, in the Jewish
4183 synagogues there was not the absolute antagonism
4184 we find today, and therefore Christians could
4185 continue attending and fellowshiping, as did the

4186 apostles, including Paul. In many cases Christians
4187 were considered simply a new sect, just like the
4188 Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, etc.. In other
4189 cases they were persecuted, and even in others they
4190 were treated one way and then another, as we see in
4191 Acts 13:5, 14; 14:1; 17:1-2, 10-13, 17; etc..

4192 **Note that all this was happening more than**
4193 **twenty years after the crucifixion**, with which I
4194 want to make clear that the fact that Gentile
4195 Christians would learn God's behavioral laws in the
4196 synagogues continued on much longer. We must
4197 also realize that if the apostles were delegating the
4198 learning of the rest of God's laws to the teachings
4199 that took place on Saturdays in the synagogues, that
4200 is implicitly telling us that **they expected the**
4201 **Gentiles to learn and keep God's law for human**
4202 **behavior. It means also they expected the**
4203 **Gentiles to keep Saturday, for if they worked on**
4204 **Saturday, they would not attend synagogue and**
4205 **learn.**

4206 What I want to say with all this is that the apostles
4207 were doing the missionary work, showing that Jesus
4208 was the Lamb of God. Nevertheless they would
4209 leave the Gentile Christians to be taken care of by
4210 the brothers, and the synagogues for the teaching of
4211 the divine norms for human behavior. Of course,
4212 reserving the right to supervise the work and the
4213 doctrinal rectification, as in this case. **I don't see in**
4214 **this passage any basis to consider God's law**
4215 **abolished.** At no moment did any of the twelve
4216 apostles or Paul talk about abolishing the behavioral
4217 laws.

4218 *

4219
4220

4221 **Does “eating” or “not eating” make us more or**
4222 **less accepted by God?**

4223 One of the things that are most challenged by
4224 Christians today in regards to the law, is not eating
4225 the meat of certain animals. They allege it is not
4226 important, **because all animals belong to God. But**
4227 **all the animals did before, and yet it was**
4228 **forbidden to eat them. The blood of these**
4229 **animals is also God’s**, yet in the apostolic letter it
4230 is forbidden to eat it. The same can be said about
4231 marijuana and other illicit things, even though they
4232 also are God’s. This should be enough to
4233 understand that the statement that “eating or not
4234 eating doesn’t make us accepted” is a hyperbolic
4235 affirmation that has to be taken sensibly.

4236 **Some say that God doesn’t concern himself**
4237 **with Christian’s diets.** I don’t know where they get
4238 such things; as always, they only affirm, without
4239 trying to prove anything. **But God does concern**
4240 **himself with the diet of his children, because he**
4241 **prohibited Christians to eat the blood.** He also
4242 concerned himself with his children’s diet during
4243 Moses’ time. Even in Noah’s time it was known
4244 what were clean animals and animals that were not
4245 clean, as we see in Genesis 7:2. So saying that God
4246 doesn’t concern himself with his children’s diet is
4247 an invalid argument, because it is totally false, and a
4248 product of sectarian dogmas.

4249 **Others, misinterpreting I Corinthians 8:8, say**
4250 **that “eating” or “not eating” doesn’t make us**
4251 **more or less accepted to God.** However, in the
4252 apostolic letter, all the principals of the church,
4253 including the twelve apostles, Paul, **together with**
4254 **the Holy Spirit**, agreed to tell them from the
4255 beginning not to eat strangled animals or blood,
4256 something the Jews already knew, but not the

4257 Gentiles. As we see, contrary to what others think
4258 about what Paul says, **the Holy Spirit did forbid**
4259 **the eating of certain things.** Therefore eating or
4260 not eating did make us more or less accepted by
4261 God.

4262 We cannot interpret from what Paul says, that we
4263 can eat anything with the pretext of “the belly for
4264 the meats and the meats for the belly” (I
4265 Corinthians 6:13), or with the false pretense that
4266 either eating or not eating won’t make us more or
4267 less accepted by God. We need to consider that **the**
4268 **Holy Spirit and the rest of the apostles (including**
4269 **Paul) did believe that certain things could not be**
4270 **eaten, in this case blood and strangled animals,**
4271 even if meats were for the belly and the belly for
4272 meats. Evidently, if we eat blood we would not be
4273 accepted by God. All arguments based on the
4274 thinking that it is ridiculous that God cares what his
4275 children eat, fade away and is dissipated by the
4276 affirmation in the apostolic letter that **the Holy**
4277 **Spirit saw it fit to warn the Gentile brothers not**
4278 **to eat strangled animals and blood.** It is not that
4279 foolish, as they would like us to think, the idea that
4280 God does care about what his children eat.

4281 As we can see here, none of the apostles said that
4282 God’s laws were obsolete.

4283 *

4284
4285
4286 **Transgression of God’s law is sin; death penalty**
4287 **and prison**

4288 None can deny that in this next passage, the
4289 apostle John says that anyone who sins transgresses
4290 God’s law, and that sin is the transgression of God’s
4291 law. It is too evident to deny. The argument begins
4292 when we try to give meaning to the word “law”.

4293 Can anyone honestly say that in this case the word
4294 “law” refers to the New Testament and not God’s
4295 Old Testament law? **The New Testament, as we**
4296 **now know it, did not exist yet.** It is clear, then, that
4297 John was referring to the Ten Commandments, the
4298 Old Testament in general, when he mentioned the
4299 word “law”.

4300
4301 *“Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth*
4302 *also the law, for sin is the transgression of*
4303 *the law”.* (I Jn 3:4)

4304
4305 **By the Apostle John’s statement that to**
4306 **transgress God’s law was a sin, we clearly see**
4307 **that he considered God’s law to be fully valid; he**
4308 **did not consider it abolished or obsolete.** If John
4309 had considered God’s law was abolished he would
4310 not have said that to transgress God’s law was a sin.
4311 **Nobody can sin by transgressing a law that has**
4312 **been abolished; and note that it was said several**
4313 **decades after Christ’s resurrection.** He said that
4314 whosoever sins, transgresses God’s law; therefore it
4315 is evident that we cannot transgress God’s law and
4316 not sin. Then, **why are we taught that we can**
4317 **transgress God’s law, and even then not sin?**
4318 Really, I do not understand the mental process
4319 through which those who think that way have
4320 arrived to such conclusion; or which logic they use.

4321 Only Paul, of whose confusing way of talking we
4322 are warned in Scripture, sometimes says things that
4323 can be misinterpreted as contrary to the validity of
4324 God’s law; but **in all these cases it can be proven**
4325 **that he is referring to the ritual law.** Not once
4326 does he refer to the Ten Commandments and the
4327 other laws about human behavior, as **I will prove**
4328 **in chapter eight.**

4329 On the other hand, all the other apostles, and the
4330 Lord Jesus Christ himself, say that God's law is
4331 valid. So, what is the result? That almost all
4332 Christians today consider God's law for human
4333 behavior abolished, only because **they think** that
4334 Paul, making use of his "august and personal divine
4335 authority", had abolished it. Sometimes I think they
4336 wish for God's law to be abolished; then they can
4337 come and go as they please without being tugged
4338 much by their conscience.

4339

4340 **Let's answer these questions:**

4341 a) The apostle John says that to transgress God's
4342 law is a sin. True or false?

4343 b) If one **does not** do as God's law commands,
4344 one is transgressing it, and transgressing it is a sin.
4345 True or false?

4346 c) If one does as God's law commands, **one** does
4347 not sin. True or false?

4348 d) How can we harmonize the idea that God's law
4349 is obsolete with the answers herein?

4350

4351 **Many Christians agree with the death penalty**
4352 **for premeditated cold blood murder.** Let's use
4353 elementary logic here. On what do they base their
4354 conviction? Does the justification to take a human
4355 life because of the crime of murder flow from the
4356 human mind? Can a Christian dare to approve of
4357 the death penalty based only on human
4358 considerations and circumstantial conveniences?
4359 **Anyone basing his convictions on God's laws to**
4360 **approve of the death penalty is solidly justified**
4361 **and backed up** by the same one who created the
4362 murderer, knows his soul, and knows he must be
4363 executed. But **any one who does not consider**
4364 **God's law valid, and is neo-testamentarian, can**

4365 **only base his support for the death penalty on**
4366 **personal or social considerations,** because the
4367 New Testament says nothing to that respect.

4368 There might be one who, insincerely, so not to
4369 give in, says he has no opinion on the issue, and he
4370 only listens to what the authorities say. That does
4371 not save him from dialectic defeat.

4372 **First** of all, even if he denies his thoughts to me,
4373 and he pretends not to have a personal opinion on
4374 the issue, and even if I believe such lie, God knows
4375 his true thoughts. It is not me to whom he is
4376 accountable for not doing the right thing.

4377 **Second,** does he approach with the same
4378 obedience and humility as he does in this case, the
4379 other governmental laws? Does he approach
4380 everything else without any personal opinion, or is
4381 this an excuse to not have an opinion about the
4382 death penalty? Is he that obedient and meek,
4383 without opinion when it comes to taxes,
4384 contributions, prices, political scandals, lack of
4385 citizen concern, etc.?

4386 **Well, it could be that the man in question does**
4387 **not agree with the death penalty, but with**
4388 **prison.** All Christians agree with imposing prison
4389 on murderers. Based on what does a Christian dare
4390 to take away someone's freedom? Is that
4391 punishment based on personal, social and political
4392 considerations, or on the Bible? **Where in the**
4393 **Bible is the prison penalty established for a**
4394 **murderer? The New Testament doesn't.** Is it not
4395 more torturing and sadistic to keep a man 30 or 40
4396 years in an exasperating prison cell, than to execute
4397 him as instructed by God's law for murderers?

4398 **Neo-testamentarians should meditate on the**
4399 **moral and spiritual responsibility they assume**
4400 **by eliminating God's law and basing such**

4401 **punishment on their own ideas.** In other words,
4402 they discard the divine support of their own
4403 convictions on crime's punishment and support
4404 themselves.

4405 And what of thieves, rapists, kidnapers, drug
4406 dealers, etc.? Should we forgive them, or should we
4407 punish them as established by the God and Father of
4408 our Lord Jesus Christ in the Old Testament? **The**
4409 **New Testament offers no legislation.**

4410 We need to be truthful to ourselves and not draw
4411 from the conflict with euphemisms and faked
4412 attitudes. When a Christian votes in favor of the
4413 legislators that made these laws, he is morally
4414 endorsing them with his vote. How can he say now
4415 that he is only following what the authorities say?

4416 **When a Christian calls the police because he**
4417 **feels he is in danger,** he doesn't do it so the police
4418 comes unarmed to allege lovingly reasons with the
4419 criminal. If he calls the police so that the police, if
4420 needed, can kill the criminal that is threatening him,
4421 which part of the Bible does he use to act this way?
4422 The New Testament? Should we not forgive the
4423 criminal? Can he be killed? Which part of the Bible
4424 does he use to think or act like that?

4425 **We have seen so far that none of the apostles**
4426 **have told that God's laws were abolished,** nor can
4427 we assume any such thing from their words.

4428 *

4429
4430
4431 **If James uses the law to prove his point, it is**
4432 **because he considers it valid; he would not use it**
4433 **deceitfully**

4434 James is talking to converted Christians, not to
4435 unbelievers. To those Christians he says: "For
4436 whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend

4437 in one point, he is guilty of all”. In other words, he
4438 is telling them that they should treat the rich and the
4439 poor in the same manner, because **not doing so is**
4440 **against God’s law. Even if they think that a**
4441 **small transgression is not important, they are**
4442 **wrong**, it is important; because if they offend one
4443 point, they are guilty of all. The same God that
4444 established one commandment established the other
4445 one, and you are a sinner just as well whether you
4446 offend in one thing or the other.

4447 **If we analyze this passage without passion,**
4448 we’ll see that James is talking to the Christian
4449 churches, warning them about not being prejudiced
4450 towards anyone. In talking to them, he warns them
4451 against the fact that if they accept only the rich,
4452 **they are violating God’s law. Can James warn**
4453 **them against violating a law that is not valid for**
4454 **Christians?** If the law would not have been valid
4455 for those churches, and for other Christians
4456 scattered all over the world, would James have said
4457 they were violating God’s? **Is it possible to violate**
4458 **a law that is not valid? Is James going to use a lie**
4459 **to scare the brothers**, by telling them they were in
4460 violation of a law that is not valid? If the law would
4461 not have been valid, James would have said they
4462 were not being nice to the brothers, not that they
4463 were transgressing a law that according to the anti-
4464 law doctrine was not in effect. **From all this it is**
4465 **extremely easy to realize that James considered**
4466 **that God’s law was not abolished.**

4467
4468 *“⁸ If ye fulfill the royal law according to the*
4469 *Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as*
4470 *thyself, ye do well. ⁹ But if ye have respect to*
4471 *persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of*
4472 ***the law** as transgressors. ¹⁰ For whosoever*

4473 *shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in*
4474 *one point, he is guilty of all.* ¹¹ *For he that*
4475 *said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do*
4476 *not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if*
4477 *thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of*
4478 *the law.* ¹² *So speak ye, and so do, as they that*
4479 *shall be judged by the law of liberty”.*

4480 (James 2:8-12)

4481

4482 As a matter of example, in verse 11, James quotes
4483 two of the Ten Commandments to show them that if
4484 they obey **the seventh and not the sixth, they are**
4485 **guilty of all.** The same could be said if they obeyed
4486 the third but not the fifth; or if they obeyed the
4487 ninth but not the sixth, etc., whichever way we want
4488 to pair them.

4489 Being this so, it could be said that **whoever obeys**
4490 **all the commandments except the fourth**
4491 **(Saturday) is considered a sinner.** If anyone
4492 considers that the fourth commandment is excluded
4493 from James’ comments, let him explain to me what
4494 he bases such personal opinion on, because I want
4495 to share such knowledge.

4496 **If James brings to light the Ten Command-**
4497 **ments to show them that what they say had to be**
4498 **obeyed, and that not obeying them is a sin, is it**
4499 **not obvious that the Ten Commandments were**
4500 **still in effect?** Therefore nobody can juggle with
4501 words, and say that the “real law” mentioned by
4502 James means blah, blah, blah; or that he was
4503 referring to the “law of love”, blah, blah, blah;
4504 because it is obvious that he was talking about
4505 God’s law for human behavior, in this case, the Ten
4506 Commandments.

4507 **Some obstinate one may even allege that he**
4508 **was talking to the Jews,** not the Gentiles. Well,

4509 let's see. **Were there only Jews accepted in the**
4510 **"scattered churches" (James 1:1), while the**
4511 **Gentiles were rejected?** These brothers to whom
4512 James was writing, did they not admit Gentiles in
4513 their churches? Was there a code for Christian Jews
4514 and another for Christian Gentiles, even within the
4515 same church?

4516 If it were true that the sacrifice of Christ abolished
4517 God's law for human behavior, did he abolish them
4518 (according to anti-laws) for the Gentiles, but not for
4519 the Jews? **How can we divide in two Jesus'**
4520 **sacrifice** so that one part save the Gentile believers,
4521 abolishing God's law for human behavior, and the
4522 other part of Jesus' sacrifice save the Jewish
4523 believers, but not abolish God's law for human
4524 behavior?

4525 Doesn't what James is thinking here agree with
4526 what Jesus said in Matthew 5:17-19? Why cling to
4527 wanting to see God's law abolished? Why would
4528 James' comments be valid to compare "thou shalt
4529 not commit adultery" to "thou shalt not kill", but
4530 not to compare "thou shalt not commit adultery" to
4531 "thou shalt keep the Sabbath?"

4532
4533 *"¹⁷ Think not that I am come to destroy the*
4534 *law, or the prophets; I am not come to*
4535 *destroy, but to fulfil. ¹⁸ For verily I say unto*
4536 *you, Till heaven and Earth pass, one jot or*
4537 *one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,*
4538 *till all be fulfilled. ¹⁹ Whosoever therefore*
4539 *shall break one of these least command-*
4540 *ments, and shall teach men so, he shall be*
4541 *called the least in the kingdom of heaven;*
4542 *but whosoever shall do and teach them, the*
4543 *same shall be called great in the kingdom of*
4544 *heaven".* (Mt 5:17-19)

4545

4546

4547

4548

4549

4550

4551

4552

4553

4554

4555

4556

4557

4558

4559

4560

4561

4562

4563

4564

4565

4566

4567

4568

4569

4570

4571

4572

4573

4574

4575

4576

4577

4578

4579

4580

Later on, in 4:11, where James exhorts Christians not to murmur against each other, he tells them that he who gossips judges the law, and immediately scolds them saying that a judge of the law is not a keeper of the law. It is understood clearly that he expects just the opposite. He expects them to be keepers of the law and not judges.

If James' mental structure denounces that he expected that those Christians be keepers of the law, it is because **he knew that God's laws for human behavior were not abolished.** Here we have another apostle who does not say that God's laws are abolished.

*

The yoke that neither Peter nor their fathers had been able to bear was the ritual law

Peter was talking about **the yoke that represented the strict obedience of the ritual law.** Why? Because every time someone sinned, he had to come from Galilee to Jerusalem, and bring a sacrifice to the Temple. This was almost impossible for those who lived far from the Temple, and for the poor, who could not afford the constant sacrificing.

During the time prior to Christ's sacrifice, in order to purge his sins, the believer had to sacrifice lambs, go through the ceremonial washing and countless other rituals.

A regular person that sinned by work, word or thought two or three times a month could not present all the sacrifices or ceremonies required.

Such would be economically prohibitive for any ordinary man, especially if we take into

4581 consideration not only his sins but those of his
4582 family.

4583 In addition, there was the logistic impossibility.
4584 **Those not living in Jerusalem, near the Temple,**
4585 **had to travel there in order to offer their**
4586 **sacrifice, since the law prohibited and punished**
4587 **sacrifices outside of the Temple.** No one could
4588 make a three or four day trip two or three times a
4589 month, every time he, his wife, or any of his
4590 children sinned. And that in addition to the three
4591 yearly celebrations during which it was required
4592 they traveled to Jerusalem.

4593 That is why **Peter says here that the ritual laws**
4594 **were a yoke that neither he nor his fathers could**
4595 **bear.** Of course, it was almost impossible to obey
4596 all the ritual laws necessary to be redeemed, every
4597 time anyone sinned in any way; especially those
4598 living far, like Peter and the other apostles who
4599 lived in Galilee.

4600 This becomes even clearer when we read Acts
4601 15:10-11, especially verse 11, which is written as a
4602 direct consequence of the previous verse 10.

4603
4604 *“¹⁰ Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a*
4605 *yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which*
4606 *neither our fathers nor we were able to*
4607 *bear? ¹¹ But we believe that through the*
4608 *grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be*
4609 *saved, even as they”.* (Act 15:10-11)
4610

4611 As we can see, Peter was already convinced that
4612 to be forgiven of our sins it was not necessary any
4613 more to go offer lamb sacrifices to the Temple, but
4614 we were clean by the grace of the Lord Jesus, who
4615 was the true Lamb of God. Due to that knowledge
4616 he could not agree to impose on the Gentiles the

4617 ritual law, since the symbolism that those sacrifices,
4618 rituals and ceremonies represented were already
4619 present in the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ.

4620 If we read the origin of this argument in 15:1-2
4621 and 5-6 we will see **that what they wanted to**
4622 **impose on the converted Gentiles as a condition**
4623 **for salvation, were the rituals of the Jewish law,**
4624 **starting with circumcision.** It wasn't that the
4625 apostles rejected God's law for human behavior;
4626 they rejected the continuation of ritual law as a
4627 requirement for salvation, as it had been done so
4628 far.

4629
4630 ***“¹ And certain men which came down from***
4631 ***Judaea taught the brethren, and said:***
4632 ***Except ye be circumcised after the manner***
4633 ***of Moses, ye cannot be saved. ² When***
4634 ***therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small***
4635 ***dissension and disputation with them, they***
4636 ***determined that Paul and Barnabas, and***
4637 ***certain other of them, should go up to***
4638 ***Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about***
4639 ***this question”.*** (Act 15:1-2)

4640
4641 ***“⁵ But there rose up certain of the sect of the***
4642 ***Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was***
4643 ***needful to circumcise them, and to command***
4644 ***them to keep the law of Moses. ⁶ And the***
4645 ***apostles and elders came together for to***
4646 ***consider of this matter”.*** (Act 15:5-6)

4647
4648 The yoke that Peter says that neither he nor their
4649 fathers could bear was the yoke of the ritual law.

4650 Add to that the enormous burden that the scribes
4651 and Pharisees had added to both the laws for human
4652 behavior and the ritual laws, as the Lord himself

4653 declared in Luke 11:46, and we can see why Peter
4654 said the yoke was unbearable.

4655

4656 *“And he said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers!*
4657 *For ye lade men with burdens grievous to be*
4658 *borne, and ye yourselves touch not the*
4659 *burdens with one of your fingers”.*

4660 (Lk 11:46)

4661

4662 **It is obvious that the yoke that the believers**
4663 **before Christ** could not bear was the yoke of the
4664 ritual law, and the impositions of the scribes and
4665 Pharisees, and not the Ten Commandments and
4666 other laws for human behavior that God had
4667 established.

4668

*

4669

4670

4671 **Summary of chapter 7.** The Twelve Apostles
4672 received Christ’s teachings directly. They had the
4673 authority given by the Lord Jesus Christ to explain
4674 the Christian doctrine, they were with Christ before
4675 and after the resurrection, and they received the
4676 Holy Spirit. **None of them ever said a thing** about
4677 suppressing God’s laws, about authorizing the
4678 eating of forbidden animals, or about changing
4679 Saturday for Sunday.

4680 **Saint Paul approved the apostles’ letter to the**
4681 **Gentiles.** It said that they should not eat blood or
4682 strangled animals. Therefore, each time you see that
4683 Paul **seems to say** that we can eat anything, you
4684 must search what it is he wants to say, because he is
4685 no going to scorn the apostolic letter, which he
4686 himself had approved, and especially a letter that
4687 had been backed by the Holy Spirit.

4688 In that same apostolic letter in Acts 15, it says that
4689 **the rest of the laws the Gentiles should learn,**
4690 **they should learn on Saturdays,** in the
4691 synagogues. It is obvious that the law was
4692 considered in effect, and that the Gentiles were
4693 expected to rest on Saturday. Note how these things
4694 are being said 20 years after the crucifixion.

4695 Every time that in a verse or passage Paul seems
4696 to say something against God's law, we can **always**
4697 verify, by reading the **entire** letter, that he referred
4698 to **circumcision and the ritual laws**. That is why it
4699 is a mistake to interpret that Paul says we can eat
4700 everything, since the apostolic letter that he himself
4701 approved, clearly said that certain things can't be
4702 eaten.

4703 John, who was one of Jesus' closest apostles, says
4704 that the transgression of the law is sin. Therefore, he
4705 knew that the law was still in effect, since it's
4706 impossible **to sin against a law that does not exist**.

4707 The same happens with James; when he
4708 encourages the brothers, **based on the law**, shows
4709 us how he considered God's law valid, as we see in
4710 James 2:8-12.

4711 The yoke that Peter said they were never able to
4712 bear was the ritual law, because of the many
4713 sacrifices and ceremonies they had to do, and the
4714 great distance from the Temple some of them lived,
4715 something we already saw.

4716
4717 ***

4718
4719
4720
4721

4722
4723
4724
4725
4726
4727
4728
4729
4730
4731
4732
4733
4734
4735
4736
4737
4738
4739
4740
4741
4742
4743
4744
4745
4746
4747
4748
4749
4750
4751
4752
4753
4754
4755

Chapter 8

Saint Paul never really said what many believe he did

Paul was not the Pope, nor did he ever pretend to be

Almost all the believers **want** a “pope”, someone who decides for them what they should believe, and someone who could be somewhat of a vice-Christ; and if they don’t have it, they fabricate it. So we have Catholicism, with their Roman Bishop; the Greek Orthodox, with their Athens Patriarch; the Russian Orthodox, with their Moscow Patriarch, Buddhists with the Dalai Lama, etc..

In the case of the Protestants, the great majority has made Paul into a “pope”. According to those who think that way, Paul can modify what God said, he can change God’s law, he can contradict the Holy Spirit, he can contradict what Jesus said, he can “modernize” God’s laws, etc.. In other words, **to them, only what Paul said is valid, even when the entire Bible says otherwise.** They proceed as Catholics do in regard to worshiping images authorized by popery.

Saint Paul never pretended to be taken and turned into a pope to contradict God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the twelve Apostles; but Christians, unwillingly have made him precisely that. **Paul is misinterpreted because they don’t read the entire Bible.** They don’t reason over what he said. They don’t compare his words with those of the rest of the apostles, who are as valuable as he. Most of all, they don’t compare them with what God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit have said.

In this chapter I will present some of Paul's passages that Christians misinterpret, due to which they blame the poor Apostle to the Gentiles, for the heresies, distortions and doctrinal errors they have fabricated. When they meet Paul in heaven they will be scolded by the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Because of Paul's special style of speaking, **the Holy Spirit found it suitable to inspire Peter to warn us** about the possibility of confusing what Paul was saying. We see this in 2 Peter 3:15-16. We will read this passage in the section after the next, in this chapter.

*

Careful how we understand what Paul said

The error and heresy of believing that God's law is obsolete and abolished is abetted most of the times by the **distortions and misinterpretations** of Saint Paul's words. Same happen with some other doctrinal errors. That's why it is convenient to include this section to show how Paul says things that confuse the superficial readers.

In this section we will see why we have to be careful with what Paul **seems** to say. We will also see various other passages where Paul **seems to** say things that actually, if we read carefully, **he did not say**.

Did God, or Christ, or the Holy Spirit, or any of the apostles warn the faithful to be careful not to confuse what Moses, Isaiah, David, Mark, Luke, Jeremiah, James, or any of the twelve apostles said? No; never has there been such warning about any Bible writer. Only about Paul did the Holy Spirit warn about the possibility that Christians would be

4791 confused reading his writings. The Holy Spirit did it
4792 through Peter, in his second letter, chapter 3:15-16.

4793 If the Holy Spirit, who was inspiring Peter, found
4794 it proper to warn us of that possibility, **we then**
4795 **must find it proper to analyze what Paul says,**
4796 **when it goes against the fiber of what the other**
4797 **apostles say, and with the rest of the Bible in**
4798 **general.** Remember, Paul is not the “Pope”.

4799 Let’s analyze some of the passages where Paul
4800 seems to say things that clearly we know he would
4801 be incapable of saying, but does so in a hyperbolic
4802 or rhetorical manner, with the intent of digging deep
4803 into the mind of the Christians with his teachings.

4804 Some other times he said things in a very
4805 condensed way, and even **some times what he said**
4806 **seemed like a lie, like when he seems to insist** that
4807 the only one who went into the Holiest of all, was
4808 the high priest, and only once a year, which is false,
4809 since others went in, and they did every day.

4810 Equally we will see that **Paul never said** that the
4811 laws for human behavior established by God,
4812 including the Ten Commandments, were abolished.
4813 Let’s see.

4814 *

4815
4816
4817 **They entered the Holiest of all every day, not**
4818 **once a year, as Paul seems to say**

4819 In II Peter 3:15-16 the Apostle Peter, as inspired
4820 as any other Bible writer, warns us against the
4821 possibility of confusing what Paul says. He informs
4822 us, among other things, that **some of the things**
4823 **Paul says might be difficult to understand,** which
4824 the unlearned and unstable twist.

4825

*“¹⁵ And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother **Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you;** ¹⁶ as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; **in which are some things hard to be understood,** which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction”*

(II Pet 3:15-16)

In Hebrews 9:1-7 there is a good example of these things that Paul seems to say, and are not true. It's from this passage of Paul that several theologians and seminary teachers, all of whom are good Christians and acting in good faith, confuse what is said, in the sense that entrance to the Holiest of all was limited to once a year.

These mistakes, though in good faith, are still mistakes, and still cause harm. They teach others that entrance was once a year, thus confusing future pastors who learn from them, and who think that their teachers cannot make mistakes. That is how doctrinal errors are spread, forming the thousands of sects that now exist.

That is the problem with reading only certain parts of the Bible, with the partial or total exclusion of others, while reading tons of books “about” the Bible or about the faith. They don’t realize that by reading such books without an analytical spirit or without having read **the entire Bible several times**, they risk being contaminated with the error on which the author has fallen. Some other times the confusion originates by reading only one part of the Bible and not the other; in this case

4861 they read the New Testament and not the Old
4862 Testament. Paul says in Hebrews 9:1-7:

4863

4864 *“¹ Then verily the first covenant had also*
4865 *ordinances of divine service, and a worldly*
4866 *sanctuary. ² For there was a tabernacle*
4867 *made; the first, wherein was the candlestick,*
4868 *and the table, and the shewbread; which is*
4869 *called the sanctuary. ³ And after the second*
4870 *veil, the tabernacle which is called the*
4871 *Holiest of all; ⁴ Which had the golden*
4872 *censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid*
4873 *round about with gold, wherein was the*
4874 *golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod*
4875 *that budded, and the tables of the covenant; ⁵*
4876 *and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing*
4877 *the mercy seat; of which we cannot now speak*
4878 *particularly. ⁶ Now when these things were*
4879 *thus ordained, the priests went always into*
4880 *the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service*
4881 *of God. ⁷ But into the second went the high*
4882 *priest alone once every year, not without*
4883 *blood, which he offered for himself, and for*
4884 *the errors of the people” (Heb 9:1-7)*
4885

4886 As we can see in verse 3, the section that was
4887 behind the second veil was called the Holiest of all.
4888 According to verse 4, there were two things there:
4889 **the golden censer and the Ark of the Covenant.**
4890 In other words, that anyone wanting to put perfume
4891 on the golden censer had to come into the Holiest of
4892 all.

4893 Indeed it is true that the high priest went into the
4894 Holiest of all only once a year **to make the**
4895 **atonement** for all the people and purify the
4896 **unrighteousness of the people, the tabernacle, the**

4897 **altar, etc..** He did that by sending the male goat to
4898 Azazel. **I repeat, while it is true that this was a**
4899 **once-a-year ritual, it is not true that no one went**
4900 **into the Holiest of all until the following year, for**
4901 **they went in every day, at least twice a day.**

4902 In the Hebrews passage what Paul is saying in a
4903 very condensed way is that, **taking blood in**, to put
4904 it on the horns of the golden censer and do the ritual
4905 mentioned, was only a once-a-year event. However
4906 he doesn't say that they could only enter on the day
4907 they took the blood, for they **went in every day to**
4908 **burn incense**, as I will prove next. Let's see
4909 Exodus 30:1-10.

4910
4911 *“¹ And thou shalt make **an altar to burn***
4912 ***incense** upon; of shittim wood shalt thou*
4913 *make it. ² A cubit shall be the length thereof,*
4914 *and a cubit the breadth thereof; foursquare*
4915 *shall it be; and two cubits shall be the height*
4916 *thereof; the horns thereof shall be of the*
4917 *same. ³ And thou shalt overlay it with pure*
4918 *gold, the top thereof, and the sides thereof*
4919 *round about, and the horns thereof; and thou*
4920 *shalt make unto it a crown of gold round*
4921 *about. ⁴ And two golden rings shalt thou make*
4922 *to it under the crown of it, by the two corners*
4923 *thereof, upon the two sides of it shalt thou*
4924 *make it; and they shall be for places for the*
4925 *staves to bear it withal. ⁵ And thou shalt make*
4926 *the staves of shittim wood, and overlay them*
4927 *with gold. ⁶ **And thou shalt put it before the***
4928 ***vail that is by the ark of the testimony,** before*
4929 ***the mercy seat that is over the testimony,***
4930 *where I will meet with thee. ⁷ **And Aaron***
4931 ***shall burn thereon sweet incense every***
4932 ***morning,** when he dresseth the lamps, he*

4933 *shall burn incense upon it. 8 And when*
 4934 *Aaron lighteth the lamps at even, he shall*
 4935 *burn incense upon it, a perpetual incense*
 4936 *before the LORD throughout your*
 4937 *generations. 9 Ye shall offer no strange*
 4938 *incense thereon, nor burnt sacrifice, nor meat*
 4939 *offering; neither shall ye pour drink offering*
 4940 *thereon. 10 And Aaron shall make an*
 4941 *atonement upon the horns of it once in a*
 4942 *year with the blood of the sin offering of*
 4943 *atonements; once in the year shall he make*
 4944 *atonement upon it throughout your*
 4945 *generations; it is most holy unto the LORD”.*
 4946 (Ex 30:1-10)

4947
 4948 When we read verse one we see that **it is talking**
 4949 **about the altar of incense**, something we must
 4950 keep in mind so not to get confused later. Verse two
 4951 says that this altar had horns, and its measurements
 4952 were one cubit long by one cubit wide by two cubits
 4953 high. Verse three says they made a crown around it,
 4954 that it had a “ceiling” and walls, and that it was all
 4955 covered with pure gold. In verses four and five it is
 4956 explained that they put golden rings to carry it with
 4957 golden rods. **Verse six says where they would**
 4958 **place it: before the veil by the ark of the**
 4959 **testimony. In other words, next to the ark which**
 4960 **was inside the Holy of Holies.** Verses seven and
 4961 eight say which would be its most frequent use:

4962
 4963 “7 And Aaron shall burn thereon sweet incense
 4964 every morning, when he dresseth the lamps, he
 4965 shall burn incense upon it. 8 And when Aaron
 4966 lighteth the lamps at even, he shall burn incense
 4967 upon it, a perpetual incense before the LORD
 4968 throughout your generations”.. (Ex 30:7-8)

4969

4970

4971

4972

4973

4974

4975

4976

4977

4978

4979

4980

4981

4982

4983

4984

4985

4986

4987

4988

4989

4990

4991

4992

4993

4994

4995

4996

4997

4998

4999

5000

5001

5002

5003

5004

When we analyze this passage we see that **Aaron went in daily where the altar of incense was**, to burn the “sweet incense”, and **that he did at morning and at even**. Verse nine lists other things that could **not** be done on that altar of incense. Finally in verse ten it explains how, **as an exception to the prohibitions of verse nine, Aaron would come in to place the blood of atonement only once a year**. Let’s read verse ten:

*“And Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of it **once in a year** with the blood of the sin offering of atonements; **once in the year** shall he make atonement upon it throughout your generations; it is most holy unto the LORD”.* (Ex 30:10)

As we can see, the same passage where the building and use of the altar is described, and where it says that he could go in **only once a year**, also says that **Aaron went in twice a day to burn incense**. However, millions of Christians think that Paul was saying that the high priest could only go into the Holy of Holies once a year.

Paul is not saying that; **it seems he does** because he talks in concise form, without details, summarizing. The same happens with those who think they see in Paul’s writings the abolition of Saturday, the diet of the believer, and in general, the law of God. That is why we can’t be Saintpaulians, but Christians. When what Paul says goes against what another Bible writer says, it is time to analyze them both, not just agree with Paul by default.

There are other passages that show that they went into the Holy of Holies every day, but to be

5005 brief, I only bring this one here. If anyone is
5006 interested in looking at the rest, go to **Appendix**
5007 **“A”** on page 439.

5008 *

5009

5010

5011 **Saint Paul was well aware that it was difficult for**
5012 **some to understand him**

5013 In the next verse Paul says that people
5014 misunderstood him. Some because of his
5015 philosophical way of talking which was a bit
5016 difficult for those who did not have his same
5017 intellectual level; others would pretend to
5018 misunderstand him **in order to have a “doctrinal**
5019 **basis” for their own lusts.**

5020

5021 *“And not rather, (as we be slanderously*
5022 *reported, and as some affirm that we say,)*
5023 *Let us do evil, that good may come? whose*
5024 *damnation is just”.* (Ro 3:8)

5025

5026 Be it for one reason or another, the truth is that, as
5027 Peter said, **Paul wrote in manner that was**
5028 **difficult to understand.** This tells us to be careful
5029 with what Paul **seems** to say, if it seems to be in
5030 contrast with the rest of the Bible.

5031 *

5032

5033

5034 **Paul seems to say that he had been blameless**
5035 **when it came to God’s law, which is not true**

5036 There are many Christians who do not understand
5037 correctly what Paul said in Philippians 3:4-6, so
5038 they believe he was a perfect man before he became
5039 a Christian. This is one of the times where the
5040 brothers can see the difficult way of talking of the

5041 Apostle to the Gentiles. When what Paul says seems
5042 to go against what the rest of the Bible says, we
5043 need to find its logic and not believe blindly and
5044 without due analysis what he says. In Philippians
5045 3:3-6 Saint Paul says something **that cannot be**
5046 **true:** that he was blameless.

5047
5048 *“⁴ Though I might also have confidence in*
5049 *the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he*
5050 *hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, **I***
5051 ***more:** ⁵ Circumcised the eighth day, of the*
5052 *stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an*
5053 *Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law,*
5054 *a Pharisee; ⁶ Concerning zeal, persecuting*
5055 *the church; touching the righteousness*
5056 *which is in the law, blameless”.*

5057 (Phil 3:4-6)

5058
5059 If we were to interpret what Paul says without
5060 analyzing it, we could reach the false conclusion
5061 that Paul was faithfully obedient of all of God’s
5062 law, and therefore was irreprehensible. This would
5063 happen if we don’t realize that what Paul says here
5064 goes against what the Bible says in other passages.
5065 The Bible says that there has been none righteous,
5066 not one; therefore, Paul can’t say he was blameless.
5067 **We need to understand one of two things, either**
5068 **Paul is lying or we have to look for what it is he**
5069 **wants to say with the word “law”.**

5070 He says that as to the justice that is in the law, he
5071 was **blameless**. Evidently, Paul was not going to
5072 lie; therefore, he is talking about the ritual law, of
5073 which he was blameless, because as a Pharisee he
5074 would make every effort to comply with all the
5075 rites, traditions and ceremonies, besides tithing the
5076 rue, the dill, the cumin, the mint, etc..

5077 We need to only slightly reason to realize that
5078 Paul cannot be talking about God's law regarding
5079 human behavior, because in the same passage he
5080 confesses to being a persecutor of the church, like
5081 most Pharisees. They **murdered** Christians without
5082 a previous trial, or with rigged trials, and **that is not**
5083 **obeying the law of God.** They **brought in false**
5084 **witnesses,** as we can see in Acts 6:13-14 in
5085 Stephen's case and that is against God's law for
5086 human behavior.

5087 Paul himself confesses in Acts 26:10-11 that he
5088 **forced some prisoners to blaspheme.** A man that
5089 acted as such could not be a faithful follower of
5090 God's laws for human behavior, but **merely a**
5091 **faithful follower of the ritual law.** Thus when Paul
5092 speaks, and in such it seems to contradict what the
5093 rest of the Bible says, we have to analyze what he
5094 says. That is the problem with the brothers who
5095 misunderstand Paul, attributing to him the abolition
5096 of God's law.

5097
5098 *“¹³ And set up false witnesses, which said:*
5099 *This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous*
5100 *words against this holy place, and the law; ¹⁴*
5101 *for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of*
5102 *Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall*
5103 *change the customs which Moses delivered*
5104 *us”.* (Act 6:13-14)

5105
5106 *“¹⁰ Which thing I also did in Jerusalem; and*
5107 *many of the saints did I shut up in prison,*
5108 *having received authority from the chief*
5109 *priests; and when they were put to death, I*
5110 *gave my voice against them. ¹¹ And I*
5111 *punished them oft in every synagogue, and*
5112 *compelled them to blaspheme; and being*

5113 *exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted*
5114 *them even unto strange cities”.*

5115 (Act 26:10-11)

5116

5117 *“This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all*
5118 *acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the*
5119 *world to save sinners; of whom I am chief”.*

5120 (I Tim 1:15)

5121

5122 In this last passage Paul himself confesses that he
5123 is the first sinner; therefore, when he said **that**
5124 **touching the righteousness which is in the law he**
5125 **was blameless and irrepressible, he could not be**
5126 **referring to God’s law for human behavior, but**
5127 **to the ritual law.** Not only do we deduce that Paul
5128 cannot be referring to behavioral law, but he
5129 himself confesses that **what he was a faithfully**
5130 **follower of was the traditions.** Let’s see.

5131

5132 *“¹³ For ye have heard of my conversation in*
5133 *time past in the Jews' religion, how that*
5134 *beyond measure **I persecuted the church of***
5135 ***God, and wasted it;** ¹⁴ and profited in the*
5136 *Jews' religion above many my equals in mine*
5137 *own nation, **being more exceedingly zealous***
5138 ***of the traditions of my fathers**”.*

5139 (Ga 1:13-14)

5140

5141 It is clear in this passage, Paul persecuted God’s
5142 church and destroyed it; **these are not the qualities**
5143 **of a man that is blameless in God’s laws for**
5144 **human behavior.**

5145 Paul makes it clear that he was the most fanatic to
5146 the traditions. It is those traditions and the ritual
5147 laws that he is referring to when he says that the law
5148 is obsolete, not the behavior laws. We have to be

5149 very careful when we understand that Paul is saying
5150 something that is not in agreement with the rest of
5151 the Bible. In this case we can see that most of the
5152 times, the word “law”, in Paul’s mouth, means the
5153 ritual laws.

5154 *

5155
5156
5157 **Paul seems to say that if we did away with money**
5158 **there would be no evil**

5159 I’ll give you another example to prove that we
5160 must be careful in taking what Paul says at face
5161 value, if what he says contradicts the rest of the
5162 Bible or Christian reasoning.

5163 If we are going to limit ourselves to one verse
5164 because “Paul said so”, we will reach very foolish
5165 conclusions. As I always say, what Paul says has to
5166 be read in the context of the rest of the Bible, not
5167 against the rest of the Holy Scriptures.

5168
5169 *“For the love of money is the root of all evil;*
5170 *which while some coveted after, they have*
5171 *erred from the faith, and pierced themselves*
5172 *through with many sorrows”. (I Tim 6:10)*
5173

5174 If we were foolish enough to take what Paul says
5175 in contrast to the rest of the Bible, we would have to
5176 erroneously conclude here that **all evil originates**
5177 **out of the love of money.** If that were so, the
5178 savage tribes that don’t use money would not suffer
5179 any evil. Indeed, to fix the world, all we’d need to
5180 do would be to do away with money. Easy, right?

5181 **So we ask, what about fornication adultery,**
5182 **rage, idolatry, envy, pride, etc..** Is their origin
5183 always the love of money? What about the evil that
5184 originated in heaven with the rebellion of the

5185 angels? Did they originate out of the love of
5186 money? Did they use money in heaven?

5187 As we can see we must be very careful with what
5188 Paul says, and understand that he speaks in
5189 **hyperbole**, as would any of us. We cannot take
5190 every phrase at face value, as when God speaks. We
5191 also say things like that without expecting to be
5192 taken literally, for example: “A million thanks;”
5193 “He was kicked 40 times;” “His only problem is
5194 the booze;” etc.. We don’t thank anyone a million
5195 times, no one kicks another more than three or four
5196 times, and that man’s only problem is not the booze,
5197 he has many more problems.

5198 *

5199
5200
5201 **Paul would rather go to Hell and be eternally**
5202 **separated from God for his countrymen to be**
5203 **saved**

5204 Let’s see another example of the many
5205 exaggerations (hyperboles) that Paul uses in his
5206 writings, in his zeal to imprint, to go deep into the
5207 soul of his readers. The letter to the Romans is full
5208 of statements that are extremely controversial, that
5209 one only accepts because of who said them.

5210 The fact that a statement is registered in the Bible
5211 doesn’t guarantee that the statement is correct. What
5212 David did with Uriah is not anyone’s normal
5213 behavior. What Solomon did is not always
5214 something to emulate; although what he says in
5215 Proverbs is. What I want to say is that not
5216 everything that the Bible characters said is
5217 necessarily correct. Let’s see.

5218
5219 *“¹ I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my*
5220 *conscience also bearing me witness in the*

5221 *Holy Ghost,* ² *that I have great heaviness*
5222 *and continual sorrow in my heart.* ³ ***For I***
5223 ***could wish that myself were accursed from***
5224 ***Christ*** *for my brethren, my kinsmen according*
5225 *to the flesh”* (Ro 9:1-3)

5226
5227 This is one of the worst hyperboles of the Apostle
5228 to the Gentiles. What Paul says in this passage
5229 borders heresy; **it is almost equivalent to rejecting**
5230 **the only salvation offered,** in favor of some
5231 kinsmen that don’t want to see the truth, much less
5232 believe it.

5233 What Paul says here means that he would want to
5234 be pushed away from Christ, if that would mean his
5235 kinsmen and brethren would convert to Christianity.
5236 In other words, he would rather be eradicated from
5237 the presence of God, never to see Him again or have
5238 fellowship with God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, if,
5239 through that horrendous sacrifice he could obtain
5240 the conversion of his kinsmen.

5241 I really don’t think that Paul actually meant what
5242 he said. I think this is one of his greatest hyperboles.
5243 This is one of those many things he says that cannot
5244 be taken literally and we have to try to understand.

5245 If we analyze what Paul said, it is like affirming
5246 that he loved his kinsmen more than God, Christ
5247 and the Holy Spirit together, and so he was willing
5248 to deny himself the blessing of God’s presence so
5249 he could give it to them. That would be, I repeat, (if
5250 we were to believe it, and I don’t believe it) that
5251 Paul loved his kinsmen more than God, Christ and
5252 the Holy Spirit, and would even prefer to go to Hell
5253 and not Heaven, so that his kinsmen could go to
5254 Heaven.

5255 So what is the alternative? To realize that Paul
5256 speaks in hyperbole and that **we have to be very**

5257 **careful with what he says**, if that contradicts other
5258 concepts we receive from the rest of the Bible. We
5259 will compare what he said in the previous passage
5260 with what he says in the letter to the Hebrews, in
5261 which he realized that there is no going back for
5262 anyone who rejects the salvation offered by Christ.
5263

5264 ***“How shall we escape, if we neglect so great***
5265 ***salvation; which at the first began to be***
5266 ***spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto***
5267 ***us by them that heard him”.*** (Heb 2:3)

5268
5269 ***“⁴ For it is impossible for those who were***
5270 ***once enlightened, and have tasted of the***
5271 ***heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the***
5272 ***Holy Ghost, ⁵ and have tasted the good word***
5273 ***of God, and the powers of the world to come,***
5274 ***⁶ if they shall fall away, to renew them again***
5275 ***unto repentance; seeing they crucify to***
5276 ***themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him***
5277 ***to an open shame”.*** (Heb 6:4-6)

5278
5279 ***“Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye,***
5280 ***shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden***
5281 ***under foot the Son of God, and hath counted***
5282 ***the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was***
5283 ***sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done***
5284 ***despite unto the Spirit of grace?”*** (Hb 10:29)

5285
5286 For me this is the most controversial of all the
5287 controversial statements that Paul makes in the
5288 letter to the Romans and in all his letters. This
5289 should serve us as a guide to understand Paul when
5290 he speaks. To me it is senseless that a mature
5291 Christian who has read the Bible many times, and
5292 has it in his heart and in his mind, would go and

5293 form doctrines with this or that verse of Paul. That
5294 lends itself to error if he doesn't have an integral
5295 balanced vision of the Bible and its mentors. Paul
5296 had as much authority as Peter, Jacob, Luke, John,
5297 Moses or Isaiah.

5298 To have a narrow partial vision of the Bible and to
5299 suffer from Saintpaulianism, leads to too many
5300 good faith errors, that though are good faith errors
5301 nevertheless they are still errors, and though good
5302 faith errors, still make us feel their harmful effects.
5303 That would be equal to go up to a high building
5304 wall and in good faith, take a false step.

5305 **No one take what I just said as a pretext** to
5306 underestimate what the great Apostle Paul says; but
5307 rather as a reason to analyze properly those things
5308 that he says and are apparently contradictory. One
5309 of this contradictory things is the supposed abolition
5310 of God's laws for human behavior.

5311 *

5312

5313

5314 **Is Paul saying he had to provide the afflictions**
5315 **Jesus missed to get our salvation?**

5316 Perhaps due to his great intellectual capacity, Paul
5317 often speaks in hyperbole and figures of speech, for
5318 which he is misunderstood by those who only pay
5319 attention to what Paul says and don't take into
5320 consideration the rest of the Bible. If we would go
5321 only by what Paul says in this verse, we would have
5322 to believe that the great Apostle to the Gentiles is
5323 telling us that Jesus' afflictions for our salvation
5324 were incomplete, and they are now being
5325 supplemented by Paul in order to complete the
5326 Lord's redemptive work. This is what he seems to
5327 say, not what he really wants to say.

5328

5329 *“Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you,*
5330 *and fill up that which is behind of the*
5331 *afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's*
5332 *sake, which is the church”* (Col 1:24)

5333

5334 **We all know that Paul is incapable of saying**
5335 **such blasphemy, but that is what he wrote.** Or, at
5336 least what we think he says. That is why when Paul
5337 makes controversial statements that go dead against
5338 what the other apostles said, who were just as
5339 inspired as him, we should try to realize what it is
5340 that Paul is trying to say. Most of the times these
5341 misunderstandings arise from figures of speech he
5342 uses, or from hyperboles with which he wants to
5343 make a certain point. We must remember the
5344 warning that the Holy Spirit made through Peter in
5345 reference to Paul's complicated way of talking.

5346 **The Apostle seems to say here that Christ's**
5347 **sacrifice was missing some afflictions, which**
5348 **Paul later fulfills.** It is ridiculous to believe that
5349 Paul is really saying that, that is why we must
5350 understand him, and for that we must compare what
5351 he says to what the other Bible authors say, and to
5352 what Paul himself says in other passages. Just as it
5353 was with the case of the idol offerings in I
5354 Corinthians 8:4-13, and in the case of believing that
5355 Paul considered that God's laws for human
5356 behavior were obsolete.

5357

*

5358

5359

5360 **Paul seems to say that in order to be saved, a**
5361 **woman must, in addition to believing in Christ,**
5362 **give birth and raise children**

5363 If we were to go solely with what Paul says, and
5364 we did not have an integral vision of Scripture and

5365 Bible doctrine, we would be making a mistake
5366 when we read that in order to be saved a woman
5367 must bear and raise children in addition to believing
5368 in Christ and remaining faithful. If that were the
5369 case, the sterile women, the single women, or those
5370 who die before bearing children could not be saved.
5371

5372 *“Notwithstanding **she shall be saved in***
5373 ***childbearing**, if they continue in faith and*
5374 *charity and holiness with sobriety”.*

(I Tim 2:15)

5376
5377 **This serves to remind us that what Paul says**
5378 **needs to be taken carefully** due to his peculiar way
5379 of talking, and we need to exercise the same care
5380 when we believe that Paul considers God’s law
5381 obsolete.

5382 *

5383
5384

5385 **Paul seems to say that all men get saved**

5386 The Apostle Paul had a very complicated and
5387 confusing way of talking. This should be taken into
5388 account by those who attempt to form a doctrine
5389 from Paul’s teaching using isolated verses.
5390 Especially those who want to attribute to him the
5391 abolition of the law, in spite of Christ’s warning
5392 against it in Mathew 5:17-19, and those who want
5393 to form doctrines that go against what was said by
5394 other apostles and prophets, and even the Lord
5395 Jesus Christ himself.

5396

5397 *“For therefore we both labour and suffer*
5398 *reproach, because we trust in the living God,*
5399 *who is the Saviour of **all men, specially of***
5400 ***those that believe**”.*

(I Tim 4:10)

5401

5402

5403

5404

5405

5406

5407

5408

5409

If we are going to take literally what Paul says in this verse, without taking into consideration the rest of Scripture, in other words, if instead of Christians we would become Saintpaulians, we would have to understand that God will save everyone, but more so those who believe. In light of the rest of the Bible, in light of what other apostles say, this is absurd.

5410

5411

5412

5413

5414

5415

5416

5417

Let's be careful, then, not to destroy what was established by God, based on supposed mandates of Paul to the contrary. By destroying the integral doctrines of the Bible, based on one dark passage of Paul we can make a big mistake, and sin greatly; something we will deeply regret when, once in the Kingdom of God we see that we could have made it better and did not.

5418

5419

5420

5421

5422

5423

5424

5425

I could give many more examples, but I will not bore the mind of the reader with just this subject, and I don't want to make this chapter any longer. So I will add the other examples of Paul's controversial passages in **Appendix "B"** on page 441, where we will see how the apostle seems to say things that in every light is not what he wanted to say. Anyone who wants to can read them there.

5426

*

5427

5428

5429

Different meanings of the term "law"

5430

5431

5432

5433

5434

5435

5436

It is important to know the meanings that the Bible gives to the word "law", because depending on the meaning on any given passage, we need to interpret what it says.

The Bible calls "law" several things that are not the law for human behavior. For us, a law is that which has been written and contain a certain

5437 norm to follow, be it rituals and ceremonies, or
5438 behavioral norms. However, we see from Bible
5439 experience, especially in the New Testament, “law”
5440 is not only the behavioral laws, per se, but also the
5441 Moses’ stone slates, a roll, the Ten Commandments,
5442 the Scriptures as a whole, one section of the
5443 Scriptures, the Psalms, the ritual laws, and any other
5444 thing that might escape me. Let’ see.
5445

5446

5447 **Where are called “law”, the behavioral norms:**

5448

5449 *“This is **the law** of the beasts, and of the*
5450 *fowl, and of every living creature that moveth*
5451 *in the waters, and of every creature that*
5452 *creepeth upon the Earth” (Lev 11:46)*

5453

5454 *“These are **the statutes and judgments and***
5455 ***laws**, which the LORD made between him and*
5456 *the children of Israel in mount Sinai by the*
5457 *hand of Moses”.* (Lev 26:46)

5458

5459 *“Then the congregation shall judge between*
5460 *the slayer and the revenger of blood*
5461 ***according to these judgments**”*
5462 *(Nm 35:24)*

5463

5464 *“And what nation is there so great, that hath*
5465 *statutes and judgments so righteous **as all this***
5466 ***law, which I set before you this day?**”*
5467 *(Dt 4:8)*

5468

5469 *“According to the sentence of the **law** which*
5470 *they shall teach thee, and according to the*
5471 *judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt*
5472 *do; thou shalt not decline from the sentence*

5473 *which they shall shew thee, to the right hand,*
5474 *nor to the left”.* (Dt 17:11)

5475

5476

5477

5478

5479 **Where is a parchment called “law?”**

5480

5481 *“And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the*
5482 *throne of his kingdom, that **he shall write him***
5483 ***a copy of this law** in a book out of that which*
5484 *is before the priests the Levites”*

5485 (Dt 17:18)

5486

5487

5488

5489 **¿Where are the Ten Commandments called**
5490 **“law?”**

5491

5492 *“And the LORD said unto Moses: Come up*
5493 *to me into the mount, and be there; and **I will***
5494 ***give thee tables of stone, and a law, and***
5495 ***commandments** which **I have written**; that*
5496 *thou mayest teach them”.* (Ex 24:12)

5497

5498

5499

5500

5501

5502

5503 **Where is the Scripture as a whole called**
5504 **“law?”**

5505

5506 *“And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon*
5507 *thine hand, and for a memorial between thine*
5508 *eyes, **that the LORD'S law** may be in thy*

5509 ***mouth, for with a strong hand hath the LORD***
5510 ***brought thee out of Egypt”.*** (Ex 13:9)

5511

5512 *“Then said the LORD unto Moses: Behold, I*
5513 *will rain bread from heaven for you; and the*
5514 *people shall go out and gather a certain rate*
5515 *every day, that I may prove them, **whether***
5516 ***they will walk in my law, or no”.*** (Ex 16:4)

5517

5518 *“Also every sickness, and every plague,*
5519 *which is not written in **the book of this law**,*
5520 *them will the LORD bring upon thee, until*
5521 *thou be destroyed”.* (Dt 28:61)

5522

5523 *“¹ Blessed is the man that walketh not in the*
5524 *counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the*
5525 *way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the*
5526 *scornful. ² But his delight is in **the law** of the*
5527 ***LORD**; and in his law doth he meditate day*
5528 *and night”.* (Psa 1:1-2)

5529

5530

5531 **Where is a section of the Scripture called “law”**
5532 **since he divides it into two, the law and the**
5533 **prophets?**

5534

5535 *“Think not that I am come to destroy **the law,***
5536 ***or the prophets**; I am not come to destroy, but*
5537 *to fulfil”.* (Mt 5:17)

5538

5539 *“Therefore all things whatsoever ye would*
5540 *that men should do to you, do ye even so to*
5541 *them, for this is **the law and the prophets**”.*
5542 *(Mt 7:12)*

5543

5544

5545 **Where are the Psalms and the prophecies**
5546 **called “law?”**

5547
5548 *“Jesus answered them: Is it not written **in***
5549 ***your law, I said, Ye are gods?** (Jn 10:34)*

5550
5551 *“I have said, **Ye are gods**; and all of you are*
5552 ***children of the most High**”. (Psa 82:6)*

5553
5554 *“But this cometh to pass, that the word might*
5555 ***be fulfilled that is written in their law: They***
5556 ***hated me without a cause**”. (Jn 15:25)*

5557
5558 *“**They that hate me without a cause** are*
5559 ***more than the hairs of mine head; they that***
5560 ***would destroy me, being mine enemies***
5561 ***wrongfully, are mighty; then I restored that***
5562 ***which I took not away**” (Psa 69:4)*

5563
5564
5565 *“The people answered him: **We have heard***
5566 ***out of the law** that Christ abideth for ever,*
5567 ***and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be***
5568 ***lifted up? who is this Son of man?”***
5569 *(Jn 12:34)*

5570
5571 *“Of the increase of his government and*
5572 ***peace there shall be no end**, upon the throne*
5573 ***of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it,***
5574 ***and to establish it with judgment and with***
5575 ***justice from henceforth even for ever. The***
5576 ***zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this**”.*
5577 *(Isa 9:7)*

5578
5579
5580

5581 **Where are the rituals and sacrifices called**
5582 **“law?”**

5583

5584 (Ex 12:49 talking about the Passover; Lv 6:9 the
5585 burnt offerings; Lv 6:14 the meat offerings; Lv
5586 6:25 y 7:1 about the sin offerings; Nm 6:13 talks
5587 about the nazirite; Mt 12:5; Lk 2:22-24; Eph 2:15).

5588

5589 *“One **law** shall be to him that is homeborn,*
5590 *and unto the stranger that sojourneth among*
5591 *you”.* (Ex 12:49)

5592

5593 *“Command Aaron and his sons, saying: **This***
5594 *is the **law** of the burnt offering: It is the*
5595 *burnt offering, because of the burning upon*
5596 *the altar all night unto the morning, and the*
5597 *fire of the altar shall be burning in it”.*
5598 (Lv 6:9)

5599

5600 *“And **this is the law** of the meat offering: the*
5601 *sons of Aaron shall offer it before the LORD,*
5602 *before the altar”.* (Lv 6:14)

5603

5604 *“Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, saying,*
5605 ***This is the law of the sin offering:** In the*
5606 *place where the burnt offering is killed shall*
5607 *the sin offering be killed before the LORD: it*
5608 *is most holy”.* (Lv 6:25)

5609

5610 *“Likewise **this is the law** of the trespass*
5611 *offering; it is most holy”.* (Lv 7:1)

5612

5613 *“And **this is the law of the Nazirite**, when*
5614 *the days of his separation are fulfilled,: he*
5615 *shall be brought unto the door of the*
5616 *tabernacle of the congregation”* (Nm 6:13)

5617
5618 *“Or have ye not read in the law, how that on*
5619 *the Sabbath days the priests in the Temple*
5620 *profane the Sabbath, and are blameless?”*

(Mt 12:5)

5622
5623 *“²² And when the days of her purification*
5624 *according to the law of Moses were*
5625 *accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem,*
5626 *to present him to the Lord; ²³ (As it is written*
5627 *in the law of the Lord, Every male that*
5628 *openeth the womb shall be called holy to the*
5629 *Lord;)²⁴ And to offer a sacrifice according to*
5630 *that which is said in the law of the Lord; A*
5631 *pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons”.*

(Lk 2:22-24)

5633
5634
5635

5636 **Paul also calls the rituals “law”.**

5637
5638 *“Having abolished in his flesh the enmity,*
5639 *even the law of commandments contained in*
5640 *ordinances; for to make in himself of twain*
5641 *one new man, so making peace”*

(Eph 2:15)

5643
5644 *“And almost all things **are by the law purged***
5645 ***with blood**; and without shedding of blood is*
5646 *no remission”.* (Heb 9:22)

5647
5648 *“For the law having a shadow of good*
5649 *things to come, and not the very image of the*
5650 *things, can never with **those sacrifices** which*
5651 *they offered year by year continually make the*
5652 *comers thereunto perfect”.* (Heb 10:1)

5653
5654
5655
5656
5657
5658
5659
5660
5661
5662
5663
5664
5665
5666
5667
5668
5669
5670
5671
5672
5673
5674
5675
5676
5677
5678
5679
5680
5681
5682
5683
5684
5685
5686
5687
5688

In this next case we see that Paul calls the book of Isaiah “law”. Let’s see.

“In the law it is written: With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord”.

(I Co 14:21)

“For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people”.

(Isa 28:11)

As we can see, in the New Testament the word “law” is used for several things. Therefore, when we see in the New Testament the word “law” to say that it is obsolete, we need to analyze whether it refers to the behavioral norms, the rituals, or what.

*

In the book of Galatians Paul only talks about the ritual laws, not the behavioral laws

Many Christians believe that the book of Galatians is the one that most clearly tells about God’s law for human behavior being obsolete, but that is not so. On the contrary, it **very clearly says that what was abolished were the rituals and ceremonies law.**

The Bible does not contradict itself, because God is not one of confusion, but of light and harmony. What he said before he will not contradict later. What was bad six millenniums ago was still bad

5689 three millenniums ago, was bad a millennium ago,
5690 and even a century ago, and is today, it will be a
5691 year from now, and so on.

5692 **In the book of Galatians Paul does not say that**
5693 **God's law for human behavior is obsolete or**
5694 **lacks value. In the epistle to the Galatians Paul is**
5695 **talking about the ritual law only, which he**
5696 **considers obsolete and rightly so, because the**
5697 **symbolisms that those rituals showed were not**
5698 **necessary any more since what was being**
5699 **symbolized has already happened. Why sacrifice**
5700 **lambs in the Temple if the true Lamb of God has**
5701 **already been sacrificed for our sins? In this epistle**
5702 **Paul talks against those who wanted to**
5703 **circumcise the Galatians and wanted them to**
5704 **keep the ritual feasts, as a condition for**
5705 **salvation.**

5706 Paul was not even against anyone voluntarily
5707 keeping the rituals, but **never** as a condition for
5708 salvation. **Paul himself kept some rituals** when he
5709 considered it beneficial to the work, as we'll see
5710 later on, but **he never did it as a conditional to**
5711 **salvation.**

5712 In spite of the clarity that the book of Galatians
5713 shows about the suppression of **only the ritual law**,
5714 many are the Christians who erroneously believe
5715 that the book talks about the suppression of God's
5716 laws for human behavior, including the Ten
5717 Commandments.

5718

5719

5720 **The error of many Christians has one or more of**
5721 **these origins:**

5722

5723 **a) The almost complete ignorance of the Bible.**
5724 They all take their Bible to church, to see if what

5725 the pastor reads is true; as if the pastor were to lie to
5726 them. However, they never turn off the television
5727 set to read the Bible alone, without being taken by
5728 the hand in their study of God's doctrines.

5729

5730 **b) The lack of an integral and coherent vision**
5731 **of Scriptures**, due to the fact that they read a
5732 passage here and a verse there, and never read the
5733 Bible in order from Genesis to Revelation. These
5734 brothers usually jump over "what they don't like"
5735 and what they consider "not important".

5736

5737 **c) The fact that they study using rigged**
5738 **"courses"** on the Bible, or on sectarian doctrines,
5739 prepared by the special interests of the sectors,
5740 whether religious or political. Many of these
5741 "courses" twist the biblical truth to their own liking,
5742 resting on the proven psychological truth that states
5743 that **it is harder for human beings to unlearn**
5744 **what they learned and correct it**, than it is to learn
5745 something for the first time.

5746 They know that once they are indoctrinated on an
5747 error; very few escape, if any. A recent case of
5748 "courses" prepared by special interests in the
5749 political sector, twisting Scripture to gain the
5750 sympathy of the Christians they so much hate, was
5751 when they "interpreted" prophesy and said that Gog
5752 and Magog were the Soviet Union. The Soviet
5753 Union fell and now they changed their
5754 interpretation to reflect their new political enemies.

5755

5756 **d) The almost total absence of a critical spirit**
5757 **in regards to the teachings received.** The
5758 seminary student or church member, trusting his
5759 teachers, **believes the doctrines taught before**
5760 **analyzing them.** After he decides to believe them,

5761 when someone contradicts him, he tries to find
5762 passages to sustain it, instead of doing the opposite.

5763 Sometimes the absence of a critical spirit is due to
5764 the fear of being alienated from the seminary or
5765 separated from the church, if he contradicts what he
5766 is being taught. If he is a pastor he also is afraid of
5767 being ousted and losing his salary and his
5768 retirement. Sometimes the lack of a critical spirit is
5769 due to a false notion of loyalty to the sect, the clan
5770 or group spirit.

5771

5772 **e) The fact that words don't have the meaning**
5773 **they attribute to them.** This is a grave semantics
5774 problem, because it is as if the brother and the Bible
5775 or the brother and his listener spoke two different
5776 languages.

5777

5778 **f) Using the same word to express two or more**
5779 **things or concepts,** without realizing when they say
5780 one thing or the other. If in the equation " $A + 7 =$
5781 11 " we have given " A " a value of four, we cannot,
5782 without properly clarifying it, say that " $A + 5 =$
5783 20 ", because in this case we are giving " A " a value
5784 of 15 and not 4 as we previously did. Doing this
5785 causes confusion in our listener, but that is precisely
5786 what many do in their debates, especially on
5787 religion.

5788

5789 **g) Using premises or concepts originated in**
5790 **tradition in order to reason on the truth of our**
5791 **doctrines,** as if these concepts were Bible premises.
5792 If by tradition we learned that the number 3 equals
5793 five units, every time we see 3×4 we will say it
5794 equals 20, in spite of the fact that it equals 12. All
5795 that happens because of the lack of a critical spirit,
5796 or fear of being separated from the seminary, being

5797 ousted as pastor or being “excommunicated from
5798 the sect”.

5799

5800 **h) Another problem the Christian faces just**
5801 **like any other human being is the mixture of**
5802 **feelings in the reasoning process.** Feelings such
5803 as: **1)** the fear of offending God if he doubts what
5804 they taught him and tries to reason it; **2)** the fear of
5805 finding a truth that he feels would be too much to
5806 bear; **3)** lack of faith in God’s support by believing
5807 that if he reasons, one more intelligent than him can
5808 deceive him and make him err on that which,
5809 intuitively, he believes to be an absolute truth; **4)**
5810 fear of changing his doctrine and then have to face
5811 the brothers that used to think like him; **5)** pride,
5812 resistance to admit he was wrong and had not used
5813 adequately his intelligence; **6)** fear of what is
5814 unknown to him, without knowing why he is afraid,
5815 etc..

5816 **Having seen the most common causes of the**
5817 **origin of human errors, let’s show in Galatians**
5818 **that Paul considers only the ritual law as**
5819 **obsolete, and not God’s law for human behavior.**
5820 But first, let’s remember that Christianity is about
5821 Christ, he is all in Christianity. **Salvation is**
5822 **possible only and exclusively through faith in the**
5823 **shedding of his blood on the cross, and on his**
5824 **sufferings. There is no other way. This is the one**
5825 **hundred percent of salvation.** Nothing needs to be
5826 done to finish it, or improve it, etc.. The only thing
5827 we can do to it is lose it; and even not lightly. This
5828 is the essence of Christianity; any other way of
5829 believing could be called religion, but not
5830 Christianity. Anyone who believes we have to add
5831 anything to our salvation, or finish it with any work
5832 on our part is as far away from salvation as

5833 someone who believes that God or Christ do not
5834 exist.

5835 **In the last section we saw that the word “law”**
5836 **has many meanings, and they can’t be ignored**
5837 **when we read a passage,** because it would be like
5838 changing the value of a letter, from one equation to
5839 another. We need to discern and be interested in the
5840 truth; that will help us.

5841 In order to understand what one passage says that
5842 contains the word “law” we need to read the
5843 context to understand in what sense and what
5844 meaning is implied as the word is used. Because, to
5845 say that the law is abolished is true when referring
5846 to the rituals, but it is false when referring to the
5847 behavioral norms or the prophecies.

5848 *

5849
5850

5851 **Let’s analyze now the Epistle to the Galatians**

5852 As we read the entire letter we get the feeling that
5853 the Galatians were visited, and they had allowed in
5854 their midst, **certain people similar to those that**
5855 **motivated the apostolic letter; the Pharisees who**
5856 **said that in order to be saved they needed to be**
5857 **circumcised and keep ritual laws.**

5858

5859 *“And certain men which came down from*
5860 *Judaea taught the brethren, and said: **Except***
5861 ***ye be circumcised after the manner of***
5862 ***Moses, ye cannot be saved”.** (Act 15:1)*

5863

5864 In Ga 1:6 we see that the apostle considers that
5865 the Galatians had walked away from the faith, and
5866 in the next verse (7) we see there were people
5867 infiltrating the church with non-Christian doctrines.
5868 Paul uses almost the same phrase that the apostles

5869 used before in a letter where they said, “There are
5870 those who trouble you”. At that time they were
5871 talking about the obligation they wanted to impose
5872 on the new Gentile brothers, of being circumcised
5873 and keeping the obsolete rituals, **as a condition for**
5874 **salvation**. Here we see that the angry response of
5875 the apostle is **again, circumcision and the other**
5876 **rituals**. Let’s see.

5877
5878 *“Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain*
5879 *which went out from us **have troubled you***
5880 ***with words**, subverting your souls, saying: **Ye***
5881 ***must be circumcised, and keep the law;** to*
5882 *whom we gave no such commandment”*
5883 (Act 15:24)

5884
5885 *“**I** marvel that ye are so soon removed from*
5886 *him that called you into the grace of Christ*
5887 *unto another gospel. ⁷ Which is not another;*
5888 *but **there be some that trouble you**, and*
5889 *would pervert the gospel of Christ”.*
5890 (Ga 1:6-7)

5891
5892
5893 **In Ga 2:3-4**, even though Paul doesn’t directly
5894 tell us in this passage, that what he is addressing in
5895 the letter is the theme of circumcision as a condition
5896 to be saved, **it is implied from his conversation.**
5897 **We see it when he explains the reasons given to**
5898 **Titus for not being circumcised**, in spite of the
5899 pressure from the false brothers. It wasn’t about a
5900 discussion on whether the Ten Commandments
5901 were good or bad for Christians. **It was a**
5902 **discussion about circumcision and other rituals**,
5903 and the freedom that a Christian has for keeping
5904 them or leaving them as he deems proper.

5905 I say freedom to not keep them because Paul
5906 advocates here for not keeping them; and I say
5907 freedom to keep them because in Acts 16:3 Paul
5908 kept the rituals, just like he did in his last trip to
5909 Jerusalem when he kept the Nazerite rituals, as seen
5910 in Acts 21:226.

5911

5912 “³ But neither Titus, who was with me, being
5913 a Greek, **was compelled to be circumcised**. ⁴
5914 And that because of false brethren unawares
5915 brought in, who came in privily to spy out **our**
5916 **liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that**
5917 **they might bring us into bondage**”.

(Ga 2:3-4)

5918

5919
5920 “¹ Then came he to Derbe and Lystra; and,
5921 behold, **a certain disciple was there, named**
5922 **Timotheus, the son of a certain woman,**
5923 **which was a Jewess, and believed; but his**
5924 **father was a Greek.** ² Which was well
5925 reported of by the brethren that were at
5926 Lystra and Iconium. ³ Him would Paul have
5927 to go forth with him; and **took and**
5928 **circumcised him** because of the Jews which
5929 were in those quarters, for they knew all that
5930 his father was a Greek”. (Act 16:1-3)

5931

5932 “²⁰ And when they heard it, they glorified the
5933 Lord, and said unto him: Thou seest, brother,
5934 how many thousands of Jews there are which
5935 believe; and **they are all zealous of the law**. ²¹
5936 And they are informed of thee, that thou
5937 teachest all the Jews which are among the
5938 Gentiles to forsake Moses, **saying that they**
5939 **ought not to circumcise their children,**
5940 **neither to walk after the customs**. ²² What is

5941 *it therefore? The multitude must needs come*
5942 *together, for they will hear that thou art*
5943 *come. ²³ Do therefore this that we say to thee:*
5944 ***We have four men which have a vow on***
5945 ***them; ²⁴ them take, and purify thyself with***
5946 ***them, and be at charges with them, that they***
5947 ***may shave their heads; and all may know***
5948 ***that those things, whereof they were***
5949 ***informed concerning thee, are nothing; but***
5950 ***that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and***
5951 ***keepest the law. ²⁵ As touching the Gentiles***
5952 ***which believe, we have written and concluded***
5953 ***that they observe no such thing, save only***
5954 ***that they keep themselves from things offered***
5955 ***to idols, and from blood, and from strangled,***
5956 ***and from fornication. ²⁶ Then Paul took the***
5957 ***men, and the next day purifying himself with***
5958 ***them entered into the Temple, to signify the***
5959 ***accomplishment of the days of purification,***
5960 ***until that an offering should be offered for***
5961 ***every one of them”.*** (Act 21:20-26)

5962
5963 It would not be logical to think that Paul’s
5964 argument would rotate around whether the Ten
5965 Commandments were or were not in effect. He was
5966 not trying to prove that not committing adultery, not
5967 killing, not stealing, not worshiping idols, not
5968 consulting spiritualists, etc., was something that
5969 Christians did not have to abide by. **It is clear,**
5970 **again, that it was about the ritual law, including**
5971 **circumcision.**

5972 If we analyze this last passage (Acts 21:20-26) we
5973 see that in verse 21, **the issue was circumcision**
5974 **and the other ceremonies of the ritual law,** which
5975 was obsolete, since Jesus had already come, which
5976 was what the rituals symbolized. We even see that

5977 the brothers called them “customs” since they had
5978 lost their value. In verses 23 and 24 it says there
5979 were other brothers who had the nazirite vow and
5980 that **they were going to shave their heads, which**
5981 **was a ritual, and not a law on human behavior.**
5982 However, Paul accepted to keep this ritual, which
5983 tells us that he felt free to keep or not to keep the
5984 ceremonial law. Much different are the Ten
5985 Commandments and the rest of the laws for human
5986 behavior, that neither Paul nor anyone else can feel
5987 free not to keep.

5988 **In verse 25** in this same passage we see that the
5989 brothers that talk to Paul tell him, in reference to the
5990 apostles’ letter, “*We have written and concluded*
5991 *that **they observe no such thing**””. Note that,
5992 inadvertently, the speaker shows that the apostles’
5993 letter was written so that the Gentiles not keep “any
5994 of this” and “this” evidently refers to the rituals.*

5995 I repeat what I said before: We cannot think that
5996 Paul’s argument is about the Ten Commandments
5997 being in effect or not. He was not trying to prove
5998 that not committing adultery, not worshiping graven
5999 images, not killing, not stealing, etc., was not
6000 applicable to the Gentile Christians. **Again, it was**
6001 **clearly a matter of the circumcision.**

6002 **In Ga 2:11-12 we see that the judaization for**
6003 **which Paul criticized Peter**, was not because Peter
6004 said that salvation was gained by keeping the law
6005 (something unbelievable in Peter), but for keeping
6006 the traditions established by the ritual laws, for not
6007 wanting to gather with Gentiles, for these
6008 “contaminated” the Jews, thus, the sanctuary. **We**
6009 **see that the argument continues to be about the**
6010 **rituals.**

6011

6012 “¹¹ But when Peter was come to Antioch, I
6013 withstood him to the face, because he was to
6014 be blamed. ¹² For before that certain came
6015 from James, **he did eat with the Gentiles**, but
6016 when they were come, **he withdrew and**
6017 **separated himself**, fearing them which were
6018 **of the circumcision**”. (Ga 2:11-12)

6019

6020 When we read Ga 4:9-10 we see that Paul is
6021 referring to the ritual laws when he talks about
6022 **days, months, times and years**, which were all
6023 kept according to the ritual laws. Someone might
6024 think that when he talked about “days”, Paul would
6025 be including the Sabbath. But that is untrue, since
6026 the Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments, not a
6027 ritual law. **I don’t think anyone believes that**
6028 **“now” there are only nine commandments**. By
6029 mentioning “days”, in plural, he was referring to the
6030 ritual “days” (or ritual Sabbaths) which were
6031 several. These Sabbaths were not the seventh day of
6032 the week, but simply days of rest during certain
6033 feasts, for example, Passover. To prove this **read in**
6034 **this same chapter the section entitled, “The**
6035 **Saturdays Paul Considers Abolished**”. As you
6036 read the next passage keep in mind that Paul is not
6037 going to call **weak and beggarly elements** to the
6038 law of God.

6039

6040 “⁹ But now, after that ye have known God, or
6041 rather are known of God, how turn ye again
6042 to the **weak and beggarly elements**,
6043 whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?
6044 ¹⁰ Ye observe days, and months, and times,
6045 and years”. (Ga 4:9-10)

6046

6047 When we read Ga 5:2 we see that, evidently,

6048 **the argument was around circumcision and not**
6049 **the Ten Commandants;** and for that, around
6050 circumcision as a way to salvation, not for any other
6051 reason far from it. I say this because Paul advised
6052 Timothy to be circumcised, as we have already seen
6053 in Acts 16:3. **So if Paul was not even against**
6054 **keeping the laws of rites, much less would he be**
6055 **opposed to keeping the Ten Commandments,**
6056 **including Saturday, which were behavioral laws.**
6057 What Paul was facing wasn't a group of Christians
6058 who tried to lead their lives learning from the law
6059 which things were good and which were bad. What
6060 he was facing was Christians who all of a sudden
6061 would step out of grace and tried to fabricate or win
6062 salvation by **keeping such rites as circumcision,** as
6063 we see in Ga 5:2, and by keeping feasts and
6064 ceremonies, as we see in Ga 4:10. That is why he so
6065 rightly says, "You are empty of Christ, whom by
6066 the law justify yourselves". They were trying to
6067 justify themselves by keeping the ritual laws,
6068 including circumcision and the ritual Sabbaths that
6069 were observed during certain ritual feast, like the
6070 Passover.

6071 **Later on in Ga 5:11 we see that Paul once**
6072 **again mentions circumcision,** from which it is not
6073 hard to realize that the Apostle's harsh reaction was
6074 not against God's law in general, or against the Ten
6075 Commandments in particular, or against the rest of
6076 the Sabbath; but against **those who wanted to show**
6077 **that in order to make perfect Christ's salvation,**
6078 **we have to add circumcision and other rituals.**

6079
6080 *"¹ Stand fast therefore in the liberty*
6081 *wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be*
6082 *not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.*
6083 *² Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be*

6084 **circumcised**, *Christ shall profit you nothing.* ³
6085 *For I testify again to every man that is*
6086 **circumcised**, *that he is a debtor to do the*
6087 *whole law*". (Ga 5:1-3)

6088

6089 By saying in this last passage, "if ye be
6090 circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing..". **he**
6091 **clearly shows that the argument revolved around**
6092 **those who wanted to circumcise themselves to**
6093 **gain or make perfect their salvation.**

6094 In spite of what Paul says here that Christ would
6095 not profit them anything; in spite of that, I repeat,
6096 he circumcised Timothy. Paul would not circumcise
6097 Timothy to ruin him for the rest of his life. It is
6098 made evident that one thing was to circumcise to be
6099 able to be around Jews, and another thing was to
6100 circumcise to make perfect one's own salvation.
6101 There is no argument there about the laws for
6102 human behavior. Paul **never** said, "if you try to
6103 keep the Ten Commandments Christ will profit
6104 nothing", **note that he is talking about**
6105 **circumcision and other rituals , like sacrifices,**
6106 **etc..** Paul cannot be saying that he who circumcises
6107 himself loses his salvation, because he circumcised
6108 Timothy; he is talking about those who circumcised
6109 themselves or kept other rituals to gain or perfect
6110 their salvation. Let's not confuse speed with bacon,
6111 because one has nothing to do with the other.

6112 **In the entire book of Galatians** we see that
6113 Paul's indignation was centered around those who
6114 wanted the new converts to circumcise themselves,
6115 since, **according to them, if they didn't they**
6116 **would not be saved.** Let's read again the last verse
6117 of the last passage to see that it is to those Galatians
6118 Christians that had fallen in the satanic trap of the
6119 ritual laws, to whom Paul talks to when he says:

6120
6121 *“For I testify again to every man that is*
6122 *circumcised**, that he is a debtor to do the*
6123 *whole law”.* (Ga 5:3)

6124
6125 According to Paul, the Gentile Christians
6126 (Galatians) that circumcise themselves were obliged
6127 to keep the entire law. Which law is he talking
6128 about? **The ritual law. Why do I say that?**
6129 Because they are talking about the ritual of
6130 circumcision. Besides, it is not logical to think that
6131 Paul is telling those who circumcise themselves that
6132 they are obliged to not commit adultery, not steal,
6133 not worship idols, not to go to spiritualists, etc., but
6134 those who did not get circumcised could commit
6135 adultery, steal, worship idols, go to spiritualists,
6136 etc.. It is proven that the phrase, “is a debtor to the
6137 law” refers to the ritual law, because the other one,
6138 the one about not stealing, not committing adultery,
6139 etc., we are all debtors to.

6140 What Paul tells these Gentile Christians is that **if**
6141 **they pretend to justify themselves** through the
6142 rituals of the law, and start keeping rituals and
6143 ceremonies, then they are bound to practice all rites
6144 and ceremonies, something the Jews were never
6145 able to fully accomplish. **Why could they not?**
6146 Because every time they sinned on any given day or
6147 week, they would have to go to Jerusalem to
6148 sacrifice a lamb. Not even the Israelites that lived in
6149 Jerusalem could do that, much less those who lived
6150 far, especially in the north, Galilee and other places.
6151 Much less would the Galatians be able to do it, who
6152 lived in what we now know as Turkey.

6153 **It is evident that the law that Paul is referring**
6154 **to is the ritual law**, because the behavioral law has
6155 to be kept always: before Christ and after Christ.

6156 We are not going to believe that anyone in his right
6157 mind would think that after Christ Christians could
6158 steal, kill, commit adultery, consult the dead,
6159 worship images, etc.. Therefore, when Paul says
6160 that he who circumcises himself is debtor to the
6161 entire law, he is referring to the ritual law.
6162 Otherwise we would have to think that Paul was
6163 saying that if anyone did not circumcise himself he
6164 would not be expected to keep God's law, including
6165 the Ten Commandments, and therefore Christians
6166 could steal, commit adultery, worship images, lie,
6167 swindle, slander, consult the dead, etc..

6168 **In this case, the Gentiles who were not**
6169 **circumcised nor wanted to be, would not be**
6170 **obliged to obey any of God's commandments,**
6171 **such as not worshipping images, not committing**
6172 **adultery, etc.. Therefore, they would be sinless and**
6173 **could not be condemned when they did such things.**
6174 **Consequently they would not need Christ, nor**
6175 **Paul's preaching, which is totally absurd.**

6176 Circumcised or not, God's laws are there to guide
6177 our actions. However, **anyone who circumcises**
6178 **himself to be saved has to keep the rest of the**
6179 **rituals,** something that he will not be able to do.

6180 In this book of Galatians the only thing addressed
6181 is the ritual law, as we will also see again in Ga 4:9-
6182 10.

6183
6184 *“9 But now, after that ye have known God, or*
6185 *rather are known of God, **how turn ye again***
6186 ***to the weak and beggarly elements,***
6187 ***whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?***
6188 *10 Ye observe days, and months, and times,*
6189 ***and years”*** (Ga 4:9-10)

6190
6191 In the last passage we see the phrase “weak and

6192 beggarly elements”. I don’t think that anyone
6193 would believe that Paul is referring to God’s
6194 laws for human behavior as weak and beggarly
6195 elements, especially the Ten Commandments.

6196 Later, in verse 10 we see he talks about months,
6197 times and years. All those were ritual laws, not
6198 behavioral laws. If not, Paul would have said, “You
6199 keep the Ten Commandments, God’s laws...”. It is
6200 clear for any one to see, that throughout the book of
6201 Galatians, Paul is referring to ritual laws. We see
6202 the same in Ga 5:11 where again he speaks of
6203 circumcision:

6204
6205 *“And I, brethren, if I yet preach*
6206 *circumcision, why do I yet suffer*
6207 *persecutions? then is the offence of the cross*
6208 *ceased”.* (Ga 5:11)
6209

6210 If Paul was not talking about ritual law, and
6211 specifically of circumcision he would not have to
6212 mention it so often in his letter to the Galatians.

6213 The same is seen once more in 6:11-15, where
6214 Paul is again **rejecting circumcision as a**
6215 **conditional for salvation**. Brothers, do you need
6216 anything else to realize that the theme throughout
6217 the epistle is circumcision, and never God’s laws
6218 for human behavior, including the Ten
6219 Commandments and Saturday? Don’t you realize
6220 that this entire argument came about because of
6221 those who wanted to introduce **circumcision as a**
6222 **condition for salvation** into Christianity?

6223 Even Paul was not against the circumcision ritual,
6224 as we saw in Acts 16:1-3, so why would he be
6225 against keeping Saturday, which is not a ritual, but
6226 one of the Ten Commandments? What he was
6227 against was taking the partial or total obeying of the

6264 seminary, or from ministry, if you recognize this
6265 truth? If you are honest and believe that Paul is
6266 speaking against the Ten Commandments, let's
6267 discuss the issue in a friendly matter. Why be afraid
6268 of discussion?

6269 **In this letter to the Galatians it is clear that**
6270 **when Paul says "law" he had in mind the ritual**
6271 **law, as seen also in Ephesians 2:14-15.**

6272
6273 *"¹⁴ For he is our peace, who hath made both*
6274 *one, and hath broken down the middle wall of*
6275 *partition between us; ¹⁵ having abolished in*
6276 *his flesh the enmity, even the law of*
6277 *commandments contained in ordinances; for*
6278 *to make in himself of twain one new man, so*
6279 *making peace"* (Eph 2:14-15)

6280
6281 As we see, when Paul said we didn't have to obey
6282 the law, he was referring only to ritual law. In the
6283 passage we just read we see that he calls "law"
6284 something that evidently is ritual law, no doubt
6285 about it.

6286 **In a few words: the entire book of Galatians is**
6287 **written to tell Christians that they don't have to**
6288 **obey the ritual law as a condition for salvation,**
6289 **but they can if we want to. Throughout the book of**
6290 **Galatians as well as the New Testament, when Paul**
6291 **says the law has been abolished and crucified, he is**
6292 **talking about the ritual laws, never the laws for**
6293 **human behavior.**

6294 *

6295
6296
6297
6298

6299 **What Paul authorized to eat here, is what the**
6300 **apostasy would later prohibit**

6301 In I Tim 4:4-5, Paul **does not** authorize eating
6302 animals that God had prohibited. What he
6303 authorized was the foods that the future apostasy
6304 would prohibit, as he prophesizes in verse 3. If we
6305 were to widely and generally interpret this verse,
6306 without taking into account the rest of the
6307 Scriptures, we would come to the very wrong
6308 conclusion that we could eat anything from worms
6309 and spiders and pork, to snakes, human flesh, blood
6310 sausage, blood pudding, poisonous fruit, marijuana,
6311 coca leaves, tobacco, booze, as long as we
6312 previously gave thanks, etc.. Good justification for
6313 cannibals.

6314
6315 *“⁴ For every creature of God is good, and*
6316 *nothing to be refused, if it be received with*
6317 *thanksgiving. ⁵ For it is sanctified by the*
6318 *word of God and prayer”.* (I Tim 4:4-5)

6319
6320 If we were to understand this verse in an isolated
6321 form, without taking into account its antecedent and
6322 the rest of the Bible, the result is a destroying
6323 doctrine. There is nothing in this world that was not
6324 created by God, or is not a natural product of his
6325 creatures. That means that everything is permitted,
6326 even the alkaloids, which are the bases for drugs.

6327 It is logical then to think that a verse like this
6328 cannot be used to set a doctrine in which it is
6329 selectively authorized to eat things that have been
6330 forbidden by God’s law. **What would be the**
6331 **criteria to use in this passage by someone**
6332 **thinking that the permission only applies to**
6333 **animals forbidden by God’s law?** What would the
6334 selection be based on? A personal whim?

6335 “People’s” opinion? Local customs? Sectarian
6336 mandates?

6337 If we want to interpret this passage honestly we
6338 will realize that **Paul is referring to permission to**
6339 **eat those things that the coming apostasy would**
6340 **prohibit.** Paul is not giving Christians unrestricted
6341 liberty to introduce the filth in gluttony and justify
6342 every vice.

6343 In verse 7 we see that at the end of this
6344 exhortation Paul tells Timothy to refuse **profane**
6345 **and old wives’ fables.** It is evident that Paul, in
6346 speaking to Timothy about what could be eaten,
6347 was not referring to animals forbidden by God’s
6348 law, since **Paul would not refer to**
6349 **God’s law as “profane and old wives’ fables”.** It
6350 is evident he was referring to what some were
6351 saying about the prohibition to eat certain things,
6352 but that was spoken of in the profane and old wives
6353 fables, not in God’s law. Let’s read the context and
6354 not limit ourselves only to the two verses mentioned
6355 earlier.

6356
6357 “¹ Now *the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in*
6358 *the latter times some shall depart from the*
6359 *faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and*
6360 *doctrines of devils; ² speaking lies in*
6361 *hypocrisy; having their conscience seared*
6362 *with a hot iron; ³ forbidding to marry, and*
6363 *commanding to abstain from meats, which*
6364 *God hath created to be received with*
6365 *thanksgiving of them which believe and*
6366 *know the truth. ⁴ For every creature of God is*
6367 *good, and nothing to be refused, if it be*
6368 *received with thanksgiving. ⁵ For it is*
6369 *sanctified by the word of God and prayer. ⁶ If*
6370 *thou put the brethren in remembrance of these*

6371 *things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus*
6372 *Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and*
6373 *of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast*
6374 *attained. ¶ But refuse profane and old wives'*
6375 *fables, and exercise thyself rather unto*
6376 *godliness".* (I Tim 4:1-7)
6377

6378 **Paul was only opposing, in the hyperbolic way**
6379 **that was characteristic of him, the doctrine that**
6380 **the apostasy would introduce. Paul was not**
6381 **starting at his own risk a new doctrine for**
6382 **Christians.** Note that in verse 3 he says the
6383 apostasy would command to abstain from the meats
6384 that God created, in other words, the meats that God
6385 created so we could eat them with His approval.
6386 Immediately, opposing that heretic doctrine of
6387 apostasy, he explains in verse 4 that what God has
6388 created is good and does not have to be rejected
6389 because of what the apostasy says.

6390 **Paul is saying that we can eat the meat that**
6391 **God did not forbid,** without paying attention to
6392 what the apostasy says to the contrary. **Paul is not**
6393 **establishing “new laws”** for the Christian’s diet. If
6394 we read and understand the true context, the
6395 passage has logic. If we want to extrapolate and
6396 grab it by the beard without taking into account the
6397 context, what it says is terrible. There would be no
6398 way to circumscribe it to a permission to ingest
6399 animals forbidden by God’s law. We would have to
6400 conclude that we can eat and drink everything.

6401 Not only that, but we would have to admit that as
6402 long as we gave thanks, we could drink blood,
6403 whiskey, rum, hallucinogens, etc., and we could eat
6404 human flesh, blood sausage, idol sacrifices, the
6405 latter being something that the apostles, the Holy
6406 Spirit, and Jesus Christ himself forbid in Acts

6407 15:28-29, and Rev. 2:14, 20. Simply, absurd!!

6408

6409 *“²⁸ For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost,*
6410 *and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden*
6411 *than these necessary things: ²⁹ that ye abstain*
6412 *from meats offered to idols, and from blood,*
6413 *and from things strangled, and from*
6414 *fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves,*
6415 *ye shall do well. Fare ye well”.*

6416 (Act 15:28-29)

6417

6418 *“But I have a few things against thee,*
6419 *because thou hast there them that hold the*
6420 *doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast*
6421 *a stumbling block before the children of*
6422 *Israel, **to eat things sacrificed unto idols**, and*
6423 *to commit fornication”.* (Rev 2:14)

6424

6425 *“Notwithstanding I have a few things against*
6426 *thee, because thou sufferest that woman*
6427 *Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to*
6428 *teach and to seduce my servants to commit*
6429 *fornication, and **to eat things sacrificed unto***
6430 ***idols”.*** (Rev 2:20)

6431

*

6432

6433

6434 **The “laws” that Paul challenges here are**
6435 **doctrines based on philosophical subtleties and**
6436 **human traditions, not on God’s laws**

6437 Verse 16 in this next passage is one of the most
6438 flaunted by those who believe that we should not
6439 lead our lives according to God’s laws. Note that I
6440 used the word “verse” because unfortunately most
6441 Christians, instead of contemplating the Bible from
6442 a wide point of view, with an integral perspective,

6443 they contemplate a very small portion of the Great
6444 Truth with myopia, inflating it in their mind until it
6445 reaches the volume of the entire truth. They so
6446 inflate that small balloon they found that its size
6447 takes up their entire face and does not allow them to
6448 see anything else clearly. They manage to see
6449 something through the balloon they have inflated,
6450 colored by the color of the balloon through which
6451 they are looking.

6452 If instead of closing one eye and stick to the verse
6453 they are “studying” to “investigate” it alone, they
6454 would sit back and open both eyes to watch the
6455 whole chapter, in its integral form, they would not
6456 be such easy pray for fallacy.

6457 From verse 4 we see that Paul is referring to
6458 people who were trying to introduce a heresy, trying
6459 to show that Christ is not a divine being, a being
6460 equal to God. This becomes more clear in verses 8
6461 and 9. We can also see in this passage that in order
6462 to support their heresy they don’t seek a biblical
6463 foundation; rather they used philosophical subtleties
6464 and human traditions.

6465
6466 “8 Beware lest any man spoil you through
6467 philosophy and vain deceit, after the
6468 tradition of men, after the rudiments of the
6469 world, and not after Christ. 9 For in him
6470 dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead
6471 bodily”. (Col 2:8-9)

6472
6473 We can’t logically believe that Paul is calling the
6474 Ten Commandments human traditions, or referring
6475 to God’s laws as philosophy and vain deceit.
6476 Therefore, we have to come to the conclusion that
6477 he is referring to something far from Scripture.

6478 Later in verses 10-13 we see one of the reasons

6479 for Paul's response. This we see in verse 11 where
6480 one realizes that it is again about people that wanted
6481 to introduce circumcision into Christianity. Later
6482 Paul goes on to tell of all the advantages we have in
6483 Christ and all he did for us, mentioning among them
6484 the fact that he **revoked the rites** with his death on
6485 the cross, which he specifies in verse 14 of the
6486 passage, as well as in Ephesians 2:14-16.

6487 It would be useful now to remember that many
6488 times we find some obscure passages in the Bible
6489 because the writer apparently did not say certain
6490 things because they were assumed or known at that
6491 time. These obscure passages are cleared up by
6492 reading others that talk about the same subject, but
6493 in more detail, showing other sides of it that the
6494 obscure passage did not show.

6495
6496 *“¹⁰ And ye are complete in him, which is the head*
6497 *of all principality and power. ¹¹ In whom also ye*
6498 *are **circumcised with the circumcision made***
6499 *without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of*
6500 *the flesh by the **circumcision** of Christ. ¹² Buried*
6501 *with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with*
6502 *him through the faith of the operation of God, who*
6503 *hath raised him from the dead. ¹³ And you, being*
6504 *dead in your sins and the **uncircumcision** of your*
6505 *flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having*
6506 *forgiven you all trespasses; ¹⁴ blotting out the*
6507 ***handwriting of ordinances** that was against us,*
6508 *which was contrary to us, and **took it out of the***
6509 ***way, nailing it to his cross**” (Col 2:10-14)*
6510

6511 Verse 14 is one of those clarifying verses that
6512 detail what has already been said and shed light
6513 over other passages not so detailed. At times Paul
6514 talks in a way that might indicate to some brothers,

6515 at first, that Jesus rejected God's laws for human
6516 behavior, including the Ten Commandments.
6517 However, **here he specifies that what Jesus**
6518 **annulled was only what referred to the rites,**
6519 **which were symbolic of his sacrifice, and he**
6520 **abolished them because they were unnecessary**
6521 **now that he had been crucified.**

6522 Immediately he goes on to describe (15) other
6523 things that Jesus did, before going on to recommend
6524 in verse 16, as a matter of conclusion, that nobody
6525 should judge the Colossians on matters of drinking,
6526 holidays, new moons or Sabbaths (plural), all of it
6527 just a shadow of what was to come which was
6528 already fulfilled. **Regarding everything else, like**
6529 **you don't handle it, or taste it, or even touch it,**
6530 **was what was being preached by the heretics**
6531 **that were infiltrating the church body.**
6532

6533 *"¹⁵ And having spoiled principalities and powers,*
6534 *he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over*
6535 *them in it. ¹⁶ Let no man therefore judge you in*
6536 *meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of*
6537 *the new moon, or of the Sabbath days;¹⁷ **which are***
6538 ***a shadow of things to come**; but the body is of*
6539 *Christ. ¹⁸ Let no man beguile you of your reward in*
6540 *a voluntary humility and **worshipping of angels**,*
6541 *intruding into those things which he hath not seen,*
6542 *vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, ¹⁹ and not*
6543 *holding the Head, from which all the body by joints*
6544 *and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit*
6545 *together, increaseth with the increase of God. ²⁰*
6546 *Wherefore **if ye be dead with Christ from the***
6547 ***rudiments of the world**, why, as though living in the*
6548 *world, are ye subject to ordinances, ²¹ touch not;*
6549 *taste not; handle not;* ²² *which all are to perish*
6550 *with the using; **after the commandments and***

6551 **doctrines of men?** ²³ Which things have indeed a
6552 shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and
6553 neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the
6554 satisfying of the flesh". (Col 2:15-23)

6555

6556 Why do I think that none of this refers to
6557 abolishing the laws for human behavior included in
6558 God's laws?

6559 a) First, because it clearly says so in verse 14,
6560 when he insists that **what was repealed at the**
6561 **cross were the rites**. It is logical to be so. It was
6562 difficult to believe that Jesus repealed on the cross
6563 the pure behavioral norms that his Father had
6564 established, such as not worshiping graven images,
6565 not committing adultery, not stealing, not consulting
6566 the dead, etc..

6567 b) It should be also noted that what was
6568 challenged in this chapter by Paul, was based by his
6569 antagonists, **not on God's law, but on**
6570 **philosophical subtleties elaborated from human**
6571 **traditions**, as stated in verse 8. Therefore, it was
6572 against that **philosophy and vain deceit, after the**
6573 **tradition of men**, that Paul was talking in this
6574 chapter, not against God's laws. I don't believe that
6575 any sensible Christian would think that Paul is
6576 calling "**philosophy and vain deceit, after the**
6577 **tradition of men**" to God's laws for human
6578 behavior, which included the Ten Commandments,
6579 and thus, Saturday.

6580 c) This is reaffirmed when we see that among the
6581 things for which nobody should fear judgment, were
6582 what they could drink. God's law prohibited them
6583 from eating certain animals, and anyone could be
6584 confused and think that Paul, repealing the law,
6585 would authorize them to eat them. **But God's law**
6586 **did not prohibit drinking wine**. Therefore verse

6587 16 cannot refer to God's law for human behavior,
6588 and not even the ritual law, because these laws did
6589 not prohibit wine. Here Paul attacks the teachings
6590 that were far from Scripture that these heretics were
6591 trying to introduce into Christianity.

6592 If the same reasoning that the anti-law doctrine
6593 applies to food in this verse 16, assuring that Paul
6594 authorized eating everything, was applied to
6595 drinking, which is right alongside, they would have
6596 to admit that Paul authorized the drinking of
6597 alcohol, something that many sects oppose. In other
6598 words, according to those who thus interpret this
6599 verse, Paul is allowing for the drinking of rum,
6600 cognac, vodka, whiskey, hallucinogenics, etc.. If it
6601 were so (and it is not) then the different
6602 denominations that insist we should not drink
6603 whiskey, vodka, cognac, rum, etc., would be going
6604 against Paul's doctrine which says "Let no one
6605 judge you...in meat or in drink".

6606 If they were sincere, anyone who interprets here
6607 that we are authorized to eat anything would also
6608 have to admit that here we are authorized to drink
6609 anything. Therefore we need to think that Paul is
6610 not referring to God's laws, but to the traditional
6611 and philosophical laws that had been fabricated by
6612 those heretics that talked with persuasive words and
6613 negated the deity of Christ.

6614 These heretics were the ones who wanted to
6615 introduce customs on food, drink, holidays,
6616 Sabbaths, etc., which Paul rejected, because they
6617 were not based on God's laws but on traditions of
6618 men, philosophies and vain deceit.

6619 **d)** The most important conclusion that the anti-
6620 law doctrine could reach based on the verse we are
6621 treating, would be that Saturday was abolished,
6622 because of that "no man judge you... or the Sabbath

6623 days". If we could conclude from here that we
6624 cannot judge anyone because they don't keep the
6625 Sabbath, we would also have to conclude that we
6626 cannot judge or exhort a Christian because he drinks
6627 whiskey, vodka, rum, cognac, hallucinogenics, etc..
6628 While it says that we should not be judged because
6629 of Sabbath days, it also says we should not be
6630 judged because of drink.

6631 The words "Sabbath days" is plural, indicates that
6632 it refers to ritual Sabbaths, which were not
6633 necessarily Saturdays, but of Jewish holidays,
6634 during which there was no work, even if it were not
6635 the seventh day, as in the case of the Passover. (See
6636 Chapter 13)

6637 We also realize that Paul is not talking about
6638 something that was being done in order to obey
6639 God's law, but rather against it, because along with
6640 the meats, drinks and Sabbath days he mentions
6641 they had a certain worshipping of angels, as we
6642 see in verse 18.

6643 **If they were worshipping angels or practicing**
6644 **any other kind of idolatry, we can't think those**
6645 **heretics were referring to something based on**
6646 **God's law.** Therefore when Paul challenged them,
6647 he was defending God's law, not going against it.

6648 e) If we keep on reading we see in 20-22 that the
6649 things the apostle condemns, do not originate on the
6650 law of God, but on commandments and doctrines of
6651 men, as we see in verse 22. We could not say such a
6652 thing of God's law, including the Ten
6653 Commandments, and within them, the fourth
6654 commandment that talks about not working on
6655 Saturday.

6656 I understand that taken out of context and without
6657 analyzing the rest of the chapter or the rest of the
6658 Bible, this verse lends itself to confusion. However

6659 it is not so to he who reads it in the context in which
6660 it lies, and who, understanding that God's word is
6661 not contradictory, analyzes the many other places
6662 where the validity of the behavioral norms
6663 established by God's laws can be understood. **In**
6664 **verse 20 of the original Reina-Valera Spanish**
6665 **translation printed in 1569, it is translated as**
6666 **"rites" instead of "ordinances"** with which we see
6667 more clearly that Paul condemns the rites and not
6668 God's laws.

6669 To believe that this verse abolishes the Saturday
6670 rest we have to think that the Saturday was a mere
6671 ritual. To this affirmation it would be good to ask:
6672 **1) What did this ritual mean? 2) Is its meaning**
6673 **abolished now? 3) Did God put a ritual in the Ten**
6674 **Commandments along with the other nine that were**
6675 **not rituals? 4) Why would we keep such "ritual"**
6676 **after our resurrection, as says in Isaiah 66:22-24?**
6677 **5) Could we say that "now" we believe in the Nine**
6678 **Commandments?**

6679 Those who think that we do not need to keep the
6680 Saturday rest should not speak of the Ten
6681 Commandments, but rather the Nine Command-
6682 ments. Neither should they use the word
6683 "Decalogue", but substitute it with something more
6684 likened to their beliefs, as "nonolog"; since there
6685 are nine and not ten commandments that they
6686 believe in effect. They should refer to themselves as
6687 "nonologists" since by no means they can say they
6688 believe in the Ten Commandments.

6689 **Concisely:** in this chapter 2 of Colossians, Paul is
6690 not referring to God's law, but to certain
6691 regulations, laws, rituals, superstitions or ordinances
6692 of human origin. Maybe it was about remnants of
6693 Greek philosophy doctrines, or Greco-Judaic, which
6694 someone had been trying to establish in Colossi in

6695 reference to the sabbatical feasts, the food, the
6696 drinks, etc., and which may have involuntarily
6697 become traditional in that atmosphere. Maybe,
6698 fearing Paul that these things would affect the body
6699 of the Church in Colossi, he wrote this passage.

6700 **We should note the power with which the**
6701 **religious traditions impregnated the canon of the**
6702 **faith.** I remember how the religious authorities in
6703 Jesus' time went by their traditional laws, (not the
6704 canon, nor logical laws), which with a greater force
6705 than God's laws, had attached themselves to the
6706 religious authorities, as we can see in Mark 7:9-13.

6707 **But that was not a rare singular phenomenon.**
6708 Throughout the centuries the Catholic Church has
6709 done the same or even worse, putting human
6710 traditions above God's commandments, in spite of
6711 the warnings of the apostle to the contrary in verse 8
6712 of this chapter.

6713 Adventists, Mormons and Russellists each do the
6714 same with their sect. Also Baptists, Methodists,
6715 Presbyterians, Pentecostals and almost, if not all the
6716 protestant sects, although on a lesser scope, do the
6717 same, as we see in the sectarian and traditional
6718 prohibition of drinking wine, the hypothesis of the
6719 rapture before the Great Tribulation, introduced into
6720 Christianity XIX century, and with the antagonism
6721 against God's law.

6722 *

6723
6724

6725 **Christ annulled in his body only the ritual laws,**
6726 **that is why Paul makes the differentiation**

6727 In this verse we see that Paul makes a very clear
6728 differentiation between the ritual laws and those of
6729 behavior, to the point of using the phrase "*the law*
6730 *of the commandments contained in ordinances*",

6731 which does not allow us to confuse it with the other
6732 commandments, such as “*thou shalt not kill*”,

6733

6734 *“Having abolished in his flesh the enmity,*
6735 *even the law of commandments contained in*
6736 *ordinances; for to make in himself of twain*
6737 *one new man, so making peace”.*

6738

(Eph 2:15)

6739

6740 **If all the law, including the Ten Command-**
6741 **ments, had been abolished, Paul did not have to**
6742 **make this differentiation or specification,**
6743 **making clear that he was referring to**
6744 **ordinances.** It would serve us good to note that this
6745 epistle was written by the apostle after the one to
6746 the Romans and after I and II Corinthians, which
6747 often are taken as the basis to sustain the wrongful
6748 believe that God’s law is abolished.

6749 There are those who, believing they can improve
6750 on their dialectic position in regards to this issue of
6751 abolishing God’s law, affirm that the law is one and
6752 is indivisible. They say that if something is
6753 abolished then everything is abolished, and that
6754 there is no such thing as “ritual law”. Against their
6755 stubborn affirmations, the apostle here says exactly
6756 the opposite; **he says there is a ritual law, and**
6757 **that is the one that was abolished with the life,**
6758 **sacrifice and resurrection of Jesus Christ.** It is
6759 not too difficult for me to decide in the face of the
6760 dilemma of believing what Scripture clearly says, or
6761 the stubborn opponents of the validity of God’s law.
6762 Those who say the word “law” means only one
6763 thing, should read again the section “Different
6764 meanings of the term law”, on page 153.

6765 When he speaks, Paul clears up perfectly that
6766 Christ annulled all **animosities** in his flesh, and as if

6767 clearing up what those animosities were, he says,
6768 ***“The law of commandments contained in***
6769 ***ordinances”***. This explains why in other occasions
6770 Paul’s words exude the idea of an animosity
6771 between the law and human beings, actually the
6772 Gentiles who could not participate in those rites and
6773 ceremonies. He speaks as such because he is
6774 referring to the rituals, not the behavioral norms.

6775 Up to a point, the rituals were against us;
6776 behavioral laws help us to live correctly. I say that
6777 the ritual laws were against us because in order to
6778 save ourselves we had to obey them all and the
6779 Gentiles were not allowed to participate in the
6780 ceremonies. Even the Jews themselves could not go
6781 sacrifice a lamb in Jerusalem each time they sinned
6782 in Galilee or Corinth.

6783 What was abolished were the rites, not the
6784 behavioral norms; not the Ten Commandments, not
6785 the essence of God’s law. **The Christian’s**
6786 **dilemma does not lie on determining whether or**
6787 **not God’s law is abolished**, in other words, the
6788 norms for our lives that He gave us; **but on**
6789 **determining which laws had to do with rituals**
6790 **and which had to do with behavior**. The ones that
6791 were not ritual are still in effect, the ones that had to
6792 do with ceremonies and symbolic rites of what was
6793 to come, were obsolete the moment Jesus came, was
6794 crucified and resurrected. The same spirit is found
6795 in passages like Col 2:13-15.

6796
6797 *“¹³ And you, being dead in your sins and **the***
6798 ***uncircumcision** of your flesh, hath he*
6799 *quickened together with him, having forgiven*
6800 *you all trespasses; ¹⁴ **blotting out the***
6801 ***handwriting of ordinances** that was against*
6802 *us, which was contrary to us, and took it out*

6803 *of the way, nailing it to his cross; 15 and*
6804 *having spoiled principalities and powers, he*
6805 *made a shew of them openly, triumphing over*
6806 *them in it". (Col 2:13-15)*

6807

6808 It is evident that Paul, both in this Ephesians
6809 passage as well as the last one in Colossians, is
6810 referring to the abolishing of the rites. To annul
6811 means to dissolve, to settle an argument. **We can**
6812 **see that in Ephesians 2:15, what was “annulled”**
6813 **was the ritual laws.** I don’t think any sincere
6814 Christian would think that Jesus annulled the Ten
6815 Commandments, and from then on we can do and
6816 undo as we please without consequence. Not only
6817 have we seen this in Ephesians 2:15, but also the
6818 context that precedes and follows the verse we
6819 cited. Let’s read Ephesians 2:11-22.

6820

6821 *“¹¹ Wherefore remember, that ye being in*
6822 *time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are*
6823 *called Uncircumcision by that which is*
6824 *called the Circumcision in the flesh made by*
6825 *hands; ¹² that at that time ye were without*
6826 *Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth*
6827 *of Israel, and strangers from the covenants*
6828 *of promise, having no hope, and without God*
6829 *in the world. ¹³ But now in Christ Jesus ye*
6830 *who sometimes were far off **are made nigh by***
6831 ***the blood of Christ.***

6832 *¹⁴ For he is our peace, who hath made both*
6833 *one, and hath broken down the middle wall*
6834 *of partition between us; ¹⁵ having abolished*
6835 *in his flesh the enmity, even the law of*
6836 *commandments contained in ordinances; for*
6837 *to make in himself of twain one new man, so*
6838 *making peace; ¹⁶ and that he might **reconcile***

6839 ***both unto God in one body by the cross,***
6840 ***having slain the enmity thereby. 17 And came***
6841 ***and preached peace to you which were afar***
6842 ***off, and to them that were nigh. 18 For***
6843 ***through him we both have access by one***
6844 ***Spirit unto the Father. 19 Now therefore ye***
6845 ***are no more strangers and foreigners, but***
6846 ***fellow citizens with the saints, and of the***
6847 ***household of God; 20 and are built upon the***
6848 ***foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus***
6849 ***Christ himself being the chief corner stone; 21***
6850 ***in whom all the building fitly framed together***
6851 ***groweth unto an holy Temple in the Lord; 22***
6852 ***in whom ye also are builded together for an***
6853 ***habitation of God through the Spirit”.***
6854 (Eph 2:11-22)

6855
6856 It is evident that Paul is referring to abolishing the
6857 rites, not only for the reasons I just mentioned, but
6858 for the context of this Ephesians passage, on which
6859 I will now comment.

6860 **a)** You were called uncircumcision by the Jews,
6861 with which we prove that there were two different
6862 peoples (verse 11) and that the separating wall was
6863 the ritual law, because the Gentiles could not
6864 participate in the rites.

6865 **b)** You were strangers to the pacts of the promises
6866 (verse 12,) since you could not participate in the
6867 rites.

6868 **c)** You have now been made fellow citizens in
6869 Christ (verse 13) with which he made one from the
6870 two peoples, knocking down the dividing wall
6871 (verse 14,) the wall of the rituals which was the
6872 only thing separating Jews from Gentiles.

6873 **d)** Which dividing wall was the law of
6874 commandments **contained in ordinances** (15).

6875 e) Reconciling both into one body. Who? Jews
6876 and Gentiles (verse 16).

6877 f) Bringing peace to those who were far
6878 (Gentiles) and those who were near (Jews) (17) .

6879 g) Through Christ both (Jews and Gentiles) have
6880 access to the Father by the same Spirit (verse 18).

6881 h) Because of all that has been said you are no
6882 longer strangers (you, the Gentiles) (19-21) but
6883 citizens.

6884 i) Being built up together (together with whom?;
6885 together with the Jews) as God's house in the Spirit.

6886 **As we can see everything in this passage refers**
6887 **to the dissolution of the ritual law;** that is the only
6888 one declared obsolete. Paul was not going to dare
6889 declare as obsolete God's law for human behavior,
6890 for two reasons: **one** because he was never going to
6891 say we could now commit adultery, kill, practice
6892 sodomy, steal, worship images, consult the dead,
6893 etc.; and **the other** because he would not contradict
6894 what the Lord Jesus Christ himself said in Mathew
6895 5:17-19 when he told the disciples that the law
6896 would not die until heaven and Earth died.

6897
6898 *“¹⁷ Think not that I am come to destroy the*
6899 *law, or the prophets; I am not come to*
6900 *destroy, but to fulfil. ¹⁸ For verily I say unto*
6901 *you, till heaven and Earth pass, one jot or*
6902 *one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,*
6903 *till all be fulfilled. ¹⁹ Whosoever therefore*
6904 *shall break one of these least commandments,*
6905 *and shall teach men so, he shall be called the*
6906 *least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever*
6907 *shall do and teach them, the same shall be*
6908 *called great in the kingdom of heaven”.*

6909 (Mt 5:17-19)

6910 *

6911
6912
6913
6914
6915
6916
6917
6918
6919
6920
6921
6922
6923
6924
6925
6926
6927
6928
6929
6930
6931
6932
6933
6934
6935
6936
6937
6938
6939
6940
6941
6942
6943
6944
6945
6946

¿Does Paul say stealing is right if it is convenient to our purposes?

In this next passage there is a very good example of Paul's hyperbolic way of speaking. It serves us as warning on the care and prudence we need to have to not set a doctrine on verses isolated from their context. Especially if they go against that is taught in the rest of the Bible. In the way the apostle talks about this verse, we get the feeling that Paul says that he can do whatever he feels like, but that not everything is convenient. However, if we don't mind such inconvenience, then we can do whatever we please because **everything** is lawful for the Christian.

“All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any”. (I Co 6:12)

Paul seems to say in verse 12 that everything is lawful, but simply, everything is not convenient because he did not want to be overpowered by anything. For a moment he seems to say something like, “for me it is legal to change jobs, I just don't do it because it is not convenient”. And when we apply this to daily life it would read **something like saying that it is legal for me to steal, commit adultery, fornicate, kill, practice sodomy, worship images, consult spiritualists, etc., but I don't do it because it is not convenient.** This is the foolish way in which many interpret what Paul says.

However, in the following verse, 13, we see that fornication was not legal. As we can see, it is a

6947 problem to take to the letter, and blindly the
6948 apostle's hyperboles and symbolisms. In verse 13 it
6949 seems as if Paul were contradicting what he just
6950 said in verse 12.

6951

6952 *“Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats,*
6953 *but God shall destroy both it and them. Now*
6954 ***the body is not for fornication, but for the***
6955 *Lord; and the Lord for the body”.*

6956

(I Co 6:13)

6957

6958 **But, is it true he is contradicting himself? No,**
6959 **of course not!** What happens is that in the first case
6960 (12) he is referring to those things that were legal
6961 according to what God had established, not
6962 absolutely **everything**. **What he says is that**
6963 **everything that had been previously approved by**
6964 **God, was legal for him to do. In other words,**
6965 **that out of those things that were legal before**
6966 **God, he would not do those that were not**
6967 **convenient, even when he had the God given**
6968 **right to do them. Paul was not saying that he**
6969 **could do everything he wanted to do.**

6970 A good example was the fact that even though he
6971 had every right to receive compensation for
6972 preaching the gospel, he did not make use of that
6973 right, (I Co 9:1-18). It is **not** logical to think that
6974 when Paul says “everything is legal”, he was
6975 referring to absolutely everything that a human
6976 being is capable of doing, including sodomy,
6977 stealing, killing, committing adultery, fornicating,
6978 rape children, worship images, consulting
6979 spiritualists, being involved in witchcraft, etc..

6980 In a case such as this we are lucky that the
6981 clearing up of the strange and apparently heretic
6982 statement that Paul made in one verse, would be

6983 right in the next verse, but it is not so in other cases.
6984 In other cases, in order to reach the correct
6985 interpretation of what Paul said, we have to read
6986 several chapters before, to realize what he is talking
6987 about. What's more, some times we have to read a
6988 different epistle, and some times even the writings
6989 of another Bible author. That is why Paul's style of
6990 speaking confuses those who do not analyze, in an
6991 integral way, what he says, but simply go by
6992 isolated verses.

6993 For those who insist on saying that according to
6994 Paul everything is legal, it would be good to ask
6995 them if they would be willing to sign and publish a
6996 document that says that in their church everything is
6997 legal, including sodomy, fornication, adultery,
6998 children rape, robbery, idolatry, witchcraft, etc..

6999 Paul says again something similar in I Co 6:12,
7000 and then again in I Co 10:23.

7001
7002 ***“All things are lawful for me, but all things***
7003 ***are not expedient; all things are lawful for***
7004 ***me, but all things edify not”.*** (I Co 10:23)
7005

7006 The first thing to ponder on is, how do we know
7007 what is lawful and what edifies? Which canon do
7008 we use as a guide? People's opinion? Each one's
7009 “feelings” on what ought to be done? What our
7010 church says? What the Pope says? What the Bible
7011 says? **In order to know what edifies and what**
7012 **doesn't, we would have to know what is wrong**
7013 **and what is right; and for that we would read**
7014 **God's laws as the only source of authority.**

7015 So to say that everything is lawful as long as it is
7016 convenient or edifies, and pretend that this verse
7017 makes obsolete the law of God, is a subterfuge and
7018 a euphemism. A subterfuge because they try to

7019 make believe that one thing was substituted by
7020 another one, when actually both are the same; and a
7021 euphemism because it is to go around as to not have
7022 to admit that after all the law is the last word. By
7023 saying that it is a subterfuge and a euphemism I am
7024 not talking about Paul, but about those who pretend
7025 to twist his words.

7026 Paul, by saying that everything is legal, was
7027 referring to the question at hand, case in point, those
7028 things allowed by God but had the potential to hurt
7029 others. Paul could not be referring to the idea that
7030 everything in life was legal. To prove it, just
7031 remember that it is the selfsame Holy Spirit who
7032 backs the apostles in their letter in Acts 15, in which
7033 four things are listed, which evidently **He did not**
7034 **consider lawful**. If He had considered them lawful,
7035 He would not have forbidden them, such as: the
7036 drinking of blood, the eating of drowned animals,
7037 things offered to idols, and fornication.

7038 **If the Holy Spirit prohibited them, rest assured**
7039 **that Paul did not dare authorize them, saying**
7040 **that “everything” is lawful.** When Paul’s
7041 statements go against, or contradict those of the
7042 Holy Spirit or the other apostles, it is time to try to
7043 understand what it is he tried to say, because,
7044 evidently, it cannot be what it seems at first sight.
7045 Everything is legal: stealing, swindling, lying,
7046 sodomy, fornicating, worshipping images,
7047 consulting mediums, lounging, faking revelations to
7048 “help” others, giving false notice when it is
7049 convenient, etc.. “Everything is legal if it is
7050 convenient to me”. This is a terrible way of
7051 interpreting poor Paul.

7052 **To take this verse as a negation of the law is**
7053 **equivalent to authorizing all human beings to do**
7054 **as they please** as long as they consider it

7055 convenient or edifying, or at least doesn't hurt
7056 anyone. The distance between this concept and
7057 religious chaos is the thickness of a piece of paper.

7058 From there on anyone could fornicate if as a result
7059 he would have the chance to preach the gospel to
7060 his partner in fornication. Equally, we could not
7061 consider adultery wrong as long as the husband
7062 agreed in order to please his wife; and why go on,
7063 for instead of ink we would have to use vomit in
7064 order to describe everything that could be
7065 concluded from such satanic and fallacious
7066 interpretation.

7067 *

7068
7069

7070 **The Sabbaths that Paul considered obsolete**

7071 By excellence, the Sabbath is the seventh day of
7072 the week. Almost every time this word is mentioned
7073 in the Bible, it refers to the seventh day. However,
7074 there are times when the word "Sabbath" refers to
7075 special days of ceremonial feasts that were
7076 important, during which no work was to be done,
7077 even though it was not the seventh day of the week.

7078 There is a good example in Lv 16:29-31.
7079 According to verse 29 the annual Day of Atonement
7080 (which the Jews today call "Yom Kippur"), **took**
7081 **place on a given day of the year: the 10th day of**
7082 **the seventh month.** Since the year has 365 days
7083 (52 weeks and one day) the tenth day of the seventh
7084 month (whether lunar or regular) falls on a different
7085 weekday every year. However, we see in this
7086 passage that, without taking into account what we
7087 just said, the day of atonement, the tenth day of the
7088 seventh month of any year, is called "Sabbath of
7089 rest".

It is obvious, then that there were certain “Sabbaths” that were not the seventh day of the week, on which no work was to be done.

“²⁹ And this shall be a statute for ever unto you, that **in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month**, ye shall afflict your souls, and **do no work at all**, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you; ³⁰ for on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the LORD. ³¹ **It shall be a Sabbath of rest unto you**, and ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute for ever”.

(Lev 16:29-31)

We see the same thing in Lv 23:24-32, with the addition that it is there where we see the phrase, “from even onto even, you shall celebrate your Sabbath”, which is the norm for keeping the Sabbath called regular or weekly. In this same passage (Lv 23:24-32) we see that the first day of the seventh month (24) it was also to be “Sabbath”, just like the tenth (already mentioned). The preceding reasoning on the fact that a given day of a given month does not fall on the same day of the week on the following years, is valid here as well.

*“²⁴ Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, **In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a Sabbath,** a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation. ²⁵ Ye shall do no servile work therein, but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD. ²⁶ And the LORD spake unto Moses,*

7126 saying: 27 Also **on the tenth day of this**
 7127 **seventh month** there shall be a day of
 7128 atonement; it shall be an holy convocation
 7129 unto you; and ye shall afflict your souls, and
 7130 offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD.
 7131 28 And ye **shall do no work in that same day:**
 7132 for it is a day of atonement, to make an
 7133 atonement for you before the LORD your
 7134 God. 29 For whatsoever soul it be that shall
 7135 not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be
 7136 cut off from among his people. 30 And
 7137 **whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in**
 7138 **that same day, the same soul will I destroy**
 7139 **from among his people.** 31 Ye shall do no
 7140 manner of work: it shall be a statute for ever
 7141 throughout your generations in all your
 7142 dwellings. 32 **It shall be unto you a Sabbath**
 7143 **of rest,** and ye shall afflict your souls; in the
 7144 ninth day of the month at even, **from even**
 7145 **unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath**".
 7146 (Lev 23:24-32)

7147
 7148 Not only can we realize that a certain day of a
 7149 month cannot be a Saturday every year, but within
 7150 that same passage we note **two Sabbaths, one on**
 7151 **the first day and one on the tenth.** It is more than
 7152 evident that two true Saturdays, two weekly
 7153 Saturdays, two seventh day of the week, cannot be
 7154 **ten days** apart. (Verses 24 and 32). In fact, when
 7155 we read verse 27 we see they are talking about the
 7156 tenth day of the seventh month, and so do the verses
 7157 that follow, until finally, in verse 32, it calls that
 7158 tenth day Sabbath, the same as the first.

7159 The same is true in Lv 23:39, because every year
 7160 the 15th and the 22nd of a month cannot fall on a
 7161 Saturday.

7162
7163
7164
7165
7166
7167
7168
7169
7170
7171
7172
7173
7174
7175
7176
7177
7178
7179
7180
7181
7182
7183
7184
7185
7186
7187
7188
7189
7190
7191
7192
7193
7194
7195
7196
7197

“Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the LORD seven days, on the first day shall be a Sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a Sabbath”. (Lv 23:39)

In Ex 12:16 says that they were to do no work **on the first and the seventh** day. In other words, these two days are days of rest, ritual Sabbaths, even though in reality they weren’t weekly Saturdays. In other words, even if they were not on the seventh day of the week they were called “Sabbaths”.

It was the Saturday that was the seventh day of the week that God ordained to keep from Creation and when he gave the Ten Commandments at Sinai.

“And in the first day there shall be an holy convocation, and in the seventh day there shall be an holy convocation to you; no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you”. (Ex 12:16)

If we analyze the last verse we’ll realize that **in a seven day sequence it is impossible for there to be two Saturdays**, in other words, it is impossible for both the first and the seventh days to be Saturdays. Let’s see.

- | | |
|--------------|-----------|
| 1 First day | Sunday |
| 2 Second day | Monday |
| 3 Third day | Tuesday |
| 4 Fourth day | Wednesday |
| 5 Fifth day | Thursday |

7198 6 Sixth day Friday
7199 7 Seventh day Saturday

7200

7201 We see that it is **impossible** for there to be two
7202 true Saturdays in seven days. But that is not all,
7203 there's more.

7204 Passover always began on the 14th day of the first
7205 month, and the unleavened bread began on the 15th.
7206 Therefore, sometimes it would begin on Monday,
7207 other on Sunday, or Thursday, etc., since no day of
7208 any month falls on the same day of the week every
7209 year. This alone would indicate that Passover
7210 couldn't fall on Saturday every year, and neither did
7211 the unleavened bread. Furthermore, in most cases
7212 neither the first nor the seventh day of this feast was
7213 going to be Saturday.

7214 All this makes us see clearly that there were days
7215 known as "Sabbath" without necessarily be the last
7216 day of the week. In other words, this shows that
7217 there were ritual Saturdays besides weekly
7218 Saturdays.

7219 As we can see, **the Hebrews called "Sabbaths"**
7220 **certain days that were not Saturdays. It is those**
7221 **exceptional and ritual "Sabbaths" that Paul**
7222 **refers to in Col 2:16 as obsolete.** The latter is more
7223 notable if we consider that in this passage, Paul says
7224 "Sabbath days", in plural, and not "the Sabbath", in
7225 singular form as it would correspond if he were
7226 referring to the seventh day of the week. Let's see
7227 the passage.

7228

7229 "¹⁴ *Blotting out **the handwriting of***
7230 ***ordinances** that was against us, which was*
7231 *contrary to us, and took it out of the way,*
7232 *nailing it to his cross; ¹⁵ and having spoiled*
7233 *principalities and powers, he made a shew of*

7234 *them openly, triumphing over them in it. 16 Let*
7235 *no man therefore judge you in meat, or in*
7236 *drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the*
7237 *new moon, or of the Sabbath days".*

(Col 2:14-16)

7239

7240

7241 Moreover, the context shows that from Col 2:14
7242 **Paul talks about the rituals**, as evidenced by verse
7243 **14. Paul would not call the Ten Commandments,**
7244 **"rituals"**. Later, as if drawing a conclusion of what
7245 was said before, the apostle says in verse 16, "let no
7246 man judge you..". and he mentions drinks, foods,
7247 feasts, new moons, and Sabbath days. We can see
7248 that the Sabbath days (plural) he mentions, are the
7249 kind we just mentioned, not the weekly Saturday,
7250 the seventh day. **In other words, Paul considers**
7251 **the ritual Sabbaths as abolished, not the weekly**
7252 **true Sabbaths.**

*

7253

7254

7255

7256 **One man makes a difference between one day**
7257 **and the other, another man considers every day**
7258 **the same**

7259 Paul refers here, as in Ga 4:10, to the ceremonial
7260 feast days that the Jews had in their ceremonial law.
7261 **This passage is a lesson on tolerance between**
7262 **those who kept those ceremonial holy days, and**
7263 **those that did not keep them.** The former wanted
7264 to keep those ceremonial holy days in spite of their
7265 being obsolete. The latter didn't because they were
7266 aware that they were only symbolic of what had
7267 already happened: the crucifixion, death and
7268 resurrection of Jesus Christ.

7305 less weight than when the Bible says dozens of
7306 times that Paul and the brothers attended synagogue
7307 on Saturdays. If they went to synagogue it was
7308 because they did not work on Saturdays. Besides,
7309 let's remember that the apostolic letter said that the
7310 new Gentile converts could learn the law on
7311 Saturdays; which implies that it was expected of the
7312 new converts not to do any work on Saturdays.

7313 Besides this I will prove on chapter 13 of this
7314 book that the disciple's Sunday meetings did not
7315 mean they were keeping Sundays, because they
7316 didn't even believe yet that Jesus had risen from the
7317 dead.

7318 **Daring to castrate a clear commandment from**
7319 **the Decalogue, and substituting it for an obscure**
7320 **tradition**, or for a nebulous personal appreciation is
7321 temerity. No church would dare call itself the
7322 Church of the Nine Commandments, but that is
7323 what they really do even though they do not say it.

7324 Those who claim not to keep any day are really
7325 not sincere; they make Sunday holy and would not
7326 dare change it. No church would change its main
7327 services to a weekday so to let Sunday free for their
7328 churchgoers to have their stroll. Most of these
7329 Sunday keepers are not honest when they say that
7330 they consider all days the same.

7331 They are in subjection to the Roman Sunday to
7332 the extent that Sunday is required of them. **Besides,**
7333 **when God established the Sabbath he did it so**
7334 **that man would do no work that day. However,**
7335 **those who say that Saturday was changed to**
7336 **Sunday don't have any qualms working on**
7337 **Sunday.**

7338 *

7339
7340

7341 **Proof that Paul continued guiding his behavior**
7342 **according to God's laws. Paul thought that the**
7343 **law was good and must be obeyed**

7344 This apostle, whom many have as a banner bearer
7345 of the thesis of anti-God's law, tells us contrary, he
7346 says that the law is good.

7347
7348 *“Wherefore the law is holy, and the*
7349 *commandment holy, and just, and good”.*

7350 (Ro 7:12)

7351
7352 It doesn't make sense to me that a man of Paul's
7353 quality, **would, on one hand tell us that the law is**
7354 **holy, and the commandment is holy and just and**
7355 **good, while on the other hand, believe and teach**
7356 **that the law is obsolete.** This would be duplicity
7357 and a major hypocrisy.

7358 If any, Paul would have said that the law **had**
7359 **been** holy, not that it **is** holy, and that the
7360 commandment **had been** holy and just and good,
7361 not that it **is** holy and just and good. Instead we see
7362 Paul talking in present tense about the goodness of
7363 the law and the commandments. In other words,
7364 when he was talking, **many years after Christ's**
7365 **crucifixion**, and long after God's law “**had been**
7366 **abolished**”, (according to the anti-law doctrine), yet
7367 he still considered the law good and holy, in the
7368 present tense, not the past. However, when he say in
7369 Ga 3: 24 that the ritual law **was** our schoolmaster to
7370 bring us unto Christ, he speaks in the past tense.

7371 Even in Ro 7:22 we see that **Paul delighted**
7372 **himself in God's law.** Plus, if we read verse 25 we
7373 see that Paul, though he understands his weakness
7374 in the flesh, he still recognized that, **at least with**
7375 **his mind he serves the law of God.** It must not be
7376 so repulsive to obey God's law if Paul himself

7377 confesses that he delights himself in it, at least with
7378 his mind, which is what he could. If obeying God's
7379 law was obsolete, if it were a sin, **if guiding**
7380 **ourselves by God's law would mean to have**
7381 **fallen from grace, Paul would not have done it**
7382 **even with his mind**. If, as many say, Paul hated
7383 God's law, what do his words mean?

7384
7385 *“²² For I delight in the law of God after the*
7386 *inward man. ²³ But I see another law in my*
7387 *members, warring **against the law of my***
7388 ***mind**, and bringing me into captivity to the*
7389 *law of sin which is in my members. ²⁴ O*
7390 *wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me*
7391 *from the body of this death? ²⁵ I thank God*
7392 *through Jesus Christ our Lord. **So then with***
7393 ***the mind I myself serve the law of God; but***
7394 *with the flesh the law of sin”.*

7395 (Ro 7:22-25)

7396
7397 If Paul obeyed the law in his mind, then the law
7398 was not obsolete, since it would not be logical to
7399 obey, even in his mind, a law that he considered
7400 obsolete.

7401 *

7402
7403
7404

7405 **Paul says that he who keeps the law does well**

7406 Paul has always been depicted as an angry
7407 antagonist of all that means modeling our behavior
7408 after God's law. However, we see he was not. What
7409 he was against, and any other true Christian is, was
7410 preaching or believing that salvation is earned by
7411 obeying the law, because no one could obey it all
7412 his life from cradle to grave. But Paul was not

7413 against having it as a behavior norm, which is the
7414 only thing it has always been good for.

7415

7416 *“²⁶ Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the*
7417 *righteousness of the law, shall not his*
7418 *uncircumcision be counted for circumci-*
7419 *sion? ²⁷ And shall not uncircumcision which*
7420 *is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee,*
7421 *who by the letter and circumcision **dost***
7422 *transgress the law?”* (Ro 2:26-27)
7423

7424 In this passage we see that, according to Paul,
7425 when the uncircumcised **keeps the righteousness**
7426 **of the law, he does good** (26). He also say that the
7427 one who keeps the law will judge him who, wanting
7428 to be saved by just knowing the law, really does not
7429 want to keep it. It is so good to keep the law of God
7430 for human behavior, that Paul says that **if the**
7431 **uncircumcised keeps it, his uncircumcision will**
7432 **be counted as circumcision**. On the other hand we
7433 see that **not obeying the law of God is so bad,**
7434 **that it even invalidates the circumcision**. We see
7435 again in this passage that the ritual (circumcision) is
7436 not what mattered, but keeping the laws of human
7437 behavior.

7438 I don't think anyone would think that a man like
7439 Paul would say things he did not believe.

7440

*

7441

7442

7443 **Paul says that not obeying the law is to dishonor**
7444 **God**

7445 It is inconceivable that any Christian would think
7446 that a man who expresses himself so clearly when
7447 he says that to disobey God's law is to dishonor
7448 God, would on the other hand be teaching that

7449 God's laws for human behavior are not longer valid
7450 for the Christian, that they are not important, that
7451 they could be disobeyed if one wants to.

7452 Here Paul shows us that anyone who trespasses
7453 God's law, dishonors God. Could we think he was
7454 only talking, but in reality he did not obey God's
7455 law? Could we, after this, imagine Paul working on
7456 Saturday, and eating pork and blood sausage?

7457
7458 *"Thou that makest thy boast of the law,*
7459 *through **breaking the law dishonourest thou***
7460 ***God?"*** (Ro 2:23)

7461
7462 Paul, which is made to look like the man who
7463 didn't care at all for God's law in his life, is the one
7464 who tells us that anyone who trespasses God's law
7465 dishonors God. After this, can we think that Paul
7466 would dishonor God by trespassing God's law?

7467 Because Paul talks against the **ritual law** and
7468 **ritual Sabbaths** four or five times, there are many
7469 brothers that confuse his teachings and that angrily
7470 rise up against God's law for human behavior.
7471 However, **they refuse to listen to the many other**
7472 **times when Paul teaches that God's law was**
7473 **made to be obeyed.**

7474 Let's remember that the ritual Sabbaths are those
7475 weekdays in which ritual ceremonies were
7476 celebrated, that is why they were declared ritual
7477 Sabbaths, even though it was not the seventh day of
7478 the week, as in the case of Passover. **I will talk**
7479 **more extensively about this, and will prove it in**
7480 **Chapter 13 of this book.**

7481 *

7482
7483

Paul uses the law to prohibit women from holding leadership positions in Church

There is not one place in all of Paul's letters where it says that God's commandments do not have to be kept, but there are many places where it is understood that he considered the law as valid and useful for knowing what to do. We see in this verse that he mentions the law as a guide on which we can base our decisions.

Here Paul is establishing a norm that is a critical point in today's human relations: prohibiting women from holding leadership positions in the Church. **For something that important, Paul finds his support in the law**. Therefore, he considered the law valid, **if not, he would not invoke it knowing it was not valid**. Paul would not use a lie or a trick, or a sacrilegious use of the word of God to defend his statement on the position of women in church. Therefore, the same law that was valid for Paul is also valid for us.

“Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law”.

(I Co 14:34)

Anyone who uses the law in that manner considers it valid. I can't believe that if he believed it to be obsolete, expired, and that Christians did not have to follow it, Paul would use it as a basis to establish behavioral norms for the Church. If the law was something so repulsive and repellent for Paul, as it is for many Christians, why would the apostle invoke it in this case? He would have said it was his own commandment, because he had

7520 received a mandate or revelation from God. Or
7521 because in his experience he considered it
7522 convenient, as he did the time he advised the youth
7523 in I Co 7:25. But he would not have invoked God's
7524 law, if he considered it abolished.

7525 What is not admissible is to try to earn salvation
7526 on the basis of obeying the law, since no one has
7527 ever been able to keep all of it, from birth to death.
7528 Therefore, we cannot be saved by it or by any other
7529 work, not even on the basis of preaching the
7530 Gospel. But the fact that we cannot be saved by
7531 obeying the law or by preaching the gospel, does
7532 not mean that we should not obey the law or stop
7533 preaching the Gospel.

7534 **We see here that the guide that Paul used for**
7535 **his life was the law.** There are many things we
7536 know not to do, thanks to God's law, for the New
7537 Testament says nothing about them. **I will talk**
7538 **more on this in chapter 12 of this book.**

7539 Here Saint Paul using the Law of God teaches the
7540 Church that women should not be in leader
7541 positions in the Church. Nevertheless, Adventism,
7542 which proclaim to follow God's Laws, had as its
7543 founder and director for many years, a woman:
7544 Ellen G. White.

7545 *

7546
7547
7548 **Paul used the law to reprimand the incestuous**
7549 **Corinthian; therefore he did not consider it**
7550 **obsolete**

7551 Paul considered **the ritual law** abolished, but he
7552 never says anything against the behavior laws, since
7553 he knew the former were abolished, but not the
7554 latter. Proof that what I'm saying is true is that it
7555 was the law in Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Ezekiel and

7556 Amos what Paul had in mind when he reprimanded
7557 the Corinthian. If Paul did not believe in these
7558 passages in the Old Testament, if he did not believe
7559 that God's law was valid, he would not have
7560 reprimanded the Corinthian. In these passages it is
7561 forbidden for son to sleep with his father's wife,
7562 even when his father is dead.

7563
7564 *"The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt*
7565 *thou not uncover: it is thy father's*
7566 *nakedness".* (Lev 18:8)

7567
7568 Although anyone may think that it is not specified
7569 here that he is talking about the widow, it is logical,
7570 because, **if his father were alive and still married**
7571 **to the woman, that would be adultery**, no need to
7572 pass a new law for that in Leviticus, Ex 20:14 was
7573 enough. We can't allege either that she were
7574 divorced from his father because such thing would
7575 not happen in his father's life in that patriarchal
7576 society, even if he were divorced.

7577 But there is more. If we **don't** limit ourselves to
7578 reading one part of the Bible, but we read all of it
7579 with the same frequency we will remember that
7580 Amos 2:7 says:

7581
7582 *"That pant after the dust of the Earth on the*
7583 *head of the poor, and turn aside the way of*
7584 *the meek, and a man and his father will go in*
7585 *unto the same maid, to profane my holy*
7586 *name"* (Am 2:7)

7587
7588 In other words, it was a desecration of
7589 God's name for a man and his son to sleep with the
7590 same woman, whether or not one of them was
7591 married with her, regardless of whether they were

7592 divorced or widowed. We find something similar in
7593 Ezq 22:11 where it says:

7594

7595 *“And one hath committed abomination with*
7596 *his neighbour's wife; and **another hath***
7597 ***lewdly defiled his daughter in law; and***
7598 *another in thee hath humbled his sister, his*
7599 *father's daughter. (Ezq 22:11)*

7600

7601 In other words, incest with the daughter in law
7602 was condemned, separating it from adultery. They
7603 were two different things, because it was not about
7604 the father sleeping with the daughter in law while
7605 his son was alive, that would have been adultery. It
7606 was about sleeping with the daughter in law after
7607 the son's passing.

7608 It is also affirmed in the passage that narrates how
7609 Thamar deceived Judah and slept together, without
7610 him knowing who she was. Even that Judah's son
7611 was dead, still he considered incest to lay with she
7612 who was his son's wife, as we see in Gn 38:26.

7613

7614 *“And Judah acknowledged them, and said:*
7615 *She hath been more righteous than I, because*
7616 *that I gave her not to Shelah my son. **And he***
7617 ***knew her again no more”.** (Gn 38:26)*

7618

7619 *“¹¹ And **the man that lieth with his father's***
7620 ***wife hath uncovered his father's nakedness:***
7621 ***both of them shall surely be put to death;***
7622 *their blood shall be upon them. ¹² And **if a***
7623 ***man lie with his daughter in law, both of***
7624 ***them shall surely be put to death; they have***
7625 *wrought confusion; their blood shall be upon*
7626 *them”.* (Lev 20:11-12)

7627

7628 So grave was the sin that in Lv 20:11-12 the death
7629 penalty was established for the culprit, whether the
7630 son that slept with his father's wife or the father that
7631 slept with his son's wife.

7632 **This was the law that Paul had in mind when**
7633 **he reprimanded the Corinthian's behavior. Paul**
7634 **made reference to this Old Testament law, so it is**
7635 **evident he did not consider it obsolete.** He would
7636 not mention it just to be a nuisance, even when he
7637 knew it was not valid and therefore knowing that
7638 "now" a son could marry his father's widow. **It is**
7639 **not logic to suppose that Paul would go so low as**
7640 **to accuse a man of violating an obsolete law,**
7641 **which he himself did not believe.**

7642 There are a few other passages that legislate the
7643 same about this type of incest. Let's see.

7644
7645 ***"A man shall not take his father's wife, nor***
7646 ***discover his father's skirt".*** (Dt 22:30)

7647
7648 ***"And the man that lieth with his father's***
7649 ***wife hath uncovered his father's nakedness;***
7650 ***both of them shall surely be put to death;***
7651 ***their blood shall be upon them".***
7652 (Lev 20:11)

7653
7654 ***"It is reported commonly that there is***
7655 ***fornication among you, and such fornication***
7656 ***as is not so much as named among the***
7657 ***Gentiles, that one should have his father's***
7658 ***wife".*** (I Co 5:1)

7659
7660 Paul is horrified about the magnitude of the sin
7661 committed by that Corinthian, so much so saying
7662 that not even the Gentiles were so degenerate; from
7663 which we find two things: **a)** that what God's law

7664 said was wrong, kept in fact, being wrong; and b)
7665 that **Paul used God's law as a normative set of**
7666 **rules for Christians' life and morals, even**
7667 **Christians Gentiles in Corinth.** I fail to see why so
7668 many erred brothers think that the law (which never
7669 saved and will never save anyone) can't be our
7670 behavioral norm.

7671 *

7672

7673

7674 **Paul uses the law to exhort the children**

7675 Once again we see that Paul uses the Law, more
7676 specifically, he uses the Decalogue as his behavioral
7677 norm, and advises the disciples likewise.

7678

7679 *"¹ Children, obey your parents in the Lord,*
7680 *for this is right. ² Honour thy father and*
7681 *mother; which is the first commandment*
7682 *with promise; ³ that it may be well with thee,*
7683 *and thou mayest live long on the Earth".*

7684 (Eph 6:1-3)

7685

7686 Not only does he mention the commandment itself,
7687 (2), but **he mentions and considers valid the**
7688 **promise that accompanies** it in the Decalogue (3)
7689 of a long life. Therefore, we could think that Paul
7690 considered that promise and the Decalogue from
7691 which it was taken, totally valid. Paul affirms such
7692 validity in spite of living in a time after the
7693 resurrection of the Lord. The anti-law currently
7694 thinks the law of God was valid up to Jesus'
7695 crucifixion only.

7696 Note also that he is advising the Ephesians, a
7697 Gentile church. Therefore he considered the law of
7698 God valid even for the Gentiles. **Can we think that**
7699 **Paul uses the Decalogue in spite of being**

7700 **obsolete?** Do you think he would have advised his
7701 disciples to follow something that was not valid?
7702 Can you conceive in Paul the double standard of
7703 using and advising following a law he did not
7704 believe in?

7705 If those who so think would mentally review the
7706 Decalogue, they would see they would also advise
7707 their disciples to obey everything that was
7708 established there, everything....except keeping the
7709 Saturday, because that commandment they would
7710 “improve” by using Sunday as their day of rest.

7711 **“Let’s work on Saturday when God ordained**
7712 **for resting! ;Let’s rest on Sunday when God**
7713 **ordained for working!** It was not ordained in the
7714 Bible, but we decided to “improve” on that
7715 commandment. We don’t do it because the Roman
7716 Empire had it as a custom nor because of its heir the
7717 Roman Church imposed it, nor because we follow
7718 that tradition without knowing where it came from;
7719 we do it because,ehhhhh ... because..... well,
7720 because...ahhh, because we are not under the law,
7721 but under graceyes. That’s right, that’s why we
7722 do it”.

7723 The annulment of Saturday and the establishment
7724 of resting on Sunday is one of the errors and sins
7725 that the reformers inherited from the Roman
7726 Church, right along with some others.

7727 *

7728
7729

7730 **Saint Paul did not work on Saturdays**

7731 Paul and Aquila’s trade was making tents. **It is**
7732 **evident that Paul did not make tents on**
7733 **Saturdays;** rather he rested and went to synagogue.
7734 Not only must we conclude that if he went to
7735 synagogue on Saturdays he could not be working at

7736 the same time, but **if he worked on Saturdays he**
7737 **would not be accepted in the synagogue, and**
7738 **much less would he be allowed to express his**
7739 **ideas. That proves he kept that day.**

7740

7741 *“¹ After these things Paul departed from*
7742 *Athens, and came to Corinth; ² and found a*
7743 *certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus,*
7744 *lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla;*
7745 *because that Claudius had commanded all*
7746 *Jews to depart from Rome; and came unto*
7747 *them. ³ And because he was of the same craft,*
7748 *he abode with them, and wrought, for by their*
7749 *occupation they were tentmakers. ⁴ And he*
7750 ***reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath,***
7751 *and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks”*

(Act 18:1-4)

7752

7753

7754 Anyone could say that Paul rested on Saturday
7755 only to go preach at the synagogue, but **you would**
7756 **not find one passage where it says that Paul also**
7757 **rested on Sunday.** Neither did he rest because
7758 Aquila, being a Jew, kept the Saturday, because in
7759 18:26 we see that the couple was Christian. If they
7760 also kept Saturday it was because the early
7761 Christians kept it.

7762 As we can see we can find several passages where
7763 it is either said or implied that **Paul’s custom was**
7764 **to not work on Saturday.** However, you will not
7765 find one passage where it is said or even implied
7766 that Paul did not work on Sunday. Yet, who knows
7767 for what dark influence, Christians have rejected
7768 Saturday and accept Sunday. Who pushes that
7769 mistaken concept from the dark’ spiritual regions?

7770

*

7771

7772 **Paul followed the law so not to curse the High**
7773 **Priest**

7774 In this passage we see that Paul calls on ignorance
7775 to excuse himself of what he said to the high priest.
7776 Paul says that he did not know this man was the
7777 high priest, because if he had known he would not
7778 have cursed him, **for God's law said that could**
7779 **not be done.** In this passage we see that Paul
7780 guided his life by God's law. If he had believed it
7781 was obsolete he would not have invoked it.

7782
7783 *"⁴ And they that stood by said: Revilest thou*
7784 *God's high priest? ⁵ Then said Paul: I wist*
7785 *not, brethren, that he was the high priest, **for***
7786 ***it is written,** Thou shalt not speak evil of the*
7787 *ruler of thy people". (Act 23:4-5)*

7788
7789 As we can see Paul followed what was written, it
7790 is to say, God's Law. If he did, so should we. **The**
7791 **law that Paul considered obsolete was the**
7792 **ceremonial law, not the behavioral law.**

7793 *

7794
7795
7796 **Paul, a sincere man, says he believed in the law,**
7797 **therefore he did not consider it obsolete**

7798 Paul says here that he believed everything that
7799 was written in the law. **If Paul said that, it is**
7800 **logical to think that he knew God's law was not**
7801 **cancelled,** because he was not going to lie, or
7802 believe on something that had no validity. If God's
7803 law for human behavior had been cancelled, Paul
7804 would have said, "I had always believed the law"
7805 rather than lie saying he is "believing in the law".

7806

7807 *“But this I confess unto thee, that after the*
7808 *way which they call heresy, so worship I the*
7809 *God of my fathers, **believing all things which***
7810 ***are written in the law and in the prophets”***

(Act 24:14)

7812

7813 **I don’t think any Christian can accuse Paul of**
7814 **being insincere and saying he believed in**
7815 **something he really didn’t, out of convenience.**
7816 We can’t say either that the “law” he is referring to
7817 were the prophecies, since he makes it clear he
7818 believed both things, specifying he believed the law
7819 and the prophets.

7820

*

7821

7822

7823 **According to Paul’s words, first Christians did**
7824 **not go to church on Sunday**

7825 Some, after learning from their teachers the
7826 heretical error that Saturday was changed to
7827 Sunday, start to look for verses to back up what
7828 they have already decided to believe. That is a very
7829 common error, to start from the finish line. **First,**
7830 **they adopt a doctrine, and then they look in the**
7831 **Bible for something that seems to back it up.**
7832 They should do the opposite, read the Bible well
7833 and then adopt a doctrine.

7834 Well then, among those who want to prove to
7835 themselves that Sunday replaced Saturday, it is used
7836 the verse I show next, as if it were “proof” of such
7837 change. **If God had changed one of his Ten**
7838 **Commandments, He would have done it himself,**
7839 He would not have charged anyone with it, **nor**
7840 **would He have left an obscure message for**
7841 **anyone to “get” the change.**

7842 But such is the case, that even in this verse, on
7843 which the anti-law doctrine is based, **it proves that**
7844 **Christians did not rest or go to church on**
7845 **Sunday.** Proof of this is that when Paul talks to
7846 them he is assuming they would be at home, not in
7847 church.

7848

7849 *“¹ Now concerning the collection for the*
7850 *saints, as I have given order to the churches*
7851 *of Galatia, even so do ye. ² Upon the first*
7852 *day of the week let every one of you lay by*
7853 *him in store, as God hath prospered him,*
7854 *that there be no gatherings when I come”.*

7855

(I Co 16:1-2)

7856

7857 **If Paul thought that Christians kept Sunday,**
7858 **he would not tell them to do this at home,** rather
7859 he would have indicated any other day; especially
7860 knowing that Sunday they would be all day in
7861 church. So those who keep Sunday thinking the
7862 disciples kept Sunday are mistaken, because not
7863 only in Corinth, but in Galatia, Christians were at
7864 home on Sundays.

7865 The fact that he said to set apart what they could
7866 on Sunday, could have been motivated by the fact
7867 that when they finished the work week on Friday,
7868 (picking up fruits, collecting their salary,
7869 harvesting, or whatever), then they rested on
7870 Saturday, and because of that, he would advise them
7871 to do it on Sunday, the first day of the week. So
7872 before they spent anything, they should set apart for
7873 the collection.

7874

*

7875

7876

7877 **The issue of the two witnesses are taken from the**
7878 **law**

7879 This norm that was established in the law of God
7880 is what Paul used and recommended in his time, as
7881 we can see in II Co 13:1 and I Tim 5:19. It is clear
7882 that Paul continued to follow what was written in
7883 God's law.

7884
7885 *“One witness shall not rise up against a man*
7886 *for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that*
7887 *he sinneth; at the mouth of two witnesses, or*
7888 *at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the*
7889 *matter be established”.* (Dt 19:15)

7890
7891 *“This is the third time I am coming to you. In*
7892 *the mouth of two or three witnesses shall*
7893 *every word be established”.* (II Co 13:1)

7894
7895 *“Against an elder receive not an accusation,*
7896 *but before two or three witnesses”.*
7897 (I Tim 5:19)

7898
7899 As we can see, St. Paul continued to consider that
7900 God's law was a good norm to follow; he did not
7901 consider it obsolete.

7902 *

7903
7904

7905 **Paul says it is not enough to hear God's law, it**
7906 **has to be obeyed**

7907 Why do some Christians treat God's law with
7908 such contempt? These brothers proceed as if they
7909 thought the law was invented by Satan. In this verse
7910 Paul himself, who some people consider the
7911 champion of the law “haters”, assures the contrary
7912 to what they think. He says it was not just the

7913 hearers of the law, but **the doers of the law who**
7914 **act correctly**. The law that Paul considers obsolete
7915 is the ceremonial law, not the behavioral law.

7916

7917 *“For not the hearers of the law are just*
7918 *before God, but the doers of the law shall be*
7919 *justified”*. (Ro 2:13)

7920

7921 Paul is saying here that we have to obey God’s
7922 law for human behavior, that we must align our
7923 behavior by that is established in God’s law.

7924 **Does that mean that salvation comes by**
7925 **finalizing a life after having lived obeying the law**
7926 **without fail?** No, no one can accomplish that; that
7927 is why the Lord came. Only Jesus did it. And we are
7928 saved thanks to what he did and his sacrifice to
7929 accomplish what we could not do ourselves. **But**
7930 **nobody is saved either by saying he believes in**
7931 **Jesus, he lives under the grace, and then goes on**
7932 **to consciously disobey God’s law, voluntarily**
7933 **and premeditated.**

7934 The Christian who sincerely believes that what
7935 was established by God does not have to be obeyed
7936 is going to suffer the local and temporary
7937 consequences of not obeying God’s law, but doesn’t
7938 stop being saved, because his sin is unconscious. If
7939 he knew he had to obey he would do it, and repent
7940 from not having obeyed before.

7941 **The Christian who does not obey what God has**
7942 **established** because of circumstances, pressures,
7943 weaknesses or temptation, even when he was
7944 conscious he had to obey, suffers the local and
7945 temporary consequences of his sin. But if he
7946 **sincerely repents** of his weakness, or fights the
7947 temptation that led him to error, without giving in to
7948 it, repentant for having let himself be deceived, does

7949 not lose his salvation either, because he did not do it
7950 voluntarily, but under human or demonic pressure.
7951 A good example of this would be Peter's denial.

7952 **A Christian, whom, surprised by sin, falls in it,**
7953 will no avoid the local and temporary consequences
7954 of his sin, but if he sincerely repents he does not
7955 lose his salvation because his sin was not
7956 premeditated.

7957 **All this is true;** but from there to affirming that
7958 what was established by God does not have to be
7959 obeyed, because we are under grace and we can
7960 disobey to our heart's delight, **there is a large and**
7961 **deep abyss; and that abyss has a name: let's try**
7962 **not to fall in it.**

7963 *

7964

7965

7966 **Did Paul ever say we must rest on Sunday**
7967 **instead of Saturday?**

7968 If we thoroughly analyze the entire New
7969 Testament we will see that **nowhere** did Paul ever
7970 say that Saturday had been changed for Sunday.
7971 Neither did any of the other apostles **ever** say it, and
7972 nothing else can be inferred from their writings.

7973 **If God personally commanded us many times**
7974 **to keep Saturday, is it not logical to think that if**
7975 **he were to change any of the Ten Command-**
7976 **ments, he would have done so personally, or**
7977 **through Jesus Christ himself?** And yet we see that
7978 those who claim that Saturday was changed for
7979 Sunday only take into consideration obscure
7980 interpretations and never the unchangeable
7981 commandment of someone with divine authority.

7982 Imagine that someone now comes and says that
7983 the commandment of not stealing was changed and
7984 that it is not a sin any more as long as it is given to

7985 the poor in the church. Would you believe it? Of
7986 course, not! Because in order to believe such a thing
7987 there has to be a very clear commandment from
7988 God, not only a vague and diffused interpretation.
7989 Well, that is just the things that do those who affirm
7990 that Saturday was changed to Sunday.

7991 **That reminds me of the disobedient prophet,**
7992 told in I Kings 13, and specifically I Kings 13:21-
7993 22. Here we see that God, **personally**, gave the
7994 prophet a command, but then, another prophet lies
7995 to him saying that “now” God said the opposite. So
7996 what does the first prophet do? Does he obey God?
7997 No, he obeys what the second prophet said that God
7998 had said.

7999 **It is the same thing that the anti-law Christians**
8000 **do.** God tells them to keep Saturday, and others say
8001 they must keep Sunday, so they keep Sunday. God
8002 tells them not to eat certain things, and others, just
8003 like the serpent with Eve, tell them that “now” these
8004 things can be eaten. And what do they do? They eat
8005 what God told them not to eat. My anti-law brothers
8006 should think thoroughly what they are doing. Think
8007 of the similarity they have with the disobedient
8008 prophet, and the consequences the first prophet
8009 suffered by rejecting what God said and listening to
8010 what others said.

8011
8012 *“11 Now there dwelt an old prophet in Bethel;*
8013 *and his sons came and told him all the works*
8014 *that **the man of God** had done that day in*
8015 *Bethel, the words which he had spoken unto*
8016 *the king, them they told also to their father. 12*
8017 *And their father said unto them: What way*
8018 *went he? For his sons had seen what way **the***
8019 ***man of God** went, which came from Judah. 13*
8020 *And he said unto his sons: Saddle me the ass.*

8021 *So they saddled him the ass; and he rode*
 8022 *thereon, ¹⁴ and went after **the man of God,***
 8023 *and found him sitting under an oak; and he*
 8024 *said unto him: Art thou **the man of God that***
 8025 ***camest from Judah?** And he said, I am. ¹⁵*
 8026 *Then he said unto him: Come home with me,*
 8027 *and eat bread. ¹⁶ And he said, I may not*
 8028 *return with thee, nor go in with thee, neither*
 8029 *will I eat bread nor drink water with thee in*
 8030 *this place, ¹⁷ for it was said to me by the word*
 8031 *of the LORD: Thou shalt eat no bread nor*
 8032 *drink water there, nor turn again to go by*
 8033 *the way that thou camest.*
 8034 *¹⁸ He said unto him, I am a prophet also as*
 8035 *thou art; and an angel spake unto me by the*
 8036 *word of the LORD, saying: Bring him back*
 8037 *with thee into thine house, that he may eat*
 8038 *bread and drink water. But he lied unto him.*
 8039 *¹⁹ So he went back with him, and **did eat***
 8040 ***bread in his house, and drank water.** ²⁰ And*
 8041 *it came to pass, as they sat at the table, that*
 8042 *the word of the LORD came unto the prophet*
 8043 *that brought him back, ²¹ and he cried unto*
 8044 *the man of God that came from Judah,*
 8045 *saying: **Thus saith the LORD: Forasmuch as***
 8046 ***thou hast disobeyed the mouth of the LORD,***
 8047 ***and hast not kept the commandment which***
 8048 ***the LORD thy God commanded thee,** ²² but*
 8049 *camest back, and hast eaten bread and*
 8050 *drunk water in the place, of the which the*
 8051 *LORD did say to thee, Eat no bread, and*
 8052 *drink no water; thy carcase shall not come*
 8053 *unto the sepulchre of thy fathers”.*
 8054 *(I K 13:11-22)*
 8055

8056 As we saw, God told him not to eat, a man told
8057 him to eat, and he disregarded God's words and
8058 obeyed man's word. Same do Christians today with
8059 food and Saturdays.

8060 *

8061
8062
8063 **Summary of Chapter 8.** Paul never pretended to
8064 be the "pope", nor the referee of the Christian
8065 religion, but many Christians have made him so,
8066 becoming themselves instead of Christians,
8067 Saintpaulians.

8068 **Many brothers wrongfully interpret Paul,**
8069 **crediting to him having said things he really**
8070 **never said,** like the myth that a priest could only go
8071 into the Holy of Holies once a year, when in reality,
8072 they went in every day, at least twice a day.

8073 Paul was conscious that sometimes it was hard to
8074 understand him, and such was that truth that the
8075 Holy Spirit inspired Peter to warn us about it in II
8076 Peter 2:15-16. That is why many understand that
8077 Paul said he was irrepressible in obeying all of
8078 God's laws, when he really did not say such thing.
8079 What he said was that as a Pharisee he was
8080 irrepressible, obeying the ceremonial laws.

8081 **All these errors from those who do not**
8082 **understand Paul** are motivated by the rhetoric and
8083 hyperbolic way of talking of the Apostle to the
8084 Gentiles. But above all, because instead of
8085 analyzing what he says when it goes against what
8086 the rest of the Bible says, what they do is to close
8087 their eyes and ears, accepting everything without
8088 reasoning. That is why there is always someone
8089 who does not understand what Paul means when he
8090 affirms that money is the root of **all** evil. Or when
8091 he says he would rather separate himself from God

8092 and go to hell, if with it he would save his
8093 countrymen.

8094 Something similar happens when it seems he says
8095 that to Christ's afflictions for the Church, have to
8096 be added Paul's own. They are exaggerations,
8097 hyperboles, to emphasize a desired point. But we
8098 are sure that Paul, in several occasions did not want
8099 to say what we understand at first sight. Sadly, that
8100 is what people erroneously interpret of him, **the**
8101 **same way they wrongfully interpret that the**
8102 **Apostle abolished God's law in just one stroke of**
8103 **his pen.**

8104 There are those who hang on to Paul's words to
8105 fabricate stupid heresies, like the idea that women,
8106 to be saved, had to give birth and raise children, or
8107 when it seems to say that all men will be saved. All
8108 these are interpretation errors, not errors that Paul
8109 had affirmed.

8110 Later we saw the **different meanings of the word**
8111 **"law"** in the Bible, in order to warn you, so when
8112 you see that something is said against the law, you
8113 may see to which law are they referring to.

8114 **We also analyzed the Epistle to the Galatians,**
8115 where many believe that Paul most clearly said
8116 God's laws for human behavior were abolished, and
8117 we showed that in this book Paul was only talking
8118 about the ritual law, which he rightly considers
8119 abolished. From no part of the book can we
8120 conclude that God's laws for human behavior
8121 would be abolished.

8122 It is the same thing when he seems to authorize
8123 **eating everything as long as we say grace**, only to
8124 find later that what Paul is authorizing for eating is
8125 what the coming apostasy would prohibit even if
8126 they were authorized by God.

8127 Others interpret that Paul considers Saturday and
8128 the law obsolete, when he is simply talking about
8129 certain commandments that some Jews were trying
8130 to introduce, based on human traditions and
8131 philosophical subtleties. **Paul was not going to**
8132 **refer to God's laws, including the Ten**
8133 **Commandments, as traditions and subtleties.**

8134 **Paul is perfectly clear, especially in Eph 2:15,**
8135 **that it is the ceremonial laws that are obsolete, in**
8136 **spite of what many brothers insist on saying, that it**
8137 **is the behavioral laws that are obsolete.**

8138 **The same is true when Paul says that**
8139 **everything is permissible, but not all is convenient.**
8140 When we read I Co 6:12, there are many who want
8141 to understand that they are free to sin without
8142 restrictions. But **what Paul is really saying is that**
8143 **of the things that God allows, those that are**
8144 **permissible, he doesn't do some.** In other words,
8145 he sets aside his right, if such thing, though
8146 permissible in God's eyes, is not convenient to do in
8147 certain circumstances. Case in point is that of Paul
8148 not receiving a salary for preaching.

8149 **I then showed the existence of ceremonial**
8150 **Saturdays, in other words, days which were**
8151 **declared Sabbaths even if they were not the seventh**
8152 **day of the week. In those "Sabbaths" certain rites**
8153 **and ceremonies took place. It was talking about**
8154 **those ceremonial Saturdays that Paul says that some**
8155 **make difference between one day and the next, and**
8156 **others don't. Paul is not saying that it pleases God**
8157 **that we work on Saturday. He is saying that those**
8158 **ceremonial Saturdays, because they were part of**
8159 **a ritual law, could or could not be kept;**
8160 **Christians were not required to keep them.**

8161 In another section of this chapter we analyzed that
8162 **Paul guided his own life after God's law, as we**

8163 could see in the more than 10 examples I presented
8164 in that section.

8165 **As we can see, nowhere in the New Testament**
8166 **is the least of hints that Paul, or any Apostle had**
8167 **given as void God's law for human behavior.**
8168 Therefore brothers, I advise you to obey God and
8169 not the "second" prophet.

8170

8171

8172

8173

8174

8175

8176

Chapter 9

8177

What is, and for what is God's law?

8178

8179

What is God's law

8180

8181

8182

8183

8184

8185

8186

8187

8188

8189

8190

8191

8192

8193

8194

8195

8196

8197

God's law are those norms that God considered convenient to teach us humans so we can walk in as much righteousness as possible during our pilgrimage through this world.

Let's not confuse God's laws with the norms imposed by religious, social or political leaders. Let's not confuse either the divine laws with the rules of the culture or civilization in which we live, nor with the traditions of the race, nation or sect that we belong to.

Unfortunately most people, without excluding Christians, admit, as behavioral norms, those imposed on the conglomerates. In other words, "if everyone does it, why can't I?"

*

8198
8199
8200
8201
8202
8203
8204
8205
8206
8207
8208
8209
8210
8211
8212
8213
8214
8215
8216
8217
8218
8219
8220
8221
8222
8223
8224
8225
8226
8227
8228
8229
8230
8231
8232
8233

What God's laws are for?

God's laws are good to let us know what things we should do, which we should not, and to guide us in the daily decisions.

God's law was never good to save anyone; the law never saved anyone, due to the fact that no one could obey it during his entire life, from the cradle to the tomb. Besides, the law is scripture, it cannot save any one, it has no intellect nor feelings. Jesus Christ can save any one who desires it.

The law never served for salvation, only as a guide to know what to do and what not to do. There are those who believe that "**before**" people saved them by obeying the law. False, that has never been possible.

People before, just like people now, were saved by faith in the lamb of God that takes away the sins of the world. The difference between those before Christ and those after Christ is that we already know that the lamb is called Jesus Christ, while before they only knew there would be one sent to take away our sins. We put our faith in the Lamb that was already slain; they put their faith in the lamb they sacrificed, and that represented he who one day would take our sins upon himself.

It is a big mistake to think that "**before**" people were saved one way, and today they are saved another. There are even those who think that in the future, during the Great Tribulation, people will be saved still by a third method. All that is a heretic and abominable error. The method of salvation has always been and will always be the same: the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the world.

*

8234
8235
8236
8237
8238
8239
8240
8241
8242
8243
8244
8245
8246
8247
8248
8249
8250
8251
8252
8253
8254
8255
8256
8257
8258
8259
8260
8261
8262
8263
8264
8265
8266
8267
8268

The auto manufacturer

The one who leads an automobile manufacture, the chief engineer knows how the car was made, what the car can do, what it cannot do, what type of gasoline it uses, what number and type of oil must be used with it, what air pressure the tires take, etc..

As a conscious person's duty this chief engineer writes up a pamphlet where he explains all those details to the buyers. The one who follows all the recommendations is going to enjoy a good car for many years; the one who rejects them sooner or later will pay for his disobedience.

However, there are those who follow some recommendations and not others. If we take good care of the engine but not the interior or the exterior, the car will function perfectly but will look deteriorated. If we take care of the seats and the outside, but we ignore the engine and the mechanical parts, the car will look like new, but will not serve any purpose, it will not run well.

Just as well, if we obey some of God's laws and not others, we will do well in certain things but not in others.

God's laws are good for guiding us in life and save us from pain and sufferings.

Many years ago a friend of mine, a good mechanic, saw me putting cheap oil in my car and advised me to use the most expensive one I could afford. Since I know about physics, I knew that the most important property of oil is its viscosity, and the cheap oil had it. So I did not pay attention to my friend's advice. It is better for the unlearned who listen to the counsel of the learned than for one who knows something and thinks he knows everything. That is what happened to me.

8269 After three or four years the car engine died and,
8270 of course, I went to see my friend who found me
8271 another engine, and changed it between the both of
8272 us, but I didn't even remember his advice. Just out
8273 of curiosity my friend opened the old engine to see
8274 why it had burned. When he saw the strainer of the
8275 in taking oil tube, he noticed that it was almost
8276 totally clogged up by hardened carbon. Then he told
8277 me I should use the more expensive oils **because**
8278 **they have a carbon solvent that prevents**
8279 **accumulation.** He did not remember he had given
8280 me that advice four years before, even though he
8281 did not tell me then that the reason I should use the
8282 more expensive oil was because it had the carbon
8283 solvents.

8284 When he gave me the first advice I thought I
8285 knew enough, I did not want to pay attention to him
8286 who knew better than I, and I paid the consequences
8287 for it.

8288 **In the same manner God gives us his**
8289 **commandments, and some times does not explain**
8290 **why we should obey them.** We, think we know
8291 better and we don't obey those little precepts and
8292 "insignificant" commandments thinking that they
8293 were for "the people of old", or thinking that they
8294 are obsolete. Then, when our "engine" breaks
8295 down, instead of admitting that it happened because
8296 we did not obey some commandment, we foolishly
8297 say, "they are trials, brother", instead of rectifying
8298 our behavior and obeying God's laws. That is why
8299 we continue suffering throughout our lives what we
8300 want to call "trials". **God's law serves to save us**
8301 **from all that pain.**

✻

8305 **Decisions based on God’s laws are the right**
8306 **decisions**

8307 Once we find ourselves living that life, and
8308 especially once we become Christians, we are
8309 constantly at a fork on the road: do we do “A” or do
8310 we do “B”; do we act before “C” or do we stay
8311 passive before “C”; do we abstain from “D” or do
8312 we not abstain. What should be our guide in such
8313 decisions? How do we know what to do and what
8314 not to do? That is why we have God’s law; they are
8315 the instructions for human behavior that God gave
8316 throughout the Old and the New Testaments. It is
8317 like the automobile manual that the factory’s chief
8318 engineer gave us.

8319 A great number of the living norms that Moses
8320 established as national laws in the old state of Israel,
8321 **existed way before Moses existed**, and the men of
8322 God guided their lives by them, **as we will see in**
8323 **chapter ten of this book**. These laws were always
8324 the same and will always be the same because God
8325 does not change his mind, needing to “improve” on
8326 what he did before.

8327 The next verse, as well as some others, says
8328 clearly that God does not change, or needs to fix
8329 something he did wrong before. If that is so, then,
8330 why do so many people think that God changed his
8331 mind in reference to the law, that what was bad
8332 “**before**” is good “**now**”? So, **that which we could**
8333 **not do before, now we can?**

8334
8335 *“Every good gift and every perfect gift is*
8336 *from above, and cometh down from the*
8337 *Father of lights, **with whom is no***
8338 ***variableness, neither shadow of turning*”.**

8339 (James 1: 17)

8340

8341 If there is no variableness in God, or shadow of
8342 turning, how do we explain that the Decalogue and
8343 God's law in general is abolished or has varied?
8344 Why think that the behavior rules that God
8345 considered good deeds are now taken as bad,
8346 negative, harmful, useless, or unnecessary? **If God**
8347 **previously gave Ten Commandments, why do**
8348 **many now think that we only have to obey nine?**

8349 *

8350
8351

8352 **Ignorance of the law is no excuse to sin against**
8353 **God. The servant who ignored the will of his lord**
8354 **will be flogged with few stripes, but will be**
8355 **flogged**

8356 When we read Lv 4:13 we realize that even if one
8357 person ignores the commission of a sin, it doesn't
8358 mean he is not guilty. In other words, if a person
8359 sins without knowing it is a sin, even so he is guilty.

8360

8361 *"And if the whole congregation of Israel sin*
8362 *through ignorance, and the thing be hid from*
8363 *the eyes of the assembly, and they have done*
8364 *somewhat against any of the commandments*
8365 *of the LORD concerning things which should*
8366 *not be done, and are guilty"* (Lev 4:13)

8367

8368 Whether or not someone is conscious that what he
8369 does was a sin, if the act he committed was sinful he
8370 will be guilty. As we can see, the excuse of
8371 ignorance does not exist for sin. **Our responsibility**
8372 **is to inquire, to seek the Supreme Being and find**
8373 **out if somehow, even if by feeling after him, as**
8374 **Paul said, we find Him.** Our obligation is to
8375 inquire about His laws, to find out about the rules
8376 before we act. **If by giving little importance to**

8377 **God and his rules**, we do not inquire about them,
8378 we do not know them, and we act against them, that
8379 is our problem. That same idea is expressed in
8380 Leviticus 4:27-28 and 5:17. Let's see.

8381

8382 *“And if any one of the common people **sin***
8383 ***through ignorance**, while he doeth somewhat*
8384 *against any of the commandments of the*
8385 *LORD concerning things which ought not to*
8386 *be done, and **be guilty**”* (Lev 4:27)

8387

8388 *“And if a soul **sin**, and commit any of these*
8389 ***things** which are forbidden to be done by the*
8390 *commandments of the LORD; **though he wist***
8391 ***it not**, yet is **he guilty**, and shall bear his*
8392 ***iniquity**”.* (Lev 5:17)

8393

8394 It is actually true that someone who is ignorant in
8395 good faith has a certain extenuating circumstances,
8396 but never absolving. This is proven in Luke 12:47-
8397 48 when the Lord Jesus himself says that the
8398 servant who did not understand, and because of his
8399 ignorance did things worthy of stripes, **will be**
8400 **striped less**. In other words, the one who knew he
8401 was doing wrong and continued doing so, will
8402 receive many stripes, while the one who sincerely
8403 did not know, **will receive less stripes**, not as many
8404 as the one who did know; **but he will be striped**.
8405 We can see clearly that ignorance is extenuating but
8406 not absolving. (Extenuating means it lessens the
8407 punishment; absolving means it totally annuls it.)

8408

8409 *“⁴⁷ And **that servant**, which knew his lord's*
8410 ***will**, and prepared not himself, neither did*
8411 *according to his will, **shall be beaten with***
8412 ***many stripes**. ⁴⁸ But **he that knew not**, and*

8413 *did commit things worthy of stripes, **shall be***
8414 ***beaten** with few stripes. For unto*
8415 *whomsoever much is given, of him shall be*
8416 *much required, and to whom men have*
8417 *committed much, of him they will ask the*
8418 *more". (Lk 12:47-48)*
8419

8420 **In short,** good faith ignorance of God's
8421 commandments **does not** free anyone from the
8422 penalty of transgression, the most it lessen that
8423 penalty.

8424 Let it then be known to the nonbelievers, who try
8425 not learning about God so they can allege
8426 ignorance, as well as the believers that do not want
8427 to inquire much about whether or not to obey God's
8428 commandments, hoping to allege good faith
8429 ignorance.

8430 *

8431
8432
8433 **Today's Perez-Uzzah Christianity and the**
8434 **"unimportant" laws for the "people of old"**

8435 In the following passage we see that it was very
8436 well known that the ark and the sanctuary's
8437 instruments had to be carried, not on a cart but on
8438 the shoulders, and not anyone's shoulders or under
8439 anyone's care, but those of the sons of Kohath only.

8440
8441 *"⁶ And Moses took the wagons and the oxen,*
8442 *and gave them unto the Levites. ⁷ Two wagons*
8443 *and four oxen he gave unto the sons of*
8444 *Gershon, according to their service. ⁸ And*
8445 *four wagons and eight oxen he gave unto the*
8446 *sons of Merari, according unto their service,*
8447 *under the hand of Ithamar the son of Aaron*
8448 *the priest. ⁹ **But unto the sons of Kohath he***

8449 ***gave none; because the service of the***
8450 ***sanctuary belonging unto them was that they***
8451 ***should bear upon their shoulders***”.

8452 (Nm 7:6-9)

8453

8454 In II Sam 6:3 we see that they **put the ark on a**
8455 **cart instead of on the shoulders of the sons of**
8456 **Kohath**, as the passage indicates. That is the reason
8457 Uzza died.

8458

8459 “³ *And they set the ark of God upon a new*
8460 *cart, and brought it out of the house of*
8461 *Abinadab that was in Gibeah, and Uzzah and*
8462 *Ahio, the sons of Abinadab, drove the new*
8463 *cart... ⁶ And when they came to Nachon’s*
8464 *threshing floor, Uzzah put forth his hand to*
8465 *the ark of God, and took hold of it; for the*
8466 *oxen shook it. ⁷ And the anger of the Lord*
8467 *was kindled against Uzzah, and God smote*
8468 *him there for his error, and there he died by*
8469 *the ark of God*”. (II Sam 6:3-7 abbreviated)

8470

8471 **They were also perfectly aware that** anyone
8472 who touched the sanctuary or any of the things
8473 inside it would die, because we are warned in Nm
8474 4:15 y 20.

8475

8476 “¹⁵ *And when Aaron and his sons have made*
8477 *an end of covering the sanctuary, and all the*
8478 *vessels of the sanctuary, as the camp is to set*
8479 *forward; after that, the sons of Kohath shall*
8480 ***come to bear it, but they shall not touch any***
8481 ***holy thing, lest they die.** ... ²⁰ But they shall*
8482 *not go in to see when the holy things are*
8483 *covered, lest they die*”.

8484 (Nm 4:15-20 abbreviated)

8485

8486

8487

8488

8489

8490

8491

All this reminds us that God's commands, **even the smallest**, those that don't seem important, are to be obeyed. Not just to be talked about and eventually **end up saying "that was for the people of old"**, just as many Christians say today about the validity of God's law.

8492

8493

8494

8495

8496

8497

Maybe those men thought that since they had "honored" God by putting the ark on a new cart and not an old one, they were free to disobey God's command. Something similar is done by those who devalue Saturday and keep Sunday "in honor" of Jesus Christ's resurrection.

8498

*

8499

8500

8501

8502

8503

We suffer much by disobeying God's law. Would Solomon think those commandments were not important?

8504

8505

8506

8507

8508

8509

8510

I have always said that God has given us the minimum laws required for our happiness in life. God has not overburdened us with precepts and laws to make our life difficult. **And much less, as many arrogantly think, would God give us difficult laws so we could not be saved and force us to opt for Christ.**

8511

8512

8513

8514

8515

8516

8517

For us Jesus is indispensable, not because God made things "hard" to force us to opt for Christ, but because in spite of making things as easy as he could, and in spite of making the laws as easy and doable as possible, in spite of that, I repeat, man still did not make the cut, and still fell short, he would not obey.

8518

8519

8520

Well then, if we think with that logic we will understand that nothing that God established is more than needed, and every law or precept is to be

8521 obeyed and practiced. **If we obey 99 and are short**
8522 **one, we will not receive the damages for which**
8523 **those 99 were established, but we will receive the**
8524 **damages for which that one that we did not obey**
8525 **was established.**

8526 There are many Christians who take for despise or
8527 devalue some of God's laws, without realizing what
8528 I just said. Much wiser people with much more
8529 fellowship with God than many of us also made that
8530 foolishness, and the experiment cost them dearly.

8531 **There we have Solomon**, whom after getting
8532 great wisdom from God, two personal revelations,
8533 absolute power, external power in his kingdom, and
8534 the realization of an extraordinary work (the
8535 Temple) decided to disobey two precepts. Maybe he
8536 disobeyed them because he thought they were for
8537 the **"men of old"**, or because he wanted to believe
8538 they were **"obsolete"**, or because he rendered them
8539 **insignificant**, or because he thought that if he
8540 obeyed the others, these **two small precepts**
8541 wouldn't have grave consequences for him.

8542 And so he did! He gathered for himself women, as
8543 we see in I Kings 11:3, and made the people return
8544 to Egypt in order to increase his horses, per I Kings
8545 4:26, thus disobeying the two **"small, insignificant**
8546 **commandments"** that in Dt 17:16-17, God
8547 ordained. The result of the violation of what maybe
8548 he thought would be two **"small, insignificant"**
8549 precepts, which were for **"the people of old"** and
8550 were now **"obsolete"**, is seen in I Kings 11:4-8.

8551
8552 *14... and shalt say: I will set a king over me,*
8553 *...¹⁵ Thou shalt in any wise set him king over*
8554 *thee, whom the LORD thy God shall*
8555 *choose...¹⁶ But he shall not multiply horses*
8556 *to himself, nor cause the people to return to*

8557 *Egypt, to the end that he should multiply*
8558 *horses, forasmuch as the LORD hath said*
8559 *unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more*
8560 *that way. 17 Neither shall he multiply wives to*
8561 *himself, that his heart turn not away; neither*
8562 *shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and*
8563 *gold”. (Dt 17:14-17 abbreviated)*

8564
8565 *“And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of*
8566 *horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand*
8567 *horsemen”. (I K 4:26)*

8568
8569 *“And Solomon had horses brought out of*
8570 *Egypt, and linen yarn; the king’s merchants*
8571 *received the linen yarn at a price”.*
8572 *(I K 10:28)*

8573
8574 *“³ And he had seven hundred wives,*
8575 *princesses, and three hundred concubines;*
8576 *and his wives turned away his heart. ⁴ For it*
8577 *came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his*
8578 *wives turned away his heart after other gods;*
8579 *and his heart was not perfect with the LORD*
8580 *his God, as was the heart of David his*
8581 *father”. (I K 11:3-4)*

8582
8583 **In summary, those “small commandments”**
8584 **and the “insignificant precepts” are also to be**
8585 **obeyed.**

8586 However, many brothers insist with great
8587 “conviction” but without biblical proof that the
8588 Saturday thing was for the people of “old”, and that
8589 of forbidden meats is irrelevant because “God
8590 doesn’t care about what we eat”.

8591 *

8592

8593 **The usefulness of obeying God**

8594 From this short passage I present next we could
8595 come out with a few lessons: **a) one about the**
8596 **wisdom of obeying God** in everything he says even
8597 when we don't know why; **b) another one about**
8598 **the obstacles we put before God** as to his
8599 blessings toward us; and **c) another one, about how**
8600 **our spiritual enemies take advantage** of our lack
8601 of knowledge, and mostly, **our lack of faith on**
8602 **God's orders**, (when we don't understand them) to
8603 modify our beliefs and **keep us from God's help**
8604 **and company**.
8605

8606 *“¹² Thou shalt have a place also without the*
8607 *camp, whither thou shalt go forth abroad, ¹³*
8608 *and thou shalt have a paddle upon thy*
8609 *weapon, and it shalt be, when thou wilt ease*
8610 *thyself abroad, thou shalt dig therewith, and*
8611 *shalt turn back and **cover that which cometh***
8612 ***from thee**”.* (Dt 23:12-13)
8613

8614 It is typical of the believer to brush away those
8615 divine ordinances and commandments that he does
8616 not understand. Or those someone tells him that he
8617 doesn't have to keep them **“anymore”**. Or if a
8618 celebrity tells him that they were for the “people of
8619 old”. We saw the first case in Gen 3:4-5 with our
8620 mother Eve, when the serpent told her she could eat
8621 what God had forbidden, that she did not have to
8622 obey what God had commanded. We are still
8623 suffering the consequences of that disobedience of
8624 that “small” commandment, the one about “you
8625 shall not eat”. **The serpent is still using that**
8626 **method that was so efficient then** with our mother
8627 Eve. At that time he told Eve she could eat that

8628 which God had commanded not to; today it still
8629 tells the brothers they can eat what God said not to.

8630 At the same time it is typical of nonbelievers to
8631 hold on to commandments, rituals, ordinances,
8632 superstitions, etc., which **are not** of divine origin,
8633 and die still holding on to them. What a paradox!
8634 What is **obviously** of divine origin is abandoned,
8635 rejected, undervalued; what **obviously** is not, is
8636 revered, obeyed and complied with.

8637 **Things don't go up a mountain by themselves,**
8638 **someone pushes them.** The natural, the "downward
8639 push" would be that what is ordained by God would
8640 become a habit, a behavioral norm passively, but we
8641 see the opposite. Why? Because there is an active
8642 agent that, along with his cronies, is hard at work to
8643 make human minds follow the non-natural course,
8644 the "upward" course.

8645 In the passage we just read there is an ordinance,
8646 one of its reasons was **totally** ignored by Christians
8647 up until less than a century ago. Today we only
8648 know one of its motives. Human waste, when **not**
8649 **deposited in a proper system like latrine, sewage,**
8650 **or the like,** but is left on the surface of the Earth
8651 brings about a number of diseases, such as parasites,
8652 typhus, dysentery, gastroenteritis, cholera, etc..

8653 In places where the custom is to deposit human
8654 waste on the Earth's surface, disease is common. If
8655 those people would blindly believe God's rules,
8656 even when they don't understand them, even if they
8657 seem like **"unimportant"** laws, and even if
8658 someone told them that they **"don't"** need to be
8659 kept because they were **"something of the past"**, if
8660 they obeyed them, I repeat, they would be free of
8661 the consequences that keeping them would avoid.
8662 **That is how obeying everything that God ordains**

8663 **is manifested as wise, even when we don't**
8664 **understand why.**

8665 We see here that God is always ready to protect us
8666 and bless us. We also see how we can lose that
8667 protection and blessing when we bring to him the
8668 filth and stench that make the angel that represents
8669 him flee from the place we live, or from the
8670 company of the person for whom that protection
8671 and blessing was directed to. In the category of
8672 stenches that set God or his angels apart from us,
8673 are, among others, the shedding of blood,
8674 fornication, sexual pollution, abortion, unnatural
8675 practices in any sense, pornography, idolatry,
8676 sodomy, witchcraft, spiritualism, dishonest gain of
8677 benefits or money, believing that others are less
8678 valuable than us, lying, and everything that goes
8679 against any divine ordinance, or against something
8680 that at any light is natural, holy and honest.

8681 God wants to give each and every human being a
8682 proportionally equal work, an important destiny in
8683 proportion to their gifts. **It is us, human beings**
8684 **who prevent the permanence of God's angel next**
8685 **to us. Why it happen? For not obeying his laws.**
8686 **For putting in or letting in filth into our soul, or**
8687 **around us, where we have, or should have**
8688 **authority, and in society around us.**

8689 Our lack of knowledge and cleanliness with
8690 respect to God is like that of a father and his two-
8691 year-old son. The father wants to take him where he
8692 is going, and he is dressed for the occasion. The son
8693 has been playing with mud, his mouth and hands are
8694 full of chocolate and he has soiled his pants. The
8695 father wants to hug him and carry him, take him
8696 with him. But he can't; he loves him...but the son
8697 force his father to love him.....from afar. He can't
8698 include him in his affairs, **the son does not want to**

8699 **be cleaner than what he is**, and he likes his play
8700 and his chocolates, and cares very little about being
8701 **dirty. He needs to learn!**

8702 Something similar happens to young Christian
8703 people when, rejecting the precepts and
8704 encouragements like those in II Co 6:4 they marry
8705 unbelievers, and then complain that God does not
8706 listen to their prayers to defend them from what the
8707 unbelievers they married do unto them.

8708 *

8709

8710

8711 **Do we obey the law merely by doing unto others**
8712 **as we want others do unto us? Many unbelievers**
8713 **do unto others what they want others to do unto**
8714 **them**

8715 In his effort to invalidate God's laws for human
8716 behavior, there are those who appeal to simplify it
8717 to the point of saying that it is enough to obey that
8718 of "you will love your neighbor as yourself". They
8719 also appeal to saying that it is enough to obey that
8720 of "do unto others as you want others do unto
8721 you".

8722

8723 *"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would*
8724 *that men should do to you, do ye even so to*
8725 *them; for this is the law and the prophets".*

8726 (Mt 7:12)

8727

8728 **That is true as long as it is about people that**
8729 **obey God's laws.** There are those who don't care
8730 that others do certain things to them that I am sure
8731 any true Christian would not want done to him. In
8732 order to know which of these things are admissible
8733 to God, we first need to know God's law.

8734 **We can't give these empty phrases as**
8735 **behavioral law to someone who doesn't know or**
8736 **accept God's law,** because what we would do is
8737 give him a "letter of marque", a license to sin
8738 without feeling guilt.

8739 **For example, a true Christian cannot be in**
8740 **agreement with a homosexual obeying that of**
8741 **doing unto others as you want others do unto**
8742 **you.** What homosexuals accept and want others do
8743 to them, no Christian would agree to under any
8744 circumstance. Therefore, things cannot be so
8745 simplified. We always have to end up in God's
8746 laws. It is not wise to expect a homosexual to guide
8747 himself by the simple phrase of *all things*
8748 *whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do*
8749 *ye even so to them;* because **that was said in a**
8750 **country, a culture and a society where most**
8751 **people followed God's laws.** That phrase is valid
8752 for that kind of people, but not to unbelievers.

8753 Although in a more general and condensed way
8754 we can say that our neighbor do to us as he wants
8755 others to do to him, such a thing is not a rule of
8756 general reach. The simple fact of doing to others
8757 what we want others to do to us does not guarantee
8758 that we are not in sin. Let's see other examples.

8759
8760 **A drug addict** is willing to share his marijuana
8761 joint so that other addicts share theirs with him. In a
8762 case such as this we can't follow such simple rule.

8763 **A sexual degenerate** is willing to share his wife
8764 with others as long as others share theirs with him.
8765 We can't apply the rule there either.

8766 **A criminal** is willing to falsely testify in favor of
8767 others so others will also give false testimony in his
8768 favor.

8769 As we can see God's laws cannot be substituted
8770 by a simple phrase. **These simple phrases work**
8771 **well only when those involved in the matter**
8772 **know and obey God's laws.** If we give these
8773 phrases as guide for their lives to people who do not
8774 know or accept God's laws we are only giving them
8775 a free card to sin without remorse.

8776 *

8777

8778

8779 **“Improving” on God's laws is as much a sin as**
8780 **not obeying them. Saul “improved” on God's**
8781 **commandment**

8782 There is a rebellious tendency in human beings. It
8783 is a tendency to modify, adapt, consider obsolete,
8784 etc., what God has ordained. Anything, except to
8785 faithfully obey what God has said! That has been
8786 happening since the Garden of Eden, and will
8787 continue on until Jesus Christ returns and governs
8788 with **iron rod**. Human beings do not understand
8789 freedom: they grossly misuse it. When they don't
8790 rebel personally, they like to follow doctrines
8791 invented by those who rebelled before, those who
8792 modified before, those who previously adapted
8793 what God has said, those who before founded the
8794 doctrines that considered the divine commandments
8795 obsolete.

8796 **That is what Catholics have done with**
8797 **salvation and with graven images, what the**
8798 **Protestants have done with Saturday (the law in**
8799 **general) and the rest with the entire Bible. Even**
8800 **Saul did it. Let's analyze.**

8801

8802 *“Now go and smite Amalek, and **utterly***
8803 ***destroy all that they have, and spare them***

8804 *not; but slay both man and woman, infant*
8805 *and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass”.*
8806 (I Sam 15:3)
8807

8808 God sent Saul to **completely** destroy Amalek (3)
8809 and he did kill the Amalekites, but **he thought he**
8810 **could make an exception with King Agag** and he
8811 let him live (8). He killed the vile and skinny
8812 animals, but refuse to kill the fat sheep **because he**
8813 **thought he should make an exception with the**
8814 **divine commandment**, and therefore he preserved
8815 the good and fat (9).
8816

8817 *“⁸ And he took Agag the king of the*
8818 *Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the*
8819 *people with the edge of the sword. ⁹ But Saul*
8820 *and the people spared Agag, and the best of*
8821 *the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the*
8822 *fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was*
8823 *good, and would not utterly destroy them.*
8824 *But every thing that was vile and refuse, that*
8825 *they destroyed utterly”.* (I Sam 15:8-9)
8826

8827 **After all this disobedience**, as if nothing, he
8828 mocks Samuel saying, “**...I have obeyed** God’s
8829 word”. (13) I don’t know if he really thought so, or
8830 if that was the rhetoric with which he wished to fool
8831 himself and/or Samuel. I tend to think the latter,
8832 because **human beings know deep within** why
8833 they don’t want to accept God’s commandments.

8834 When Samuel shows Saul that the presence of the
8835 animals there was proof that he had not obeyed (14)
8836 he shields a very common human reason, **I did it to**
8837 **improve on God’s commandment**. So, sure
8838 enough, when Samuel senses the presence of
8839 animals that should be dead, Saul comes up with the

8840 pseudo reason that motivated him to “improve” on
8841 God’s commandment. Let’s read.

8842

8843 “¹³ And Samuel came to Saul, and Saul said
8844 unto him: *Blessed be thou of the LORD; I*
8845 *have performed the commandment of the*
8846 *LORD.* ¹⁴ And Samuel said: *What meaneth*
8847 *then this bleating of the sheep in mine ears,*
8848 *and the lowing of the oxen which I hear?* ¹⁵
8849 *And Saul said: They have brought them from*
8850 *the Amalekites, for the people spared the best*
8851 *of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice*
8852 *unto the LORD thy God; and the rest we*
8853 *have utterly destroyed”.* (I Sam 15:13-15)

8854

8855 What Saul said is equal to saying, “Many of us
8856 (and because we are many we can’t go wrong,) have
8857 agreed, **to improve what was said by God**, to obey
8858 only a great part of his commandments and not the
8859 other part. With that other part we are going to do
8860 something better than what God orders: we are
8861 going to make those sacrifices that are so pleasing
8862 to God”.

8863 This reminds me of those who authorize and
8864 encourage the worshipping, honoring, revere, etc.,
8865 of graven images with the “noble” purpose of
8866 **giving the “ignorant masses”, (as they say),**
8867 **“something concrete”** that represents God, without
8868 which (they say) they would not worship God.

8869 I am equally reminded of those who “in order to
8870 honor Christ” **have agreed not to keep the day**
8871 **that God commanded, but that in which Christ**
8872 **came from the dead.** Another “noble”
8873 “improvement” of God’s commandment.

8874 As we can see these two groups can mock that
8875 Saul says in verse 15 and say, “that is the only

8876 commandment we are not obeying, and we do it to
8877 better honor the Lord your God, but we obey the
8878 other nine”.

8879 In both cases we see the same pseudo reason:
8880 **“improving” on what God established** (15) and
8881 the same true reason: **fear of the people** (24). What
8882 would people think if I change so radically? And
8883 some times we find the same self-justifying rhetoric
8884 from verse 13 of this chapter” “...I have done as the
8885 Lord has said”.

8886 But all that rhetoric does not extinguish the echo
8887 of what Samuel said in verses 22-23, “....Certainly
8888 **obeying is better than sacrifices;** and to pay
8889 attention is better and the fat of rams, because
8890 **rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and**
8891 **stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry”.**

8892
8893 *“²² And Samuel said: Hath the LORD as*
8894 *great delight in burnt offerings and*
8895 *sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the*
8896 *LORD? Behold, to obey is better than*
8897 *sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.*
8898 *²³ For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft,*
8899 *and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry.*
8900 *Because thou hast rejected the word of the*
8901 *LORD, he hath also rejected thee from being*
8902 *king”.* (I Sam 15:22-23)

8903
8904 **Neither do these pretexts extinguish the echo of**
8905 **what Jesus said in Mat 5:17-19.**

8906
8907 *“¹⁷ Think not that I am come to destroy the*
8908 *law, or the prophets; I am not come to*
8909 *destroy, but to fulfil. ¹⁸ For verily I say unto*
8910 *you, Till heaven and Earth pass, one jot or*
8911 *one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,*

8912 *till all be fulfilled. 19 Whosoever therefore*
8913 *shall break one of these least commandments,*
8914 *and shall teach men so, he shall be called the*
8915 *least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever*
8916 *shall do and teach them, the same shall be*
8917 *called great in the kingdom of heaven”.*

(Mt 5:17-19)

*

8921
8922 **Reason to obey the commandments we don’t**
8923 **understand**

8924 The main reason to obey God’s commandment is
8925 that He is God, that’s all. He is not like a human
8926 father, or a company CEO who can make mistakes.
8927 We obey his commandments because they are
8928 God’s.

8929 God established a certain number of laws and
8930 ordinances, most of which the religious people and
8931 even Christians, have rejected or modified. What
8932 God says that has to be done, must be done, and
8933 must be done as He says, without modifying it
8934 according to our narrow and undocumented criteria.
8935 God knows what he does. He knows what he
8936 ordains. He does not establish laws capriciously. To
8937 not obey we have to be very, very sure, that they are
8938 definitely not valid.

8939 **When establishing Passover, God ordained not**
8940 **to break any bones of the Passover lamb.** It is
8941 almost certain that many Jews then didn’t know the
8942 reason for an apparently “unimportant” ordinance.

8943
8944 *“In one house shall it be eaten; thou shalt*
8945 *not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out*
8946 *of the house; neither shall ye break a bone*
8947 *thereof”.* (Ex 12:46)

8948

8949

8950

8951

8952

8953

8954

8955

8956

8957

8958

8959

8960

8961

8962

8963

8964

8965

8966

8967

8968

8969

8970

8971

8972

8973

8974

8975

8976

8977

8978

8979

8980

8981

8982

8983

It is possible that many of them thought the commandment was strange, but they would have to obey by faith, even if they did not know why God had established it, while others didn't, shielding themselves behind ideas such as: a) "well, that was before, but we can break bones now;" b) "that is because when they left Egypt they had nothing to break bones with, and that way they avoided being wounded by doing it with their hands;" c) "that is because in those times lambs had a bone disease, but since they don't have it now we can now break their bones and eat the marrow;" d) maybe some would say to themselves, "If what God wants is for us to eat a roasted lamb, what does it matter if we break a bone? That would make it easier for me to distribute the lamb. After all, what matters is the love and the faith with which we eat the lamb. Besides, God is the god of Passover and therefore we don't have to obey the laws of Passover", etc., etc., blah, blah, blah...

However, as the centuries went by we see after all the motive for not breaking any bone of the Passover lamb. Jesus Christ, our true Passover Lamb, when he was crucified, had no broken bones (Jn 19:31-36). So that law that perhaps many thought to be unimportant, that could be violated because they saw no logic or usefulness, that law that they thought was for "**the people of old**", this law that did not have to be obeyed, was still good enough for something, even if those who obeyed it didn't understand yet what good it was for.

So today there are still many ordinances and divine laws, small and big, that people just don't want to obey, but for which there is a reason for having them established, as in the case of Saturday

8984 and forbidden animals. The faith that God knows
8985 what He does and ordains is what makes us obey his
8986 commandments instead of rejecting them or modify
8987 them. That is why all those “reasons” that many
8988 give for not obeying God’s laws are invalid. When
8989 we talk about not eating pork’s meat, shrimp, etc.,
8990 Christians today say that was for “the times of old”,
8991 or “that is because they didn’t know how to cook
8992 the pork”, or “that is because back then pork had
8993 diseases”, or “everything God created is good, what
8994 matters is the love”, etc..

8995 *

8996

8997

8998

The Pharisees also “improved” on God’s commandments

8999

9000

9001

9002

9003

9004

9005

9006

9007

9008

9009

9010

9011

9012

9013

9014

9015

9016

9017

9018

9019

In this passage we see how Jesus has to defend God’s law “interpreted” and “improved on” by the religious clicks of the times. God had given a clear, very clear commandment! “Honor your father and mother”, but the religious clicks “interpreted it” and “improved on it” in such a way that, in their opinion, God would be very satisfied.

Imagine that! What God determined to be given to the parents, these religious clicks “graciously” gave to God. Or better yet, to the priests, because it was the religious clicks that would benefit from it. God asked for the tithe, but they gave more, even that which was set apart to help their parents. The Pharisees, greedy as they were (Lk 16:14), and reflecting unto God their own way of being, thought they were pleasing God by modifying His commandment, changing it for another one that they considered “better”. I say that they would consider it better because they gave God more than what He had asked for. This behavior, as we will see later on

9020 in this chapter, was harshly criticized by the Lord,
9021 to the point of calling them hypocrites.

9022

9023 *“⁴ For God commanded, saying: Honour thy*
9024 *father and mother; and, He that curseth*
9025 *father or mother, let him die the death. ⁵ But*
9026 *ye say: Whosoever shall say to his father or*
9027 *his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou*
9028 *mightest be profited by me; ⁶ and honour not*
9029 *his father or his mother, he shall be free.*
9030 *Thus have ye made the commandment of*
9031 *God of none effect by your tradition”.*

9032 (Mt 15:4-6)

9033

9034 This is a lot like those who today modify God’s
9035 laws authorizing the eating of what God prohibited,
9036 like that offered to idols, blood pudding, or
9037 prohibited animals. Or those who “improve” on the
9038 commandment for Saturday to “honor” Christ
9039 keeping Sunday. **Christ was honored by obeying**
9040 **His Father.**

9041 **Whoever modifies or “improves” on God’s**
9042 **laws is as guilty as he who despise them.**

9043

*

9044

9045

9046 **What would be our habits if instead of being**
9047 **dead to the ceremonial laws we were dead to the**
9048 **behavioral laws?**

9049 Which law are we Christians dead to? And, what
9050 does it mean to “be dead unto the law?” Would that
9051 mean that for us to be saved we are not forced to go
9052 along its enslaving ceremonies and rituals, or would
9053 it mean that we don’t have to obey the
9054 commandments and precepts that God expressed in
9055 the Old Testament as the norm for our behavior?

9056
9057 *“Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are*
9058 ***become dead to the law** by the body of Christ;*
9059 *that ye should be married to another, even to*
9060 *him who is raised from the dead, that we*
9061 *should bring forth fruit unto God”.* (Ro 7:4)
9062

9063 If that verse means that in order to be saved **we**
9064 **are not** obliged to go along its enslaving
9065 ceremonies and rituals, that goes along with the rest
9066 of the Bible. But if they want to give it the meaning
9067 that we don’t have to obey those commandments
9068 **anymore**, and the precepts that God expressed in
9069 the Old Testament as the norm for our behavior,
9070 that would go against the rest of the Bible.

9071 If we misinterpret it as not having to obey
9072 anything that was said in the Old Testament, it
9073 would mean that we could do whatever we feel like
9074 it, without arbitrations or restrictions except that
9075 which seemed good to anyone, or at most, what
9076 seemed good to the congregation to which we
9077 belong. **Doing what seems right to each one is**
9078 **chaos; doing what seems right to a group, if not**
9079 **chaos, it borders it.**

9080 If Christians died to the behavioral law, and it is
9081 not valid, how do we know what is wrong? If such
9082 were the case, then the only forbidden sins would be
9083 the ones **described** in the New Testament. What
9084 was not described in the New Testament had no
9085 reason to be forbidden. Then we would have to go
9086 by the customs of the region in which we live. In
9087 which case we would have to accept that:

9088 **a) Men and women running naked**, in a region
9089 where such is the custom would not be sinful; the
9090 New Testament only talks about dressing honestly,

9091 and if a society thinks that a loincloth is honest,
9092 what other referee do we have?

9093 **b) Marrying a niece or a sister** would not be a
9094 problem, nor could it be classified as incest. After
9095 all, before the law, Abraham and Nachor did it. The
9096 New Testament does not specifically prohibits it,
9097 and it doesn't describe which unions are considered
9098 incest. Only God's "obsolete" law for human
9099 behavior describes what incest is, and only it
9100 prohibits it. Those who are not "under the law"
9101 could marry their sisters, nieces, aunts, and even
9102 their fathers and mothers, none would be a sin to
9103 those who hate and consider God's law obsolete, as
9104 expressed in the Old Testament.

9105 **c) Having several women**, why not? After all,
9106 God only talks against polygamy in the Old
9107 Testament (Mal 2:13-15), which is "obsolete"
9108 according to those who so believe. There is no
9109 mention of polygamy anywhere in the New
9110 Testament. It is only expressed in some of Paul's
9111 letters that, **in order to be a deacon or a bishop**,
9112 the chosen man had to be a monogamist (I Tim 3:1-
9113 13; Tit 1: 5-9); but he ordains nothing for those
9114 who did not care to be deacons or bishops. The rest
9115 has been taught by tradition, and if we were to trust
9116 tradition, then let's listen and obey everything that
9117 Catholicism has to say.

9118 **d) There would be no basis to reprimand a**
9119 **church member that decided to practice**
9120 **bestialism** instead of marrying a sister in Christ,
9121 alleging that a female animal is cheaper than a wife,
9122 and that the New Testament does not say anything
9123 against such abominable practice. There would be
9124 no New Testament basis to ban him from the
9125 church. That is only forbidden in Lev 18:23, and
9126 that belongs in the despised and hated Old

9127 Testament. They confuse the “old pact” which is a
9128 ceremonial law, with the Old Testament.

9129 **e) Neither do we have to keep any Sabbath**
9130 **day,** because the New Testament does not
9131 command such a thing for Saturday or Sunday.
9132 Employers would have the right to ask and demand
9133 someone to work seven days a week....and then say
9134 goodbye to organized churches.

9135 **f) Tithing to the church?**never! That would
9136 be a sin, because we would be submitting to the
9137 law, like those who keep Saturday, we would “fall
9138 from grace”. No worthy sect, congregation or pastor
9139 would talk about tithing because anyone could think
9140 he would be twisting his “new testamentarian”
9141 convictions for the vile interest of money...and
9142 that...**never!!**

9143 **g) Collecting money in the temple or church**
9144 **would be abolished** because that was never a New
9145 Testament custom, you would not find it in the New
9146 Testament. The only thing it mentions once or twice
9147 is that money was collected **only for charitable**
9148 **purposes,** or to pay for the expenses of some
9149 missionary, but never were these funds collected in
9150 church for its own expenses, or to cover the pastors
9151 salaries.

9152 Collecting money in the Temple was established
9153 by Jehoiada the priest (II R 12:9) and practiced in
9154 the hated and “obsolete” Old Testament, and only
9155 by those who kept the law. There is no New
9156 Testament basis to keep that custom.

9157 **Why bother continuing.... that would be part of**
9158 **the horrendous picture** that the churches presented
9159 if, being mentally honest, they were actually
9160 convicted that the Old Testament is obsolete, or that
9161 we only have to follow the New Testament.

9162

*

9163 **Reason to be and temporariness of certain ritual**
9164 **laws**

9165 Ritual laws had two main reasons to exist: one
9166 was to symbolize, prophesize, **be our schoolmaster**
9167 **to bring us unto Christ.** The other reason was to
9168 preserve the sacred places while the Tabernacle of
9169 Testimony or the Temple existed. There were laws
9170 and ordinances to keep the sanctity of those
9171 symbols. Once that the symbolized thing came, or
9172 once the people could not come to the Temple to
9173 contaminate it, there was no need for those ritual
9174 laws to continue their existence.

9175 The reason why there were such ordinances about
9176 the “uncleanness” for touching this or that, was,
9177 like many other ritual laws, because the sacred
9178 places were among them, first the Tabernacle and
9179 then the Temple, which were a “shadow” of those
9180 in heaven. Supposedly God inhabited these places,
9181 or at least His name, and under no circumstance
9182 could any of them be contaminated.

9183
9184 *“Or if a soul touch any unclean thing,*
9185 *whether it be a carcass of an unclean beast,*
9186 *or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase*
9187 *of unclean creeping things, and if it be hidden*
9188 *from him; he also shall be unclean, and*
9189 *guilty”.* (Lev 5:2)

9190
9191 The close relation I just mentioned that existed
9192 between body cleanliness and preserving the
9193 cleanliness in the sanctuary is more clearly seen in
9194 Lev 12:4; 15:31; Num 19:13 y 20; Ezq 43:7-8;
9195 and in Ex 19:11-15; where one is linked to the other
9196 (body cleanliness and the holiness of the sanctuary.)
9197 It merits that we analyze these verses before going
9198 on.

9199
9200 *“And she shall then continue in the blood of*
9201 *her purifying three and thirty days; **she shall***
9202 ***touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the***
9203 ***sanctuary**, until the days of her purifying be*
9204 *fulfilled”.* (Lev 12:4)
9205
9206 *“Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel*
9207 *from their uncleanness; **that they die not in***
9208 ***their uncleanness, when they defile my***
9209 ***tabernacle that is among them**”.*
9210 (Lev 15:31)
9211
9212 *“Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any*
9213 *man that is dead, and purifieth not himself,*
9214 ***defileth the tabernacle of the LORD;** and*
9215 *that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because*
9216 *the water of separation was not sprinkled*
9217 *upon him, he shall be unclean; his*
9218 *uncleanness is yet upon him”.*
9219 (Nm 19:13)
9220
9221 *“But the man that shall be unclean, and*
9222 *shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut*
9223 *off from among the congregation, **because he***
9224 ***hath defiled the sanctuary of the LORD;** the*
9225 *water of separation hath not been sprinkled*
9226 *upon him; he is unclean”.* (Nm 19:20)
9227
9228 *“⁷ And he said unto me: **Son of man, the***
9229 ***place of my throne, and the place of the soles***
9230 ***of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of***
9231 *the children of Israel for ever, and **my holy***
9232 ***name, shall the house of Israel no more***
9233 ***defile, neither they, nor their kings, by their***
9234 *whoredom, nor by the carcasses of their kings*

9235 *in their high places. 8 In their setting of their*
9236 *threshold by my thresholds, and their post by*
9237 *my posts, and the wall between me and them,*
9238 ***they have even defiled my holy name by their***
9239 ***abominations that they have committed:***
9240 *wherefore I have consumed them in mine*
9241 *anger”. (Ezq 43:7-8)*

9242
9243 *“¹¹ And be ready against the third day, for*
9244 ***the third day the LORD will come down in***
9245 *the sight of all the people upon mount*
9246 *Sinai....¹⁵ And he said unto the people: Be*
9247 *ready against the third day, **come not at your***
9248 ***wives”.** (Ex 19:11-15 abbreviated)*
9249

9250 Chapter 12 of Leviticus talks about this issue as
9251 well, and besides chapter 15. Also, in Lev 21:7 and
9252 14 we see that the priest must meet the conditions of
9253 cleanliness in his marriage that was not demanded
9254 from the common Israelite, such as not marrying a
9255 divorced woman. I imagine it was because the priest
9256 was closer to God’s things than the average person.

9257 **In essence, the establishment of ordinances**
9258 **about body cleanliness, I assume was due to the**
9259 **fact that, because of having the Tabernacle first,**
9260 **and then the Temple, they could contaminate**
9261 **them.** Therefore, I also assume that once the
9262 Temple disappeared, the ordinances that referred to
9263 or were established for the Temple, also
9264 disappeared.

9265 **There is a very good reason to think that some**
9266 **of these ceremonial laws were established only**
9267 **for certain cases,** such as the fact that they were a
9268 nomad people during the exodus, and the
9269 Tabernacle of Testimony traveled with them.

Being as they were a people on the go, and having, as they did the tabernacle at hand during their exodus through the wilderness, both things could happen: **a)** that during her ritual uncleanness would contaminate the sanctuary, and **b)** that a woman would get to the sanctuary “in a hop” and offer the prescribed sacrifices of her uncleanness.

The situation would have been very different for a woman who lived in Dan or Beersheba, dozens of miles from the Temple in the times of the kings. Given the distance (sometimes 60 miles) neither thing would have been probable: 1) that a woman so far from the Temple could contaminate it, or 2) that every woman who had irregular menstrual cycle would travel to Jerusalem every month in order to offer the sacrifices mentioned in Lev 15:29-30.

Therefore, logic tells me that some of these laws were established specifically for the people in exodus, and particularly for those who lived close to the Temple, or that by chance would find themselves close while traveling. Even in the last case, it would not have much reason to be once the Temple was established; because as we can see in II Chr 23: 19, there were porters guarding the Temple to avoid its contamination.

“And he set the porters at the gates of the house of the LORD, that none which was unclean in any thing should enter in”.

(II Chr 23:19)

In closing, what I want to say with all of this is that **many times the ceremonial laws were especially and particularly for certain temporary situations**, as in the situation of a people in exodus

9306 that facilitated the contamination of the sanctuary
9307 by any one, since they were close to it. In my point
9308 of view, some of these ritual laws were obsolete
9309 **even** during the time of the reign of the ritual law.

9310 *

9311
9312

9313 **Summary of chapter 9.** God's laws are those
9314 norms that He considered convenient that we keep
9315 them, both for his personal glory and for our
9316 benefit. Let's not confuse God's laws with the rules
9317 of one particular sect, whether it is the Pharisees or
9318 a Christian sect.

9319 **God's law never served to save anyone,** since
9320 nobody kept all of it during his lifetime, but it was
9321 to guide him in life, to tell him what was right and
9322 what was wrong.

9323 It is like the example we first presented about the
9324 car maker who, because he knew about cars, tells us
9325 which kind of gas and oil we should put in it.

9326 **After conversion we continue needing to make**
9327 **decisions.** These decisions must be based on God's
9328 law, not on our own whims, or the traditions of our
9329 nation or our religious sect.

9330 **Our obligation is to seek God's law.** Ignorance
9331 of the law is no excuse to sin against it. The Lord
9332 taught it when he taught about the servant who
9333 ignored his master's will, and did not do it, would
9334 be flogged less, but will be flogged nevertheless.

9335 By not caring about those "small" command-
9336 ments, or the laws that were for the "old times",
9337 Uzza died when he touched the ark. It is because of
9338 not obeying God's laws that we suffer many things,
9339 as it happened to Solomon when he rejected a
9340 couple of commandments that perhaps he thought

9341 “were not important” or that were for the “old
9342 times”.

9343 **Under no circumstance can we teach**
9344 **unbelievers that keeping God’s law means doing**
9345 **to others as we want others to do to us.** That only
9346 works when both parties keep God’s laws, but if
9347 one party is corrupted that advice does not work.

9348 Just as bad as not obeying God’s laws, is
9349 “improving” on God’s laws, as Saul did, as the
9350 Catholic church has done for centuries with the
9351 images, and how the Protestant churches have done
9352 with God’s law in general and Saturday in
9353 particular.

9354 Sometimes we ignore the why of a command-
9355 ment, but in spite of not knowing we should still
9356 obey it, as the faithful to God did, by not breaking
9357 any bones on the Passover lamb. Much later, at
9358 Christ’s crucifixion, the why was discovered: it was
9359 a symbolism of Christ.

9360 If God’s laws were not valid, no pastor or church
9361 would have the authority to tell others they should
9362 wear clothes and not go around naked, or not to
9363 marry close relatives, or not to have more than one
9364 wife, or that bestialism is a sin, or that they should
9365 tithe.

9366 We also saw that many of the ritual laws were
9367 directed only to avoid the people from
9368 contaminating the Tabernacle or the Temple with
9369 their uncleanness. Since the Temple ceased to exist,
9370 so did these ritual and ceremonial laws.

9371
9372 ***

9373
9374
9375
9376

9377
9378
9379
9380
9381
9382
9383
9384
9385
9386
9387
9388
9389
9390
9391
9392
9393
9394
9395
9396
9397
9398
9399
9400
9401
9402
9403
9404
9405
9406
9407
9408
9409
9410
9411

Chapter 10

The behavioral laws have existed since the creation of man

Before Sinai it was known that idolatry and adultery were serious sins

There are brothers who think that God's laws were "invented" at Mount Sinai. The behavioral laws and some ceremonial laws, such as the lamb's sacrifice, existed since the creation of man. The behavioral laws always existed. What Moses did was to codify them and make them into national laws. That is why the behavioral laws were not obsolete after the crucifixion.

Let's remember that Job's account dates way before Moses, since Job is from the time where people lived many more years than Moses lived.

In this passage we are about to read, we see that long before Moses declared the law in general and the Decalogue in particular, in a country that was not Israel, **God's servants considered that adultery was punishable by the judges. Later on, in verses 26-28 there is a similar note about idolatry.** As we can see the laws for human behavior have always existed, since God put man on the Earth. What Moses did was to give it a national status, a state power; he did not "invent them for the first time" as some believe.

"⁹ If mine heart have been deceived by a woman, or if I have laid wait at my neighbour's door; ¹⁰ then let my wife grind unto another, and let others bow down upon her. ¹¹ For this is an heinous crime; yea, it is an iniquity to be punished by the judges. ¹²

9412 *For it is a fire that consumeth to destruction,*
9413 *and would root out all mine increase”.*
9414 (Job 31:9-12)
9415

9416 *“²⁶ If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the*
9417 *moon walking in brightness; ²⁷ and my heart*
9418 *hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath*
9419 *kissed my hand; ²⁸ this also were an iniquity*
9420 *to be punished by the judge; for I should*
9421 *have denied the God that is above”.*
9422 (Job 31:26-28)
9423

9424 As we can see, long before Moses existed, long
9425 before the Jews and even Abraham existed, there
9426 was already the knowledge that called for the
9427 judges’ punishment for adultery and for worshipping
9428 the sun or the moon. They knew it was a sin against
9429 God.

9430 *

9431
9432
9433 **It seems as if Paul said that sin did not exist**
9434 **before the advent of the law, but that is not what**
9435 **he means**

9436 If it is indeed true from the legalist point of view
9437 of the Romans, that where there is no law there
9438 can’t be a transgression, this cannot be taken as a
9439 wide absolute, because this **is only the apostle’s**
9440 **hyperbolic example.**
9441

9442 *“For until the law, sin was in the world, but*
9443 *sin is not imputed when there is no law”.*
9444 (Ro 5:13)
9445

9446 Paul is not trying to say here that if anyone sinned
9447 before Sinai, he is without sin, nor is he saying that

9448 anyone who doesn't know the law now, is without
9449 sin. Why do I think that?

9450

9451 **First.** Sin started in Eden, when not even Moses
9452 existed. Besides, in other passages, Paul himself
9453 says that a person can know right from wrong even
9454 without the knowledge of the Mosaic Law. They
9455 can know just by following the conscious that God
9456 put in him, therefore being inexcusable, as he says
9457 in Ro 1:18-20. Likewise, according to Paul, his
9458 thoughts accuse and excuse each other, even if he
9459 does not know the Sinai laws, as we see in Rom
9460 2:14-15.

9461

9462 *“¹⁸ For the wrath of God is revealed from*
9463 *heaven **against all ungodliness and***
9464 ***unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth***
9465 *in unrighteousness; ¹⁹ **Because that which***
9466 ***may be known of God is manifest in them;***
9467 ***for God hath shewed it unto them.** ²⁰ For the*
9468 *invisible things of him **from the creation of***
9469 ***the world** are clearly seen, being understood*
9470 *by the things that are made, even his eternal*
9471 *power and Godhead; so that they are without*
9472 *excuse”* (Ro 1:18-20)

9473

9474 *“¹⁴ For when the Gentiles, which have not*
9475 *the law, do by nature the things contained in*
9476 *the law, these, having not the law, are a law*
9477 *unto themselves, ¹⁵ which shew the work of*
9478 *the law written in their hearts, their*
9479 *conscience also bearing witness, and their*
9480 *thoughts the mean while accusing or else*
9481 *excusing one another”* (Ro 2:14-15)

9482

9483 Therefore, Paul really did not consider it
9484 necessary to know the Sinai law in order to know
9485 right from wrong, which is what he seems to say in
9486 Ro 5:13.

9487

9488 **Second.** There was knowledge of God's law
9489 before Moses, although **it was not the national**
9490 **legal system of a country, as it was with Moses in**
9491 **Israel.** Therefore, it is evident that Paul did not
9492 think that before Moses' law there was no sin in the
9493 world, as the aforementioned verse seems to say.

9494 **Why do I think that God's law was known**
9495 **before Moses?** Before the law was issued in Mount
9496 Sinai, there were sacrifices (ceremonial laws) and it
9497 was known that murder and adultery were wrong
9498 (behavioral laws). Therefore, both ceremonial and
9499 behavioral laws were known. How do we know
9500 these things were known?

9501 **a) Noah sacrificed to God (Gen 8:20) which**
9502 **shows that they knew the meaning of such rituals**
9503 without having to wait to be given Moses' law. The
9504 difference was that there was not a daily obligation
9505 about it, as it was later with the continual burnt
9506 offering. Note that Noah **built altar and offers**
9507 **holocausts on which he offers clean animals,**
9508 therefore he knew God's laws before Sinai. He
9509 knew which animals were forbidden and what a
9510 holocaust meant.

9511

9512 *“And Noah builded an altar unto the LORD;*
9513 *and took of every clean beast, and of every*
9514 *clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the*
9515 *altar”.* (Gn 8:20)

9516

9517 **b) From the beginning of creation there was**
9518 **knowledge about offerings to God and sacrifices,**

9519 in other words, the ceremonial laws, as we see in
9520 Gen 4:3-4.

9521

9522 *“³ And in process of time it came to pass,*
9523 *that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground **an***
9524 ***offering unto the LORD.** ⁴ And Abel, he also*
9525 *brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the*
9526 *fat thereof. And **the LORD had respect unto***
9527 ***Abel and to his offering**”.* (Gn 4:3-4)

9528

9529 **c) In Gn 22:7, Isaac’s conversation with**
9530 **Abraham** shows us that the son was used to see the
9531 holocausts. That of Gn 22 was not the first he saw,
9532 since he knew enough to inquire about the missing
9533 element, in this case, the lamb. What I want to say
9534 with this is that before the Mosaic Law, they knew
9535 the meaning of the rituals.

9536

9537 *“And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father,*
9538 *and said: My father; and he said: Here am I,*
9539 *my son. And he said: **Behold the fire and the***
9540 ***wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt***
9541 ***offering?**”* (Gn 22:7)

9542

9543 **Equally, everyone knew what sin was. How do**
9544 **we know this?**

9545

9546 **d) In Gn 4:9 Cain hides his murder,** showing
9547 that he knew that what he had just done was a sin.

9548

9549 *“And the LORD said unto Cain: Where is*
9550 *Abel thy brother? And he said: **I know not,***
9551 ***Am I my brother's keeper?**”* (Gn 4:9)

9552

9553 **e) God destroys Sodom** even though the Mosaic
9554 Law had not yet been established. This is a sign that

9555 **it was counted unto them as a sin, even though**
9556 **Moses had not been born yet.**

9557
9558 **f) Lot's daughters, infected with Sodom's**
9559 **degeneration, got their father drunk** before
9560 committing incest. This was a sign that they knew it
9561 was a sin, and that their father, had he been awake,
9562 would not have allowed such thing. And Lot's
9563 daughters had this knowledge of sin even though
9564 Moses had not received the law yet, for he had not
9565 even been born.

9566
9567 **g) Something similar can be learned from**
9568 **Judah's abstinence with his daughter-in-law,**
9569 **Thamar.** After Judah learned of Thamar's scheme,
9570 he never had sex with her, as we see in Gen 38:26.
9571 This is a sign that he knew that was incest, and
9572 therefore a sin. And he knew this before Moses was
9573 born, and before Moses officially established in
9574 **the nation of Israel** the laws regarding incest.
9575 Moses established that law as a national statute, in
9576 Lev 18:15 a lot later than Judah's death. From this
9577 we see that **the behavioral laws were known long**
9578 **before Moses,** even though they did not have the
9579 strength of obligatory state laws.

9580
9581 *"And Judah acknowledged them, and said:*
9582 *She hath been more righteous than I; because*
9583 *that I gave her not to Shelah my son. And he*
9584 *knew her again no more". (Gn 38:26)*

9585
9586 *"Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of*
9587 *thy daughter in law; she is thy son's wife;*
9588 *thou shalt not uncover her nakedness"*
9589 (Lev 18:15)
9590

9591 **h) We see in Gen 12:13-20 that Pharaoh knew**
9592 **that taking another man's wife was a sin,** and that
9593 God could punish him for it. We also see that God
9594 punished such things even though the law had not
9595 been given in Sinai. Therefore what Paul says about
9596 not counting it as a sin if there is no law is a
9597 hyperbolic example, a rhetoric allegation taken
9598 from Roman laws.

9599 In Gen 20:1-9 we see that **Abimelech, king of the**
9600 **Philistines knew that adultery was a sin,** and in
9601 verse 9 we see that he knew it was a serious sin. We
9602 also see that God punished such thing even though
9603 the law had not yet been declared in Mount Sinai.

9604 **And these two men were Gentiles,** in other
9605 words, not from the seed of Abraham, but from **a**
9606 **couple of Gentile nations, where they had**
9607 **knowledge of God's laws long before Mount**
9608 **Sinai.**

9609
9610 *“¹⁸ And Pharaoh called Abram, and said,*
9611 *What is this that thou hast done unto me?*
9612 ***Why didst thou not tell me that she was thy***
9613 ***wife?** ¹⁹ Why saidst thou, She is my sister? So*
9614 *I might have taken her to me to wife; now*
9615 *therefore behold thy wife, take her, and go thy*
9616 *way”.* (Gn 12:18-19)

9617
9618 *“Then Abimelech called Abraham, and said*
9619 *unto him: What hast thou done unto us? and*
9620 *what have I offended thee, **that thou hast***
9621 ***brought on me and on my kingdom a great***
9622 ***sin?** Thou hast done deeds unto me that ought*
9623 *not to be done”.* (Gn 20:9)
9624

i) In Gen 26:10 we see that the knowledge of sin persisted in spite of the years that had passed from the time of Abraham to the time of Isaac.

*“9 And Abimelech called Isaac, and said: Behold, of a surety she is thy wife; and how saidst thou: She is my sister? And Isaac said unto him: Because I said: Lest I die for her. 10 And Abimelech said: What is this thou hast done unto us? One of the people might lightly have lien with thy wife, **and thou shouldest have brought guiltiness upon us**”.*

(Gn 26:9-10)

j) In Gen 31:32 and 44:9 we see a decree of punishment against theft. Therefore, there was consciousness that theft was sin, even though the Decalogue had not yet been established.

*“With whomsoever thou findest thy gods, let him not live; before our brethren discern thou what is thine with me, and take it to thee. For **Jacob knew not that Rachel had stolen them**”.* (Gn 31:32)

(Gn 31:32)

“With whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die, and we also will be my lord’s bondmen”. (Gn 44:9)

(Gn 44:9)

k) In Gen 39:9 we see that Joseph knew that adultery was a sin against God.

*“There is none greater in this house than I; neither hath he kept back any thing from me but thee, because thou art his wife, **how then***

9661 *can I do this great wickedness, and sin*
9662 *against God?”* (Gn 39:9)

9663

9664 **In summary, God’s laws were perfectly known**
9665 **even before Mount Sinai**, both, the ceremonial and
9666 the behavioral laws. Sin existed, it was known as
9667 sin, it **was known that to sin was to act against**
9668 **God**, and the wrongdoing was counted as sin to the
9669 wrongdoer. It was not as it seems that Paul says in
9670 Ro 5:13.

9671

9672 **Even before Moses’ law came, both God and**
9673 **men counted it as sin to the sinner**, as we can see
9674 in the Cain and Abimelech incidents. To both of
9675 them God spoke as to never doubt the
9676 accountability of sin to sinners, even long before the
9677 law at Sinai. Therefore, what **at first sight** Paul
9678 **seems** to say in Ro 5:13 is not interpreted correctly.
9679 It is logical then, knowing his difficult way of
9680 speaking, to try to understand what it was that Paul
9681 really wanted to say.

9682 Once again it is good to remember here the
9683 warning about Paul’s difficult way of speaking, that
9684 Peter gives in II P 3:15-16, without diminishing
9685 with it the wisdom that he himself recognized that
9686 was given to the Apostle to the Gentiles.

9687

*

9688

9689

9690 **Before the handing down of the law in Mount**
9691 **Sinai, they kept the Sabbath**

9692 In this 16th chapter of Exodus, that narrates the
9693 things that happened before the handing of the Ten
9694 Commandments, we can perceive several things:

9695 **a)** Being situated in the moment of this passage,
9696 in other words, before Sinai, before the handing

9697 down of the law, **before the law was written in the**
9698 **tablets, we see that keeping the Saturday was**
9699 **supposed to be known and obeyed by the**
9700 **Israelites.** Its observance began with creation, and
9701 will continue through the Millennium.

9702 **b)** God was so interested in his servants keeping
9703 the Saturday, even before Sinai, that he warns them
9704 that on Friday he would send a double portion of
9705 manna (verses 5, 22, 23, 25), for them to gather
9706 enough. That way they would not go hungry, but
9707 they kept Saturday, they kept the law. God has
9708 always provided for his servants a way to keep the
9709 law, if they truly want to keep it.

9710 **c) God himself continued to rest on Saturday.**
9711 He did it during creation, and continued doing it 24
9712 centuries later, even though he had not yet handed
9713 down the law at Sinai as the national law for the
9714 Hebrew nation. God did not want to produce
9715 unnecessarily the miracle of sending manna on
9716 Saturday (verses 25-26).

9717 **d)** Back then, just like today, and **just as always,**
9718 **there were those who justified themselves for not**
9719 **keeping Saturday.** They did not do it because they
9720 simply did not want to, in spite of what God had
9721 said so clearly in verses 23-30.

9722
9723 *“²³ And he said unto them: This is that which*
9724 *the LORD hath said: **To morrow is the rest of***
9725 ***the holy Sabbath unto the LORD;** bake that*
9726 *which ye will bake to day, and seethe that ye*
9727 *will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay*
9728 *up for you to be kept until the morning. ²⁴ And*
9729 *they laid it up till the morning, as Moses*
9730 *bade; and it did not stink, neither was there*
9731 *any worm therein. ²⁵ And Moses said: Eat that*
9732 *to day; **for to day is a Sabbath unto the***

9733 *LORD, to day ye shall not find it in the field.*
 9734 *26 Six days ye shall gather it; but on the*
 9735 *seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there*
 9736 *shall be none. 27 And it came to pass, that*
 9737 *there went out some of the people on the*
 9738 *seventh day for to gather, and they found*
 9739 *none. 28 And the LORD said unto Moses:*
 9740 *How long refuse ye to keep my*
 9741 *commandments and my laws? 29 See, for that*
 9742 *the LORD hath given you the Sabbath,*
 9743 *therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the*
 9744 *bread of two days; abide ye every man in his*
 9745 *place, let no man go out of his place on the*
 9746 *seventh day. 30 So the people rested on the*
 9747 *seventh day". (Ex 16:23-30)*
 9748

9749 e) God's complaint against the people: "**How**
 9750 **much longer** do you refuse to keep my
 9751 commandments and my laws!". It shows us that
 9752 God considered that the law was something that
 9753 they should have been **used to** obeying, even
 9754 though the Decalogue had not been declared.

9755 The next sentence in verse 29 says the same thing,
 9756 "**See, for that the LORD hath given you the**
 9757 **Sabbath**". This is another sign that this was nothing
 9758 new, because the verb "hath given" is in past tense.
 9759 **In other words, because Saturday had been**
 9760 **given** since creation, God was expecting them to
 9761 keep it even before the Decalogue.

9762 In addition, God's complaint indicates that there
 9763 was a set of behavioral norms given by God to
 9764 human beings, which He expected them to know
 9765 and keep now that they were not slaves.

9766 We see the same thing in Ex 18:16 where we
 9767 realize that **even before Sinai there were laws and**
 9768 **divine ordinances, and they were known and**

9769 **obeyed.** The only thing Mount Sinai did was to
9770 make those laws official and give the power as
9771 national laws.

9772

9773 *“When they have a matter, they come unto*
9774 *me; and I judge between one and another,*
9775 *and I do make them know the statutes of*
9776 *God, and his laws”.* (Ex 18:16)

9777

9778 Besides this, some could argue that God does
9779 work on Saturdays because it rains, women and
9780 animals give birth, people die, etc., but **all this is**
9781 **part of the automatic functions that God started**
9782 **at creation.** All this works on its own, just like the
9783 Earth and the Moon continue to rotate on Saturdays,
9784 and things fall down to the floor; while manna was
9785 something that had to be intentionally given.

9786 **We could also argue that since the Earth is**
9787 **round,** while it is Saturday in one place, it could be
9788 Friday, or even Sunday in other; I am aware of that.
9789 But the same thing happened during Christ’s time,
9790 and he kept Saturday, as well as the Jew that lived
9791 in Rome, or in Persia. So it seems that for God’s
9792 purpose for Saturday, these things did not matter. It
9793 is probable that besides being good for rest of body
9794 and mind, Saturday is **a symbol of submission to**
9795 **God.** Hence the persistence that his enemy, the
9796 **Devil has always displayed in insisting that**
9797 **God’s servants reject Saturday, or at least twist**
9798 **it, if he can’t make them reject it completely.**

9799 Besides, we will at least agree on one thing: there
9800 was a time in which God’s servants had it as their
9801 duty to rest on Saturday. Well then, during that time
9802 Earth was also round, and God saw it very well the
9803 progressive way in which Saturday was kept around
9804 the Earth as it rotated. And **what’s more, even**

9805 **from creation, God knew that would be so, and**
9806 **he thought it was good.** So I see no basis for the
9807 argument of the Earth being round to invalidate
9808 Saturday.

9809 *

9810
9811

9812 **It was known before Christ that salvation was**
9813 **through grace, not works**

9814 As we will see in the coming verse, from the
9815 oldest of time, human beings in general, not just the
9816 Jews, knew the plan of salvation. What they did not
9817 know was who would make it happen.

9818 **Just like Job, Elihu lived much earlier than**
9819 **Moses** and the Jewish people did. However, they
9820 knew that God had shown mercy, in other words,
9821 that we would not be able to pay for our salvation;
9822 it had to be through mercy and grace.

9823

9824 *“²³ If there be a messenger with him, an*
9825 *interpreter, one among a thousand, to shew*
9826 *unto man his uprightness. ²⁴ Then he is*
9827 *gracious unto him, and saith: Deliver him*
9828 *from going down to the pit; I have found a*
9829 *ransom”.* (Job 33:23-24)

9830

9831 As we can see, these **Gentiles** knew that God had
9832 delivered us from death, and ultimately, they knew
9833 they had found man’s redemption. The same is seen
9834 in verses 27 and 28. What they did not know then
9835 were the details: that his name would be Jesus, that
9836 he would be crucified, etc., but not even the
9837 disciples knew that before it happened.

9838

9839 *“²⁷ He looketh upon men, and if any say, I*
9840 *have sinned, and perverted that which was*

9841 *right, and it profited me not; 28 He will*
9842 *deliver his soul from going into the pit, and*
9843 *his life shall see the light*". (Job 33:27-28)

9844 *

9845

9846

9847 **Now Paul himself testifies that salvation through**
9848 **grace and not works was known in the Old**

9849 **Testament times**

9850 As we will see in this passage of Romans,
9851 salvation by grace was known to those that lived
9852 during the Old Testament times, because **Paul tells**
9853 **us that David was aware of it.** Here we can clearly
9854 see that before Christ, those who had the right
9855 attitude towards the divine knew salvation by grace
9856 just like we do. The only difference between them
9857 and us is that they were expecting a salvation that
9858 will happen, and had no legal right to it during their
9859 lifetime, or at death. Even the dead had to wait for
9860 its realization centuries later.

9861 We, on the other hand, don't have to wait for its
9862 realization after hearing the good news of salvation.
9863 Simultaneously with the news that there is such
9864 salvation, we also find that it was finished two
9865 millennia ago, that it had no fault, and that we can
9866 legally possess it, immediately. That is why the post-
9867 Christ dead (Christians) will go directly to God's
9868 presence, while before they had to go to a waiting
9869 place that was later called "Abraham's bosom".

9870

9871 *"5 But to him that worketh not, but believeth*
9872 *on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is*
9873 *counted for righteousness. 6 Even as David*
9874 *also describeth the blessedness of the man,*
9875 *unto whom God imputeth righteousness*
9876 *without works, 7 saying: Blessed are they*

9877 *whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins*
9878 *are covered. 8 Blessed is the man to whom the*
9879 *Lord will not impute sin". (Ro 4:5-8)*

9880 *

9881

9882

9883 **Summary of chapter 10.** God's laws were
9884 known right from creation, These laws were not
9885 "invented" at Mount Sinai. Sin started in Eden even
9886 though Moses' law did not exist yet. We also see
9887 that Job and Elihu knew that **idolatry and adultery**
9888 **were punishable**, in spite of the fact that they lived
9889 long before Moses was even born.

9890 We saw that **Noah offered sacrifices to God**, and
9891 that Isaac knew what sacrifices were, which tells us
9892 that even the main ceremonial laws were known.

9893 Before Moses established the laws, **God**
9894 **destroyed Sodom**. It is a sign that sin was counted
9895 against them, since they always knew God's laws.
9896 What did not exist was the Mosaic structure, the
9897 obligatory laws which were of national and official
9898 obedience, as it was later with Moses.

9899 Even though the Mosaic Law had not been
9900 established all knew what sin was. That is why Cain
9901 tried to hide his murder. **Pharaoh and Abimelech**
9902 **considered adultery a great sin**. Lot's daughters
9903 got their father drunk. Judah had no more sexual
9904 relations with Tamar. Joseph, in Egypt, was very
9905 conscious that adultery was a great sin against God.
9906 All these people lived before Moses, where we
9907 logically conclude that before Mount Sinai they
9908 knew God's laws for human behavior, and even the
9909 main ceremonial laws.

9910 **In regards to Saturday** we see that not only was
9911 it established during creation, but that the people
9912 kept it during their exodus, even before they arrived

9913 to Mount Sinai. We know that because God
9914 expected them to keep it, as we can see in the
9915 manna episode. They could not do it in Egypt
9916 because they were slaves there.

9917 **In regards to salvation by grace**, we see that
9918 Job, Elihu and David, who lived before Christ,
9919 knew that salvation was not of works, but through
9920 the mercy of God.

9921

9922

9923

9924

9925

9926

9927

Chapter 11

9928

The mistake of believing that God's laws were only for the Jews and not for the Gentiles

9930

9931

9932

9933

9934

The fact that the Gentiles knew and obeyed God's laws is an indication that they were not established just for the Jews

9935

9936

9937

9938

9939

9940

9941

9942

9943

9944

9945

9946

There are Christians who think that God's laws were made only for the Jews. There is no such thing. As we saw in the previous chapter. Long before the first Jew was born, God's laws were already known and obeyed by the Gentiles. They were not obeyed by all Gentiles, just as they were not obeyed by all the Jews, but in the case of two Gentile kings, Pharaoh and Abimelech, we see that such laws were general knowledge, even though they were not obeyed by all.

Today God's laws are general knowledge as well, and very few obey them, not even many who call

9947 themselves Christians, as is the case of idolatry and
9948 Catholicism.

9949 **In Abimelech's case we see that all this**
9950 **happened before the Sinai law.** However, we see
9951 in verse 3 that it is God himself who tells
9952 Abimelech in a dream, "*You are but a dead man,*
9953 *for the woman you have taken is a man's wife*". In
9954 other words, **before the law at Mount Sinai, God**
9955 **had established the death penalty for adultery,**
9956 **and this was among the Gentiles.**

9957 Not keeping or obeying God's law was a different
9958 story, but God did consider that adultery should be
9959 punished by death. This same thought is seeing in
9960 verse 7, where God tells Abimelech after the dream,
9961 "...if you do not restore her, you will surely die.

9962 **Note that it was not about "old customs", but a**
9963 **clear exposition of God's commandments to the**
9964 **Gentiles, made by God himself. God's laws were**
9965 **not just for the Jews.**

9966
9967

9968 *"³ But God came to Abimelech in a dream by*
9969 *night, and said to him: **Behold, thou art but a***
9970 ***dead man, for the woman which thou hast***
9971 ***taken, for she is a man's wife.** ⁴ But*
9972 *Abimelech had not come near her, and he*
9973 *said: Lord, wilt thou slay also a righteous*
9974 *nation? ⁵ Said he not unto me: She is my*
9975 *sister? And she, even she herself said: He is*
9976 *my brother; in the integrity of my heart and*
9977 *innocence of my hands have I done this. ⁶*
9978 *And God said unto him in a dream: Yea, I*
9979 *know that thou didst this in the integrity of thy*
9980 *heart; for **I also withheld thee from sinning***
9981 ***against me;** therefore suffered I thee not to*
9982 *touch her. ⁷ Now therefore restore the man his*

9983 *wife, for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for*
9984 *thee, and thou shalt live; and if **thou restore***
9985 ***her not, know thou that thou shalt surely die,***
9986 ***thou, and all that are thine”.***

(Gn 20:3-7)

*

9990
9991 **Gods law was known and obeyed during the time**
9992 **of the flood, when there were still no Jews,**
9993 **because Shem and Japheth walked backwards**

9994 God’ laws for human behavior were completely
9995 valid long before Moses was born. Those laws
9996 guided the lives of the men of faith, men who **were**
9997 **not Jewish, but Gentiles.** They were laws of
9998 religious character, not legal. In other words, they
9999 were laws for the conscience, not the government.

10000 These laws were later incorporated to the
10001 legislature and politics of the Israelite nation by
10002 Moses, but Moses did not “invent” them. They
10003 were already guiding the lives of the men of faith,
10004 **Gentile men.** Later, Moses would see that these
10005 laws would reign as national laws. Let’s see an
10006 example.

10007
10008 *“And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and*
10009 ***laid it upon both their shoulders, and went***
10010 ***backward, and covered the nakedness of***
10011 ***their father; and their faces were backward,***
10012 ***and they saw not their father's nakedness”***

(Gn 9:23)

10014
10015 In this passage we see clearly that Noah’s eldest
10016 sons, who were raised before the flood, made a
10017 conscious effort not to see their father’s nakedness.
10018 This is sign that they knew that from the point of

10019 view of the divine laws, that should not be done.
10020 Through this attitude of them we see that their
10021 behavioral norm was guided by God's law. **This**
10022 **behavioral norm was valid before the flood**, and
10023 they respected it even though their younger brother
10024 did not. Perhaps he was thinking that "it was
10025 something for the old times", or something "for the
10026 Jewish people, whenever it came into existence".

10027 It was not until centuries later that that behavioral
10028 law was incorporated into the Mosaic Law, as we
10029 can see in Lev 18:7. Anyone who says that Moses'
10030 law is obsolete should realize that **it refers only to**
10031 **the ceremonial laws, never to the behavioral**
10032 **laws**, which are eternal. As it says in Mat 5:17-19
10033 they will last until heaven and Earth subside.
10034

10035 *"The nakedness of thy father, or the*
10036 *nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not*
10037 *uncover; she is thy mother; thou shalt not*
10038 *uncover her nakedness". (Lev 18:7)*
10039

10040 **Shem and Japheth, in order to obey God's laws**
10041 **that taught them not to uncover their father's**
10042 **nakedness, walked backward instead of forward**
10043 **to go cover him.** Had it not been a behavioral norm
10044 given by God, a behavioral norm that God's
10045 servants must follow, they had no reason to choose
10046 the more difficult way of covering their father. It
10047 would have been enough to walk forward and cover
10048 him, which would have been much easier. If it had
10049 not been a **behavioral norm given by God to be**
10050 **obeyed throughout all nations and times**, the
10051 elder sons would not have walked backwards, and
10052 Noah himself would not have been outraged when
10053 he found out what his younger son had done with
10054 him.

10055 **All this is an indication that the behavioral**
10056 **laws were known and obeyed by the men of faith**
10057 **since the Creation, when there were no Jews in**
10058 **the world.**

*

10062 **Some animals were considered forbidden since**
10063 **creation, and it was not allowed to eat blood**
10064 Many of those who believe that Saturday is
10065 obsolete, and so are the laws about not eating
10066 certain animals, often claim that these laws were set
10067 in the time of Moses, and **that it only pertained to**
10068 **the Jews.**

10069 **In this coming passage, God,** without trying to
10070 establish the law “now”, but rather as **talking to**
10071 **people who knew and obeyed the law since way**
10072 **back,** mentions the difference between clean and
10073 unclean animals. In other words, this knowledge
10074 was part of the religious wealth of our forefathers.
10075 **It was something completely known and**
10076 **practiced by them,** in spite that they existed long
10077 before the Jewish existence. Later, in Gen 7:8 and
10078 8:20, Noah mentions the same difference, and adds
10079 the birds.

10080 Later, in 9:4 **God mentions the issue of not**
10081 **eating blood**, which is later picked up in Moses’
10082 law, as well as other issues. **The apostolic letter**
10083 **picks it up as well.** As we can see these were
10084 behavioral laws, in this case about their diets, which
10085 were known since Creation; they were not
10086 “invented” in the time of Moses for only the Jews.

10087
10088 *“Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee*
10089 *by sevens, the male and his female; and of*

10126 **Jesus Christ himself affirms that Saturday was**
10127 **made for man**

10128 As I said before, the Lord Jesus Christ did not say
10129 that Saturday was made for the Jew, but for man.
10130 This Saturday was made during Creation, when the
10131 Jews did not exist. This is an indication that
10132 Saturday was not something exclusively for the
10133 Jews, but also for Gentiles. **Our Lord affirms very**
10134 **clearly that Saturday applies to the Gentiles, for**
10135 **he says that when Saturday was made during**
10136 **Creation, it was made for man; and during that**
10137 **time the only men that existed were Gentiles,**
10138 **there were no Jews yet.** These men, for whom
10139 Saturday was created, for whom Saturday was
10140 established were non-Jews, in other words, they
10141 were Gentiles.

10142
10143 *“And he said unto them: **The Sabbath was***
10144 ***made for man, and not man for the Sabbath”.***
10145 (Mr 2:27)

10146 *

10147
10148

10149 **The Old Testament promises**

10150 The way that many brothers understand the Old
10151 Testament is funny and childish. When the
10152 Scripture talks about God’s laws they think it was
10153 for the Jews, but when it talks about the promises,
10154 they believe that the Gentiles are heirs to such
10155 promises. That is like saying: if I like it, I’ll accept
10156 it; if I don’t like it, I don’t accept it. It is a lot like
10157 children’s behavior. Dad is really smart when he
10158 takes me out to play, but not so much when he
10159 makes me study.

10160 *

10161

10162
10163
10164
10165
10166
10167
10168
10169
10170
10171
10172
10173
10174
10175
10176
10177
10178
10179
10180
10181
10182
10183
10184
10185
10186
10187
10188
10189
10190
10191
10192
10193
10194
10195
10196

The tithe of the Gentiles

One of those promises so widely accepted by the brothers is the one found in Malachi in regards to tithing. If we were to reject the Old Testament because it was “for the Jews”, we should also reject the idea of tithing to the Church and not believe ourselves to be beneficiaries of the promises found here. However, that is not the way they proceed. But that is just the case; tithing was also practiced by Gentiles, as we see in the case of Melchizedek; because Abraham gave it, but Melchizedek received being a Gentile.

Just like the rest of God’s laws, including Saturday and the forbidden animals, the tithing law existed long before Moses and the Jewish people. In the passage below we see that Abraham gives Melchizedek tithes of all, from which **we have to conclude that both Abraham and Melchizedek knew and obeyed God’s law.** In other words, long before Sinai, men of God guided their lives after the law. It was not Moses who invented God’s law for human behavior, to give it only to the Jews; ever since Creation the Gentiles knew and practiced these laws.

*“¹⁸ And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine, and he was the priest of the most high God. ¹⁹ And he blessed him, and said: Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and Earth; ²⁰ and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. **And he gave him tithes of all**”.* (Gn 14:18-20)

10197 Ever since creation God’s law for human behavior
10198 was known and practiced, that is why everyone
10199 knew that killing, stealing, adultery, idolatry, etc.,
10200 was wrong, and that is why they knew they should
10201 tithe.

10202 In Gen 28:22 we have another example. This
10203 episode of Jacob is the second time in which **tithing**
10204 **appears as a behavioral norm before the Mosaic**
10205 **Law.**

10206 *“And this stone, which I have set for a pillar,*
10207 *shall be God's house; and of all that thou*
10208 *shalt give me **I will surely give the tenth unto***
10209 ***thee”.*** (Gn 28:22)

10210
10211
10212 This shows us that the **tithing law was not**
10213 **“invented” during the time of Moses**, but that it
10214 was already a behavioral norm (just like the unclean
10215 animals and Saturday,) since long before, from the
10216 beginning of Creation. The behavioral norms that
10217 God established for man since his creation, **were**
10218 **later included in Moses’ law**, but that does not
10219 mean he established them for the first time or that
10220 he established them only for the Jews.

10221 **What Moses did was to give those behavioral**
10222 **norms which already existed, an obligatory**
10223 **character, of national and legal status**, making
10224 them the laws for the new nation and its
10225 government.

10226 Moses also added or established for the first time
10227 other behavioral norms that did not exist, such as
10228 outlawing the marriage among close relatives. Add
10229 to that what we consider a complicated web of rites
10230 and ceremonies, and we have what we now know as
10231 “the law”, without forgetting that this word has
10232 several meanings in Scripture. We know that the

10233 two most important of those meanings are “the
10234 ceremonial law” and the “behavioral law or norm”.

10235 *

10236

10237

10238 **Paul considered that God’s law should rule over**
10239 **the churches of the Gentiles**

10240 We see in I Co 5:1 that Paul applies God’s law for
10241 human behavior as found in Dt 22:30. What is most
10242 revealing in this case is that Paul applies it to a
10243 church formed by Gentiles, **in other words, Paul**
10244 **considered that the Gentiles should obey God’s**
10245 **law for human behavior**, though not the
10246 ceremonial laws. This was considered obsolete after
10247 Jesus fulfilled all those symbolisms on the cross.
10248 We see clearly that God’s law for human behavior
10249 was not only for the Jews, but also for the Gentiles.

10250

10251 *“It is reported commonly that there is*
10252 *fornication among you, and such fornication*
10253 *as is not so much as named among the*
10254 *Gentiles, that one should have his father's*
10255 *wife”.* (I Co 5:1)

10256

10257 *“A man shall not take his father's wife, nor*
10258 *discover his father's skirt”.* (Dt 22:30)

10259

10260 As we can see, Paul applied the behavioral laws to
10261 a Gentile church. If God’s laws would have been
10262 obsolete and worthless, Paul would not have
10263 bothered his brothers with such application.

10264 *

10265

10266

10267 **According to Isaiah, Saturday was also for the**
10268 **Gentiles, as well as the other nine**
10269 **commandments**

10270 There are those who believe that because in Ex
10271 31:16-17 it reads that Saturday is a sign between
10272 God and the Israelites, it means that the
10273 commandments do not apply to the Gentiles. **This is**
10274 **denied in two ways.**

10275
10276 *“¹⁶ Wherefore the children of Israel shall*
10277 *keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath*
10278 *throughout their generations, for a perpetual*
10279 *covenant. ¹⁷ It is a sign between me and the*
10280 *children of Israel for ever; for in six days the*
10281 *LORD made heaven and Earth, and on the*
10282 *seventh day he rested, and was refreshed”.*

10283 (Ex 31:16-17)

10284
10285 **First**, by showing that according to Isa 56:6 the
10286 Saturday issue does apply to the **non-Jews**, for in
10287 the next verse (7) we see that God makes promises
10288 to the foreigners that keep Saturday. If he gives
10289 them a promise it is because they must also keep it.
10290 If the foreigners did not have to keep the Saturday
10291 because it was merely a sign for the Jews, this issue
10292 would not be mentioned for the foreigners, and they
10293 would not receive promises similar to those of the
10294 Israelites.

10295
10296 *“⁶ Also the sons of the stranger, that join*
10297 *themselves to the LORD, to serve him, and to*
10298 *love the name of the LORD, to be his*
10299 *servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath*
10300 *from polluting it, and taketh hold of my*
10301 *covenant; ⁷ even them will I bring to my holy*
10302 *mountain, and make them joyful in my house*

10303 *of prayer; their burnt offerings and their*
10304 *sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar;*
10305 *for mine house shall be called an house of*
10306 *prayer **for all people**". (Isa 56:6-7)*

10307

10308 If some were to allege that the Gentiles mentioned
10309 in Isaiah should keep Saturday because they were
10310 still under the old covenant, anyways it would make
10311 invalid the idea that Saturday was only for Jews, for
10312 they themselves would admit that by virtue of being
10313 under the old covenant, Gentiles must keep
10314 Saturday.

10315 **The second manner of showing that Saturday**
10316 **affects both Jews and Gentiles** is to reason that if
10317 one of the Ten Commandments does not apply to
10318 the Gentiles, then neither do the other nine. This
10319 means that the Gentiles could work on Saturday,
10320 they could worship their idols, they could have
10321 other gods before God, they could steal, they could
10322 commit adultery, they could kill, they could
10323 sodomize, consult the dead, etc.. Anyone who
10324 considers that the Gentiles, for not being Jews, do
10325 not have to keep Saturday, which is one of the Ten
10326 Commandments, has to agree that the Gentiles do
10327 not have to keep any one of the Ten
10328 Commandments. Otherwise, they would have to
10329 explain how it is that they can conclude that the
10330 Gentiles must obey the other nine commandments,
10331 but not the fourth.

10332 It is precisely **that type of fallacy that**
10333 **Catholicism applies when they authorize**
10334 **themselves to worship the graven images of**
10335 **saints and virgins.** They allege that the
10336 commandment against idolatry applied only to the
10337 Jews, since they worshiped pagan idols, but that
10338 Catholics can worship and revere the images of the

10339 saints and the virgins because those are not pagan
10340 idols, but Christian in nature.

10341 *

10342

10343

10344 **Several passages show that God wanted the**
10345 **Gentiles to obey the law as well**

10346 Some allege that the law was given by God only
10347 for the Jews to follow and not for the Gentiles, and
10348 therefore, we don't have to use God's laws today as
10349 norms for behavior for Christians. This verse,
10350 however, clearly shows that **God wanted Gentiles**
10351 **to obey his laws as well.** By saying here that the
10352 foreigners hold themselves accountable to this law,
10353 it is indicated that the Gentiles should also obey the
10354 law.

10355

10356 ***“One law shall be to him that is homeborn,***
10357 ***and unto the stranger that sojourneth among***
10358 ***you”.*** (Ex 12:49)

10359

10360 Also, in Lev 17:12, where **eating blood is**
10361 **forbidden, it is clear that such dietary law also**
10362 **applied to the Gentiles,** in other words, the Gentile
10363 as well as the Jew. Such is also the assumption in
10364 Lev 24:22, where it says that both the foreigners as
10365 well as the Israelites must obey the same law. A
10366 similar idea can be extracted from these passages:
10367 Ex 20:10; Lev 16:29; 18:26; 24:16; y Num 15:14.

10368

10369 ***“Therefore I said unto the children of***
10370 ***Israel: No soul of you shall eat blood, neither***
10371 ***shall any stranger that sojourneth among***
10372 ***you eat blood”.*** (Lev 17:12)

10373

10374 In the verse we saw before we see that in spite of

10375 stating that this commandment was given to the
10376 children of Israel, it also makes it clear that the
10377 foreigners must obey it, too. Let's remember that
10378 before the existence of the Jews, during the time of
10379 Noah, when the commandments were applied only
10380 to the Gentiles, they were already forbidden to eat
10381 the blood.

10382
10383 ***"But flesh with the life thereof, which is the***
10384 ***blood thereof, shall ye not eat"***.
10385 (Gn 9:4)

10386
10387 ***"Ye shall have one manner of law, as well***
10388 ***for the stranger, as for one of your own***
10389 ***country; for I am the LORD your God"***.
10390 (Lev 24:22)

10391
10392 ***"But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the***
10393 ***LORD thy God; in it thou shalt not do any***
10394 ***work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy***
10395 ***manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy***
10396 ***cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy***
10397 ***gates"*** (Ex 20:10)

10398
10399 ***"And this shall be a statute for ever unto***
10400 ***you; that in the seventh month, on the tenth***
10401 ***day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls,***
10402 ***and do no work at all, whether it be one of***
10403 ***your own country, or a stranger that***
10404 ***sojourneth among you"***
10405 (Lev 16:29)

10406
10407 ***"Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my***
10408 ***judgments, and shall not commit any of these***
10409 ***abominations; neither any of your own***

10410 *nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth*
10411 *among you”* (Lev 18:26)

10412
10413 *“And he that blasphemeth the name of the*
10414 *LORD, he shall surely be put to death, and all*
10415 *the congregation shall certainly stone him; as*
10416 *well the stranger, as he that is born in the*
10417 *land, when he blasphemeth the name of the*
10418 *LORD, shall be put to death”.*

10419 (Lev 24:16)

10420
10421 *“And if a stranger sojourn with you, or*
10422 *whosoever be among you in your generations,*
10423 *and will offer an offering made by fire, of a*
10424 *sweet savour unto the LORD; as ye do, so he*
10425 *shall do”* (Nm 15:14)

10426
10427 **As we can see in all these passages, God**
10428 **wanted for the Gentiles to obey his laws as well,**
10429 **therefore, God’s laws were not only for the Jews, as**
10430 **many brothers think today.**

10431 **Someone could allege** that Gentiles had to obey
10432 **God’s laws while in Israel, but once they left Israel**
10433 **they were not obliged. It is not logical to think that**
10434 **obeying God’s commandments is a territorial**
10435 **thing,** or something that depends on the district, the
10436 **region, or the geographical position that a person**
10437 **finds himself in. Besides, the people that lived**
10438 **before the issuance of the Decalogue, who obeyed**
10439 **God’s laws, such as Noah, Abimelech and Pharaoh,**
10440 **were not living in Israel. The Jews that lived in**
10441 **foreign lands also had to obey the laws, so it was**
10442 **not a territorial issue.**

10443 **By the same token, the New Testament clearly**
10444 **says that to God, there is neither Jew nor Gentile,**

10445 but rather we are all one in Christ. **If the Jews have**
10446 **to obey God's laws, the Gentiles have to as well.**

10447
10448 ***“For there is no difference between the Jew***
10449 ***and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is***
10450 ***rich unto all that call upon him”.*** (Ro 10:12)

10451
10452 ***“Where there is neither Greek nor Jew,***
10453 ***circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barba-***
10454 ***rian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all,***
10455 ***and in all”*** (Col 3:11)

10456
10457 I would ask those who think that God's laws only
10458 apply to the Jews if they believe that the promises
10459 that God gives the Jews in the Old Testament also
10460 apply only to the Jews. Besides, which part of the
10461 Bible do they use as a basis to affirm that God's
10462 laws were only for the Jews?

10463 **Many times the reason they allege is that they**
10464 **only obey those commandments that are**
10465 **repeated in the New Testament.** In that case we
10466 would have to ask them if they would consent to the
10467 marriage between close relatives such as siblings
10468 and nieces and nephews, or to bestiality, or other
10469 sins that are not forbidden in the New Testament.
10470 We would also have to ask them which criteria they
10471 use to encourage Christians to tithe, since that is
10472 only in the Old Testament.

10473 **As we can see God's laws were supposed to be**
10474 **obeyed by all of God's servants, whether Jews or**
10475 **Gentiles, whether inside or outside of Israel.**
10476 There are several behavioral laws that were not
10477 repeated in the New Testament, because they were
10478 already in the Old Testament, which continued to be
10479 valid for Christians.

10480 *

10481

10482

10483

Paul tells the Gentiles that what is important is to obey the commandments

10484

10485

10486

10487

10488

10489

10490

10491

10492

10493

10494

10495

10496

10497

10498

10499

10500

10501

10502

10503

10504

10505

10506

10507

10508

10509

10510

10511

10512

10513

10514

10515

In just a few words, Paul says here the same thing he says in the rest of his writings: the ceremonial law is abolished; the behavioral laws are still valid. We see that Paul draws a clear difference between the ceremonial law, which is abolished, and the law that affects behavior, which continues, and will continue being valid, because it is eternal.

Paul himself, whom some say taught the absolute abolishment of all of God's laws for human behavior, **affirms in this verse that the ceremonial part of the law, in this case circumcision, is nothing; that the important thing was "the keeping the commandments of God"**. And that he told, as we see in verse 18, **the uncircumcised** as well as the circumcised; in other words, Gentiles and Jews. **Thus we can't say that "the law only applies to the Jews"**.

"¹⁸ Is any man called being circumcised? Let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? Let him not be circumcised. ¹⁹ Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God".

(I Co 7:18-19)

If Paul tells the Gentiles (the Corinthians) that circumcision (the ritual) is of no importance, and that what is important is the keeping of the commandments of God (the behavioral law), then it is evident that the Apostle to the Gentiles

10516 considered that the law also ruled over the Gentiles,
10517 **and it was not exclusively for the Jews.**

10518 *

10519

10520

10521 **Summary of Chapter 11.** In this chapter we have
10522 seen that the fact that the Gentiles knew and obeyed
10523 God's laws is an indication that these laws were not
10524 only made for the Jews. Even in the case of
10525 Abimelech we can see that it is God himself who
10526 tells this Gentile ruler that he has to obey his laws.

10527 The behavior of Shem and Japheth, walking
10528 backwards as to not see their father's nakedness,
10529 shows us that such law, which was later
10530 incorporated by Moses to the Israelite laws, was
10531 known and obeyed since creation.

10532 When God tells Noah to take seven pairs of the
10533 clean animals, but only one pair of the unclean, we
10534 see that the knowledge of what could or could not
10535 be eaten existed since creation. This attitude
10536 towards the animals is later confirmed when Noah
10537 offers sacrifices to God and takes only clean
10538 animals for it. Also, the fact that it is forbidden to
10539 eat meat with the blood shows that there were diet
10540 laws, and that certain animals were off limit for
10541 eating.

10542 Keeping Saturday did not rule only over the Jews,
10543 but all humans, as Christ said. **Saturday was**
10544 **created for man, not for the Jew.** Christ did not
10545 say that Saturday had been created because of the
10546 Jew, but because of the men who lived at the
10547 beginning of Creation, who were not Jews.

10548 If believers consider that the Old Testament
10549 promises apply to Christians, then it is logical to
10550 consider that the Commandments apply to us as
10551 well.

10552 The case of Melchizedek and the tithe is evidence
10553 that the Gentiles knew and practiced the tithing law,
10554 because Abraham gave it but Melchizedek
10555 accepted. We also say that before the law was
10556 given, Jacob knew and practiced the tithing law.

10557 We also see that Paul considered that the law
10558 applied to the Gentiles, for if not, he would not have
10559 mentioned the law when referring to the incestuous
10560 Corinthian. Also, when Paul tells the Corinthians
10561 that the ceremonial laws were not important, but
10562 rather the behavioral laws, he shows us that he
10563 considered that the Gentiles had to obey the divine
10564 laws.

10565 We also saw through almost a dozen passages
10566 from the Old Testament that it was expected then
10567 that the Gentiles obeyed God's laws.

10568

10569

10570

10571

10572

10573

10574

10575

10576

10577

10578

10579

10580

10581

10582

10583

10584

10585

10586

10587
10588
10589
10590
10591
10592
10593
10594
10595
10596
10597
10598
10599
10600
10601
10602
10603
10604
10605
10606
10607
10608
10609
10610
10611
10612
10613
10614
10615
10616
10617
10618
10619
10620
10621

Chapter 12

Unknowingly, Christians admit to and obey the law

Here are several of the Old Testament laws that Christians accept without knowledge

There are many brothers, who reject God's laws believing that obeying them would mean they have no faith, or they have rejected Jesus Christ, or they have fallen from grace, etc.. This is motivated because other brothers, in teaching positions such as seminary professors and pastors, have taught them so, and they don't think by themselves.

These brothers who believe they do not have to obey Gods laws actually do obey many of them, or at least consider they must.

For instance, of the Ten Commandments they admit to at least nine. The only one they do not accept, and suppress it gladly and irresponsibly, is the fourth commandment, which refers to not working on Saturday. They agree that: **1) There is only one God and should not have any other gods, 2) they should not make graven images and worship them, 3) they should not take God's name in vain, 4) they should not kill, 5) they should not steal, but they 6) should honor their father and mother, that 7) they should not covet what belongs to their neighbor, that 8) they should not give false witness, 9) or commit adultery. All Christians agree with this, in other words, they admit to nine of the ten commandments.**

There are other laws that do not belong to the Ten Commandments that were displayed in the Old Testament **only**, and are also accepted by Christians. For example, they agree that bestiality is

10622 a sin as it is said in Lev 18:23; they agree that
10623 anyone who causes an accident must pay for the
10624 damages, as established in Ex 21:28-36; things that
10625 are not established in the New Testament. They also
10626 agree that criminals should be punished, something
10627 that is not legislated in the New Testament. They
10628 also agree that widows and orphans should not be
10629 afflicted, that we ought to have mercy on the poor
10630 and the enemy, etc., as it is established by God in
10631 chapters 22 and 23 of Exodus.

10632 Other Old Testament laws in which Christians
10633 agree are those about not fornicating, not marrying
10634 close relatives, not exploiting your neighbor, not
10635 taking vengeance, not lying, not going to mediums
10636 or sorcerers, not exploiting the foreigner, using just
10637 balances, etc., as ordered by God in chapter 19 of
10638 Leviticus.

10639 They also agree on legislation to protect women
10640 and children, and on preaching in favor of tithing,
10641 on legislation against blasphemy, on specifying the
10642 duties of the rulers, on legislation against usury and
10643 animal abuse, etc., as God ordains in chapters 21 to
10644 24 of Deuteronomy.

10645 **As we can see, Christians accept almost all of**
10646 **God's laws as expressed in the Old Testament,**
10647 **without knowing that all this is God's Law they**
10648 **so vehemently reject.** The only thing they do not
10649 accept is keeping the Saturday and the laws about
10650 what can or cannot be eaten, since that is what their
10651 pastors were taught in seminary, and that is how the
10652 pastors taught their disciples.

10653 *

10654
10655
10656

10657 **Why do Christians unknowingly accept some of**
10658 **God's laws and not the others?**

10659 Thanks to the preaching of the Christian
10660 missionaries since the first century, Christianity has
10661 influenced pagan countries partially or totally
10662 changing their practices. That is how during the first
10663 centuries of our times, all of Europe, part of the
10664 Middle East and part of Africa as adopting
10665 Christianity if only by name, they also changed
10666 their customs. Since then, every land that Europe
10667 conquered, missionaries took **customs** that had been
10668 influenced by Christianity, though not necessarily
10669 the good Christian doctrine. The customs of a good
10670 part of Asia, Africa and Oceania, plus almost all of
10671 Europe and America are influenced at least partly
10672 by Christianity.

10673 **That does not mean they are Christian**
10674 **countries**, what it means is that just like they had
10675 pagan customs before that they obeyed even though
10676 they did not know where they came from, now they
10677 have customs that have been influenced by
10678 Christianity, without them knowing where they
10679 come from either.

10680 **That is why in these societies they believe** that
10681 polygamy is unacceptable, even though some
10682 practice it surreptitiously; they consider theft as
10683 punishable, even though their principals steal and
10684 go unpunished; they consider adultery immoral,
10685 even though it is practiced in secret, etc.. In other
10686 words, even if only by lip service, everyone
10687 considers that sinning is bad.

10688 **So, those who have grown up in these societies,**
10689 **when they come to the Lord, easily adopt many**
10690 **of Christianity's rules**, which their society
10691 considers good, if only by mere lip service, however
10692 these converts adopt them by heart. That is why

10693 most Christians obey almost all of the Ten
10694 Commandments, the laws about not marrying close
10695 relatives, and others that I mentioned in the last
10696 section.

10697 **Having been exposed now to God's word, they**
10698 **wholeheartedly obey all those laws that their**
10699 **society admit**, because these are easy to obey; and
10700 they also obey those that their teachers teach them,
10701 but they never explore the laws written in the Old
10702 Testament, because **their teachers tell them they**
10703 **are obsolete**. They consider them obsolete without
10704 knowing which ones are obsolete; they only know
10705 there is something called law that is to be
10706 considered obsolete, despicable and even harmful to
10707 observe. However, they continue, without realizing
10708 it, those practices that are Old Testament based,
10709 which do not appear in the New Testament, but are
10710 widely observed in the society they live in, and
10711 therefore easy to obey, and they even receive praise
10712 for obeying them.

10713 That is why seminary professors, pastors and
10714 church members reject incest, spiritualism,
10715 witchcraft, bestiality, etc., and accept tithing,
10716 monogamy, punishing the criminal, etc., **all these**
10717 **rules that are not mentioned in the New**
10718 **Testament**. In other words, they reject God's law,
10719 but obey those social rules that God's law has
10720 introduced into society.

10721 If someone should ask them they say that God's
10722 law is obsolete. If someone should ask them if those
10723 despicable acts that are forbidden only in the Old
10724 Testament can be done, they say, "No, that is a sin".
10725 It is true that it is a sin, but, based on what? Based
10726 on a law that they consider to be obsolete.

10727 That is how most of Christianity functions; they
10728 are obeying the right thing many times, but have no
10729 idea why.

10730 *

10731

10732

10733 **Witchcraft, spiritualism, and the first Christians**

10734 The vast majority of Christians today **believe** they
10735 are “neo-testamentarian”, which means Christians
10736 who admit only the New Testament and reject all of
10737 the Old Testament. This is an attitude that evidently
10738 was not shared by the apostles and early Christians,
10739 who led their lives according to the Old Testament,
10740 and the now rejected law of God. How do we know
10741 that?

10742 **First of all, it is obvious that during the time of**
10743 **Acts the New Testament had not been written.**
10744 **The only written norm, by which they would**
10745 **guide their lives, was the Old Testament, or**
10746 **God’s laws.**

10747 In this specific case, they knew that witchcraft
10748 was a sin; however, the New Testament does not
10749 indicate that witchcraft is a sin. **They knew it**
10750 **because they followed God’s Law that was found**
10751 **in the Old Testament.**

10752

10753 *“Many of them also which used curious arts*
10754 *brought their books together, and burned*
10755 *them before all men; and they counted the*
10756 *price of them, and found it fifty thousand*
10757 *pieces of silver”.* (Act 19:19)

10758

10759 There is the similar case of the fortune teller of
10760 Acts 16:16-18. **The New Testament, which had**
10761 **not even been written, does not legislate anything**
10762 **against spiritualism.** Yet all these Christians knew

10763 it was wrong. How? Well, because they followed
10764 God's law, which is so despised by those Christians
10765 who do not know what they believe, and only
10766 believe a doctrine because they were told in their
10767 church, without taking the time to read the Bible.
10768 How do actual New Testamentarian Christians
10769 know that spiritualism and witchcraft are sins?
10770 Because the law today's Christians despise says so.

10771 **Christ did not come to abolish the law but to**
10772 **fulfill it, and until heaven and Earth passes it**
10773 **will be the model of behavior for Christians.**

10774
10775 *“¹⁷ Think not that I am come to destroy the*
10776 *law, or the prophets; I am not come to*
10777 *destroy, but to fulfil. ¹⁸ For verily I say unto*
10778 *you, Till heaven and Earth pass, one jot or*
10779 *one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,*
10780 *till all be fulfilled. ¹⁹ Whosoever therefore*
10781 *shall break one of these least commandments,*
10782 *and shall teach men so, he shall be called the*
10783 *least in the kingdom of **heaven**, but*
10784 *whosoever shall do and teach them, the same*
10785 *shall be called great in the kingdom of*
10786 *heaven”.* (Mt 5:17-19)

10787 *

10788
10789
10790 **Could we tear off the Old Testament from the**
10791 **Bible without altering our faith?**

10792 Many Christians believe (they have told me so
10793 themselves) that if the Old Testament disappeared
10794 our faith would not be altered one bit. In other
10795 words, they think that all that a Christian has to
10796 know and obey is in the New Testament. This is a
10797 mistake, that stems from little studying; from
10798 believing slogans, stereotyped phrases, traditions,

10799 sectarian doctrines, and commentaries from
10800 religious leaders; such things lack biblical
10801 foundation and logic.

10802 **In order to prove that we cannot do without**
10803 **the Old Testament,** I could mention the prophecies
10804 as an example. All the prophecies that concern our
10805 future are not in the New Testament. This is enough
10806 reason to think that the disappearance of the Old
10807 Testament would affect the Christian religion.

10808 **The New Testament says that we should not**
10809 **fornicate, but it does not indicate what**
10810 **fornication is.** Therefore, if the Old Testament
10811 disappeared, Christians would only know they
10812 should not fornicate, but then they would live in
10813 fear without knowing if they are fornicating or not
10814 because they would have no way of knowing. They
10815 could appeal to the customs of their time and
10816 region, or tradition, or their leaders words, or they
10817 could throw a coin up in the air and cast lots, but
10818 they would not have an authorized source that
10819 would define what fornication or incest was, or
10820 what was honest or not, or what could or could not
10821 be done. On the contrary, if we admit that the Old
10822 Testament is still valid, we could find there,
10823 perfectly defined, what are the behavioral norms
10824 that God desires for his children.

10825 If we did not have the law to teach us what we can
10826 or cannot do, we could not establish any **biblical**
10827 rule of behavior. No one could **biblically** challenge
10828 a man who wants a church wedding to marry his
10829 sister or his daughter, or his granddaughter, mother,
10830 etc.. The New Testament does not say anything to
10831 that effect. All we know about it comes from God's
10832 law that Moses established in detail. It is what
10833 teaches us what incest and fornication mean giving
10834 specific examples which the New Testament

10835 doesn't give. What is the difference between
10836 marrying a cousin and marrying a sister? Which is
10837 incest and which is not? The New Testament does
10838 not specify what is incest and what is not. **If we do**
10839 **not accept the law, we have to follow tradition**
10840 **for these things.**

10841 This example should be enough to convince these
10842 ardent Neo-testamentarian Christians not to be so
10843 ardent or so Neo-testamentarian; convince them to
10844 be a little bit more open-minded, **to read the Bible**
10845 **because all of it is God's word;** to convince them
10846 to use reason and analysis and ask themselves often
10847 what they base their beliefs on and go prove it in the
10848 Bible. That way they would not fall into the colossal
10849 lies and errors in which they are and fall.

10850 To conclude the theme of illicit marriages, they
10851 should read Lev 20:10-21, where the punishments
10852 for those who commit those abominations are
10853 spelled out. **This is a sign that the sins listed in**
10854 **chapter 18 were grave. However, they are not**
10855 **specified in the New Testament,** it only says there
10856 that we should not fornicate. It is the Christian's job
10857 to go look in the Old Testament to learn what
10858 fornication or incest means.

10859 *

10860

10861

10862 **Summary of Chapter 12.** Christians,
10863 unknowingly, admit and obey God's laws as
10864 expressed in the Old Testament, many of which are
10865 not even mentioned in the New Testament, since the
10866 writers of the New Testament presupposed that they
10867 were known by the missionaries and new converts.
10868 Since the law was still valid it was not necessary to
10869 repeat in the New Testament, which had already
10870 been explained in the Old Testament.

10871 However, even unconsciously, Christians know
10872 and obey many of God's laws; they believe that if
10873 they obey the behavior laws as expressed in the Old
10874 Testament, that would indicate that they have fallen
10875 from grace, that they have rejected Christ, and that
10876 they have no faith. That is due to what their pastors
10877 have taught them, and which the pastors themselves
10878 have been taught by seminary teachers, who were
10879 taught by professors, who were taught like that...
10880 by whomever invented such lie or mistake.

10881 For example, these brothers who believe that they
10882 don't obey the law "because they are not under the
10883 law", they admit to and obey nine of the Ten
10884 Commandments; the only one they reject is
10885 Saturday. They also consider that bestiality is a sin,
10886 even if the New Testament doesn't say anything to
10887 that effect; they follow God's laws unknowingly.
10888 They agree that, as the law indicates, if anyone
10889 causes an accident he should pay for the damages,
10890 something that is not legislated in the New
10891 Testament. They believe criminals should be
10892 punished, that they should not marry close relatives,
10893 that they should not go to witches, warlocks or
10894 spiritualists, that they should tithe, that there should
10895 be legislature against usury, etc., things that are not
10896 legislated or even mentioned in the New Testament.
10897 So the brothers that brag they are not "under the
10898 law" **meticulously obey the Old Testament laws,**
10899 **but without calling it as such so "not to fall from**
10900 **grace".** In other words, the appeal to euphemisms,
10901 which is to use a different name for something
10902 when it is not convenient to call it by its real name.
10903 The only thing they don't consider that has to be
10904 obeyed is the Saturday and the eating of animals
10905 forbidden by the law. If in the first century the Old
10906 Testament were to be torn off from the Bible, none

10907 of these laws that they now obey would be known
10908 by Christians. That is why I consider it foolishness
10909 and arrogance for someone to say that he is “neo-
10910 testamentarian”, a “New Testament” Christian;
10911 instead of a Whole-Bible Christian.

10912 ***
10913

10914 Chapter 13

10915 Let’s talk specifically about Saturday

10916 Saturday and the graven images

10917
10918
10919
10920
10921
10922 There are two very clear commandments in the
10923 Decalogue that the Christian sects look upon with
10924 Olympic contempt toward He who established
10925 them: one is not to make graven images (Catholics,) and the other one is not to work on Saturday (Protestants and Catholics.)

10926
10927
10928
10929 *“⁴ Thou shalt not make unto thee any*
10930 *graven image, or any likeness of any thing*
10931 *that is in heaven above, or that is in the Earth*
10932 *beneath, or that is in the water under the*
10933 *Earth. ⁵ Thou shalt not bow down thyself to*
10934 *them, nor serve them, for I the LORD thy*
10935 *God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of*
10936 *the fathers upon the children unto the third*
10937 *and fourth generation of them that hate me; ⁶*
10938 *and shewing mercy unto thousands of them*
10939 *that love me, and keep my commandments”.*

10940 (Ex 20:4-6)
10941

In spite of the clarity with which the commandment “you shall not make a graven image to yourself”, Catholics and Orthodox allege a thousand “reasons” to justify not keeping such commandment: this was for the people of old, that was for the Jews, that is for people under the law, etc..

10949 **Just as well, in spite of the clarity with which**
10950 **the “remember the Sabbath and keep it holy” is**
10951 **expressed,** Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox,
10952 etc., allege a thousand “reasons” to justify not
10953 keeping such commandment: this was for the
10954 people of old, that was for the Jews, that is for
10955 people under the law, etc..

10957 “**8 Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it**
10958 **holy.** 9 Six days shalt thou labour, and do all
10959 thy work, 10 **but the seventh day is the**
10960 **Sabbath of the LORD thy God, in it thou**
10961 **shalt not do any work,** thou, nor thy son, nor
10962 thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy
10963 maidservant, nor thy cattle, **nor thy stranger**
10964 **that is within thy gates.** 11 **For** in six days the
10965 LORD made Heaven and Earth, the sea and
10966 all that in them is, **and rested the seventh**
10967 **day;** wherefore the LORD blessed the
10968 **Sabbath day and hallowed it”.**

(Ex 20:8-11)

10971 **The same happens to Adventists and**
10972 **Mormons. In spite of the clarity with which God**
10973 **warns against adding to his commandments or to**
10974 **Scripture,** both groups have books parallel to the
10975 Bible, to which they give as much authority as the
10976 Bible, going against what it clearly and expressively
10977 warns in Rev 22:18-19, which says:

10978
10979 *“¹⁸ For I testify unto every man that heareth*
10980 *the words of the prophecy of this book: **If any***
10981 ***man shall add** unto these things, God shall*
10982 *add unto him the plagues that are written in*
10983 *this book; ¹⁹ **and if any man shall take away***
10984 *from the words of the book of this prophecy,*
10985 *God shall take away his part out of the book*
10986 *of life, and out of the holy city, and from the*
10987 *things which are written in this book”.*

(Rev 22:18-19)

*

10990
10991
10992 **The only thing God commanded was not to work**
10993 **on Saturday, not to worship Him on Saturdays,**
10994 **or not go to synagogue on Saturday**

10995 When we speak of keeping Saturday, there are
10996 many brothers who, believing themselves to be
10997 better than those who don't work on Saturday, and
10998 believing to have an irrefutable argument, say: “I
10999 do not worship God just on Saturday, I worship God
11000 every day”. They mistakenly think that the fourth
11001 commandment was given to worship God only on
11002 Saturday, or believe that those who keep Saturday
11003 worship God only on that day.

11004 **The fourth commandment only tells us not to**
11005 **work on Saturday.** It doesn't even tell us to go to
11006 church or synagogue on Saturday. If people were
11007 going to synagogue on Saturday it was because
11008 since they did not work that day, it was easier to go
11009 to synagogue. God **did not** establish synagogue,
11010 that was something that the Jews did on their own,
11011 very wisely, yes, but the fourth is not a
11012 commandment to attend synagogue. Synagogues
11013 did not even exist during the time of Moses and the

11014 kings of Israel, which came later. **The only reason**
11015 **God established the fourth commandment was**
11016 **so they would not work on Saturday.**

11017 God did not tell them to worship Him on
11018 Saturday; that was done every day. Therefore, that
11019 of “I worship God every day”, is not the
11020 “marvelous argument” against Saturday, that those
11021 who brandish it believe they use, and it is not the
11022 self-praise they invent for themselves.

11023 **In the Ten Commandments God said not to**
11024 **work on Saturday** and in dozens of passages the
11025 same commandment is repeated. However, **there is**
11026 **not one verse in the Bible that says that we can**
11027 **now work on Saturday.** Why then do so many
11028 Christians insist in saying that we can now work on
11029 Saturday? Are they going to tell me that God used
11030 dozens of passages to teach us to keep Saturday,
11031 and when it came time to make it obsolete he did
11032 not use one passage? Is it logical to think that
11033 knowing the Jews’ fanaticism with Saturday he
11034 would not clear up to the Jewish converts that
11035 Christians can “now” work on Saturday? Is it
11036 logical that they are not told **either** that they should
11037 not work on Sunday? **Will they call me a**
11038 **“legalist” because I obey what God commanded?**

11039 Such explanation is not even included in the
11040 letters that were intended for the Jews, like
11041 Hebrews, James and I Peter, which justifiably they
11042 would have needed if the change from Saturday to
11043 Sunday had been true. **This is because Saturday**
11044 **was never changed for Sunday.**

11045 I often hear brothers that say that **Christians**
11046 **must do every moment what Jesus would do.** If
11047 the Lord kept Saturday, then why don't Christians
11048 do what Jesus did? If those brothers really do what
11049 Jesus did, can they prove that Jesus kept Sunday?

11050 Those who keep Sunday instead of Saturday, do
11051 they keep it the same way that Jesus did? Do they
11052 stop working on Sunday? **And if they do work on**
11053 **Sunday when they need to, or when it is**
11054 **convenient for them, does that mean that the**
11055 **other nine commandments are kept when they**
11056 **can or when it is convenient to do so?** Can we
11057 worship graven images when it is opportune or steal
11058 when it is convenient?

11059 *

11060

11061

11062 **There is no place in the Bible where it was**
11063 **ordained or customary not to work on Sunday.**
11064 **The day that was made holy was Saturday, not**
11065 **any other**

11066 Those who believe and teach that we can “now”
11067 work on Saturday, but not on Sunday, or those who
11068 teach that we can keep any other day, be it Tuesday
11069 or Thursday, or those who believe we don’t need to
11070 keep any day, it would do them good to **stop and**
11071 **reflect on the origin of this commandment.**

11072 This commandment did not appear for the first
11073 time when Moses established it as a national law in
11074 a theocratic government. It had already been
11075 established, and not by Moses, but by God himself.
11076 **It is not a ceremonial law** given by Moses “until
11077 its reformation time;” **it is a behavioral law**
11078 established by God right from the week of creation.

11079 **God did not sanctify or bless Sunday or**
11080 **Tuesday or Thursday...but Saturday.**

11081

11082 *“¹ Thus the heavens and the Earth were*
11083 *finished, and all the host of them. ² And on the*
11084 *seventh day God ended his work which he had*
11085 *made; and he rested on the seventh day from*

11086 *all his work which he had made. 3 And God*
11087 *blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it,*
11088 *because that in it he had rested from all his*
11089 *work which God created and made”.*

11090 (Gn 2:1-3)

11091

11092 **Notice that the only day that God blessed was**
11093 **Saturday. Notice that the only day he sanctified**
11094 **was Saturday.** Pay attention as well at the reason
11095 why God blessed and sanctified Saturday: it was
11096 because it was then that he rested from all his work.
11097 Therefore, the reason for keeping Saturday is still
11098 standing, it has not expired. **That reason is to**
11099 **admit that God is the Creator. No wonder his**
11100 **spiritual enemies work so hard to disregard and**
11101 **vilify it.**

11102 We cannot change with impunity one of God’s
11103 commandments. **Who authorized working on**
11104 **Saturday and keeping Sunday?** Where is the
11105 biblical reason to show that Saturday was changed
11106 for Sunday?

11107 Did God sanctify Sunday? **Is there any biblical**
11108 **evidence to let us think that God “de-sanctified”**
11109 **Saturday and in its place sanctified Sunday?**
11110 However, it is evident here, and beyond the slightest
11111 doubt that God sanctified Saturday.

11112 The only thing that those who keep Sunday can
11113 prove is a Catholic tradition that is lost in the mist
11114 of the centuries, but doesn’t even go back as far as
11115 the apostolic era. **Rome still has an influence on**
11116 **true Christianity.**

11117 Those who defend Sunday only have tradition to
11118 do so and a few weak lucubration about the
11119 hypothesis that the first Christians met on Sunday.
11120 However, the commandment about Saturday is
11121 clear, precise, and transparent. It is ordained in a

11122 multitude of passages; it is not a lucubration about
11123 one or another possibility. It is an absolute truth,
11124 indisputable. **However, this clear and precise**
11125 **truth falls under the attack of a tradition based**
11126 **on obscure possibilities and laborious**
11127 **lucubration, never under the power of a new**
11128 **commandment.**

11129 *

11130
11131
11132

11133 **Saturday and marriage**

11134 One interesting thing is to think on the criteria
11135 that today's Christians use to say that **the**
11136 **commandment in Gn 2:2-3 (on Saturday) is**
11137 **invalid, but the commandment on 2:24 (on**
11138 **marriage) is still sound, valid, and eternal.** If one
11139 thing were abolished, so would the other, since they
11140 were both given at the same time.

11141 Something that stands out greatly is how **many of**
11142 **those who keep Sunday; reject the celebration of**
11143 **Christmas** alleging that such is a celebration with
11144 pagan origins, since it used to celebrate the winter
11145 solstice. But the case is that they keep Sunday, that
11146 it is true that is of pagan origin, since it was
11147 dedicated to the sun god, but yet they don't care
11148 about that origin. We can see that the goal of the
11149 spiritual enemy that misleads them or control them
11150 is to devalue Saturday on one hand, and Christmas
11151 on the other. In other words, to attack anything that
11152 honors God the Father (Saturday) or Jesus Christ his
11153 son (Christmas).

11154

11155 **It is false that December 25 is the winter**
11156 **solstice;** that happens on the 21st, and at most the
11157 22nd, but **never the 25th.** It is hard to understand the

11158 zeal they show in discrediting Christmas, and the
11159 complacency and strength they put in admitting and
11160 defending Sunday as the day of rest, in spite of it
11161 being a pagan feast to the sun god.

11162 *

11163
11164

11165 **Honor your parents and keep Saturday, which in**
11166 **turns honors God our Father**

11167 Most people make their decisions without any
11168 type of criteria. They are decisions simply based on
11169 feelings, most of the times circumstantial feelings.
11170 Such is what happens to Christians with the passage
11171 in Lev 19:3. It says:

11172

11173 ***“Ye shall fear every man his mother, and***
11174 ***his father, and keep my Sabbaths. I am the***
11175 ***LORD your God”.*** (Lev 19:3)

11176

11177 In this passage we see that **God personally** gives
11178 two commandments in the same verse. However,
11179 most Christians admit to the first but reject the
11180 second. Which criteria do they use to recognize that
11181 of honoring father and mother, and rejecting
11182 keeping Saturday, which honors our Father God?
11183 They do not follow any criteria, and cannot explain
11184 why they do it. They do it just because. Because
11185 that is how they were taught.

11186 *

11187

11188

11189 **Sunday and the Lord’s apparitions**

11190 If the advocates for abolishing Saturday (the only
11191 one of the Ten Commandments they abolish) have
11192 **no reason to suppress it, much less do they have**
11193 **one to substitute it for Sunday,** as they have done.

11194 One of their favorite arguments is that Jesus rose on
11195 Sunday, and another one, that the apostles met on
11196 Sunday. Neither one is reason enough to change a
11197 commandment that God himself gave, but that is
11198 not the argument I will address here.

11199 Some may say that the first two meetings the
11200 disciples held and the first two apparitions of Jesus
11201 happened on Sunday. For that they quote John
11202 20:19 and 26. While it is true that the first meeting
11203 and the first apparition happened on Easter Sunday,
11204 because that was the day he rose, the second one
11205 that John mentions was Monday, because he says it
11206 happened eight days later. If we were going to
11207 sanctify Sunday based on meetings and apparitions,
11208 we would also have to sanctify Monday. They met
11209 on Saturdays, Sundays, Mondays, and any other
11210 day. But the day to rest from their work was still
11211 Saturday.

11212
11213 *“Then the same day at evening, being the*
11214 *first day of the week, when the doors were*
11215 *shut where the disciples were assembled **for***
11216 ***fear of the Jews**, came Jesus and stood in the*
11217 *midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto*
11218 *you”.* (Jn 20:19)

11219
11220 As we can see they were not meeting on Sunday
11221 because it had been changed from Saturday, but
11222 **because they were afraid of the Jews. At that**
11223 **time they didn’t even think that Jesus had risen,**
11224 as we can see in Luke 24:1 and 11; much less were
11225 they going to celebrate his rising with a Sunday
11226 meeting.

11227 **In regards to the second apparition of Jesus,** it
11228 was on Monday, and they were also together on

11229 Monday. We can't believe then that they also
11230 changed Saturday for Monday.

11231

11232 *“And after eight days again his disciples*
11233 *were within, and Thomas with them; then*
11234 *came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood*
11235 *in the midst, and said: Peace be unto you”.*

11236

(Jn 20:26)

11237

11238 **There are those who stubbornly pretend to**
11239 **allege that eight later was Sunday again, but that**
11240 **is not true. If today is Sunday, one day later is**
11241 **Monday, two days later is Tuesday, three would be**
11242 **Wednesday; four, Thursday; five, Friday; six,**
11243 **Saturday; seven, Sunday; and eight, Monday. There**
11244 **is no way to force the count to get that eight days**
11245 **later would be Sunday again.**

11246

11247 I found, however, a passage that appears to agree
11248 with those who think mistakenly. This is Lev 23:39;
11249 but in it the issue is shown another way. It is not
11250 talking about “so many days later”, but that if the
11251 first day is Saturday, the eighth is Saturday again.
11252 That is logical. The first is Saturday; the second is
11253 Sunday; the third, Monday; the fourth, Tuesday; the
11254 fifth, Wednesday; the sixth, Thursday; the seventh,
11255 Friday; and the eighth, it is Saturday again.

11256

11257 It is clear that eight days **after** Easter Sunday was
11258 Monday. Therefore, even though they may want to
11259 continue finding a reason in other verses, they can't
11260 do it in this one.

11261

11262 **As for the third apparition, as is narrated in**
11263 **John 21:1-14, we see that it does not say that it was**
11264 **the first day of the week. But the issue is that if it**
11265 **had been a Sunday, it is evident that they were not**
11266 **resting on Sunday, but working at their own**
11267 **trades. Therefore, neither the first or the second or**

11265 the third apparition of the Lord can be used as
11266 arguments to say that the disciples had began to rest
11267 on Sunday instead of Saturday.

11269 ***“1 After these things Jesus shewed himself***
11270 ***again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias;***
11271 ***and on this wise shewed he himself. 2 There***
11272 ***were together Simon Peter, and Thomas***
11273 ***called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in***
11274 ***Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two***
11275 ***other of his disciples. 3 Simon Peter saith***
11276 ***unto them: I go a fishing. They say unto***
11277 ***him: We also go with thee... 14 This is now***
11278 ***the third time that Jesus shewed himself to***
11279 ***his disciples, after that he was risen from the***
11280 ***dead”.*** (Jn 21:1-14 abbreviated)

11282 If Saturday had been changed to Sunday, they
11283 would not have been working at their trades on a
11284 Sunday. So this passage cannot be used to allege
11285 that the apparition was on Sunday, because they
11286 were not in church; and if it was on Sunday, it can't
11287 be used to allege that they did not work on Sundays
11288 or that they gather at church on Sundays.

In addition to all the arguments expressed here we must remember that **when God gave the Ten Commandments he did not say they should meet on Saturday, but to rest from their work on Saturday.** Therefore, the fact that the disciples met on Sunday would not prove anything, since it is beyond all doubt that they also met on Saturday.

✱

11301 **The eight mentions of the first day of the week**
11302 Those who don't believe we should keep
11303 Saturdays allege that Saturday was changed for
11304 Sunday. In order to "justify" it they say that the
11305 disciples started keeping Sunday in remembrance of
11306 Christ's resurrection which happened that day. To
11307 "prove" it they quote the only **eight** passages in
11308 which "the first day of the week is mentioned" and
11309 they think they see in them that the disciples were
11310 meeting the first day of the week to keep Sunday.
11311 These passages are: Mat 28:1; Mar 16:2 y 9;
11312 Luke 24: 1; John 20:1 y 19; Acts 20:7 y I Cor
11313 16:2.

11314 Besides these eight passages we just mentioned,
11315 "the first day of the week" is never mentioned
11316 anywhere in the Bible, and **none of these passages**
11317 **say or even imply that they were really meeting**
11318 **on Sundays in order to celebrate the**
11319 **resurrection, and even less that there had been a**
11320 **change from Saturday to Sunday.** Let's see these
11321 passages.

11322
11323 1) *"In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to*
11324 *dawn toward **the first day of the week**, came*
11325 *Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see*
11326 *the sepulchre"* (Mt 28:1)

11327
11328 2) *"And very early in the morning **the first***
11329 ***day of the week**, they came unto the sepulchre*
11330 *at the rising of the sun".* (Mr 16:2)

11331
11332 3) *"Now when Jesus was risen early **the first***
11333 ***day of the week**, he appeared first to Mary*
11334 *Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven*
11335 *devils".* (Mr 16:9)

11336

11337 **4) “Now upon *the first day of the week*, very**
11338 *early in the morning, they came unto the*
11339 *sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had*
11340 *prepared, and certain others with them”.*

(Lk 24:1)

11342 **5) “*The first day of the week* cometh Mary**
11343 *Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto*
11344 *the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away*
11345 *from the sepulchre”.* (Jn 20:1)

11347 **6) “Then *the same day at evening, being the***
11348 *first day of the week, when the doors were*
11349 *shut where **the disciples were assembled for***
11350 ***fear of the Jews**, came Jesus and stood in the*
11351 *midst, and saith unto them: Peace be unto*
11352 *you”.* (Jn 20:19)

11354 **7) “And upon *the first day of the week*, when**
11355 *the disciples came together to break bread,*
11356 *Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on*
11357 *the morrow; and continued his speech until*
11358 *midnight”.* (Act 20:7)

11360 **8) “Upon *the first day of the week* let every**
11361 *one of you lay by him in store, as God hath*
11362 *prospered him, that there be no gatherings*
11363 *when I come”.* (I Co 16:2)

11365 If we read carefully **the first five passages** we
11366 will see that they all say that the women came to the
11367 tomb to bring the spices, because they thought he
11368 was dead. **If in these five verses we see that**
11369 **nobody new yet that Christ had risen**, it is not
11370 logical to suppose that, in these passages, the
11371 mention of the first day of the week supports at all
11372

11373 the idea that the disciples kept Sunday to celebrate
11374 Jesus' resurrection. In these five passages they were
11375 not resting on Sunday, but rather trying to anoint
11376 Jesus' dead body Therefore there are only three left
11377 of the eight passages.

11378 **The same can be assumed from the sixth**
11379 **passage.** The disciples were together, not to
11380 celebrate Christ's resurrection which had happened
11381 that same day, because nobody believed it yet.
11382 According to the text itself, they **were together**
11383 **because they were afraid of the Jews**, not to keep
11384 the Sunday or celebrate the resurrection. Therefore,
11385 of the eight, we have only two left.

11386 **As for the seventh passage** we must note two
11387 things, which I will comment on later: **a)** Paul
11388 preached until midnight, and **b)** Paul was planning
11389 on leaving the next day. Those who use this passage
11390 to support the change of Saturday to Sunday cannot
11391 prove with it that the fact that they had come
11392 together to break bread would mean that they did
11393 not work on Sunday. It does not mean such a thing
11394 because in Acts 2:4 we see that the disciples came
11395 together to break bread any day.

11396
11397 *“And they, **continuing daily** with one accord*
11398 *in the Temple, and breaking bread from house*
11399 *to house, did eat their meat with gladness and*
11400 *singleness of heart” (Act 2:46)*

11401
11402 In the case of Acts 20:7, the disciples could have
11403 been together to listen to Paul, eat with him and
11404 have a time of Christian fellowship. In other words,
11405 the simple fact that they were eating together that
11406 Sunday does not “prove” that Saturday was
11407 changed for Sunday. God was not about the change
11408 a commandment he gave himself, as Saturday is,

11409 using for it the only argument that the disciples ate
11410 with Paul on a Sunday. We have to understand that
11411 there were many Christian Jews that needed an
11412 argument that would leave them no doubt.

11413 **Additionally, there are things in that same**
11414 **passage that contradicts the idea that they were**
11415 **keeping Sunday.** Let's remember that the days
11416 ended at sundown, and at that moment the next day
11417 would start. Since they mentioned the first day of
11418 the week, and since the meeting went on until
11419 midnight we have to suppose three possibilities: **1)**
11420 that they started the meeting early Saturday during
11421 the day, because they were keeping Saturday, night
11422 fell, and it then became the first day of the week, as
11423 mentioned in the passage; **2)** that they started the
11424 meeting the first day of the week, but in the
11425 evening; in other words, that they met after
11426 Saturday was over, by sundown, and as Sunday
11427 night was starting, so that Paul could embark on his
11428 trip on the following Sunday morning; and **3)** that
11429 they started their meeting the first day of the week
11430 during the day, nightfall came, Sunday was over,
11431 and they continued with the meeting during the
11432 night of the second day of the week, which is
11433 Monday.

11434 **Case number 3** I think should be set aside
11435 because if it had already been the evening of the
11436 second day of the week they would not say they
11437 were meeting on the first day of the week, but they
11438 would rather say they were meeting the second day
11439 of the week.

11440 **If we accept case number 2** let's remember first
11441 that dusk had begun, it was almost evening. That
11442 being so, we see that they met on the evening of
11443 Sunday (at the end of Saturday,) but Paul was
11444 leaving the next day; that would mean that Paul did

11445 not keep Sunday, because he was traveling the
11446 following morning, and would not meet with the
11447 church Sunday morning.

11448 **If we accept case number 1**, and that is why we
11449 think they met on Saturday and went late into the
11450 evening, we see then that **this verse could not**
11451 **prove that Saturday was changes to Sunday,**
11452 **because the meeting took place on Saturday.** As
11453 we can see in any one of these three scenarios, nor
11454 any additional one, does this passage **prove** that
11455 Saturday's rest was changed for Sunday's rest. The
11456 only thing it tells us is that for some worthy reason,
11457 such as listening to and fellowshiping with Paul,
11458 were the disciples meeting on Sunday evening.

11459 This passage does not "prove" either that there
11460 had been a change from Saturday to Sunday; we
11461 can't even assume it or suspect it, there is no basis.
11462 Therefore there is only one passage left. Let's see.

11463 **In regards to the eighth passage** we realize that
11464 according to it, **the brothers were in their houses**
11465 **on Sunday, not in church.** If they were in their
11466 houses and not in church it is because they did not
11467 go to church on Sunday. To choose the first day of
11468 the week to set aside their offerings could have been
11469 simply because after finishing their weekly work on
11470 Friday, they received their earnings, or gathered
11471 their fruit, rested on Saturday, and then Sunday they
11472 continued about their daily tasks. Maybe that was
11473 the moment in which Paul wanted them to set aside
11474 their offering, before they started spending their
11475 money. This eighth passage where it does mention
11476 the first day of the week doesn't "prove" either that
11477 there had been a change from Saturday to Sunday.

11478 **Inevitably the first six passages do not refer to**
11479 **a change from Saturday to Sunday, and it would**
11480 **not be wise to take them as "proofs" in this**

11481 **sense.** The other two passages don't prove anything
11482 either; and even if we take them with the best of
11483 intentions to try to see a change in them, they have a
11484 very weak base to convince anyone of this change.
11485 However, based on these two weak passages is what
11486 those who believe on Sunday base their heresy.

11487 There is a lot more than two passages where we
11488 can see that the disciples met on Saturday, but they
11489 are all rejected. In other words, for those who
11490 believe in this change from Saturday to Sunday the
11491 other seven, very clear passages in which we see
11492 that their meetings took place on Saturday, have no
11493 power, but the other two weak passages do. They
11494 allege that when the apostles met on Saturdays it
11495 was not to keep it, but to be able to talk to the Jews
11496 But if that is the case, then they would need to cease
11497 work on Saturday; therefore they rested on
11498 Saturday, not on Sunday.

11499
11500 *“But when they departed from Perga, they*
11501 *came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the*
11502 *synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat*
11503 *down”.* (Act 13:14)
11504

11505 It would be logical to think that if the apostles
11506 **kept Sunday and the brothers would have met**
11507 **on Sunday, there would be more mentions of**
11508 **these Sunday meetings than those of Saturday.**
11509 However, that is not so. Throughout the entire book
11510 of Acts, the first day of the week is mentioned only
11511 once, in Acts 20:7; but the Saturday meetings are
11512 mentioned in **Acts 13: 14; 13:42; 13:44; 15:21;**
11513 **16:13; 17:2; 18:4**, a sign that the brothers met on
11514 Saturday, not on Sunday.

11515 All these arguments against the supposed change
11516 from Saturday to Sunday are not as important as the
11517 words of Jesus Christ himself when he said:

11518

11519 *“¹⁷ Think not that I am come to destroy the*
11520 *law, or the prophets; I am not come to*
11521 *destroy, but to fulfil. ¹⁸ For verily I say unto*
11522 *you, Till heaven and Earth pass, one jot or*
11523 *one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,*
11524 *till all be fulfilled. ¹⁹ Whosoever therefore*
11525 *shall break one of these least*
11526 *commandments, and shall teach men so, he*
11527 *shall be called the least in the kingdom of*
11528 *heaven, but whosoever shall do and teach*
11529 *them, the same shall be called great in the*
11530 *kingdom of heaven”.* (Mt 5:17-19)

11531

11532 I don't understand why Christians have insisted in
11533 going against the Lord as if he were not Lord. **They**
11534 **give priority to what the “interpreters” say**
11535 **instead of what Jesus Christ himself said.** If one
11536 of the Ten Commandments, a very clear
11537 commandment, like “you will not work on
11538 Saturday” would have been changed by divine will,
11539 the Lord would have made it perfectly clear. **God**
11540 **would not have clearly said, and many times**
11541 **indeed, not to work on Saturday and then**
11542 **through a couple of dark, nebulous, tortuous and**
11543 **sinuous interpretations let people “realize” that**
11544 **now they could work on Saturday. In other**
11545 **words, that one of his ten commandments had**
11546 **now been changed, but without directly saying it.**
11547 It is not logical think that God would let an apostle
11548 make the change in a dark and nebulous manner
11549 instead of the Lord doing it himself in the same

11550 clear and precise manner that he had ordered it to
11551 begin with.

11552 *

11553

11554

11555 **The disciples met any day**

11556 Those who want to change Saturday for Sunday
11557 say they base it in that, according to them, the
11558 disciples met on Sunday. It is not true, as we
11559 already saw. There are a couple of passages where it
11560 says that the disciples were meeting on a Sunday,
11561 but there are many more passages that say they met
11562 on Saturday. We also saw another one where they
11563 met on a Monday. In actuality, they would meet
11564 every day, as we see in Acts Hch 19:9.

11565

11566 *“But when divers were hardened, and*
11567 *believed not, but spake evil of that way before*
11568 *the multitude, he departed from them, and*
11569 *separated the disciples, **disputing daily in the***
11570 ***school** of one Tyrannus”.* (Act 19:9)

11571 *

11572

11573

11574 **The error of believing that today’s**
11575 **Saturday is not the same weekday of the**
11576 **creation**

11577 Some people who do not want to keep Saturday
11578 allege that a week today is not the same as the week
11579 at the time of creation, or the week in the time of
11580 Moses, or the week in the time of Christ. They say
11581 that since there have been changes in the calendar
11582 through the centuries, the sequence of the weekdays
11583 has been altered, and that today’s Saturday may not
11584 be the seventh day as before; it could be the
11585 Wednesday, or the Thursday of Moses’ time.

11586 **Dogmatically based on such a statement**
11587 **without proof**, they conclude that keeping Saturday
11588 is irrelevant, since we may now be keeping any day
11589 and not the seventh without our knowledge. These
11590 people ignore history and ignore the Bible. It is true
11591 that there have been modifications to the calendar,
11592 but **the sequence of the weekdays has never been**
11593 **altered**. Let's prove it using the Bible, history and
11594 common sense.

11595 We are going to prove with three incontrovertible
11596 facts that the week of today is exactly the same as
11597 the week during the time of Moses, at the time of
11598 Creation, and at the time of Christ. These are: **a)**
11599 Christ kept the Saturday; therefore, the week during
11600 his time was the same as the week of Creation and
11601 the week of Moses. **b)** Today we celebrate Christ's
11602 resurrection on Sunday. **c)** The Jews kept the
11603 current Saturday as the seventh day, just like in the
11604 time of Moses, and Muslims keep Friday.

11605
11606 *"¹ And when the Sabbath was past, Mary*
11607 *Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James,*
11608 *and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that*
11609 *they might come and anoint him. ² And very*
11610 *early in the morning the first day of the*
11611 *week, they came unto the sepulchre at the*
11612 *rising of the sun".* (Mr 16:1-2)

11613
11614 **If our Lord Jesus Christ kept Saturday, it is**
11615 **because he knew that ever since Creation, to**
11616 **Moses and through his own time there had been**
11617 **no alteration in the day**, in other words, Saturday
11618 in roman times was still the seventh day, just as it
11619 was during Moses and during Creation. Not only
11620 did the Lord prove it by keeping Saturday, but the
11621 Jews throughout the centuries, from Moses to

11622 Christ, kept a very meticulous account of the days
11623 of the week.

11624 **Our Lord Jesus Christ, so not to sin and thus**
11625 **save us, had to perfectly fulfill God's law.**

11626 Therefore, he would not have accepted to keep a
11627 day different from that of Creation and that of
11628 Moses. So we can guarantee that at least until
11629 Christ's time, the sequence of the weekdays had not
11630 been altered. We are now going to prove that it was
11631 not altered afterwards.

11632 **According to Mk 16:1-2 Christ rose the day**
11633 **after the Sabbath, or, Sunday.** If we celebrate
11634 today Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem on Palm
11635 Sunday, and his resurrection on Easter Sunday, that
11636 indicates that Sundays are the same today as they
11637 were in Jesus' time, and thus the same as those
11638 during Moses' time and Creation time. Therefore,
11639 today's Saturdays have to be the same Saturdays as
11640 the Saturdays during Christ, Moses, and Creation.

11641 **Additionally, we know that the Jews** have kept
11642 the sequence of the weekdays before and after
11643 Christ very meticulously without paying attention to
11644 the changes in the calendar or papal bullae. If they
11645 continue recognizing today's Saturday the same as
11646 before, this is a sign that it has not changed.

11647 **We also know that the Muslims,** who started
11648 keeping Friday in the VII century, still keep Friday
11649 today, sign that they have not seen changes in the
11650 week days, motivated by the Gregorian calendar of
11651 1582, or by any other reason. Besides, neither Jews
11652 nor Muslims were going to accept a change made
11653 by a Catholic pope, such as the Gregorian calendar.

11654 The fact that for both Jews and Muslims the
11655 present week is the same as the Creation week and
11656 Moses', reaffirms what we have reasoned before. In
11657 light of these three irrepressible facts there is no

11658 reason to give credit to the foolish hypotheses that
11659 the week days were changed, and that the present
11660 Saturday is not the same as the creation Saturday.

11661 **As for history**, it teaches us that when Pope
11662 Gregory XIII reformed the Julian calendar in
11663 October of 1582 they skipped 10 days in October,
11664 but not one weekday. It is like saying that they
11665 skipped from Tuesday, October 12 to Wednesday,
11666 October 22. They skipped ten days, but the
11667 weekdays continued to run as always.

11668 *

11669
11670

11671 **Exaggerations and foolishness while keeping**
11672 **Saturday. You may leave the house on Saturdays**

11673 Among those who keep Saturday there are those
11674 who exaggerate, based on the following verse, and
11675 do not leave the house on Saturday, while others go
11676 out only to the synagogue or to church.

11677

11678 *“See, for that the LORD hath given you the*
11679 *Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth*
11680 *day the bread of two days; abide ye every*
11681 *man in his place, let no man go out of his*
11682 *place on the seventh day. (Ex 16:29)*

11683

11684 When it says: *“abide ye every man in his place,*
11685 *let no man go out of his place on the seventh day”*,
11686 **it does not mean that in order to keep Saturday**
11687 **you have to stay at home.** This is being said to a
11688 particular group of people, for a particular reason,
11689 and for a particular period of time.

11690 **Since there were those who disobeyed and went**
11691 **out to get manna on Saturday**, Moses tells them
11692 they will not find it, and not to bother going out to
11693 get it, making this (if they did it) a disobedience to

11694 God. In other words, they are not forcing the
11695 keepers of Saturday to not go outdoors on the
11696 seventh day, what it is saying, only to those men, is
11697 that there was no manna on Saturday; therefore they
11698 were not to go out to get it on Saturday any more. In
11699 order to understand this better, we must read verses
11700 22 to 29 and realize by the context why and to
11701 whom is this being told. When it comes to making
11702 up doctrine from one single verse there is always
11703 the danger of falling into heresy or foolishness.
11704

11705 *“22 And it came to pass, that on the sixth day*
11706 *they gathered twice as much bread, two*
11707 *omers for one man; and all the rulers of the*
11708 *congregation came and told Moses. 23 And he*
11709 *said unto them: This is that which the LORD*
11710 *hath said: **To morrow is the rest of the holy***
11711 ***Sabbath unto the LORD.** Bake that which ye*
11712 *will bake to day, and seethe that ye will*
11713 *seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up*
11714 *for you to be kept until the morning. 24 And*
11715 *they laid it up till the morning, as Moses*
11716 *bade; and it did not stink, neither was there*
11717 *any worm therein. 25 And Moses said: Eat that*
11718 *to day; **for to day is a Sabbath unto the***
11719 ***LORD, to day ye shall not find it in the field.***
11720 *26 Six days ye shall gather it; but on the*
11721 *seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there*
11722 *shall be none. 27 And **it came to pass, that***
11723 ***there went out some of the people on the***
11724 ***seventh day for to gather,** and they found*
11725 *none. 28 And the LORD said unto Moses: How*
11726 *long refuse ye to keep my commandments and*
11727 *my laws? 29 See, for that the LORD hath given*
11728 *you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on*
11729 *the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye*

11730 *every man in his place, let no man go out of*
11731 *his place on the seventh day”*. (Ex 16: 22-29)

11732

11733 As we saw, that of not leaving the house on
11734 Saturday was not done as a way to correctly keep
11735 the Sabbath, it was told to the disobedient ones
11736 who, in spite of the warning that there wouldn't be
11737 manna on Saturday, insisted in going out of their
11738 tents to get manna.

11739 **Errors motivated by extrapolating what the**
11740 **Scriptures say are very frequent among**
11741 **believers.** In other words, from taking a verse of a
11742 sentence out of context and giving it a general
11743 meaning. That is how what I call “**single-verse**
11744 **doctrines**” are formed, and I call them so because
11745 they were formed by isolating what is said in one
11746 verse without taking into consideration the rest of
11747 the Bible.

11748 **In this specific case, those who believe they**
11749 **cannot leave the house on Saturday do not take**
11750 **into account that Jesus walked around the fields**
11751 **on Saturday** (Lc 6:1), and that the priests, as well
11752 as the people, went to Temple on Saturday. If Jesus
11753 walked around the fields on Saturday, this is
11754 **evident** that they could go out of the house on
11755 Saturday and that in order to keep Saturday they did
11756 not have to stay home. That's why we see that even
11757 those who rightly kept Saturday went out of their
11758 houses on that day.

11759

11760 *“And it came to pass on the second Sabbath*
11761 *after the first, that he went through the corn*
11762 *fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of*
11763 *corn, and did eat, rubbing them in their*
11764 *hands”*. (Lk 6:1)

11765

*

11766 **You can light a fire and make war on Saturday**
11767 Those who in exaggeration keep Saturday
11768 conclude from the next verse (Ex 35:3) the
11769 erroneous idea that we can't light a fire in the house
11770 on Saturday. I have heard of some Adventists and
11771 Jews from cold countries that on Saturdays they
11772 avoid turning on their range, or their chimney in
11773 winter to warm their homes.

11774
11775 *“Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your*
11776 *habitations upon the Sabbath day”.*

11777 (Ex 35:3)

11778
11779 These fools did the same thing as those who in
11780 Maccabees era allowed themselves be killed by
11781 enemy armies in order not fight on Saturday. By
11782 believing the foolishness of their leaders and not
11783 reading the Scripture on their own, they ignored that
11784 **Joshua, Moses' disciple, who betters than all of**
11785 **us knew how to keep the Sabbath day, fought**
11786 **against Jericho for seven consecutive days, one of**
11787 **which necessarily had to be a Saturday.** If Joshua
11788 fought on Saturday (Jos 6:14-15) and if God
11789 himself ordered it to, (Jos 6:2-4), **it was evident**
11790 **that it was all right to fight on Saturday.** But
11791 because they followed the “divine inspiration” of
11792 their religious leaders instead of Scripture itself on
11793 their own, they made the mistake that their teachers
11794 taught them and they paid the consequences.

11795
11796 *“² And the LORD said unto Joshua: See, I*
11797 *have given into thine hand Jericho, and the*
11798 *king thereof, and the mighty men of valour. ³*
11799 *And ye shall compass the city, all ye men of*
11800 *war, and go round about the city once. Thus*
11801 *shalt thou do six days. ⁴ And seven priests*

11802 *shall bear before the ark seven trumpets of*
11803 *rams' horns; **and the seventh day ye shall***
11804 ***compass the city seven times**, and the priests*
11805 *shall blow with the trumpets”.*

(Jos 6:2-4)

11807
11808 *“¹⁴ And the second day they compassed the*
11809 *city once, and returned into the camp; so they*
11810 *did six days. ¹⁵ **And it came to pass on the***
11811 ***seventh day**, that they rose early about the*
11812 *dawning of the day, and compassed the city*
11813 *after the same manner seven times; only on*
11814 *that day they compassed the city seven times”.*

(Jos 6:14-15)

11816
11817 As we can see we can defend ourselves on
11818 Saturday, for even Joshua attacked on Saturday.

11819 **In the other absurd case, that of those who**
11820 **would not light a fire at home on Saturday**, they
11821 followed their “inspired” leaders, and isolated
11822 verses such as 35:3.

11823 There were no matches in Moses’ times. Even on
11824 non-Sabbath days, if someone’s fire went off it was
11825 supposed to be done by rubbing or they had to go
11826 get it at a neighbor’s house. Therefore, **no one let**
11827 **their fire go off, day or night, Saturday or any**
11828 **other day of the week.** The ones in charge of
11829 keeping the light on was the housewife, and to let
11830 their light go off by negligence, even at night, was a
11831 sign of ineptitude, foolishness and lack of maturity
11832 in a woman, as we seen in Prv 31:18.

11833
11834 *“She perceiveth that her merchandise is*
11835 *good; **her candle goeth not out by night”.***

(Prv 31:18)

11837

11838 **I remember from my grandmother's**
11839 **storytelling and from the very old ladies when I**
11840 **was a boy,** that in the countryside, they had a habit
11841 of putting thick wood in the hearth or kitchen range
11842 as the afternoon started to die, and before leaving
11843 the kitchen they covered it with ashes. This allowed
11844 the wood to stay on consuming it very slowly. In
11845 the morning, when the housewife woke up, which
11846 was usually about 5:00 or 5:30 a.m., they would fan
11847 the flames and add new dry wood. To fan the flame
11848 means to bring it to life setting aside the ashes that
11849 is accumulated on the log itself as it begins to burn
11850 off.

11851 As we can see, if we analyze both the Scriptures
11852 and the old customs, **we see that nobody turned**
11853 **off their fire on Friday, and therefore, there be**
11854 **no need to kindle it on Saturday, since it was**
11855 **always on.** See Lev 6:12-13. If at that time, when
11856 there were no matches, an entire nation would turn
11857 off their fires on Friday, there would be quite an
11858 ordeal on Sunday to turn it back on, because
11859 rubbing two twigs in order to light a fire is not the
11860 easy deal that we see in movies or cartoons, it takes
11861 hours and hours, if they can do it at all. And if you
11862 want to try it, take two pieces of wood and try
11863 lighting a fire.

11864 **What I'm trying to say is that what God**
11865 **command in this verse is not that an entire**
11866 **nation turn off its fires. God does not give**
11867 **commandments that produce chaos and**
11868 **bitterness.**

11869
11870 *“¹² And the fire upon the altar shall be*
11871 *burning in it; it shall not be put out; and the*
11872 *priest shall burn wood on it every morning,*
11873 *and lay the burnt offering in order upon it;*

11874 *and he shall burn thereon the fat of the peace*
11875 *offerings. ¹³ **The fire shall ever be burning***
11876 ***upon the altar; it shall never go out***.
11877 (Lev 6:12-13)

11878
11879 The commandment in Ex 35:3 is motivated, in my
11880 opinion, by the desire to insist that if they were
11881 receiving the manna in the desert, and preparing it
11882 the day before (Friday) in order to eat in on
11883 Saturday (Ex 16:23), there was no reason to be
11884 doing kitchen work on Saturday. In other words, it
11885 is a particularization, a complement, a reiteration of
11886 what had already been commanded in Ex 16:23, not
11887 a new commandment against having the fire on
11888 Saturday.

11889
11890 *“And he said unto them: This is that which*
11891 *the LORD hath said: To morrow is the rest of*
11892 *the holy Sabbath unto the LORD; **bake that***
11893 ***which ye will bake to day, and seethe that ye***
11894 ***will seethe; and that which remaineth over***
11895 *lay up for you to be kept until the morning”*
11896 (Ex 16:23)

11897
11898 *“See, for that the LORD hath given you the*
11899 *Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth*
11900 *day the bread of two days; **abide ye every***
11901 ***man in his place, let no man go out of his***
11902 ***place on the seventh day”**. (Ex 16:29)*

11903
11904 It is similar to what happened on Ex 16:29, where
11905 they were not receiving a new commandment to not
11906 leave their homes in Saturdays, but a complement
11907 or reiteration of the one given before. Doctrinal
11908 errors are formed by taking a verse out of context

11909 that had been directed to a specific case and giving
11910 it a general meaning.

11911 **In conclusion:** it doesn't say here that we should
11912 not kindle a fire at home on Saturday, since the fire
11913 never went out, not even in the Temple or the
11914 Tabernacle, as we saw in Lev 6:12-13, what is
11915 being reiterated here is that they should not be
11916 reviving the fire for cooking on Saturday, instead,
11917 food should be cooked from the day before.

11918 *

11919

11920

11921 **The ridiculous Saturday of Adventists and Jews**

11922 I keep Saturday because I know that it is not
11923 "abolished", as many brothers erroneously think;
11924 but it is a long way to endorse the foolish and
11925 ridiculous behavior of some Adventists and Jews.

11926 **Adventists advised** (or at least they did in 1945
11927 when I read it) that even taking a bath had to be
11928 postponed for after Saturday.

11929 **Jews would let the light on** in the synagogue on
11930 Friday afternoon so they would not have to turn it
11931 on Saturday, in other words they considered it work
11932 to move the light switch. These two should be
11933 enough as a sample. However, both groups allow
11934 the use of air conditioning in their places of
11935 worship, or the use of their cars, etc.. Why?
11936 Because without air conditioning people would not
11937 go to their preaching house (church or synagogue)
11938 and would not leave their offerings there. The same
11939 as with the light and the cars. After swallowing this
11940 camel, they strain the mosquito: one who
11941 recommends not taking a bath until after Saturday,
11942 and the other one who doesn't turn on or off the
11943 light switch or the air conditioner.

11944

11945 “¹ And it came to pass, as he went into the
11946 house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat
11947 bread **on the Sabbath day**, that they watched
11948 him. ² And, behold, **there was a certain man**
11949 **before him which had the dropsy.** ³ And
11950 Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers and
11951 Pharisees, saying: **Is it lawful to heal on the**
11952 **Sabbath day?** ⁴ And they held their peace.
11953 And he took him, and healed him, and let him
11954 go; ⁵ And answered them, saying: **Which of**
11955 **you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a**
11956 **pit, and will not straightway pull him out on**
11957 **the Sabbath day?** ⁶ And they could not
11958 answer him again to these things”.

(Lk 14:1-6)

11960
11961 **For those who want to keep Saturday the right**
11962 **way, without relaxation or exaggeration,** it would
11963 be good what this verse says: that on Saturday they
11964 had a meal at a Pharisee’s home and that Jesus
11965 approved it with his presence.

11966 It is logical to think that the meal had been
11967 prepared ahead of time as ordered in Ex 16:23, but
11968 they had no problem with preparing a place and
11969 food for at least fourteen people: Jesus, the twelve
11970 disciples, and the Pharisee.

11971 **I would not invite many people to eat on a**
11972 **Saturday,** because that would make me do work
11973 that is not essential; but if some friends come by my
11974 house and have not eaten, they sure aren’t going to
11975 leave my house hungry because it is Saturday.

11976 **The spirit behind keeping Saturday is that man**
11977 **honors God by resting physically and mentally**
11978 **on that day, no that he feels tormented and**
11979 **overwhelmed.** I keep Saturday because that was the
11980 day, and not any other, the one God established, and

11981 God does not change his mind; but know this: **I**
11982 **keep Saturday, Saturday does not keep me.**

11983 I feel at liberty to do everything that does not
11984 make me or other work; and when I say “work”,
11985 I’m not thinking of ridiculous foolishness.

11986 *

11987

11988

11989 **The religion of the “Ifeel” and the Saturday**

11990 Man likes to follow his feelings and not his
11991 reasoning in everything, especially in religion.

11992 **This foolish habit has two serious problems.**

11993 **The first** is that no one can guarantee that what he
11994 “feels” is right, for many times he has failed after
11995 following what he “feels”. Anyone could allege,
11996 and rightly so, that one can also make a mistake
11997 when one thinks. True. But when one thinks and
11998 makes a mistake, one can review the process of that
11999 thinking and the information used for that thinking
12000 and find where the mistake was made. One can also
12001 get experience and skill, thanks to that mistake, to
12002 not make the same mistake again. We can even
12003 counsel with a friend to find where our reasoning
12004 mistake was.

12005 However, when someone follows his “feelings”
12006 and makes a mistake, he can never analyze and find
12007 out why he “felt” incorrectly; he has to continue
12008 “feeling” his luck to see if he makes the mark. He
12009 who makes one hundred mistakes in his reasoning
12010 can learn a lot and not keep on making mistakes. He
12011 who makes a hundred mistakes when he “feels”, is
12012 just as lost now as he was at the beginning: he is
12013 still naked in the middle of the street.

12014 **The second great harm encountered by those**
12015 **who follow what they “feel”, is that they can not**
12016 **consult with another brother about the issue,**

12017 because one of those “feelings” that people allege
12018 having (about doing one thing or another) **cannot**
12019 **be clearly defined to another**; it cannot be
12020 expressed; one cannot make someone else “feel”
12021 what one feels.

12022 **However, he who reasons can communicate his**
12023 **thoughts to someone else**, the reasons behind his
12024 thinking, and his conclusions; and on what data he
12025 based his reasoning. That way friend or foe can let
12026 him know if the mistake is in the information
12027 received or in his chain of reasoning. Thus, thanks
12028 to his friend or foe, the sincere human being that
12029 seeks the truth can find it. He can rectify his
12030 thoughts totally or partially, as he has been shown
12031 the total or partial error of either his reasoning or his
12032 information, or simply a gap or an omission of other
12033 factors, information or reasoning that should have
12034 been present.

12035 None of this can be done to a man that says: “the
12036 truth is that I ‘**feel**’ I should do or believe such a
12037 thing”. Millions act that way in this crazy world.
12038 That is why I say that the biggest religion of all
12039 times is the religion of the “**Ifeels**”.

12040 If a man who is talking to a friend about an issue,
12041 tells his friend, “**I feel** this should be done this or
12042 that way”, there are no reasons or words to
12043 convince him of the contrary. The only thing that
12044 can be hoped for, and I don’t know how to do it,
12045 would be to “feel” our thesis stronger than he feels
12046 his, and to send him our “vibes”, projecting our
12047 “influences” on him, to see if we make him
12048 “change” his mind and he “feels” something else.
12049 But that battle of voodoo, hypnotism, suggestion,
12050 “spiritual power”, “charismatic influence” or
12051 whatever you want to call it, I don’t know how to
12052 carry it out. **I prefer the archaic, prosaic, and**

12053 **non-mysterious method of reasoning over**
12054 **Scriptures.**

12055 I don't believe that God would be sending anyone
12056 "vibes" or "influences" so that person "feels" the
12057 right thesis instead of reason it. **This strikes me as**
12058 **arrogance and egotism from those who think of**
12059 **themselves as influenced by esoteric powers.**

12060 Well then, having just finished explaining the
12061 "Ifeel" religion, I'll say that there are many who
12062 have practiced it through the centuries. During the
12063 time of the Maccabees, as I explained before, the
12064 Jews, or at least some of them, kept Saturday in
12065 such a foolish way that they would not defend
12066 themselves when attacked by their enemies on
12067 Saturday. For them, to defend themselves when
12068 their enemies attacked them on Saturday was a sin.
12069 However, as we saw in the case of Jericho, God
12070 **ordered them not to just defend themselves, but**
12071 **to attack during Saturday.**

12072 If the Jews at the time of the Maccabees, instead
12073 of "feeling" they should not defend themselves on
12074 Saturday, would have informed themselves reading
12075 Scripture and reasoning over them, they would not
12076 have suffered the consequences of their foolish
12077 beliefs, the consequences of their "feelings". **The**
12078 **"Ifeel" religion is very big, but very harmful.**

12079 Whenever I meet a brother that practices the "I
12080 feel" religion and he says, "I feel I must do 'A' or
12081 must believe in 'B' and practice it", I immediately
12082 ask him, **"Who put that feeling in you, in which**
12083 **you base your action?"** Without a doubt they say,
12084 **"Well! I believe it was God",** or, **"I have faith that**
12085 **it was God".** The next question is obvious and is,
12086 **"Do you have a way to prove it?"** When they say,
12087 **no,** I ask them, **"Can Satan put feelings in people?**
12088 **Can people have their own feelings?"** They have to

12089 answer, yes to both questions, therefore I finish by
12090 saying, “And if you don’t know the origin of what
12091 you are ‘feeling’, why do you follow those
12092 feelings? **Why do you base your faith and your**
12093 **behavior in something that you don’t know the**
12094 **origin of?** You don’t know if it comes from God, or
12095 yourself, or even Satan”.

12096 Now you could ask me, “What is the result of
12097 those good advices you have given?” **None!!** I
12098 waste my time trying to help them and they
12099 continue holding on to their error; they continue
12100 acting on their “feelings”. Why? **Because it is**
12101 **easier to “feel” than to be informed, reason and**
12102 **discuss to find out the truth;** because it is nicer to
12103 believe that we are “special chosen” to whom these
12104 “feelings” are sent from esoteric regions; because it
12105 is very hurtful for a person with an inflated “ego” to
12106 admit that he was wrong, and if he reasoned or
12107 discussed the issue, he would have to arrive to the
12108 **very hurtful conclusion that he was wrong.** That
12109 is why he hides, as an escape from his inflated
12110 “ego”, in the “Ifeel” technique, instead of that of
12111 discussing the issue with the other brothers, as the
12112 apostles did, or to reason, which is discussing the
12113 issue with himself.

12114 **That is the way that most of those who reject**
12115 **Saturday and God’s law in general act.**

12116 And are they not worthy of pity? Yes...but not so
12117 much. They are like that because they want.
12118 Nobody can lie to himself. They know what they
12119 are doing. They love themselves so but so much,
12120 that they would rather protect their ego and their
12121 vanity, than find the truth. That is why they can’t
12122 find it. Then, when the consequences of their
12123 foolishness reach them, foolishly, all they think of
12124 saying is, “They are trials, brother”.

12125 **I remember the case of a friend**, that because of
12126 what the Bible says, did not eat pork, but worked
12127 Saturdays, even though if he wanted he didn't have
12128 to, since he wasn't obliged to it and he didn't lose
12129 anything because he worked for himself.

12130 One day I asked my friend why he didn't eat pork,
12131 and he said he "felt" he shouldn't. Then I asked him
12132 why he worked on Saturdays, if the Bible says not
12133 to, and he answered that he "felt" it was all right to
12134 work on Saturdays. In other words, he obeyed one
12135 commandment from God's Law, and rejected the
12136 other, based on what he "felt", not on what he read
12137 in the Bible. On one hand he felt like obeying the
12138 law, and on the other he didn't feel like obeying the
12139 law, just because he didn't want to. That is how
12140 human beings act in this crazy world.

✱

12144 **If Satan can't get us to disobey a commandment,**
12145 **then he tries to get us to obey it in a hurtful,**
12146 **ridiculous and exaggerated way**

12147 In the passage that I present next, Jesus is not
12148 condemning those who keep Saturday and he is not
12149 abolishing its keeping. Christ is not abolishing one
12150 of his father's commandments; what he is doing is
12151 contradicting the **ridiculous and anti-human**
12152 **tradition that the Pharisees wanted to impose as**
12153 **a norm to keep Saturday.** If Christ had gone
12154 against keeping Saturday in this passage, he would
12155 have gone against God's law, he would have sinned
12156 and therefore he could not have saved us.

12158 *“¹ At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath*
12159 *day through the corn; and his disciples were*
12160 *an hungred, and began to pluck the ears of*

12161 **corn, and to eat.** ² *But when the Pharisees*
 12162 *saw it, they said unto him: Behold, thy*
 12163 *disciples do **that which is not lawful to do***
 12164 ***upon the Sabbath day.*** ³ *But he said unto*
 12165 *them: Have ye not read what David did, when*
 12166 *he was an hungred, and they that were with*
 12167 *him; ⁴ how he entered into the house of God,*
 12168 *and did eat the shewbread, which was not*
 12169 *lawful for him to eat, neither for them which*
 12170 *were with him, but only for the priests? ⁵ Or*
 12171 ***have ye not read in the law, how that on the***
 12172 ***Sabbath days the priests in the temple***
 12173 ***profane the Sabbath, and are blameless?*** ⁶
 12174 *But I say unto you that in this place is one*
 12175 *greater than the Temple. ⁷ But if ye had*
 12176 *known what this meaneth: I will have mercy,*
 12177 *and not sacrifice, ye would not have*
 12178 *condemned the guiltless. ⁸ For the Son of man*
 12179 *is Lord even of the Sabbath day”.*

(Mt 12:1-8)

12181
 12182 The Pharisees, just like they had done with the
 12183 cups washing (Mk 7:1-8), or with the swearing
 12184 (Mat 23:16-22) had “interpreted” God’s command-
 12185 ments in their own way, twisting them to such a
 12186 degree that the original commandment was
 12187 unrecognizable. That way they distorted the original
 12188 intent of the commandment, and they turned them
 12189 into a hurtful burden for those whom it was
 12190 supposed to benefit in the first place.

12191 **This diabolical technique was not new, it had**
 12192 **already been used in Eden** when God had
 12193 commanded, for the good of humanity, not to eat
 12194 from the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen
 12195 2:16-17). At that time **the serpent deformed the**
 12196 **commandment** making them believe (Gn 3:1) that

12197 it was an inhumane burden. At that moment he told
12198 them that in order to obey God's commandment
12199 they could not eat from any of the trees in the
12200 garden, which was false. In other words, he made
12201 them think that God's commandment would place
12202 us in the position that, either we ate from all of the
12203 trees in the garden, or none at all, from one extreme
12204 to the other.

12205 It is a similar job to the one that the Pharisees
12206 would later do, and that a great part of the clergy
12207 does today. **Either they say that God's command-**
12208 **ments should not be obeyed, or on the contrary,**
12209 **like the Pharisees, they make us think that in**
12210 **order to obey God's commandments we have to**
12211 **be bound and burdened inhumanely by**
12212 **something that is impossible to bear.**

12213 The passage we are looking at tells how the same
12214 happened at that time. Saturday, which had been
12215 created as a benefit, had been turned into a
12216 commandment to obey which we were to go
12217 hungry, not seek health, etc.. It was clear they
12218 should not work on Saturday, that they should not
12219 work the fields on Saturday, as it says in Ex 34:21;
12220 **but the disciples were not working the fields,**
12221 **they were only picking enough ears of grain to**
12222 **tame the hunger they felt, as verse one says they**
12223 **did.**

12224
12225 *"Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh*
12226 *day thou shalt rest, in earing time **and in***
12227 ***harvest thou shalt rest**". (Ex 34:21)*
12228

12229 It is true they should have prepared their food the
12230 day before (Ex 16:23), but if they had forgotten or
12231 the circumstances had kept them from it, it was not
12232 necessary that they go hungry as the Pharisees

12233 wanted; they could eat. We can see how **the**
12234 **inhuman severity of keeping the Saturday was**
12235 **one of Pharisaic origin and not of divine origin.**
12236 God foresaw that they had to eat on Saturday, which
12237 is why he suggested what they could do to eat on
12238 Saturday.

12239
12240 *“And he said unto them: This is that which*
12241 *the LORD hath said: **Tomorrow is the rest of***
12242 ***the holy Sabbath unto the LORD**, bake that*
12243 *which ye will bake today, and seethe that ye*
12244 *will seethe; and **that which remaineth over***
12245 ***lay up for you to be kept until the morning”.***

12246 (Ex 16:23)

12247
12248 Good judgment, the knowledge of God
12249 throughout the **integral** reading of the Bible, and
12250 not pretending to be holier than thou, are qualities
12251 and factors more than enough to help us know what
12252 we should and should not do.

12253 That is why Jesus rubs in their faces that when a
12254 man like David, whom they could not even judge,
12255 was hungry and had needs, he did something that
12256 under different circumstances could not be
12257 approved of: he ate the consecrated bread, which
12258 only the priests, sons of Aaron could eat, as we see
12259 in Lev 24:9.

12260 **This did not mean that from that time on any**
12261 **Jew, for whatever reason, could go bite into the**
12262 **consecrated bread. Jesus doesn’t authorize in**
12263 **these passage either to stop keeping Saturday**
12264 **and consider mowing the lawns, washing the cars,**
12265 **or any other thing we want to do on Saturday as a**
12266 **necessary, humanitarian and impossible to postpone**
12267 **thing. Neither does Jesus authorize to change**

12268 **Saturday for Sunday, and this is something we**
12269 **should really keep in mind.**

12270 But as I said before, anyone who abundantly reads
12271 the word of God and has good will and good
12272 judgment will understand the validity of the divine
12273 commandments and the ridiculousness of the
12274 Pharisaic traditions of yesterday, today and
12275 tomorrow.

12276 *

12277

12278

12279 **How should we keep Saturday? Should we**
12280 **imitate the Pharisees or Christ?**

12281 Many brothers who do not keep Saturday think
12282 that in order to keep Saturday it is necessary to do
12283 as the Pharisees preached it should be done. These
12284 brothers do not admit to anything but two positions:
12285 **a) not to keep Saturday at all, or b) it has to be kept**
12286 **in the way of the Pharisees. That is the same thing**
12287 **Satan tries to do.**

12288 Both positions are mistaken. Saturday **must** be
12289 kept, but not pharisaically, but as Jesus did. Christ
12290 came to obey the law to the last detail in order to
12291 save us. **He obeyed the entire law without failing**
12292 **one point; therefore, the way he kept Saturday**
12293 **was the correct one,** as the strictest way of keeping
12294 God's laws. Therefore, the way the Pharisees kept it
12295 was not correct; we should keep Saturday as Jesus
12296 kept it. Why do the brothers that are against
12297 Saturday try to demand from the ones who do, to do
12298 it as the Pharisees did?

12299 *

12300

12301

12302

12303

12304
12305
12306
12307
12308
12309
12310
12311
12312
12313
12314
12315
12316
12317
12318
12319
12320
12321
12322
12323
12324
12325
12326
12327
12328
12329
12330
12331
12332
12333
12334
12335
12336
12337
12338
12339

The unexpected tasks

Jesus ordered a man to carry his bed on Saturday, a sign that doing certain menial jobs, or others that without being menial they were motivated by something unexpected, was not wrong. The fact that the Pharisees criticized the man carrying his bed did not mean that according to God's laws that type of activity was sinful to do on Saturday. **What that meant was that the Pharisees had a twisted idea of how to rest on Saturday, but Jesus did know how to do it.**

“⁸ Jesus saith unto him: Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. ⁹ And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked; and on the same day was the Sabbath. ¹⁰ The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured: It is the Sabbath day, it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed”.

(Jn 5:8-10)

Of course, it doesn't mean either that we should move from one house to a new one on Saturdays. The man was sick in his bed, after getting whole, he didn't have to leave it where it was.

*

Electricity, hospitals, police, and the automobile

You can fix a deflated tire on Saturday, fix a car that stalled on the road, or buy gas or oil, if you find yourself on the road and stranded in an inconvenient place. You can do that to the benefit of human beings because you could also get a bull out of pit if

12340 by accident it fell on a Saturday. Therefore, how
12341 much more would it be to get a family out of a car
12342 that stalled for whatever reason!

12343

12344 *“And answered them, saying: Which of you*
12345 *shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit,*
12346 *and will not straightway pull him out on the*
12347 *Sabbath day?”* (Lk 14:5)
12348

12349 **What needs to be done in these cases is to**
12350 **prevent the logical possibilities,** and not risk going
12351 out to a place, or in an automobile that offers
12352 doubtful possibilities of obeying the rest that God
12353 commands us. We can have enough gasoline so we
12354 can go places where we should not be stranded; also
12355 we could have some portable spare gas tank, the
12356 same with the oil. We should also not go farther
12357 than what good sense tells us according to the
12358 amount of gas and other possibilities permit.

12359 **There are things today, just like before, that**
12360 **need to be done on Saturday if the need arise.**
12361 Joshua fought against Jericho on Saturday, since he
12362 surrounded it for seven days; one of these had to be
12363 necessarily on Saturday. The same way, armies
12364 today have to be kept on at least minimum alert in
12365 peacetime, as a precaution; and they have to fight
12366 with all they have during wartime. By ignoring
12367 these things which are written in the Bible, some
12368 Jews during the time close to the Maccabees were
12369 stupid enough not to defend themselves on
12370 Saturday.

12371 **The same can be said of the police;** it does not
12372 matter that it is Saturday, criminals do not keep
12373 Saturday.

12374 **Neither we can abandon the sick in the**
12375 **hospitals. Today electricity is essential for many**

12376 **things.** It would cause very tragic problems if we
12377 did not have it. Hospitals, small children, heating in
12378 cold climates, traffic lights and computers that
12379 direct traffic, air conditioners in big buildings that
12380 have no other ventilation system, refrigeration for
12381 grocery stores and industry, darkness in the cities,
12382 which would make them vulnerable to crime and
12383 immorality, as well as many other needs. In general,
12384 “we would put or leave in the pit many oxen”
12385 wrongly, if we wanted everyone who worked in
12386 electric plants, police departments, soldiers, doctors,
12387 firemen, etc... to keep Saturday all at the same time.
12388 The honest desire to keep God’s commandment
12389 on one hand, and the reading of the Bible and the
12390 use of good judgment on the other, provide us with
12391 enough basis to situate us in the correct spot.

12392 *

12393
12394
12395

Jehoiada, the army and Saturday

12396 In this passage we see that **the coup against the**
12397 **wicked queen Athaliah started and was**
12398 **concluded during a Saturday**, which means that
12399 Saturday military activities were not wrong, since
12400 the high priest himself did it, and a great high priest
12401 like Jehoiada, who was really a pious man. Being a
12402 godly man like he was, he would not have done
12403 such a thing on Saturday if it had been a sin in
12404 itself. **What’s more, we see that it was customary**
12405 **to change the guard on Saturdays.** Therefore,
12406 military activities also took place on Saturday.

12407
12408
12409
12410
12411

*“5 And he commanded them, saying: This is
the thing that ye shall do: a third part of you
that enter in on the Sabbath shall even be
keepers of the watch of the king's house; 6*

12412 *and a third part shall be at the gate of Sur;*
 12413 *and a third part at the gate behind the guard;*
 12414 *so shall ye keep the watch of the house, that it*
 12415 *be not broken down. 7 **And two parts of all***
 12416 ***you that go forth on the Sabbath, even they***
 12417 ***shall keep the watch of the house of the LORD***
 12418 ***about the king. 8 And ye shall compass the***
 12419 ***king round about, every man with his***
 12420 ***weapons in his hand; and he that cometh***
 12421 ***within the ranges, let him be slain; and be ye***
 12422 ***with the king as he goeth out and as he***
 12423 ***cometh in. 9 And the captains over the***
 12424 ***hundreds did according to all things that***
 12425 ***Jehoiada the priest commanded. And they***
 12426 ***took every man his men that were to come in***
 12427 ***on the Sabbath, with them that should go out***
 12428 ***on the Sabbath, and came to Jehoiada the***
 12429 ***priest***. (II K 11:5-9)

12430
 12431 **This passage, together with Joshua’s taking of**
 12432 **Jericho for seven days**, both set the doctrine on
 12433 military and police activities on Saturday. If those
 12434 that let themselves be killed on Saturday during the
 12435 time previous to the Maccabees had read the Bible
 12436 directly instead of following the “divine
 12437 inspiration” of their religious leaders they would
 12438 not have faced so many problems and pain.

12439 *

12440
 12441
 12442 **We must keep Saturday even if the work is for**
 12443 **God**

12444 Mentioning the fact that Saturday observance
 12445 must be kept, and to do it just after talking about the
 12446 work that needs to be done in the tabernacle of
 12447 testimony, and then starting it with the phrase “with

12448 all this, you will keep...”, makes me think that
12449 surely this allocution had the purpose of warning
12450 the faithful that, even when they work for God, they
12451 must rest on Saturday.

12452
12453 *“Speak thou also unto the children of Israel,*
12454 *saying: **Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep**, for*
12455 *it is a sign between me and you throughout*
12456 *your generations; that ye may know that I am*
12457 *the LORD that doth sanctify you”.*

12458 (Ex 31:13)

12459
12460 This observation is not my original; I read it in the
12461 marginal notes to the translation of the Bible by
12462 Felipe Scio de San Miguel. What I added was the
12463 reasoning of why I believe that it is correct.

12464 There, as in almost all (and almost without the
12465 “almost”) writings of religious character, the writer
12466 speaks in a very similar way as if he said: “believe
12467 it because I said so”. Very few, if any, bother to
12468 back up their words with an exhaustive reasoning
12469 and a dialectic annulment of all the opposite
12470 theories. This, for me, is very important, since I am
12471 not a man who likes to follow a teacher with my
12472 eyes closed, just because he is a teacher, and thus I
12473 don’t like others to believe me just because I said
12474 so. It is because of following teachers, without a
12475 critical spirit, that there is so much error and so
12476 many Christian sects (Catholicism, Orthodox,
12477 Methodist, Baptist, etc.). In few words, if the
12478 church building needs to be painted, don’t paint it
12479 on Saturday. If it needs to be cleaned, clean it
12480 another day.

12481 *

12482
12483

12484 **Summary of chapter 13.** Some say they keep
12485 Sunday to honor Christ, but, **would Christ like**
12486 **their rejecting one of his father's commandments**
12487 **to honor him?** It is not logical. Remember the
12488 passage Christ mentioned when he says, **they honor**
12489 **me in vain by teaching man's commandments as**
12490 **doctrine**".

12491 There are two very clear commandments in the
12492 Decalogue that have been rejected by the different
12493 Christian sects, one is not to worship graven
12494 images, which has been rejected by Catholicism,
12495 and the other one is the Saturday, rejected by both
12496 Catholicism and Protestantism.

12497 Some brothers, in order to justify themselves in
12498 not keeping Saturday say that they worship God
12499 every day. But God did not tell us to worship him
12500 on Saturday, he ordered us not to work on Saturday.
12501 I have also heard these brothers say that we must do
12502 what Christ would have done every minute of our
12503 lives. Well, Christ kept Saturday. Saturday was the
12504 only day that was made holy by God, not Sunday.
12505 The Bible doesn't say anywhere that we can already
12506 work on Saturday, and it doesn't say that we should
12507 not work on Sunday.

12508 Since Genesis, God gave two commandments,
12509 one about marriage and one about Saturday; what
12510 criteria is used, if any, by those who suppress one
12511 commandment and not the other, in spite of both
12512 being in the same verse? It is similar to the one in
12513 Leviticus, when he commands to honor our parents
12514 and to keep Saturday. They suppress the Saturday
12515 one, but not the other.

12516 As for the mentions of Sunday and the apparitions
12517 of Jesus in the New Testament, we see that none of
12518 these mentions say they were resting on Sunday, or
12519 that they were together in honor of Jesus Christ or

12520 his resurrection. We also saw that the disciples met
12521 any day, not only on Saturday or Sunday.

12522 Since Jesus kept Saturday during his time, that
12523 shows us that the Creation Saturday was the same
12524 as the Roman era Saturday, and the fact that we
12525 celebrate Palm Sunday and Easter Sunday, shows
12526 that the current Sundays and thus the current
12527 Saturdays, are the same as during the time of
12528 Christ. This is confirmed by the fact that the Jews
12529 continue to keep the same Saturday as we have, and
12530 the Muslims keep the same Friday that we have.

12531 It is true that there are some that exaggerate and
12532 ridicule the keeping of Saturday, as in not taking a
12533 bath or not moving the light switch on Saturday, but
12534 that does not mean that it is the way to keep
12535 Saturday. These are wrong interpretations, as it is
12536 that of not leaving the house, or not lighting a fire
12537 even in the cold weather, or not defend oneself on
12538 Saturday.

12539 All these doctrinal errors, including not keeping
12540 Saturday originate in the religion of the “Ifeel” that
12541 follows feelings instead of what the Bible says.

12542 If Satan can’t make humans not keep a
12543 commandment, then he will try to make them keep
12544 it stricter than required, in order to make the
12545 commandment undesirable. This satanic technique
12546 is not new; he used it in Eden when he showed our
12547 mother Eve that the commandment was to not eat of
12548 any tree in the garden.

12549 To keep Saturday we don’t have to fall into
12550 sectarian exaggerations, we just need to imitate
12551 Jesus Christ. Those who work producing electricity,
12552 policemen, firemen, hospitals, army, etc... can’t all
12553 take off on Saturday, but they can take turns and
12554 reduce their activities to what is indispensable.
12555 Some examples of how some jobs can be done on

12556 Saturday can be found in what the Lord said about
12557 getting an ox out of the pit, or the attack on Jericho,
12558 or Jehoiada's coup d'etat.

12559

12560 ***

12561

12562

12563

12564

12565

12566

12567

12568 **Chapter 14**

12569 **Let's talk specifically about the edible**

12570 **foods**

12571

12572 **The tactics used by the serpent in Eden are the**
12573 **same today**

12574 I the Garden of Eden the serpent said that what
12575 God said could not be eaten, could, in fact, be eaten.
12576 Today, the same serpent says once again that what
12577 God says that cannot be eaten, can, in fact be eaten.
12578 This satanic tactics is the same because it brings
12579 him results, why change it? Today, the serpent
12580 whispers in the ears of many that Paul said that
12581 what God had commanded not to eat, in reality, can
12582 be eaten. **History repeats itself, the technique**
12583 **does not change: why change something that**
12584 **brings in results?**

12585 It looks as if we were listening to devilish dialog,
12586 something like, "So God said, you cannot eat any
12587 meat?" And humans say, "We can eat of all clean
12588 animals, like cattle, fish with fins and scales, clean
12589 poultry, etc.; but animals and fish that are forbidden
12590 we cannot eat". So the serpent responds, "God

12591 knows that the day you eat the forbidden animals
12592 you are going to be under the grace and not under
12593 the law”. And then, millions of Christians do what
12594 the serpent tells them, they eat the forbidden
12595 animals.

12596 *

12597

12598

12599

12600 **Peter’s vision and the supposed cleanliness of all**
12601 **animals**

12602 The first thing we must take into account when
12603 we read this passage is that **this vision is**
12604 **happening about eleven years after Peter met**
12605 **Jesus for the first time.** For three and a half years
12606 Jesus had been teaching the disciples the correct
12607 doctrines. Then, for about eight years, thanks to the
12608 Holy Spirit, the apostles reaffirmed what they had
12609 learned from Jesus; they practiced it, and taught
12610 others these doctrines. **It would be illogical, and**
12611 **even absurd, to think that eleven years after**
12612 **having started his learning journey at the feet of**
12613 **Jesus, that the apostles did not know which were**
12614 **the correct doctrines.**

12615 Well, having set this precedent, let’s take a good
12616 look at Peter’s mental structure. Let’s see what he
12617 believed about eating pork, crab, etc.. When God’s
12618 voice tells him in verse 13, “*Rise, Peter; kill, and*
12619 *eat*”, Peter replied, “Not so, Lord; for **I have never**
12620 **eaten any thing that is common or unclean**”.
12621 Peter didn’t respond by saying something like,
12622 “Yes, Lord, I will do it immediately, because you
12623 taught me when you preached that we could now
12624 eat anything”. He didn’t say either, “Yes, Lord, I’ll
12625 eat anything because after you left, the Holy Spirit

12626 revealed to us that we can now eat the animals that
12627 you commanded not to eat before”.

12628 If Peter did not respond like that it was because
12629 the apostles had not received any teaching or
12630 revelation telling them that everything was good to
12631 eat. **If, in Peter’s mental structure would have**
12632 **been the knowledge, or the idea, that these**
12633 **animals could now be eaten, he would have never**
12634 **dared to respond to the Lord that these animals**
12635 **could not be eaten, he simply would have risen to**
12636 **obey Jesus’ order.** The fact that Peter objected is
12637 proof that he never learned from Jesus, or from the
12638 Holy Spirit or from the other apostles that the
12639 forbidden animals could “now” be eaten. **It is not**
12640 **logical to think that now, eleven years later, they**
12641 **were going to be taught that “now” they could**
12642 **eat all the animals.**

12643 Therefore we cannot deny that **up until the**
12644 **moment of that vision, Peter had not learned**
12645 **that the animals that God had forbidden could**
12646 **now be eaten.** Let’s see now if that vision was
12647 given so that Christians could change their clean
12648 diet for a filthy one, where they could eat spiders,
12649 flies, worms, lizards, shrimp, pork, blood sausage,
12650 human flesh, etc..

12651 Many feel that this Peter’s vision was given to
12652 indicate to Christians that they could now eat any
12653 animal. There is reason to interpret it like that, and I
12654 personally did for a while when I first started
12655 reading the Bible. However, once we analyze this
12656 case we fix the error. **This vision was not given so**
12657 **that the Christian can eat everything, but so that**
12658 **the Jews would abandon their traditional**
12659 **scruples, in the sense that they did not mingle**
12660 **with Gentiles.** Scripture indicates or implies in
12661 many passages that the Jews considered abominable

12662 to mix with Gentiles, as we can see in Acts 10:28.
12663 That was not one of God's commandments, but a
12664 **custom that they had adopted, one of their**
12665 **traditions.**

12666
12667 *“And he said unto them, Ye know how that it*
12668 *is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew*
12669 *to keep company, or come unto one of*
12670 *another nation; but God hath shewed me that*
12671 *I should not call any man common or*
12672 *unclean”.* (Act 10:28)

12673
12674 In order to change that attitude toward the
12675 Gentiles within the disciples the Lord gives Peter
12676 that vision. **Let's analyze it.** From the moment the
12677 chapter starts telling the episode at Cornelius' (an
12678 episode that ends with the introduction of the
12679 Gentiles to the Gospel) the vision is linked to Peter
12680 and the coming of Cornelius' messengers;
12681 therefore, it is not a vision aimed at changing the
12682 Christians' diet, but aimed at the same issue, that of
12683 mingling with Gentiles. **Thus we see how the**
12684 **author links, in verse 9, the coming of the**
12685 **messengers to the city, to Peter's trip to the roof**
12686 **to pray.** We already saw in verse 28 how it
12687 specifically says that **the purpose of the vision was**
12688 **to help the Jews see that they could mingle with**
12689 **the Gentiles, which really was never forbidden,**
12690 **those were only customs and traditions.**

12691
12692 *“¹ There was a certain man in Caesarea*
12693 *called Cornelius, a centurion of the band*
12694 *called the Italian band, ² a devout man, and*
12695 *one that feared God with all his house, which*
12696 *gave much alms to the people, and prayed to*
12697 *God always. ³ He saw in a vision evidently*

12698 *about the ninth hour of the day an angel of*
12699 *God coming in to him, and saying unto him:*
12700 *Cornelius. 4 And when he looked on him, he*
12701 *was afraid, and said: What is it, Lord? And he*
12702 *said unto him: Thy prayers and thine alms are*
12703 *come up for a memorial before God. 5 And*
12704 *now send men to Joppa, and call for one*
12705 *Simon, whose surname is Peter; 6 he lodgeth*
12706 *with one Simon a tanner, whose house is by*
12707 *the sea side; he shall tell thee what thou*
12708 *oughtest to do. 7 And when the angel which*
12709 *spake unto Cornelius was departed, he called*
12710 *two of his household servants, and a devout*
12711 *soldier of them that waited on him*
12712 *continually; 8 and when he had declared all*
12713 *these things unto them, he sent them to Joppa.*
12714 *9 **On the morrow, as they went on their***
12715 ***journey, and drew nigh unto the city, Peter***
12716 ***went up upon the housetop to pray about the***
12717 ***sixth hour***” (Act 10:1-9)

12718
12719 Once Peter’s vision started we see in verse 12 that
12720 the sheet had all kinds of **four-legged animals,**
12721 **reptiles and birds.** If we were to think that this
12722 vision was to allow Christians to eat everything, we
12723 would have to admit that nothing was established,
12724 that nothing was “modernized” **in reference to**
12725 **aquatic animals,** since these are not on the sheet. If
12726 we would accept that this vision was to change the
12727 diet, we would have to ask: **a)** if we can’t eat any
12728 aquatic animal, since they were not mentioned in
12729 the vision; **b)** if the prohibition is still valid for
12730 these; or **c)** if, even when they are not mentioned in
12731 the vision, would we include them with the ones the
12732 allowed, “just because”.

12733 All this makes me think that, **if the vision had**
12734 **been given with the purpose of modifying the**
12735 **Christian's diet, it would have included fish and**
12736 **seafood;** they would not have been passed over.
12737 Nevertheless, if the animals shown there were only
12738 a symbol for the Gentiles, then we can perfectly
12739 understand the absence of the aquatics, for they
12740 were not needed for the general symbolism.

12741
12742 *“¹⁰ And he became very hungry, and would*
12743 *have eaten, but while they made ready, he fell*
12744 *into a trance, ¹¹ and saw heaven opened, and*
12745 *a certain vessel descending unto him, as it*
12746 *had been a great sheet knit at the four*
12747 *corners, and let down to the Earth, ¹² wherein*
12748 *were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the*
12749 *Earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things,*
12750 *and fowls of the air. ¹³ And there came a*
12751 *voice to him: Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. ¹⁴ But*
12752 *Peter said: Not so, Lord, for I have never*
12753 *eaten any thing that is common or unclean.*
12754 *¹⁵ And the voice spake unto him again the*
12755 *second time: What God hath cleansed, that*
12756 *call not thou common. ¹⁶ This was done*
12757 *thrice; and the vessel was received up again*
12758 *into heaven”.* (Act 10:10-16)

12759
12760 When we get to verse 17 we see again these two
12761 things linked: **the vision and the coming of the**
12762 **Gentiles,** just as it was in verse nine. **Nowhere in**
12763 **these chapters is the vision's interpretation and**
12764 **the change of diet linked,** except in the course of
12765 the vision itself, when Peter is told to kill and eat.

12766 We see in verse 17 that **the vision, far from**
12767 **provoking in Peter the assurance that it was only**
12768 **a change of diet for Christians, it provokes**

12769 **doubt;** he did not believe that the given
12770 significance, the diet change, would be true,
12771 because if so, he had no reason to doubt. It is then
12772 that the Gentiles knock on his door, and as to
12773 dissipate the doubts the apostle had about the
12774 meaning of the vision, if it was about a diet change
12775 or about mixing with Gentiles, **the Holy Spirit**
12776 **orders him to go with the Gentiles without**
12777 **doubt.** We see again that the vision is once again
12778 linked to the visit of Cornelius' Gentile messengers.

12779 In verses 19-20 Peter's doubt surfaces once again
12780 about the meaning of the vision, and then it is again
12781 wiped away by the divine order to go with the
12782 Gentiles. Evidently the vision had nothing to do
12783 with a diet change, but with **a change in the**
12784 **traditional attitude towards the Gentiles that the**
12785 **Jews had.**

12786
12787 *“¹⁷ Now while Peter doubted in himself*
12788 *what this vision which he had seen should*
12789 *mean, behold, the men which were sent from*
12790 *Cornelius had made enquiry for Simon's*
12791 *house, and stood before the gate, ¹⁸ and*
12792 *called, and asked whether Simon, which was*
12793 *surnamed Peter, were lodged there. ¹⁹ While*
12794 *Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said*
12795 *unto him: Behold, three men seek thee. ²⁰*
12796 *Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go*
12797 *with them, doubting nothing, for I have sent*
12798 *them. ²¹ Then Peter went down to the men*
12799 *which were sent unto him from Cornelius, and*
12800 *said: Behold, I am he whom ye seek; what is*
12801 *the cause wherefore ye are come?”*

(Act 10:17-21)

12803

12804 If we follow the reading up to verse 28 we will
12805 see how the **only interpretation that the apostle**
12806 gives about his vision is that God had shown him
12807 that **no man** (he says nothing about animals)
12808 should be called common or unclean. In other
12809 words, that all men were equal in God's eyes. **If**
12810 **there had been additional interpretations they**
12811 **would have been indicated, but no, the only**
12812 **interpretation** that Peter mentions is that in
12813 reference to Gentiles. What refers to animals and
12814 diet is not mentioned anywhere. So, the "common
12815 and unclean" that is mentioned in the vision in
12816 verse 15, did not refer to animals but to people; that
12817 is the case of the Gentiles.

12818
12819 *"²⁷ And as he talked with him, he went in,*
12820 *and found many that were come together. ²⁸*
12821 *And he said unto them: Ye know how that it is*
12822 *an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to*
12823 *keep company, or come unto one of another*
12824 *nation; but God hath shewed me that I*
12825 *should not call any man common or*
12826 *unclean. ²⁹ Therefore came I unto you*
12827 *without gainsaying, as soon as I was sent for,*
12828 *I ask therefore, for what intent ye have sent*
12829 *for me?"* (Act 10:27-29)

12830
12831 It is not logical to think that Jesus' sacrifice had
12832 been adjudicated to animals too. **Jesus' sacrifice**
12833 **was not to take away the uncleanness of the**
12834 **human body** (who, at the end, die) but to clean
12835 **the filthiness of their souls**. How then, can we
12836 **think that that same sacrifice would be to clean**
12837 **the filthiness of an animal's body**? This is clearer
12838 if we remember what Paul said in I Co 9:9-10 in the
12839 sense that God does not care about the oxen. How

12840 then, can we think that Jesus' sacrifice would free
12841 animals from their filthiness, as if it were due to the
12842 sins of the animal?

12843 **If Jesus' sacrifice freed animals from their**
12844 **filthiness,** it would mean that it was a spiritual
12845 issue, which is absurd, and therefore, unacceptable.
12846 Then, what was the change that happened in the
12847 forbidden animals, which now can be eaten when
12848 they could not be eaten before? Are we going to
12849 believe that animals were cleansed from their sins?
12850 And the clean animals that continue to be clean,
12851 does it mean that they had no sin before? Do you
12852 realize the degree of absurdity that we would reach
12853 if we believed that the animals were cleansed by
12854 Jesus' sacrifice?

12855 **It is not sensible to think that Jesus' sacrifice,**
12856 besides the salvation of our souls, had been good to
12857 take away from the spiders, roaches, rats, eels,
12858 worms, pigs, crabs, etc., the reason that made God
12859 forbid them for his servants since the beginning of
12860 time. Remember that even in the times of Noah,
12861 long before the ceremonial law, animals were
12862 already classified as clean and unclean, as we see in
12863 Gen 7:2 and 8, and in 7:20. **If unclean animals**
12864 **were considered forbidden before the ceremonial**
12865 **law, we can't even think that that prohibition**
12866 **was part of the ceremonial law, and therefore**
12867 **consider it obsolete together with the rest of the**
12868 **ceremonial law.**

12870 *"Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee*
12871 *by sevens, the male and his female; and of*
12872 *beasts that are not clean by two, the male and*
12873 *his female". (Gn 7:2)*

12874

12875 ***“Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not***
12876 ***clean, and of fowls, and of every thing that***
12877 ***creepeth upon the Earth”*** (Gn 7:8)

12878
12879 ***“And Noah builded an altar unto the LORD;***
12880 ***and took of every clean beast, and of every***
12881 ***clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the***
12882 ***altar”*** (Gn 8:20)

12883
12884 And if really we would think that any change
12885 happened to the animals after the sacrifice of our
12886 Lord, **we would have to think that the same**
12887 **universal cleanliness happened to vegetables,**
12888 **which is inadmissible,** since we know there are
12889 some poisonous ones.

12890 If we continue reading to verses 34 and 35 we will
12891 see proof in them of the concept of equality of all
12892 races and nationalities, a concept that came only out
12893 of that vision. There had not been another source for
12894 such information, and there is no other meaning
12895 mentioned for that vision. In other words, we can
12896 honestly say that, at least as explained by Peter,
12897 there is no other meaning for the vision except to
12898 warn the Jews that they could set aside their
12899 traditional scruples of not mingling with the
12900 Gentiles.

12901
12902 ***“³⁴ Then Peter opened his mouth, and said:***
12903 ***Of a truth I perceive that **God is no respecter*****
12904 ***of persons, ³⁵ but in every nation he that***
12905 ***fearth him, and worketh righteousness, is***
12906 ***accepted with him”.*** (Act 10:34-35)

12907
12908 As a colophon, verses 44 and 45 tells how the
12909 Holy Spirit, making good on his word to Peter, was
12910 poured out on the Gentiles. The chapter is closed

12911 without any of the interpretations made about this
12912 vision show us that it referred to the cleanliness of
12913 animals.

12914 It is true that if we take it literally and not pay
12915 attention to the interpretations of Peter and the rest,
12916 it does talk about eating all animals, but if we take it
12917 as such, **then it does not say we can eat seafood,**
12918 **and it doesn't talk about the equality of the**
12919 **races.** Besides, the authorized interpretation of the
12920 vision by the Holy Spirit and by Peter already says
12921 that it refers to people and not animals.

12922 **At the end of chapter 10 of Acts,** in verse 11 we
12923 see the same tendency, (Acts 11:1-19) **at no time**
12924 **no one interprets this revelation as meaning that**
12925 **the animals in it could now be eaten;** it was all
12926 always about the admission of the Gentiles.

12927 In 11:2-3 we see that Christians in Jerusalem were
12928 opposed to Peter having met with the Gentiles.
12929 **They do not throw in his face anything in**
12930 **regards to the diet; that is not addressed. If Peter**
12931 **had changed his diet as a result of his vision,**
12932 **those in Jerusalem would have held him**
12933 **accountable,** just like they held him accountable for
12934 meeting with the Gentiles. Therefore, it is easy to
12935 assume that **there was no knowledge on the part**
12936 **of the Christians in Jerusalem of a change of diet**
12937 **for the believers.** We even see that Peter, in self-
12938 defense, brings out the matter of the Gentiles again.
12939 At no moment, is the issue of the forbidden animals
12940 mentioned.

12941
12942 *“¹ And the apostles and brethren that were in*
12943 *Judaea heard that the Gentiles had also*
12944 *received the word of God. ² And when Peter*
12945 *was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of*
12946 *the circumcision contended with him, ³*

12947 saying: *Thou wentest in to men*
 12948 *uncircumcised, and didst eat with them.* ⁴
 12949 *But Peter rehearsed the matter from the*
 12950 *beginning, and expounded it by order unto*
 12951 *them, saying....* ¹⁸ *When they heard these*
 12952 *things, they held their peace, and glorified*
 12953 *God, saying: Then hath God also to the*
 12954 *Gentiles granted repentance unto life.* ¹⁹ *Now*
 12955 *they which were scattered abroad upon the*
 12956 *persecution that arose about Stephen,*
 12957 *travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and*
 12958 *Antioch, preaching the word to none but*
 12959 *unto the Jews only*". (Act 11:1-19 abbr)

12960

12961 We must remember here that Jesus told his
 12962 disciples in Mt 10:6 to preach first to the Jews,
 12963 maybe that's why now they have to be alerted of
 12964 preaching now also the Gentiles.

12965 **Someone may object or ask why, if there is a**
 12966 **message that is being given in regards to human**
 12967 **beings, are** animals used as symbols, and not
 12968 people. That, I cannot explain, but it is **evident** that
 12969 animals were used to symbolize things concerning
 12970 people, since they were used to say that Jews can
 12971 now interact with Gentiles.

12972 But this is not an isolated case in Scripture. In
 12973 Joseph's vision that he interpreted for Pharaoh's
 12974 servants, the grapes represented the wine steward,
 12975 and the baskets represented days. In the one he
 12976 interpreted for Pharaoh, the cows meant time, and in
 12977 the one in Daniel 8:19-20 the lamb and the goat
 12978 represented persons.

12979 **In summary,** the vision in Acts 10 meant that the
 12980 Jews could be with Gentiles; it had nothing to do
 12981 with a change in the believers' diet.

12982

*

12983
12984
12985
12986
12987
12988
12989
12990
12991
12992
12993
12994
12995
12996
12997
12998
12999
13000
13001
13002
13003
13004
13005
13006
13007
13008
13009
13010
13011
13012
13013
13014
13015
13016
13017

**The authorization to eat everything, cannibalism
and vegetarians**

From this passage in Rom 14:1-2 many erroneously conclude that Paul authorizes Christians to eat everything, going against what was said by the other apostles and the Holy Sprit in the apostolic letter, as well as Christ himself in Mt 5:17-19; Rev 2:14 and 20. Let's see.

To start, it is good for us to be aware that **this chapter of Romans is talking about vegetarians**, since verse 2 says that the weak only ate herbs (legumes). As we can see it is **not** about a dispute between those who ate lamb, beef, chicken or fish on one side, and those who ate pork, shrimp, lobster, cats, worms, etc. on the other. We see that in one corner were those that only ate vegetables (herbs), and in the other there were those who ate clean meat in addition to vegetables.

We see today also people who find it painful to kill animals to eat. There are also those who, for one reason or another, believe we should try not to eat any meat, not even those authorized by God, like the Adventists. According to what we read in this chapter, we see that this vegetarian lifestyle already existed then, and that some of them had become Christians, but had brought their customs and superstitions in about not eating meat.

*“¹ Him that is **weak in the faith** receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. ² For one believeth that he may eat all things, **another, who is weak, eateth herbs**”. (Ro 14:1-2)*

13018 In this chapter Paul teaches them to be tolerant
13019 one with another, since **neither one was doing**
13020 **anything against God's law**. Besides, the spirit of
13021 the chapter is not to attack those who did not eat
13022 meat, but to respect them, as we see in verses 3-4.

13023

13024 “³ *Let not him that eateth despise him that*
13025 *eateth not; and let not him which eateth not*
13026 *judge him that eateth; for God hath received*
13027 *him.* ⁴ *Who art thou that judgest another*
13028 *man's servant? To his own master he standeth*
13029 *or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up, for God*
13030 *is able to make him stand”*. (Ro 14:3-4)

13031

13032 Then, in verses 5-6 it says that this spirit of
13033 tolerance and respect toward the Christian who did
13034 not want to eat meat but only vegetables, should be
13035 extended as well to Christians who still kept the
13036 ritual days and ceremonies of Judaism. As it had
13037 been mandated in the apostolic letter, Christians,
13038 especially Gentile Christians did not have to keep
13039 the rites and ceremonials, since they were mere
13040 announcers of what had already happened with the
13041 coming, crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Jesus
13042 Christ. However, Paul says that those who had it
13043 clear about **not** needing to keep the ritual days, had
13044 to be tolerant of those who did keep them, and not
13045 argue with them, and he gave them the reasons for
13046 telling them so.

13047

13048 “⁵ *One man esteemeth one day above*
13049 *another; another esteemeth every day alike.*
13050 *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own*
13051 *mind.* ⁶ *He that regardeth the day, regardeth*
13052 *it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the*
13053 *day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that*

13054 *eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God*
 13055 *thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he*
 13056 *eateth not, and giveth God thanks. 7 For none*
 13057 *of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to*
 13058 *himself. 8 For whether we live, we live unto*
 13059 *the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the*
 13060 *Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we*
 13061 *are the Lord's. 9 For to this end Christ both*
 13062 *died, and rose, and revived, that he might be*
 13063 *Lord both of the dead and living. 10 But why*
 13064 *dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost*
 13065 *thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall*
 13066 *all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. 11*
 13067 *For it is written: As I live, saith the Lord,*
 13068 *every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue*
 13069 *shall confess to God. 12 So then every one of*
 13070 *us shall give account of himself to God. 13 Let*
 13071 *us not therefore judge one another any more,*
 13072 *but judge this rather, that no man put a*
 13073 *stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his*
 13074 *brother's way". (Ro 14:5-13)*

13075
 13076 After giving them the reasons that supported
 13077 being tolerant one to another, he also gives them his
 13078 opinion regarding that **they could eat meat and**
 13079 **that it was not necessary to be vegetarians.** In
 13080 verse 14 he uses a hyperbole (exaggeration) which
 13081 is characteristic of Paul's writings, by saying that
 13082 **nothing** is unclean. By saying "**nothing**" he is
 13083 referring to those vegetables and meats that God
 13084 allowed for eating like **lamb, goat, clean poultry,**
 13085 **and edible fish.** It is not logical to think that Paul is
 13086 referring to everything human beings eat.

13087 For example cannibals eat human flesh. I am sure
 13088 that when Paul said that "**there is nothing unclean**
 13089 **of itself**", he was not referring about eating the

13090 **brains of an old lady that died in her tribe. I am**
13091 **also absolutely sure that Paul was not advising**
13092 **them to eat of the blood of the animals,** as they do
13093 in those countries where they eat blood pudding and
13094 blood sausage, which is made with the blood of the
13095 pork and spices, since in Acts 15:28-29 the Holy
13096 Spirit himself prohibited eating blood. So when
13097 Paul says that “nothing” is unclean, he is not
13098 authorizing us to **eat everything**, as many brothers
13099 think.

13100
13101 *“¹⁴ I know, and am persuaded by the Lord*
13102 *Jesus, **that there is nothing unclean of itself,***
13103 *but to him that esteemeth any thing to be*
13104 *unclean, to him it is unclean. ¹⁵ But if thy*
13105 *brother be grieved with thy meat, now*
13106 *walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him*
13107 *with thy meat, for whom Christ died. ¹⁶ Let*
13108 *not then your good be evil spoken of. ¹⁷ For*
13109 *the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but*
13110 *righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy*
13111 *Ghost. ¹⁸ For he that in these things serveth*
13112 *Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of*
13113 *men. ¹⁹ Let us therefore follow after the things*
13114 *which make for peace, and things wherewith*
13115 *one may edify another. ²⁰ For meat destroy*
13116 *not the work of God. **All things indeed are***
13117 ***pure;** but it is evil for that man who eateth*
13118 *with offence”.* (Ro 14:14-20)

13119
13120 This generalization, this hyperbole (which was
13121 very frequent with Paul) that we see in verses 14
13122 and 20 that affirms that in and of itself nothing is
13123 unclean, must be taken with a grain of salt and with
13124 good sense. I say this because, according to the
13125 apostles’ letter in chapter 15 of Acts, in verses 28

13126 and 29, they insist that **in and of itself it is unclean**
13127 **to eat blood, to eat strangled animals, and to eat**
13128 **what had been sacrificed to idols.** And I would
13129 ask, doesn't nature itself, our natural instincts, tell
13130 us that **it is unclean to eat human waste, roaches,**
13131 **scorpions, human flesh, etc.?** Therefore, it is not
13132 true what those who wrongfully interpret this
13133 passage say, for of itself there are many unclean
13134 things.

13135 We see that Paul is referring to vegetables, and
13136 that food which comes from those animals that are
13137 allowed by God. There are many Christians who
13138 would gladly eat a sea lobster (which has been
13139 prohibited by God, but then would consider unclean
13140 and filthy eating locusts as John the Baptist did.

13141
13142 *“²⁸ For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost,*
13143 *and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden*
13144 *than these necessary things: ²⁹ that ye*
13145 *abstain from meats offered to idols, and*
13146 *from blood, and from things strangled, and*
13147 *from fornication; from which if ye keep*
13148 *yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well”.*

13149 (Act 15:28-29)
13150

13151 When we read this passage in Acts, in which **the**
13152 **Holy Spirit himself forbid the eating of blood,**
13153 **strangled animals and things sacrificed to idols,**
13154 we have to think one of two things: **a)** either Paul is
13155 going against the Holy Spirit here, and amending
13156 God and the other apostles by saying we could eat
13157 everything, because of itself nothing is unclean, or
13158 **b)** what Paul says in this chapter of Romans in
13159 respect to **nothing being unclean**, is referring only
13160 to those things that God had allowed for eating as
13161 are legumes, the meat of clean animals, but that

13162 some brothers, weak in the faith, and dragged by
13163 old superstitions, did not want to eat.

13164 If we were to give Paul's statement in verses 14
13165 and 20 the ample scope that those who see there a
13166 permission for filthiness in gluttony, we would have
13167 to conclude that we can even eat human flesh, and
13168 that there is nothing wrong with taking the brains of
13169 a relative to make fritters, or eating a steak off the
13170 liver of a neighbor that donates it when he dies, or
13171 eating blood pudding, or drink blood, or accepting a
13172 dinner invitation from a tribe of cannibals in the
13173 middle of the jungle, even if they offer a soup made
13174 from the eyes of their beaten enemies, etc..

13175 Those who, based on this passage of Paul, believe
13176 that they can eat pork, crabs, etc., but not blood,
13177 idol offerings, or human beings, let them tell me
13178 where they base that differentiation from a biblical
13179 point of view.

13180 But let us analyze what Paul himself advises
13181 Christians in I Co 10:19-20, where he is talking
13182 about whether or not Christians should eat what was
13183 sacrificed to idols, and says:

13184
13185 *"¹⁹ What say I then? That the idol is any*
13186 *thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to*
13187 *idols is any thing? ²⁰ But **I say, that the things***
13188 ***which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to***
13189 ***devils, and not to God; and I would not that***
13190 ***ye should have fellowship with devils.** ²¹ Ye*
13191 *cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup*
13192 *of the devils; ye cannot be partakers of the*
13193 *Lord's table and of the table of devils".*

13194 (I Co 10:19-21)

13195
13196 It is evident that Paul is telling Christians in
13197 Corinth that they **cannot eat** from the sacrifices that

13198 the Gentiles made for their gods. Therefore, it is
13199 also evident that **Paul did not think we could eat**
13200 **everything**, for he considered that “of itself” there
13201 were unclean things. Paul himself denies here in
13202 Corinthians what other Christians want to interpret
13203 that he said in Romans.

13204 Same thing we can conclude as well from what
13205 Christ said in Rev 2:14 and 20. In both cases we see
13206 that Jesus indirectly challenges the idea that we
13207 could eat everything, the idea that “of itself there is
13208 nothing unclean”, since he prohibits the eating of
13209 certain things. If he prohibits the eating of certain
13210 things, it is not true that “of itself nothing is
13211 unclean”, because what had been offered to idols is
13212 unclean of itself. Therefore it is **not** valid to think
13213 that Paul, going over Christ’s opinion, would dare
13214 to go against it and authorize Christians to eat
13215 everything.

13216
13217 *“But I have a few things against thee,*
13218 *because thou hast there them that hold **the***
13219 ***doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast***
13220 ***a stumbling block before the children of***
13221 ***Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and***
13222 ***to commit fornication”.** (Rev 2:14)*

13223
13224 *“Notwithstanding I have a few things against*
13225 *thee, because thou sufferest that woman*
13226 *Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to*
13227 *teach and to seduce my servants to commit*
13228 *fornication, and **to eat things sacrificed unto***
13229 ***idols”.** (Rev 2:20)*

13230
13231 Seeing what it says in Ro 14:21, we see that in
13232 this chapter **Paul is not referring to eating the**
13233 **meat of forbidden animals, but rather to meats**

13234 **and drinks that for one reason or another some**
13235 **brothers considered they should not consume.**
13236 We realize he is referring to any other issue
13237 different than the divine prohibition of eating
13238 certain animals, because in verse 21, together with
13239 the meat that some did not want to eat, wine is
13240 mentioned, which was never among the prohibitions
13241 of what should not be consumed. Therefore, it is
13242 clear that he was not talking about food that had
13243 been forbidden by God, but about some other issue
13244 in the minds of certain brothers at the time.

13245 Let's analyze now something else in this same
13246 chapter. As I said before, **everything that is said**
13247 **here in regards to the meat is also said in regards**
13248 **to the wine**, as we saw in verse 21 which is a few
13249 lines down. If from what is said here, those who
13250 advocate eating pork interpret that it is all right to
13251 eat pork, then they should interpret as well that they
13252 can drink wine. However, these sects who say that a
13253 Christian can eat pork, lobster, etc., also prohibit
13254 their followers to drink wine. If they do not allow
13255 drinking wine, why don't they forbid eating pork or
13256 lobster? Their doctrines have no inner logical
13257 concordance.

13258
13259 *“²¹ It is good neither to eat flesh, **nor to***
13260 ***drink wine**, nor any thing whereby thy*
13261 *brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made*
13262 *weak. ²² Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself*
13263 *before God. Happy is he that condemneth not*
13264 *himself in that thing which he alloweth. ²³ And*
13265 *he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because*
13266 *he eateth not of faith, for whatsoever is not of*
13267 *faith is sin”.* (Ro 14:21-23)

13268

13269 It is very clear that wine should not be consumed
13270 when there is someone present that is bothered by
13271 wine; but those same words are also evidence that
13272 when the person present doesn't have a problem
13273 with wine, it can indeed be consumed. If the
13274 Christian could never drink wine, Paul would not
13275 tell them not to drink wine if there is someone who
13276 could be offended. He would simply tell them not to
13277 ever drink wine. Why interpret one thing for the
13278 wine and another one for the meat? Although I am
13279 not arguing in favor of wine with this statement, for
13280 I have already done it in previous occasions, I am
13281 using it to show the dialectical weakness, the double
13282 standard of their thinking, and the inadequate way
13283 of reasoning of those who hold the doctrine that we
13284 can now eat anything, because Christ abolished the
13285 law. **It is not true; Christ did not abolish the law,**
13286 **and much less Paul, as we saw in Mat 5:17-19.**

13287 **Bottom line: Paul refers here to some**
13288 **Christians who were vegetarians.** To those and to
13289 others, Paul teaches them to be tolerant; that
13290 teaching is on Christian tolerance between
13291 vegetarians and non-vegetarians, and is not a
13292 teaching authorizing the eating of anything, even
13293 against what Christ and the Holy Spirit had taught.

13294 *

13295
13296

13297 **To the clean everything is clean: the**
13298 **commandments of men and the Jewish fables**

13299 Here we see again what I have said previously,
13300 that what Paul defends here as clean, are not the
13301 animals that God's law forbade them to eat, rather
13302 something else. Maybe certain foods, maybe being
13303 around certain people, or maybe animals or
13304 vegetables that the heretics took as unclean without

13305 them being so, like the Egyptians did in Joseph's
13306 time, who did not eat sheep as we can see in Gen
13307 46:34. On reading this passage it is easy to see that
13308 he is not referring to the animals that had been
13309 prohibited by God, and I will go on to prove it, but
13310 let's read the passage first:

13311

13312 *"¹³ This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke*
13313 *them sharply, that they may be sound in the*
13314 *faith; ¹⁴ **not giving heed to Jewish fables, and***
13315 ***commandments of men**, that turn from the*
13316 *truth. ¹⁵ **Unto the pure all things are pure,***
13317 *but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving*
13318 *is nothing pure, but even their mind and*
13319 *conscience is defiled". (Tit 1:13-15)*

13320

13321 Here, just like before, such heresy of not eating
13322 certain things is linked to "Judaic fables" and
13323 "commandments of men", as verse 14 says. **It is**
13324 **evident that Paul would not call God's**
13325 **commandments "Judaic fables" or "command-**
13326 **ments of men"**, so he must be referring to
13327 something else that we don't know about. It was
13328 God himself, through Moses, who said that certain
13329 animals could not be eaten. That was not a
13330 commandment of men, and much less a Judaic
13331 fable.

13332 So, what Paul seems to be defending here, or the
13333 exhortation that he gives, is about not submitting to
13334 ordinances which are a product of the
13335 commandments of men, maybe of pharisaic style,
13336 that they always tried to impose on others. I say
13337 pharisaic because it seems that the troublemakers,
13338 according to verse 10, were Jews. Maybe they were
13339 trying to impose the washing of the cups and the

13340 hands, which they had as God's commandments
13341 when they really were not.

13342 Paul often spoke, due to his great culture, in a
13343 metaphoric and hyperbolic manner. In this case he
13344 says in hyperbole, that "all things are clean to those
13345 who are clean". Taken as a saying, or as an
13346 exaggerated form of expression it is acceptable, but
13347 it is not to be taken as a Bible truth, or as a personal
13348 commandment, contrary to what was ordained by
13349 God, Christ, the Holy Sprit and the other apostles.

13350

13351 *"¹⁴ Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and*
13352 *commandments of men, that turn from the*
13353 *truth. ¹⁵ Unto the pure all things are pure,*
13354 *but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving*
13355 *is nothing pure, but even their mind and*
13356 *conscience is defiled". (Tit 1:14-15)*

13357

13358 **However clean a Christian is, those meats**
13359 **offered to idols will never be clean**, because Jesus
13360 Christ himself said it in Rev 2:14 and 20, as well as
13361 the Holy Spirit and the apostles in Acts 15:28-29.
13362 For that reason blood sausage or blood pudding,
13363 which are made of blood, nor the strangled animals,
13364 are clean. Therefore, what Paul says about **all**
13365 **things** being clean is not true, if we want to take it
13366 as a commandment. Nor is theft clean, or murder,
13367 homosexuality, etc.; no matter how clean is the one
13368 who does these sins. **Paul is referring to those**
13369 **things that the Jews ate on a daily basis were**
13370 **clean**, and not that everything in the world is clean
13371 and we can eat everything, because that is not true.

13372 We all use hyperbole in everyday language, and
13373 no one takes them literally, rather in the context of
13374 what is being said. If someone asks us about a
13375 common friend, and we say we have not seen him

13376 in ages, no one will interpret that we have not seen
13377 this person in exactly “ages”. If we say that the
13378 boxer got squashed in the last battle, no one will
13379 believe that he literally got squashed. If we say that
13380 so-and-so’s wife dumped him, no one will think she
13381 literally threw him in the garbage can. These are
13382 metaphoric expressions or hyperboles that
13383 embellish our language.

13384 Likely so, Paul, who was a teacher and a man of
13385 great culture, is rich in hyperboles when he tries to
13386 send a message through, exaggerating his speech in
13387 order to impress on the memory of his listener. He
13388 does not expect to amend God’s words, or Christ’s,
13389 or the Holy Spirit’s, and he doesn’t try to create a
13390 “new” religion. There are many who instead of
13391 Christians have become Saintpaulians, but that is
13392 not Paul’s fault, anymore than it is the Virgin
13393 Mary’s fault that many, instead of Christians, have
13394 become “Marians”.

13395 **Those who honestly want to understand this**
13396 **passage** will realize that Paul says that everything is
13397 clean right after he tells them not to pay attention to
13398 Jewish fables. So we see how he is referring to
13399 something that the Jewish teachers did, telling them
13400 that the things that Christians did, touched, or ate,
13401 were not clean They were not referring to God’s
13402 commandments.

13403 *

13404
13405

13406 **Is everything edible or is everything useful for**
13407 **our life?**

13408 Some say that Gen 9:3 authorized us to eat
13409 everything. Not true; the Bible has to be understood
13410 as a whole, not by isolated verses. First of all, we
13411 see in Gen 7:2 that **God made a difference**

13412 **between clean and unclean animals right from**
13413 **the beginning** of Genesis; therefore it is logical to
13414 think that when it says we could eat them it is
13415 referring to the clean ones. If not, then why call
13416 some clean and others unclean if they were all the
13417 same, if they were all clean?

13418
13419 *“Of every **clean beast** thou shalt take to thee*
13420 *by sevens, the male and his female; and of*
13421 *beasts that are not clean by two, the male and*
13422 *his female”.* (Gn 7:2)

13423
13424 *“Every moving thing that liveth **shall be***
13425 ***meat for you;** even as the green herb have I*
13426 *given you all things”* (Gn 9:3)

13427
13428 That means, as it says in the Reina-Valera
13429 version, that **all would be good for sustenance**, not
13430 necessarily for eating. We could use its skin, its
13431 hair; we could use them as pets, as in the case of
13432 dogs, cats, and horses. We could use dogs as guard
13433 and alarms, cats to eliminate rats, horses to work the
13434 field, etc.. For example, John the Baptist dressed in
13435 camel hair, as we see in Mat 3:4 and Mar 1:6, in
13436 spite of the camel being a non-edible animal.

13437 But if we gave it such an extensive meaning to the
13438 statement on animals, it would be honest to give the
13439 same extensive meaning to the statement about
13440 plants, since they are also mentioned. He mentions
13441 legumes, and herbs, in which case **we should**
13442 **understand that the commandment was to eat all**
13443 **kinds of vegetables**. Yet we know that there are
13444 many vegetables we can't eat, starting with the
13445 grass that cows eat, which we could not digest and
13446 we would die. We can not eat certain plants such as
13447 poisonous mushrooms, as well as many others that,

13448 without being poisonous, we still can't eat. The
13449 same could be said of the marihuana leaves, or the
13450 coca tree, the poppy flower, the nettle, etc., etc..

13451 **If it were true that we can eat any kind of**
13452 **vegetable, the hunger problem of the world**
13453 **would be solved.** However, we see that when
13454 hunger attacks a country, human beings die by the
13455 thousands and their bodies fall next to vegetables
13456 and they can't eat them. I think this is enough to not
13457 want to give that extensive interpretation to the
13458 statement that all vegetables can be eaten.

13459 Well, if from Gn 9:3 we can't get the idea that all
13460 plants can be eaten, why hang on to the idea that
13461 this verse authorizes us to eat of all animals? Is such
13462 a conclusion honest?

13463 But there is some more. Even if it were true that
13464 all animals were to be eaten, later God forbade
13465 some of them. In other words, even if in the
13466 beginning all animals were edible (which was not
13467 so), later God commanded not to eat some of them.
13468 Also in the beginning siblings could marry among
13469 themselves, but after God forbade such marriages,
13470 now it is not to be done, it is sin.

13471 *

13472

13473

13474 **Summary of chapter 14.** Neither Paul nor any
13475 other apostle left ineffective God's prohibition
13476 about eating certain animals. In the passages where
13477 such a thing might be interpreted we can always see
13478 that it was referring to something else. We notice
13479 that, from the language that Paul uses to denigrate
13480 such supposed "commandments". These adjectives
13481 were "commandments of men", "Jewish fables",
13482 "traditions", etc., adjectives that could, in no way,

13483 refer to God's commandments about not eating
13484 unclean animals.

13485 The trick that our spiritual enemy uses today to
13486 convince humans to eat what God prohibited is the
13487 same one that the serpent used in the garden. Then
13488 he told Eve she could eat from the tree that God told
13489 them not to eat. Today he tells Christians that they
13490 can eat the animals that God told them not to eat.

13491 We also saw that Peter's vision referred to the
13492 Jews whom, by tradition and not by commandment,
13493 abstained from socializing with Gentiles. To make
13494 them known that they were permitted to socialize
13495 with anyone was given this vision, and in no way it
13496 referred to altering a Christian's diet.

13497 **In Ro 14:1-2 Paul was referring to certain**
13498 **prohibitions that some people outside**
13499 **Christianity had "fabricated" about not eating**
13500 **meat, but only legumes.** In addition, when Paul
13501 refers to everything is clean to he who is clean, we
13502 can see that he is referring to everything that has
13503 been approved by God. We can see that such
13504 prohibition had to do with non-Christian doctrines
13505 that some brought in, as if they were divine
13506 commandments. When Paul talks about such things
13507 he calls them Jewish fables and commandments of
13508 men, an adjective that Paul would have never given
13509 to God's commandments.

13510 When in Gen 9:3 it seems like we are authorized
13511 to eat of everything, what is really being authorized,
13512 what is to be the commandment, is to use the skin,
13513 the hair, etc.. But even if someone wants to believe
13514 that this verse authorized to eat everything, we see
13515 that later God himself forbade eating those animals,
13516 same way as he forbade marriages between siblings,
13517 which at the beginning were allowed.

13518 ***

13519
13520
13521
13522

13523

Chapter 15

13524

Is love a substitute for God's law?

13525

13526

Only God's law teaches us which type of love God approves

13527

13528

13529

13530

13531

13532

13533

13534

13535

13536

13537

13538

13539

13540

13541

13542

13543

13544

13545

13546

13547

13548

13549

13550

13551

13552

Is it true that anyone who follows "love" is obeying God's law? How does a person know if his concept of love is approved by God?

Some say that we don't need to read or obey God's law because love is the fulfillment of the law, because "Paul said it", and they have made him pope and referee of Christianity, without him even wanting it.

"For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself".
(Ga 5:14)

It is true that in some way anyone who loves his brother fulfills a great part of the law, but the reality is that we need the law and the rest of the Bible to know which is the true love approved by God. To start with we see that this phrase lacks the most important part: to love God with all your heart. The phrase in which Paul synthesizes the relationship between love and the law is true only if both parties accept all of God's laws. **If any of the parties does not accept God's laws as expressed in the Old Testament, that summary of what the law is, is not applicable.**

13553 Many are the cultures and civilizations that have
13554 existed, and still do, in which the concept of “love”
13555 has been distorted to the point of making it an
13556 abomination; and if we don’t use God’s law as a
13557 guide we would have to adopt the concept of “love”
13558 that prevails in our culture, our nation, our race, or a
13559 mixture of several cultures, so we are not branded
13560 as “narrow-minded”.

13561 In other words, even though in short, in order to
13562 say it in a few words, love is the fulfillment of the
13563 law, **we need to learn God’s laws and the entire**
13564 **Bible, in order to know what true love is, the love**
13565 **that God approves.**

13566 **For example, in a Muslim culture,** love means
13567 being a good father and loving husband to four
13568 women, something that butts head to the love
13569 concept of Christianity. However, that man and
13570 those four women could allege that they are
13571 fulfilling the law because they love each other. The
13572 same would happen with the Mormons of the XIX
13573 century.

13574 **Something similar could be alleged by a**
13575 **homosexual couple** who, “don’t hurt anyone” and
13576 have their own concept of “love”. If we are not
13577 going to see what God’s law says, we can’t say that
13578 such “love” is a horrible sin, because they would
13579 say that they are loving their neighbor and
13580 according to Paul, that is obeying the laws. If only
13581 we would obey the law by loving our neighbor, as
13582 Paul said, then that couple is obeying the law.

13583 **Some may allege that homosexuality is**
13584 **something that is condemned in the New**
13585 **Testament,** and that is true; but it condemns it
13586 based on the Old Testament. Besides, if they say
13587 that somewhere in the New Testament it says that
13588 homosexuality is a sin, and that couple is sinning,

13589 then they are already not guiding themselves strictly
13590 by what Paul says in Ga 5:14, they are looking up
13591 the rest of the Bible. **That is exactly what I say.**
13592 We can't take one verse or passage, whether Paul's
13593 or anyone's to come up with a doctrine.

13594 **Therefore, what Paul says** in the aforementioned
13595 verse cannot be used to convince us that God's laws
13596 are obsolete. They still serve the same purpose they
13597 have always served: to tell us which actions are
13598 good and which are bad.

13599 Sometimes Paul talks in a confusing way,
13600 motivated by his hyperboles, as it is in this case.
13601 Here, he says that the law is fulfilled by loving our
13602 neighbor as ourselves.

13603
13604 *"For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even*
13605 *in this: **Thou shalt love thy neighbour as***
13606 *thyself". (Ga 5:14)*

13607
13608 **That is not totally true.** Although it is true that
13609 such commandment is the second most important
13610 one of the two great commandments that
13611 **summarize** the law, we still need the most
13612 important one, which is: "you will love the Lord
13613 your God above everything". So without going any
13614 further we can clearly see that the law cannot really
13615 be circumscribed to that of "you will love your
13616 neighbor", because we are missing loving God
13617 above all else. In Mat 22:35-40, Jesus Christ
13618 himself says it, calling them both important, but
13619 classifying one as more important than the other.

13620 **As we can see, we cannot risk taking these**
13621 **isolated statements of our good brother Paul, to**
13622 **put them against the rest of the Bible, and insist**
13623 **that the words he says are now the "new**
13624 **doctrine**" that God wants us to follow instead of

13625 **the “old one”.** Remember, we are not
13626 Saintpaulians, we are Christians; we do not follow
13627 Paul’s words exclusively, but the meaning that we
13628 can extract from the entire Bible, the attitude
13629 towards a particular theme that we can perceive
13630 from the whole Bible; let us remember that God
13631 does not change his mind, and does not need to
13632 amend the laws that He himself established before.

13633 **Today’s “humanists” would be so glad to be**
13634 **able to reduce Christianity to a simple club that**
13635 **only talks about loving your neighbor.** It is true
13636 that the law can be summarized in these two
13637 commandments, but under no circumstances can it
13638 be substituted by those two commandments,
13639 **because the law, when described in detail,**
13640 **explains what loving God above all else is, and**
13641 **what it means to love your neighbor as yourself.**

13642 If the law would not teach us in detail what sin is
13643 and what it is not, then someone who worships God
13644 above all else and who loves his neighbor, but at the
13645 same time would worship one hundred other gods
13646 and saints and virgins, etc., would feel he was doing
13647 the right thing and we could not rebuke him,
13648 because he loves God above all else. However,
13649 thanks to God’s law that is in the Old Testament
13650 and not the New Testament, we can allege that that
13651 is a sin because, according to the law, we cannot
13652 have any other god.

13653 **We could also allege, and rightly so, that such**
13654 **is idolatry,** because the Old Testament clearly
13655 details we are not to make graven images to kneel
13656 before them. The New Testament does not. It only
13657 mentions the word ‘idolatry,’ but without
13658 explaining what it is, that is detailed in the Old
13659 Testament. Catholicism says that to worship the
13660 Virgin Mary is not idolatry and therefore it is not a

13661 sin, because the New Testament does not say
13662 anything about it.

13663 If we guided our moral laws only after Paul said
13664 in the aforementioned verse, **we could not accuse a**
13665 **man of sin, who, with the approval of a married**
13666 **couple**, would form a triangle, because he would
13667 say that he loves his neighbor as himself, since it
13668 doesn't bother him if anyone did the same with his
13669 marriage.

13670 **What I am trying to prove is that we should**
13671 **not happily discard God's law and substitute it**
13672 **with phrases and verses, without profoundly**
13673 **harming the Christian doctrine.**

13674 What happens with many Christians is that they
13675 don't realize that **while they consciously discard**
13676 **God's law, unconsciously they keep it.** When we
13677 tell them that if only the passage we just read were
13678 our norm, we could not convict a sex triangle as sin,
13679 they allege that it is, because that would be adultery.
13680 They don't realize that such concept of adultery that
13681 they so correctly flash is taken from God's Old
13682 Testament law, and not from Ga 5:14, or even
13683 worse, they did not get it from the law, but from
13684 tradition.

13685 **People in general, and Christians are no**
13686 **exception**, are so greatly confused in their minds,
13687 that they keep concepts which they have no idea
13688 where they came from. In many occasions they
13689 claim as their only source of information or right
13690 something that never was, and fiercely rebel, not
13691 against those who got them in that mental
13692 whirlwind, but against those who tell them that they
13693 are in such whirlwind and mental or philosophical
13694 chaos.

13695 *

13696

13697

13698

Those Who Are Better Than God

13699

13700

13701

13702

13703

13704

13705

13706

13707

The “loveoids” are those Christians who believe that everything must be fixed with **what they believe love is**. They go so far as to oppose to the laws that God established against crime. According to them, a policeman should not use his weapon against a murderer, but rather talk and convince him. The death penalty should not exist, ohhh, my goodness! The army should be dissolved. We should not punish our children, etc..

13708

13709

13710

13711

13712

13713

13714

13715

13716

13717

13718

13719

13720

13721

13722

13723

13724

13725

13726

When they think and express such foolishness they are disguising themselves as better than God: **they “greatly love” the poor murderer, but do not love the victim, his orphans and his family**. When they reject the death penalty they destroy the only deterrent there is against crime, the only protective wall for the innocent victims. The “lovoid” has “a lot of love for the murderer” but none for the victim, his widow or his children, whom this “lovoid” is not going to support the rest of their lives. His “Christian love” is only enough to feel sorry for the condemned criminal, since that is a lot easier and cheaper than feeling sorry for the victim, his orphans and his widow, plus that makes him look very “civilized” and “open minded”. The first, only require words; the second requires certain money sacrifices to help the widow and the orphans. However, when the crime is committed against him, he always call the police.

13727

13728

13729

13730

13731

13732

When they want to disarm the army they forget the torturous hours the Christians endured victims of their countries invasion by regimes that hate the faith. In this case, their “Christian love” is not enough to go preach the gospel in those dangerous places and, **with Christian love, share in their**

13733 **brothers' lot.** Thanks to that army that the
13734 "loveoids" want to disarm, or they don't want to
13735 enroll in, they can preach their foolishness and
13736 hypocrisy in this country.

13737 When they don't punish or chastise their children
13738 it rather is so them will not be bothered, because
13739 they are not really interested in how their children
13740 turn out in the future. On the other hand, by saying
13741 children should not be spanked, they pretend they
13742 are "better" than God, and expect to amend God's
13743 words, since Solomon says the contrary in Prv 3:12
13744 and 13:24, where it says that **the father that loves**
13745 **his son, will chastise him.**

13746
13747 *"For whom the LORD loveth he correcteth;*
13748 *even as a father the son in whom he*
13749 *delighteth".* (Prv 3:12)

13750
13751 *"He that spareth his rod hateth his son, but*
13752 *he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes".*
13753 (Prv 13:24)

13754
13755 Now, they say it is ok to chastise, but not spank.
13756 Really? What if your son refuses to obey your
13757 chastisement because he knows that your
13758 "convictions" keep you from spanking him?
13759 Besides, what makes you think you should not
13760 spank your child? **Are you smarter than the Holy**
13761 **Spirit who inspired Solomon** in the Bible to advise
13762 you to do exactly the opposite to that foolishness in
13763 your head? To prove it, just read the book of
13764 Proverbs, which is full of advise on how to raise
13765 your children, but if you don't want to bother, at
13766 least read Prv 23:13-14.

13767

13768 “¹³ Withhold not correction from the child,
13769 for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall
13770 not die. ¹⁴ Thou shalt beat him with the rod,
13771 and shalt deliver his soul from hell”.

(Prv 23:13-14)

13773

13774 **All this is fine... but, where is the connection to**
13775 **the relevance of the law?** Well, many Christians
13776 think that the law is “obsolete”, that we are living in
13777 “different” times, that God has “changed” his mind,
13778 etc., etc.; that is when these foolish ideas get into
13779 the heads of those fools that confuse speed with
13780 bacon. That is why our youth is like it is today.

13781

13782 “⁸ Owe no man any thing, but to love one
13783 another, for he that loveth another hath
13784 fulfilled the law. ⁹ For this: Thou shalt not
13785 commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou
13786 shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false
13787 witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be
13788 any other commandment, it is briefly
13789 comprehended in this saying, namely: Thou
13790 shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. ¹⁰ Love
13791 worketh no ill to his neighbour, therefore love
13792 is the fulfilling of the law”. (Ro 13:8-10)

13793

13794 **We can say briefly, as it says in the passage**
13795 **above, that anyone who loves his brother obeyed**
13796 **the law**, but only when we refer to it partially, and
13797 above all, a group of Christians. Can someone say
13798 that a person, who loves his brother and believes in
13799 God **but not in Christ**, is obeying the law? If
13800 anyone loves God, and Christ and his brother, but
13801 also tries to **communicate with the spirits of his**
13802 **ancestors**, because he loves them too and wants to
13803 preach to them, is he obeying the law? **If anyone**

13804 **loves his brother, God, and Christ, and at the**
13805 **same time kneels before a graven image of**
13806 **Christ, is he obeying the law?** Where do we learn
13807 that all that is a sin? In the New or in the Old
13808 Testament? The New Testament only mentions the
13809 case of the Thyatira fortune teller (Acts 16:16-18)
13810 but it does not say if it is good or bad, just that Paul,
13811 after the girl had annoyed them for many days with
13812 her “testimony”, ordered the spirit to flee from her.

13813 If this were the only passage we had to show to a
13814 medium or a spiritualist, there would be no way of
13815 proving to him that spiritualism is highly sinful. The
13816 only thing we could prove is that mediums should
13817 not annoy others by yelling out their divinations. **It**
13818 **is the law that teaches us that spiritualism is a**
13819 **sin.** If the law is obsolete we have nothing to say to
13820 spiritualists if they believe in God, Christ, and the
13821 Holy Spirit, as well as love their brother.
13822 **Therefore,** when Paul says that he who loves his
13823 brother has obeyed the law, he is referring to those
13824 who love their brother and act out their lives
13825 according to God’s law.

13826 **There are tribes that consider that a form of**
13827 **hospitality is to lend the host’s wife to a pilgrim**
13828 that comes to his house. They love their brother so
13829 much that not only do they lend him their home, but
13830 their wife as well. So also do many “civilized”
13831 people in our cities. Is it true, then, that they obeyed
13832 God solely by loving their brother? **Those that**
13833 **exchange their wives in orgies are treating their**
13834 **neighbor as they want to be treated.** Is it true,
13835 then, that if anyone loves his brother as himself, he
13836 is obeying the law? **No, it is not true.**

13837 God’s law, that set of laws for human behavior
13838 are still valid. The only laws that Paul considers
13839 obsolete are the ritual laws of the Jewish religion,

13840 the lamb sacrifices, and other ceremonies. What
13841 Paul is saying here is that in very general terms, **he**
13842 **who loves his brother has obeyed the law, but**
13843 **only as long as that love is that one which is**
13844 **approved by God's law for human behavior.** He
13845 who loves his sister and marries her is not obeying
13846 God's law.

13847 If the law were obsolete no one had the right to
13848 impose the death penalty, and **in that case no**
13849 **Christian could be a judge, a policeman, etc.,**
13850 **and neither could they have the right to defend**
13851 **their own lives with a weapon, or call the police**
13852 **in their defense, because that is not taught**
13853 **anywhere in the New Testament for a Christian**
13854 **to do.** Besides, if he calls the police and the
13855 policeman kills the assailant, the one who called the
13856 police would be at fault.

13857 **However, if we realize that the law is still valid**
13858 **in its entirety** for that for which it was created (a
13859 behavioral norm) then we see that it makes sense, it
13860 has connectivity, harmony, and logic.

13861 I have briefly explained it; if we are forced to
13862 condense the laws in one phrase, we could say that
13863 anyone who loves his brother has obeyed the law;
13864 **but if we want to know what loving our brother**
13865 **means, who should we love, when loving one**
13866 **person is antagonistic with loving another, what**
13867 **are the correct procedures of love, etc., we have**
13868 **to unfailingly appeal to God's law for human**
13869 **behavior.**

13870 Because of its failure to do so, Christianity is head
13871 down and, among many other things, there are
13872 many children of Christians that have a worse
13873 testimony than the children of non-Christians. They
13874 can't find consistency in the doctrine they have
13875 been taught, because it is not consistent with itself,

13876 and their parents are not, nor can they be, consistent
13877 with what they **say** they believe.

13878 And why does this happen to parents? Because
13879 they **try to lead their common life, which is real**
13880 **and natural, guided by artificial illusive and**
13881 **artificial doctrines** that do not originate in the
13882 Bible, but in the traditions of the sect to which they
13883 belong. Because these non-biblical doctrines cannot
13884 be applied fully to a real and natural life; the son
13885 sees it, and when something fails, he loses trust in
13886 the whole doctrine.

13887 Till faith doesn't become their personal faith, till
13888 it is not of their own, (the children already adult)
13889 can't submit themselves to an illogical belief, which
13890 confuses them. And when they finally accept faith,
13891 they do it just as their parents, they hold on to it
13892 oppressing common sense, reason and logic
13893 (something unnecessary). And occasionally failing,
13894 because they can't make sense of it; and can't find
13895 the harmony between faith in Jesus and the outside
13896 infrastructure of the behavior that they have to
13897 employ in life.

13898 If these kids, even without a personal faith, saw a
13899 coherence between their parents' faith and the
13900 celestial dynamics on one side and the
13901 circumstances and needs of real daily life on the
13902 other, even when they don't believe yet, they would
13903 at least respect that logical system that they were
13904 taught and that, as an invisible guide, would put
13905 them in the right track for life's labyrinths.

13906 *

13907
13908

13909 **The error and heresy of being Neo-**
13910 **Testamentarian**

13911 There are those who brag about being “Neo-
13912 Testamentarian” while they show contempt towards
13913 the Old Testament and those “wretches” that follow
13914 it together with the New Testament. **They talk and**
13915 **act as if the Old Testament had been inspired by**
13916 **Satan and not by God**, or as if God had changed
13917 his mind after its inspiration.

13918 **Evidently that was not Paul’s mental structure.**
13919 When he wrote the second letter to Timothy, the
13920 New Testament did not exist yet, and much less
13921 when Timothy was a child. Obviously, what
13922 Timothy knew from infancy was the Old Testament
13923 and not the New Testament. That is what Paul calls
13924 here “the Sacred Scriptures” and not the New
13925 Testament yet. Therefore, **all that Paul says in**
13926 **these verses he says it in reference to that Old**
13927 **Testament that so many Christians reject and**
13928 **even abominate.**

13929
13930 *“¹⁴ But continue thou in the things which*
13931 *thou hast learned and hast been assured of,*
13932 *knowing of whom thou hast learned them; ¹⁵*
13933 *and that from a child thou hast known the*
13934 *Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee*
13935 *wise unto salvation through faith which is in*
13936 *Christ Jesus. ¹⁶ All Scripture is given by*
13937 *inspiration of God, and is profitable for*
13938 *doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for*
13939 *instruction in righteousness; ¹⁷ that the man*
13940 *of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished*
13941 *unto all good works”.* (II Tim 3:14-17)

13942
13943 What does Paul say about the Old Testament? He,
13944 who knew what he was talking about, better than all

13945 of the talkative “doctors” that we now have, says
13946 that **the Old Testament can make us wise for our**
13947 **salvation by the faith that is in Christ Jesus.** Yes,
13948 for anyone who does not close his eyes, the Old
13949 Testament will guide him to Jesus. That is why it
13950 was written! Don’t you remember that it was to that
13951 respect that the Berean Jews used it according to
13952 Acts 17:11?

13953 **Later,** referring still to the Old Testament, he says
13954 that all of it was inspired by God. This does not
13955 mean that later when the New Testament came into
13956 existence, it could not apply to it as well; but **when**
13957 **Paul said it, he was referring to the Old**
13958 **Testament.**

13959 Later on he says that the Old Testament, which is
13960 abominated by the Neo-Testamentarians, **is useful**
13961 **for teaching. Teaching who? The Christians.** And
13962 teaching them, what? Everything, because all
13963 Scripture (he says of the Old Testament) is inspired
13964 by God, including the Decalogue and all of God’s
13965 laws.

13966 And not just that; he also says that **the Old**
13967 **Testament is useful for reproof, and for**
13968 **correction for Christians.** If Christians were
13969 reproofed and corrected through the use of the Old
13970 Testament, **it is because Christians followed the**
13971 **Old Testament. In other words, because**
13972 **Christians had it as a standard of behavior; they**
13973 **did not consider it obsolete not abominate it.** If
13974 Paul approved and encouraged such thing, even at
13975 the end of his life, why can’t Christians do so
13976 today? Why reject the Old Testament and hate it
13977 and even contradict it? Isn’t that one of the reasons
13978 for the weakness of Christianity in all times? When
13979 will we have an integral Christianity that follows

13980 the entire Bible and not just part of it, to the
13981 convenience of each sect?

13982 **I don't see a conflict, but rather a complement**
13983 **between the Old and the New Testaments.**

13984 Lastly, Paul says that **the Old Testament is**
13985 **profitable for instructing in righteousness, or**
13986 **that its laws must be our model for justice,** our
13987 guide for righteous behavior. This, I have always
13988 said, there are many things that we would never
13989 have known they are sinful if we did not read the
13990 Old Testament, whose validity the apostle is not
13991 rejecting, rather he highlights.

13992 **So what else is the Old Testament that so many**
13993 **Christians despise or abominate good for?** Well,
13994 it is so that every man of God (Timothy and
13995 Christians in general) be perfect, **fully instructed**
13996 for all good deeds. Nothing much what is ignored
13997 by those who brag about being Neo-
13998 Testamentarians!

13999 **And who says all this in favor of the Old**
14000 **Testament?** The same man who, erroneously,
14001 **those who consider the Old Testament useless,**
14002 **hold as their champion.** The same man who they
14003 say he insisted that the law had been abolished and
14004 that the Old Testament was old fashioned. The same
14005 man that, when speaking of a new covenant
14006 replacing an old one, they believe is talking about
14007 the Old Testament and God's law, and not the
14008 rituals and Jewish ceremonies.

14009 **To read the Bible many times without fear of**
14010 **finding the truth is a very good way to find it.**

14011 *

14012
14013

14014 **Summary of chapter 15.** It is true up to a point
14015 that some phrases articulated by Paul about how

14016 loving our brother is obeying the law, serve as a
14017 guide **for Christians**. But they will never be
14018 enough to guide rightly **a non-believer**. The
14019 unbeliever does not know the true meaning of love,
14020 since he has never learned God's law directly from
14021 the Bible, and if he has any shallow knowledge of
14022 it, it comes from the traditions that surround him in
14023 his social environment.

14024 If we were to give these cloudy phrases to
14025 homosexuals and Muslims, they would believe they
14026 are doing the same that Christians do. The first,
14027 because they love their partner, and the second,
14028 because they love their four wives.

14029 Thanks to God's law, contained in the Old
14030 Testament, we can know which things can and
14031 cannot be done, and thanks to that we can help
14032 others in matters of religion.

14033 If we were to tell a Catholic that anyone who
14034 loves his brother obeyed the law, they would think
14035 that they can continue worshipping the virgins and
14036 saints. If we gave these bare phrases to a spiritualist,
14037 he would continue practicing his spiritualism.

14038 These brief phrases as told by Paul would not
14039 serve as a guide to those whose religion teaches
14040 them to love God and their neighbors, but not
14041 Christ. It could be that someone might allege that
14042 this of loving Christ was said in the New Testament.
14043 That is true, but we are talking about the
14044 ineffectiveness of using the phrase that strictly says
14045 that he who loves his brother has obeyed the law, in
14046 order to prove that such phrase cannot be used to
14047 "demonstrate" that God's law is obsolete. Love for
14048 God is not even included in this phrase. If we have
14049 to read the entire New Testament in order to
14050 understand this, then that shows that the phrase

14051 itself does not teach what the anti-law doctrine
14052 believes it teaches.

14053 Being a Neo-Testamentarian is an error and a
14054 heresy, because Paul himself, whom they believe
14055 was the one who abolished the Old Testament in
14056 general, says the contrary in II Tim 3:14-17.

14057 ***

14058

14059

14060

14061

14062

Chapter 16

14063

Discordances in the beliefs of those who think that God's law is abolished

14064

14065

14066

Compartmentalization of the human mind: it retains two contradictory concepts without realizing it

14067

14068

14069

14070

14071

14072

14073

14074

14075

14076

14077

14078

14079

14080

14081

14082

14083

14084

14085

I have seen countless times people who can entertain in their mind two antagonistic concepts without realizing it. Some times they act in accordance with one of them while some other times they use the other one for their behavior. I have seen this strange, but frequent psychological phenomenon in all circles; politics, science, religion, education, personal relationships, and everything requiring a person to make decisions.

Their mind function as a wine rack or pigeonhole cabinet where they keep putting in each slot or niche their concepts and experiences as life goes by. So they keep the idea that the Earth is round in B-4, and the concept that the Earth is flat in D-8. As time goes by they, unconscious of this duality, sometimes make their decision using concept B-4 and others using D-8, and unless someone points it

14086 out, they will never realize the antagonistic duality
14087 of their mind.

14088 This phenomenon is always manifested in the
14089 brothers who believe that God's laws have been
14090 abolished. On one hand they deny that God's law
14091 for human behavior is valid, while on the other they
14092 obey God's laws, with few exceptions.

14093 *

14094

14095

14096 **God doesn't contradict himself and Christ does**
14097 **not contradict him either. Why do they refuse to**
14098 **discuss his doctrines?**

14099 The brothers accept the idea that Christ is the
14100 same kind of being as God, and that there is no
14101 discrepancy between them. They also accept that as
14102 it says in Heb 13:8, Jesus Christ is the same
14103 yesterday, today, and for ever. They accept just as
14104 well what it says in James 1:17, that in God there is
14105 no change nor shifting shadows. However, **at the**
14106 **same time that they have these two concepts in**
14107 **their minds, they think that God changed his**
14108 **mind**, and therefore, the laws that he had given
14109 before to guide human behavior are now obsolete
14110 and do not have to be obeyed.

14111 **Other, more audacious, think** that "before" God
14112 thought that those laws were good, but Jesus,
14113 realizing they were not convenient, decided to
14114 change everything. They have in box B-4 the
14115 concept that God and Christ are the same and think
14116 the same. In D-4 they hold the concept that Jesus
14117 Christ is the same forever. In F-3 they hold the
14118 concept that God changed his mind. And in H-9
14119 they hold the idea that Jesus Christ amended the
14120 Father's commandments and changed what God had
14121 determined.

14122 **This is a sad condition of the human mind,**
14123 which remains in each person because of his denial
14124 to discuss their ideas and concepts with those who
14125 think to the contrary, which are the **only ones** that
14126 can point out their error.

14127 I like to talk and discuss with those who think
14128 differently than myself because they are **the only**
14129 **ones** that can point out to me where I am wrong and
14130 where my error lies, if really I am in error. Those
14131 who think like me, if we are both wrong, have no
14132 way of helping me leave my error. That is why I
14133 like to discuss the important issues, like religion and
14134 politics. Sadly, most brothers walk away from the
14135 discussion that contradicts what they believe.

14136 **Why they don't want to discuss?** Several
14137 reasons: **a)** they have a very inflated ego and can't
14138 stand it if someone find an error on them; **b)** they
14139 are afraid to be "confused", because they don't trust
14140 that God will protect them if they sincerely seek the
14141 truth; **c)** they are at a moment in their lives in
14142 which, if they change their mind, they lose their
14143 *modus vivendi*, benefits and retirement; and don't
14144 want to find out the truth because they feel less
14145 weight on their conscience if they don't find out
14146 what is the truth than if they do, and don't change;
14147 **d)** they are afraid to face their religious colleagues
14148 and, due to their fanaticism, be isolated from their
14149 friendship and fellowship; **e)** they think that God
14150 will punish them if they doubt what they were
14151 taught when they came to the Gospel; **f)** they are
14152 comfortable with the set of beliefs they have, even
14153 if some are wrong or antagonistic, and not loving
14154 truth enough, they would rather continue living like
14155 that; **g)** for two or more of the aforementioned
14156 reasons.

14157 *

14158

14159

14160

14161

14162

14163

14164

14165

14166

14167

14168

14169

14170

14171

14172

14173

14174

14175

14176

14177

14178

14179

14180

14181

14182

14183

14184

14185

14186

14187

14188

14189

14190

14191

14192

14193

Some examples of contradictions in the minds of those who believe that God's laws are abolished

Not having internal mental harmony, takes the believer to a series of blunders, foolish behavior and insoluble contradictions. Let's imagine here a series of situations that no pastor who say that the law of God is obsolete, would ever like to encounter.

A Christian is sent as pastor to a certain not very civilized country. One of the first problems he encounters is a couple who comes to get marry and complain that the pastor in the next town, where they live, does not want to marry them, in spite of the fact that this country laws do not forbid marriage between siblings. The pastor in the other town told us it was a sin, but I don't see any prohibition of it in the New Testament. What he showed us was a prohibition of it back in the Old Testament. God's law, as we learned in that church, is obsolete, because we are not under the law anymore, but under the grace. Because under the grace, what is important is the "love", and my sister and I love each other.

What can this poor pastor do faced with this situation? He has only three alternatives: **1)** Tell them that the behavioral laws are still valid, and not marry them: **2)** marry them and sin against God, so not to have to admit his previous doctrinal error, **3)** tell them, "I will not marry you because I just don't feel like it", without any explanations, and thus protect his ego and not say he was wrong.

If we go to Gen 20:12 we will see that before Moses established the incest laws, God allowed men to marry their sisters and other close relatives.

14194 Moses himself was a product of a marriage in which
14195 his father was his mother's nephew. Even at
14196 creation, **God only created one couple, when he**
14197 **could have created several.** That indicates that at
14198 the beginning it was not wrong to marry our sisters.

14199 It seems like when the crossing of close relatives
14200 became harmful, that God established the law
14201 against incest. That is why later, during Moses'
14202 time, in Lev 20:17-19, God forbids and even
14203 assigns the death penalty to such marriages. In other
14204 words, it is clearly expressed, and in a very
14205 uncontested manner, that **these unions were**
14206 **forbidden only as a result of God's law expressed**
14207 **by Moses.** Before the law there could be marriages
14208 between siblings. With these preliminaries set, let's
14209 now analyze if God's laws should still be obeyed or
14210 not, if it is abolished or not.

14211
14212 *“¹¹ And Abraham said: Because I thought,*
14213 *surely the fear of God is not in this place; and*
14214 *they will slay me for my wife's sake. ¹² And*
14215 *yet indeed she is my sister; she is the*
14216 *daughter of my father, but not the daughter*
14217 *of my mother; and she became my wife”.*

14218 (Gn 20:11-12)

14219
14220 *“And if a man shall take his sister, his*
14221 *father's daughter, or his mother's daughter,*
14222 *and see her nakedness, and she see his*
14223 *nakedness; it is a wicked thing; and they **shall***
14224 ***be cut off** in the sight of their people. He hath*
14225 *uncovered his sister's nakedness; he shall*
14226 *bear his iniquity”.* (Lev 20:17)

14227
14228 **Most Christian sects reject the obeying of**
14229 **God's laws without differentiating between the**

14230 **ritual law (which is abolished) and the**
14231 **behavioral laws (which are not abolished).** They
14232 make a clean slate of all of God's law, saying that
14233 "now", God's law does not have to be obeyed.

14234 All right, if your sect preaches that the law of God
14235 does not have to be obeyed, does this mean that
14236 your sectarian doctrine establishes that its members
14237 **can marry brother and sister in a church**
14238 **ceremony?** Can it be said publicly that such sect
14239 allows and even encourages sibling marriages,
14240 without being opposed by its directors?

14241 And if they didn't admit such incestuous
14242 marriage, then how do they support their statement?
14243 With tradition? With the country's customs? Is it
14244 that they don't really follow the Bible strictly, but
14245 rather introduce such religious doctrines in their
14246 sects by the tradition of their parents and the
14247 customs of the country, as the Roman Church does
14248 in Africa, Latin America, etc.?

14249 **There is great inconsistency among those who**
14250 **think that God's laws have been abolished.** Due
14251 to reasons unknown to me, maybe through evil
14252 spiritual influences, **the human mind, in general,**
14253 **holds the most erroneous and contradictory**
14254 **ideas,** without scruples or pain.

14255 Such is the case of those who, on one hand shout
14256 that God's laws have been abolished, while on the
14257 other are horrified (and rightly so) before the
14258 possibility of a sibling marriage. The marriage
14259 between siblings is a sin, and it is so because the
14260 law that God established through Moses for human
14261 behavior is still valid in its entirety and in all its
14262 strength. The fact that humans, some out of
14263 ignorance, others for convenience, don't want to
14264 obey it, doesn't deprive it of its power.

14265 After reading this reasoning there will be many

14266 who will keep their doctrine just as before because
14267 they have no desire to seek the truth or teach it to
14268 those who are wrong. Have any of these anti-law
14269 brothers anything to say to these reasons? Are they
14270 willing to discuss the issue? Surely not, because
14271 they don't want to abandon the doctrine of which
14272 they are such fans, and they don't want to receive
14273 what they consider a defeat to their ego, when in
14274 reality it would be a blessing for themselves. If I am
14275 the one who is wrong, I would be thankful to those
14276 who think different if they rid me of my error
14277 though my "ego" be destroyed.

14278
14279 **Let us imagine another one of those situations**
14280 **in which no anti-law pastor would like to find**
14281 **himself.** A Catholic man visits an evangelical
14282 church, talks to the pastor and says, "Pastor, I am
14283 Catholic, I worship an image of Christ, but my
14284 friend who brought me here tells me that it is a sin,
14285 and showed me a few passages in the Old
14286 Testament. I told the priest at my church and he said
14287 that it was before, when we were under the law,
14288 because it was talking about pagan gods, but now
14289 we are under grace. He said that I am worshiping an
14290 image of Christ not an image of a pagan god, and
14291 that the New Testament does not say we can't
14292 worship images of Christ. You, then, Pastor, what
14293 can you tell me? Should I believe only what the
14294 New Testament tells me, or should I also believe the
14295 rest of the Bible, especially Ex 20:4-5 and 23, or is
14296 it true that God's Ten Commandments are obsolete?

14297
14298 **Let's visit a similar case, this time with a**
14299 **spiritualist.** Pastor, I love God above all, and I
14300 believe in Christ, and I love my neighbor. I also
14301 love my grandparents and my parents and want to

14302 talk to them through a medium, but in your church
14303 they tell me that is a sin, because it says so in the
14304 Old Testament, which you have said that it is
14305 obsolete. I have read the New Testament and it
14306 doesn't say anything there against spiritualism. It is
14307 only addressed once when Paul rebuked a fortune
14308 teller because she was annoying him. We,
14309 spiritualists, do not bother or annoy anyone; we just
14310 want to talk to our dead loved ones. I do not
14311 worship them; I just want to know how they are.
14312 What can you tell be about it? Should I believe only
14313 the New Testament, or should I try to follow God's
14314 laws as expressed in the Old Testament?

14315
14316 **Pastor, why do we keep Sunday?** The other day
14317 someone who keeps Saturday came and some
14318 brothers told him that as in Ga 4:10 we should not
14319 keep Saturdays. I read it and it said, "*Ye observe*
14320 *days, and months, and times, and years*", if that
14321 means we don't have to keep Saturday, why do we
14322 keep Sunday?

14323 These brothers say that when Paul rebuked the
14324 Galatians for observing days, what he was saying is
14325 that they should not keep Saturday. But the issue is,
14326 **it doesn't say here they should not keep**
14327 **Saturday. In any case it is saying not to keep any**
14328 **day.** If that is what we sincerely believe Paul is
14329 saying, why do we observe Sunday? Why tell our
14330 brothers that Sunday is the day of the Lord, and
14331 therefore the day to come to church, if Paul says we
14332 should not observe any day? What do you think
14333 about that, Pastor?

14334
14335 **Pastor, why do we say that we must respect our**
14336 **parents but not observe Saturday?** I was reading
14337 the book of Leviticus and saw in 19:3 that there

14338 were two commandments: one, to respect our
14339 parents and honor them, the other, to keep the
14340 Saturday. If both commandments are in the same
14341 verse, why do we recognize one and reject the
14342 other?

14343 What is the reason? Which is the criteria we have
14344 followed to obey one part of this verse and not the
14345 other?

14346
14347 “3 Ye shall fear every man his mother, and
14348 his father, and keep my Sabbaths, I am the
14349 LORD your God. 4 Turn ye not unto idols, nor
14350 make to yourselves molten gods: I am the
14351 LORD your God”. (Lev 19:3-4)

14352
14353 I even saw in the next verse, 4th, that it talks
14354 against idolatry, putting the commandment about
14355 keeping Saturday right between honoring our
14356 parents and that against idolatry. What reason do we
14357 have to disobey the commandment in the middle
14358 and obey the two extremes? **Would you like to**
14359 **explain it to me?**

14360
14361 **Pastor, what can you tell me about forbidden**
14362 **animals and the tithe?** Many are the brothers who
14363 have told me that God’s law is obsolete. In their
14364 crazy mental structure they reject, on one side, the
14365 idea of prohibiting pork, crab, and other animals
14366 that God’s law considers non-edible, while on the
14367 other, they accept that Christians must tithe to their
14368 church.

14369 I would like to know which criteria those brothers
14370 use to negate the validity of the forbidding of
14371 certain animals, but admit the validity of tithing.
14372 Note that out of Deuteronomy 14, they accept what
14373 verse 22, but reject the previous 19 verses. I would

14374 like you to explain to me, in all honesty, which
14375 criteria they use for such decision, if in fact they
14376 follow some criteria, and it is not a capricious
14377 decision, based on tradition or on what others have
14378 told them.

14379

14380 *“³ Thou shalt not eat any abominable thing.*

14381 *⁴ These are the beasts which ye shall eat: the*
14382 *ox, the sheep, and the goat, ⁵ the hart, and the*
14383 *roe buck, and the fallow deer, and the wild*
14384 *goat, and the pygarg, and the wild ox, and the*
14385 *chamois. ⁶ And every beast that parteth the*
14386 *hoof, and cleaveth the cleft into two claws,*
14387 *and cheweth the cud among the beasts, that ye*
14388 *shall eat ⁹ These ye shall eat of all that*
14389 *are in the waters: all that have fins and scales*
14390 *shall ye eat... ¹¹ Of all clean birds ye shall eat.*
14391 *¹² But these are they of which ye shall not*
14392 *eat.... ²² Thou shalt truly tithe all the*
14393 *increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth*
14394 *forth year by year”.*

14395 (Dt 14:3-22 abbreviated)

14396

14397 **Pastor, why do we accept the tithes, which**
14398 **were for the Levites, who were Jewish, and reject**
14399 **Saturday, saying that was only for the Jews?**
14400 Note this verse I’m showing you; it says that **the**
14401 **tithes were received by the Levites**, who belonged
14402 in the Old Testament, the old covenant. The Levites
14403 were Jewish, and you had to be a Levite, and
14404 therefore, a Jew, in order to receive the tithes. Why
14405 then, do they say that Saturday was exclusively for
14406 the Jews, and they don’t say that the tithe was
14407 exclusively for the Jews?

14408

14409 *“And, behold, I have given the children of*
14410 *Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance,*
14411 *for their service which they serve, even the*
14412 *service of the tabernacle of the*
14413 *congregation”.* (Nm 18:21)

14414
14415 *“But the tithes of the children of Israel,*
14416 *which they offer as an heave offering unto the*
14417 *LORD, I have given to the Levites to inherit.*
14418 *Therefore I have said unto them: Among the*
14419 *children of Israel they shall have no*
14420 *inheritance”.* (Nm 18:24)

14421
14422 In light of all this, pastor, I can’t conceive, **how**
14423 **am I to understand the attitude of those who say**
14424 **that Saturday was a sign of God’s covenant with**
14425 **the Jews, and only with the Jews,** and that this is
14426 why Christians should not observe it; however, they
14427 do expect to be given the tithe, in spite of the fact
14428 that the tithe was given to the Levites and only the
14429 Levites, who were Jewish. Therefore, if we are
14430 going to reason about tithing the same way they
14431 reason about Saturday, we have to say that tithing
14432 was something of the old covenant; it was **not** for
14433 the Gentiles, but for the Jews. Why then, ask for the
14434 tithe, or teach that Christians should give them, or
14435 just passively receive them, if **the New Testament**
14436 **makes no mention of such duty to tithe?** Which
14437 criteria do they follow to reason these things, if, in
14438 fact they follow one, and it is not simply a whim, a
14439 superstition, a tradition, or an economic
14440 convenience? Which criteria do they follow to
14441 accept the tithe and reject Saturday? Pastor, please,
14442 take me out of this maze!

14443

14444 **Pastor, if the apostolic letter prohibits eating**
14445 **blood and strangled animals,** why then, do they
14446 teach me in church that Paul declared the law
14447 abolished and authorizes us to eat everything? Who
14448 should I pay attention to, those who interpret Paul
14449 that way, or the twelve apostles and Paul himself,
14450 who wrote the letter? According to what I believe,
14451 didn't Paul take part in drafting that letter? Did he
14452 not approve it with his signature and presence?
14453 Could you tell me, Pastor, whom should I obey?

14454
14455
14456 **Pastor, fifty years ago, if someone got a divorce**
14457 and remarried was expelled from the church. My
14458 mother divorced my father because he was an
14459 alcoholic and beat her every day when he came
14460 home drunk. Then she married a good man who
14461 treated her well and supported all of us, something
14462 that my mother could not do on her own. Why was
14463 she expelled from the church, if, **God's law allows**
14464 **a woman to divorce her husband?**

14465 And what hurts me the most is that now that
14466 society is so corrupt, and half the marriages end up
14467 in divorce, people who are divorced and remarried
14468 are admitted into church.

14469 Why divorcees are admitted now and not before?
14470 Is it that before they went by the New Testament
14471 alone and now they go by the entire Bible, including
14472 the Old Testament? Or is it economic convenience,
14473 since there are so many divorced people, and if they
14474 would not admit them, the churches would be
14475 empty?

14476 Why did they tell Mom that she was committing
14477 adultery for having married her second husband,
14478 and now they don't say the same thing to those

14479 who, belonging to a church have married even three
14480 times? Do you know the answer to this, Pastor?

14481

14482 **Let's visit Reverend Precocious Jones.** He is 70
14483 years old and has been in ministry for 35, let's listen
14484 in on his conversation with a young man from his
14485 church who asked him a few questions:

14486

14487

14488 **"Pastor, I heard you say this morning that the**
14489 **law was abolished and that nobody could obey it.**

14490 I agree with you that no one has been able to obey
14491 God's law **in their entire life**, from the cradle to the
14492 tomb; but there comes a moment when all the
14493 behavioral laws that God established become part of
14494 our nature and we end up obeying them all, don't
14495 you think?"

14496

14497

14498 **"Look son,** the law was established to force
14499 everyone to come to Jesus Christ for their salvation,
14500 which is why nobody can fulfill it".

14501

14502

14503 **"Reverend, we know that you** were a sinner just
14504 like all of us. At some time in your life you have
14505 sinned, but gradually you have come closer to
14506 holiness. Well, can you briefly answer:

14507

14508 **1) How long since you don't worship other gods?"**

14509

14510 **"Ever since I came to Christ,** at 23 years old; I
14511 remember that at 31 I started to study for the
14512 ministry, and at 35 I had my first church".

14513

14514 **“2) Since when** don’t you worship graven
14515 **images?”**
14516
14517 **“Same as before,** since I was 23”.
14518
14519 **“3) Since when** don’t you take God’s name in
14520 **vain?”**
14521
14522 **“I remember the last time I did was** at 27. I was
14523 **very very sorry and never did it again”.**
14524
14525 **“4) Since when** don’t you dishonor your father or
14526 **mother?”**
14527
14528 **“Well, you see,** that is one sin I never committed”.
14529
14530
14531 **“5) When was the last time you killed somebody?”**
14532
14533 **“I have never killed anyone,** nor have I ever felt
14534 **hatred against anyone; I don’t have that in my**
14535 **conscience”.**
14536
14537 **“6) Since when** do you not steal?”
14538
14539 **“Well, a few times** I took something that did not
14540 **belong to me, but sometimes we use things that**
14541 **don’t belong to us, and that constitutes robbery. I**
14542 **can tell you I have been rid of that problem since I**
14543 **was 30 years old”.**
14544
14545 **“7) Since when** have you not committed adultery?”
14546
14547 **“This is one of a man’s biggest problems,** and I
14548 **was weak even after becoming a Christian, but at 31**

14549 I decided to marry and have not had that problem
14550 ever since”.

14551

14552 **“8) Since when do you not raise false testimony**
14553 **against anyone?”**

14554

14555 **“That is something** we have to learn to control.
14556 Most of the time we do it as a result of a heated
14557 discussion. The last time I did it I was seriously
14558 chastised, and since then I have had no problems.
14559 That happened during the last year of seminary”.

14560

14561 **“9) Since when don’t you covet someone else’s**
14562 **property?”**

14563

14564 **“Son, that was something** that never controlled
14565 me; I have always lived content with what I have”.

14566

14567 **“10) One last question Reverend Jones, since when**
14568 **do you not observe Saturday?”**

14569

14570 **“Observe Saturday? I have never observed**
14571 **Saturday!** The law has been abolished; it was
14572 nailed on the cross. We don’t have to obey it. The
14573 Commandments and God’s law was only for the
14574 Jews. The law can never be obeyed, my friend.
14575 Remember it says, ‘there is not just, not one.’ The
14576 law was established so no one could fulfill it, so
14577 they had to come to Christ. Anyone who pretends to
14578 obey it has fallen from grace, is lost. Besides, Paul
14579 said...”.

14580

14581 **“Forgive the interruption, Reverend.** According to
14582 your previous answers I can conclude that you have
14583 faithfully obeyed the Decalogue for at least 35

14584 years. The only thing you have not obeyed is
14585 keeping Saturday”.

14586

14587 “Well, that is true; but, allow me to explain..”.

14588

14589

14590 **Don’t those who think that God’s law was**
14591 **abolished realize that they would also have to**
14592 **consider the prophets abolished as well?** Exactly,
14593 in Mathew 5:17 Jesus mentions the prophets, along
14594 with the law, as things that would not pass away
14595 until heaven and Earth did. But if in spite that
14596 neither heaven nor Earth have passed away,
14597 someone wants to make God’s law obsolete, then
14598 they would have to consider the prophets obsolete.
14599 **How could they separate the law from the**
14600 **prophets, and consider one obsolete but not the**
14601 **other?**

14602 As we can see, the anti-law position is full of
14603 illogic and contradictory affirmations. These poor
14604 brothers have their minds full of contradictions;
14605 they have in one compartment that God’s law is
14606 abolished, while in the other they have cherished
14607 the concept that they should not worship graven
14608 images, and so on. The discordance in the beliefs of
14609 those who think that God’s law is abolished is large,
14610 as we have already seen.

14611

*

14612

14613

14614 **Summary of chapter 16.** In order to see some of
14615 the contradictions in the minds of so many brothers,
14616 we only need to analyze that God does not
14617 contradict himself, and neither does our Lord Jesus
14618 contradict him. Why then, is it just that what many
14619 Christians think Jesus did with the law?

14620 We saw in the first hypothetical case about a
14621 pastor that was sent to a half uncivilized country
14622 where two siblings want to marry. We saw the one
14623 who loves God above all else and his neighbor as
14624 himself, but rejects Christ. Another case was the
14625 one who worships God and Christ and loves his
14626 neighbor, but worships an image of Christ. In
14627 addition the other who also loves God, loves Christ,
14628 etc., but consults the dead. We also analyzed the
14629 case of those who say that Paul said we should not
14630 observe the days, but they observe Sunday. In other
14631 words, we saw some of the contradictory concepts
14632 that so many brothers keep in their minds.

14633 Another contradictory issue is that in which in the
14634 same verse it says that we should honor our father
14635 and mother and keep Saturday, and in the other
14636 passage it says that we should not eat abominable
14637 animals, but we should tithe our money, and in both
14638 cases, today most Christians keep one of the
14639 commandments while they reject the other in the
14640 same verse.

14641 Some other brothers say that the law was for the
14642 Jews. However, in spite of the fact that the law says
14643 that the tithe was for the Levites, who were Jewish,
14644 and in spite that the Levites do not exist anymore,
14645 they understand we should tithe, but not to the
14646 Jewish Levites, but to the churches. They obey of
14647 the law what is convenient for them.

14648 If it were true that the law is abolished, and if it
14649 were true that Paul authorized eating everything,
14650 should we ignore the apostles' letter, in which all
14651 twelve apostles, Paul, and the Holy Spirit prohibit
14652 the eating of blood and strangled animals?

14653 Previously they would claim they went by the
14654 New Testament to prohibit divorce, to the point that
14655 anyone who got a divorce and remarried was

14656 expelled from the church. In spite that God's law
14657 allowed divorce, the churches applied this measure
14658 with divorced people, saying they were following
14659 the New Testament. However, now they allow in
14660 church divorcees that remarry, and even accept
14661 them as deacons and pastors. What part in the Bible
14662 did they use before to expel them, and what part do
14663 they now use to admit them?

14664 Lastly, Reverend Precocious Jones obeyed the
14665 law unknowingly. Out of the Ten Commandments,
14666 the only one he did not obey was the Saturday, but
14667 he still believes that the law is abolished and he
14668 does not have to obey it.

14669 ***
14670
14671
14672
14673
14674

14675 **Chapter 17**

14676 **The supposedly "harshness" of God's law**

14677 **Was God "harsh" and Christ "merciful?"**

14678 I have heard a lot more often than I should, people
14680 who are supposed to know their Bible, talking about
14681 the "harshness" of God's laws. They talk with such
14682 conviction that gives out the feeling that God was a
14683 "harsh", uncompassionate being, but then Christ,
14684 who was kinder, amended the slate and changed all
14685 that God has legislated for human behavior. They
14686 don't remember that Christ always did the Father's
14687 will, and that therefore, there is no contradiction
14688 between them.

14689 The problem with these brothers is that they don't
14690 read the Bible; rather they read books written by

14691 “scholars” and that talk about the Bible. If they had
14692 read the Bible several times, they would have found
14693 out about the many laws that poured God’s mercy
14694 upon those that needed it. Later I will present a few
14695 of the existing examples, which show the mercy of
14696 the Old Testament laws. Some of them, much more
14697 compassionate than what is presently carried on by
14698 the churches.

14699 *

14700
14701

14702 **Mercy, love, compassion, etc., were not**
14703 **“invented” in the New Testament**

14704 There are those who, confusing biblical customs
14705 with Muslim customs, believe that in the society
14706 where the Old Testament reigned, a woman’s
14707 position was only one step above that of a slave. All
14708 that is ignorance of the Bible, and knowledge of
14709 books that “talk about the Bible”. When an ignorant
14710 or ill-intentioned person writes a book about the
14711 Bible, and is read by one who has not read the Bible
14712 enough, he absorbs all the errors that, in good or
14713 bad faith, the writer discharged on his book. Let’s
14714 take a look at several examples of love in God’s
14715 law, compassion, forgiveness, kindness toward the
14716 poor, the widow, the orphan, the foreigner, etc...

14717 *

14718
14719

14720 **Charity towards the poor and the foreigner**

14721 These verses in Lev 19:9-10 hold the doctrine that
14722 must be applied in the treatment of the poor and the
14723 foreigners. It encourages, and even commands, that
14724 when the fruit is harvested, it should not be done
14725 with greed, but they should leave the leftovers for
14726 those who have less. And this, you will read, is

14727 commanded by the law that so many fools say is
14728 harsh and unmerciful.

14729

14730 *“⁹ And when ye reap the harvest of your*
14731 *land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of*
14732 *thy field, neither shalt thou gather the*
14733 *gleanings of thy harvest. ¹⁰ And thou shalt not*
14734 *glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather*
14735 *every grape of thy vineyard; **thou shalt leave***
14736 ***them for the poor and stranger. I am the***
14737 ***LORD your God”.** (Lev 19:9-10)*

14738

14739 In spite that this preaching of love and help to the
14740 foreigner is a clear teaching of the law, many
14741 continue to talk foolishness against the laws of the
14742 God they say they love.

14743

*

14744

14745 **The law against the oppression of the poor and**
14746 **the unlawfulness of holding out salaries**

14747 When a human being works for another for a
14748 salary, it is because he has no other way of making
14749 a living. The evil practice of postponing an earned
14750 wage has been frequently practiced.

14751

14752 *“Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbour,*
14753 *neither rob him. **The wages of him that is***
14754 ***hired shall not abide with thee all night until***
14755 ***the morning”.** (Lev 19:13)*

14756

14757 And this abuse is not only addressed in the
14758 aforementioned verse; but Dt 24:14-15; Jer 22:13;
14759 Mlch 3:5 y James 5:4 also speak on the issue.

14760

14761 *“¹⁴ **Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant***
14762 ***that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy***

14763 *brethren, or of thy strangers that are in thy*
14764 *land within thy gates. 15 At his day thou shalt*
14765 *give him his hire, neither shall the sun go*
14766 *down upon it; for he is poor, and setteth his*
14767 *heart upon it, lest he cry against thee unto*
14768 *the LORD, and it be sin unto thee”.*

14769 (Dt 24:14-15)

14770
14771 *“Woe unto him that buildeth his house by*
14772 *unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong;*
14773 *that useth his neighbour's service without*
14774 *wages, and giveth him not for his work”*

14775 (Jer 22:13)

14776
14777 *“And I will come near to you to judgment;*
14778 *and I will be a swift witness against the*
14779 *sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and*
14780 *against false swearers, and against those that*
14781 *oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow,*
14782 *and the fatherless, and that turn aside the*
14783 *stranger from his right, and fear not me,*
14784 *saith the LORD of hosts”.* (Mlch 3:5)

14785
14786 *“Behold, the hire of the labourers who have*
14787 *reaped down your fields, **which is of you kept***
14788 ***back by fraud, crieth,** and the cries of them*
14789 *which have reaped are entered into the ears*
14790 *of the Lord of sabaoth”.* (James 5:4)

14791
14792 As we can see, all these passages show the mercy
14793 and love contained in the law. It is foolishness to
14794 say that the law was harsh and lacking mercy. Let’s
14795 see other examples.

14796 *

14797
14798

14799

14800

14801

14802

14803

Why do some brothers think that the Old Testament is basically a teaching of hate and harshness, but the New Testament is of love and forgiveness?

14804

14805

14806

14807

14808

14809

14810

14811

14812

14813

14814

14815

14816

14817

14818

14819

14820

14821

14822

14823

14824

14825

14826

14827

14828

14829

14830

14831

14832

14833

14834

Those who think that the Old Testament is a teaching of hate, quote Mt 5:38 and 43, where the Lord mentions certain phrases and sayings that were popular in that culture, but were not from God's law. They did not think to go read in the Old Testament to see if, in fact, what they were imagining was true.

“Ye have heard that it hath been said: An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth”

(Mt 5:38)

“Ye have heard that it hath been said: Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy”.

(Mt 5:43)

It seems that these brothers believe that God, “before”, preached hate, and “after”, changed his mind and decided to make the New Testament to preach love. Apparently, Heb 13:8 doesn't speak to them about the immutability of God. And in spite of its clarity, neither does this Old Testament passage that follows (if they have ever read it):

“¹⁷ Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him. ¹⁸ Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. I am the LORD”.

(Lev 19:17-18)

14835

14836

14837

14838

14839

14840

14841

14842

14843

14844

14845

14846

14847

14848

14849

14850

14851

14852

14853

14854

14855

14856

14857

14858

14859

14860

14861

14862

14863

14864

14865

14866

14867

14868

14869

14870

As we can clearly see, God says in this passage, “*Thou shalt not hate thy brother..*”; “*Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge..*”; “*thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself..*”, but none of this tells them that God also preached love in the Old Testament, not only in the New. They still think that the Old Testament is a teaching of hate, harshness, lack of mercy, blah, blah, blah.

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

Ex 23:4-5 doesn't tell them either that it preaches love to our enemies. No, they only know to look at, they can only look at, want to look at, or were taught to look at Mt 5:38 and 43, **without discerning or realizing that these are not God's laws, but rather expressions, or antique fables.** They already “fabricated” their doctrine out of two verses...and that is all. Now they have a “verse doctrine” to preach. And in the words of the poet we can say, “if anyone contradicts it he turns over, he changes countenance, and with high-sounding voice proclaims: the Bible says... what say you, oh fool! When have you the Bible read, or known?”

As we can see, it is major foolishness to say that “before” God preached hate and “now” he preaches love. Besides, it is an insult.

*

14871 **The right to asylum for the foreigner. The**
14872 **elderly, the orphan and the widow**

14873 I have calluses in my ears from hearing such
14874 nonsense in regards to the “harshness of the law”,
14875 the “cruelty” of the Old Testament versus the love
14876 of the New Testament. Anyone who does not know
14877 the Bible and hears this stupidity will conclude that
14878 the New Testament was written by God and his
14879 chosen, but the Old Testament was written by Satan
14880 and his followers.

14881 What these charlatans don't understand is that
14882 both are God's word; one cannot contradict the
14883 other, because God does not contradict himself, nor
14884 he changes his convictions. The Old and the New
14885 Testaments do not contradict each other, they
14886 complement each other; they are two
14887 chronologically distant parts, **of one unit.**

14889 ***“¹⁵ Thou shalt not deliver unto his master***
14890 ***the servant which is escaped from his master***
14891 ***unto thee.*** ¹⁶ *He shall dwell with thee, even*
14892 *among you, in that place which he shall*
14893 *choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him*
14894 ***best; thou shalt not oppress him”.***

(Dt 23:15-16)

14897 In the last passage we saw the right to exile
14898 established. A man who is running from another or
14899 from an institution, for non-criminal reasons must
14900 receive our hospitality and help. Not only that, but it
14901 is commanded to us to treat him with respect and be
14902 given the rights of a native, and should receive our
14903 charity.

14906 “²¹ ***Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor***
14907 ***oppress him, for ye were strangers in the land***
14908 ***of Egypt. ²² Ye shall not afflict any widow, or***
14909 ***fatherless child***”. (Ex 22:21-22)

14910
14911 “***Also thou shalt not oppress a stranger, for***
14912 ***ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye***
14913 ***were strangers in the land of Egypt***”.
14914 (Ex 23:9)

14915
14916 “³² ***Thou shalt rise up before the hoary***
14917 ***head, and honour the face of the old man,***
14918 ***and fear thy God; I am the LORD. ³³ And if a***
14919 ***stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye***
14920 ***shall not vex him. ³⁴ But the stranger that***
14921 ***dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one***
14922 ***born among you, and thou shalt love him as***
14923 ***thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of***
14924 ***Egypt. I am the LORD your God***”
14925 (Lev 19:32-34)

14926
14927 “***And when ye reap the harvest of your land,***
14928 ***thou shalt not make clean riddance of the***
14929 ***corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither***
14930 ***shalt thou gather any gleanings of thy harvest;***
14931 ***thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to***
14932 ***the stranger. I am the LORD your God***”.
14933 (Lev 23:22)

14934
14935 “***And the sabbath of the land shall be meat***
14936 ***for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for***
14937 ***thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for***
14938 ***thy stranger that sojourneth with thee***”
14939 (Lev 25:6)

14940

14941 “¹⁸ *He doth execute the judgment of the*
14942 *fatherless and widow, and loveth the*
14943 *stranger, in giving him food and raiment.* ¹⁹
14944 *Love ye therefore the stranger, for ye were*
14945 *strangers in the land of Egypt”.*

14946 (Dt 10:18-19)

14947
14948 After reading these passages I ask, how many of
14949 those who believe that the Old Testament is “harsh”
14950 and “cruel” practice the charity established therein?
14951 How many of those who speak so stupidly about the
14952 cruelty of God’s law, do as that “cruel” Law of
14953 Moses commands us to do? How many set aside
14954 from their business or from their profits a
14955 substantial amount for the orphans, the widows, and
14956 the poor in general? How many respect the aged by
14957 standing up at their grey hair, as established by the
14958 law of God that they consider “cruel?” How many
14959 help the foreigners in need, as taught by that “cruel
14960 and harsh” Mosaic Law?”

14961 **As we can see both the slave and the foreigner**
14962 **were at the heart and enjoyed the love of the**
14963 **“harsh” Old Testament law. But that is not**
14964 **legislated in the New Testament;** nobody ordains
14965 such behavior there. Why, simply because it had
14966 already been said in the Old Testament and there
14967 was no need for repetition; because they are both
14968 part of the same unit. They are not antagonistic,
14969 rather complementary. Otherwise we would have to
14970 think that the Old Testament is more merciful than
14971 the New Testament. For that same reason the
14972 commandments on not marrying one’s sister, or not
14973 eating forbidden animals, or the observance of
14974 Saturday is not in the New Testament. All this had
14975 already been said in the Old Testament

14976 *

14977

14978

14979

14980

It is not stealing if it is for food

14981

14982

14983

14984

14985

14986

14987

14988

14989

14990

14991

14992

In this passage we see again the highly charitable nature of the Old Testament, in spite of what many say to the contrary. We can see that they don't read that which they criticize (the Old Testament), or that, prejudiced by what their prejudiced seminaries, sects, pastors or teachers tell them, are not capable of detecting the opposite to what they were taught, when they read it on their own. **It is logical that the Old Testament be merciful**, because God is merciful. Those who say that the Old Testament is harsh and cruel don't seem to realize who they are insulting.

14993

14994

14995

14996

14997

14998

14999

15000

15001

15002

15003

15004

15005

The next passage establishes the law that whoever comes into a man's vineyard can eat if he is hungry, without it being catalogued as theft. **We can see here the love, the charity towards the poor, to avoid at all costs that he go hungry.** The same spirit is found in the established laws in Ex 23:10-11; Dt 15:9-11 and 24:10-22, that, as we can see were not representative of the stereotype many have of the Old Testament, accusing it of "lacking love" and speaking of the "harshness of the law" that so many lazy charlatans are spreading around the world.

15006

15007

15008

15009

15010

15011

*"²⁴ When thou comest into thy neighbour's vineyard, **then thou mayest eat grapes thy fill at thine own pleasure; but thou shalt not put any in thy vessel.** ²⁵ When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbour, **then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand; but***

15012 *thou shalt not move a sickle unto thy*
15013 *neighbour's standing corn". (Dt 23:24-25)*
15014

15015 Well, then, it is not considered a thief, one who,
15016 **being hungry**, takes **what is strictly necessary** to
15017 satisfy his hunger, from one who **has more than**
15018 **enough** to satisfy his own. I have emphasized some
15019 key points in this statement because even though
15020 they are not specifically mentioned in the passage, it
15021 is implied in its content. Let's see!

15022 I said "**one who is hungry**", because this law
15023 does not allow taking anything home, only eating it
15024 on the spot, and presumably, one does that only
15025 when he is hungry. Especially if we consider that he
15026 has to take the fruit from the branches without any
15027 tools, using only his hands. We need to realize that
15028 in these conditions, a human being is only going to
15029 take what he needs to satisfy his hunger. Besides,
15030 by not taking it home, one has to eat the grain raw,
15031 which is not necessarily the most delectable dish
15032 This law was put into practice by Jesus' disciples in
15033 Luke 6:1 where we see that it was known and used.

15034 I said "**strictly what was necessary**", because
15035 anyone who has to pull the wheat by hand, peel it
15036 and rub it in order to eat it is going to eat strictly
15037 what is necessary.

15038 Lastly, I said, "**takes from him who has more**
15039 **than enough to satisfy his own**", because anyone
15040 who owns a field full of food, has more than enough
15041 for himself and his loved ones, and can easily afford
15042 a bite for someone who needs it. It would not be the
15043 same as a man who enters a home and steals
15044 whatever little the homeowner has for his own food
15045 that that of his family.

15046 **In short**, we can take two lessons from here: **a)**
15047 eating from what someone else has in abundance, in

15048 order to satisfy our hunger when we can't buy it, is
15049 not stealing; **b)** the Old Testament does not lack
15050 love as think certain "loud blabbermouths with
15051 scholarly desires", who only know how to parrot
15052 the errors that their hierarchs teach them.

15053 **The God of the Old and the God of the New**
15054 **Testaments is the same God;** and since he is the
15055 same yesterday, today, and forever, he loves the
15056 same in both testaments. Besides, it is clear **that the**
15057 **fact that this issue is not legislated in the New**
15058 **Testament shows us that God's law is still the**
15059 **same, and it is still valid,** therefore it is not
15060 necessary to repeat in the New Testament the
15061 merciful laws that were already recorded in the Old
15062 Testament.

15063 *

15064
15065

15066
15067

Ruth and Naomi were beneficiaries of God's merciful laws

15068
15069 The next passage shows that at the time of doing
15070 our charity work we must take into account not only
15071 the orphan, the widow and the poor but the
15072 foreigner as well. In those cases, it was only enough
15073 for them to be allowed to pick up the leftovers on
15074 the field. That benefited Ruth and Naomi when they
15075 returned from Moab. Here we see again the charity
15076 that the Old Testament taught the believers; a very
15077 different charity than what the fools that say that the
15078 Old Testament and its laws are nothing but
15079 harshness and cruelty.

15080
15081
15082
15083

*"¹⁹ When thou cuttest down thine harvest in
thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field,
thou shalt not go again to fetch it, it shall be*

15084 *for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for*
15085 *the widow; that the LORD thy God may bless*
15086 *thee in all the work of thine hands. 20 When*
15087 *thou beatest thine olive tree, thou shalt not*
15088 *go over the boughs again, it shall be for the*
15089 *stranger, for the fatherless, and for the*
15090 *widow. 21 When thou gatherest the grapes of*
15091 *thy vineyard, thou shalt not glean it*
15092 *afterward; it shall be for the stranger, for the*
15093 *fatherless, and for the widow. 22 And thou*
15094 *shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in*
15095 *the land of Egypt, therefore I command thee*
15096 *to do this thing”.* (Dt 24:19-22)

15097 *

15098
15099
15100
15101 **“An eye for an eye” was a standard for the**
15102 **judges, not a commandment for the common**
15103 **citizen**

15104 The following passages clearly show that “an eye
15105 for an eye” was a standard for the judges, not a
15106 license to execute personal vendettas. It wasn't said
15107 so that each person would be able to justify a free
15108 execution of his hate, or their desire for vengeance;
15109 it was given to the judges as a rule for judgment, to
15110 know how to dictate justice when there was no
15111 written law about a certain issue.

15112 What happens is that the people twisted the
15113 original purpose of the law to adapt it to their own
15114 vengeful lust and personal hatred. As it happens
15115 often (even within Christianity) the force of
15116 tradition was stronger than the force of the law.

15117
15118 *“22 If men strive, and hurt a woman with*
15119 *child, so that her fruit depart from her, and*

15120 yet no mischief follow, he shall be surely
15121 punished, according as the woman's husband
15122 will lay upon him; and he shall pay as the
15123 judges determine. ²³ And if any mischief
15124 follow, then *thou shalt give life for life, ²⁴ eye*
15125 *for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot*
15126 *for foot, ²⁵ burning for burning, wound for*
15127 *wound, stripe for stripe".* (Ex 21:22-25)

15128
15129 As we saw in verse 22, that of an eye for an eye,
15130 etc., was told to the mediator, in this case, the
15131 judges. This passage of Lv 24:17-20 clears it up
15132 even more, in the fact that the passage we read is a
15133 tool of guidance for the judges, when there is no
15134 specific law on an issue. That is why he legislates
15135 death to he who kills, restitution of one animal for
15136 another, and to give the aggressor the same wound
15137 he inflicted on the victim. Another example is in Dt
15138 19:18-21, where in judging the false witness is
15139 established that they are to do with him as he was
15140 thinking of doing with the other, in other words, an
15141 eye for an eye, but that was for the judges.

15142
15143 “¹⁷ And he that killeth any man shall surely
15144 be put to death. ¹⁸ And he that killeth a beast
15145 shall make it good; beast for beast. ¹⁹ And if a
15146 man cause a blemish in his neighbour; as he
15147 hath done, so shall it be done to him. ²⁰
15148 Breach for breach, ***eye for eye, tooth for***
15149 ***tooth;*** as he hath caused a blemish in a man,
15150 so shall it be done to him again”.
15151 (Lev 24:17-20)

15152
15153 “¹⁸ And *the judges* shall make diligent
15154 inquisition, and, behold, if the witness be a
15155 false witness, and hath testified falsely against

15156 *his brother, 19 then shall ye do unto him, as*
15157 *he had thought to have done unto his*
15158 *brother. So shalt thou put the evil away from*
15159 *among you. 20 And those which remain shall*
15160 *hear, and fear, and shall henceforth commit*
15161 *no more any such evil among you. 21 And*
15162 *thine eye shall not pity; but life shall go for*
15163 *life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for*
15164 *hand, foot for foot". (Dt 19:18-21)*

15165
15166 **As we have seen, an eye for an eye was a**
15167 **standard for the judges,** especially when there was
15168 not a specific law written on a certain crime.

15169 Another proof that an “eye for an eye” that we
15170 see in **Mat 5:38 was a corruption of this**
15171 **commandment, and not an application of it,** is
15172 the fact that both Ex 23:4-5 and Lev 19:17-18 give
15173 a very different doctrine to treat the enemies, which
15174 is very distant from the corruption of that judicial
15175 norm that Jesus threw on their faces in Mat 5:38.

15176
15177 *“4 If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass*
15178 *going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back*
15179 *to him again. 5 If thou see the ass of him that*
15180 *hateth thee lying under his burden, and*
15181 *wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt*
15182 *surely help with him". (Ex 23:4-5)*

15183
15184 *“17 Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine*
15185 *heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy*
15186 *neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him. 18*
15187 *Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge*
15188 *against the children of thy people, but thou*
15189 *shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. I am the*
15190 *LORD". (Lev 19:17-18)*

15191

There are Christians that, because of reading only the New Testament, if they do it at all, believe that forgiveness and love was first invented in the New Testament. We see in this passage how God always commanded, and not only in the New Testament, to love those who hurt us and those who are our enemies. This contradicts the foolish talk of those who say that the old covenant was one of hate, harshness and vengeance, contrary to the new covenant, which is one of love, forgiveness and kindness.

15203 They talk as if God were one way before and now
15204 he has changed his mind to be another way totally
15205 opposite to the first. Or as if God the Father were
15206 harsh and full of vengeance and hatred, and Jesus
15207 Christ were the opposite, soft, forgiving and loving.
15208 **This is blasphemy and foolishness**, motivated by
15209 the Bible ignorance of those whose only job is to
15210 seat donors in the pews of their church.

*

15214 **A comparison of the Old Testament charity and**
15215 **the modern church**

In the Old Testament, the whole tithe of every three years was solely used for charity, in favor of the orphans, in favor of the widows, in favor of the foreigners, and in favor of the Levites, who had no other means of support, especially those who lived in the cities of the inner country, as we see in Dt 4:28 y 29. Thus, the tithes were managed according to the law that established them. We see some more of it in Dt 26:12-13. Let's see.

15226 “²³ *And thou shalt eat before the LORD thy*
15227 *God, in the place which he shall choose to*

15228 *place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of*
15229 *thy wine, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of*
15230 *thy herds and of thy flocks; that thou mayest*
15231 *learn to fear the LORD thy God always... 28*
15232 *At the end of three years thou shalt bring*
15233 *forth all the tithe of thine increase the same*
15234 *year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates. 29*
15235 *And the Levite, (because he hath no part nor*
15236 *inheritance with thee,) and the stranger, and*
15237 *the fatherless, and the widow, which are*
15238 *within thy gates, shall come, and shall eat*
15239 *and be satisfied; that the LORD thy God may*
15240 *bless thee in all the work of thine hand which*
15241 *thou doest”. (Dt 14:23-29 abbreviated)*
15242
15243

15244 *“¹² When thou hast made an end of tithing*
15245 *all the tithes of thine increase the third year,*
15246 *which is the year of tithing, and hast given it*
15247 *unto the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless,*
15248 *and the widow, that they may eat within thy*
15249 *gates, and be filled, ¹³ then thou shalt say*
15250 *before the LORD thy God: I have brought*
15251 *away the hallowed things out of mine house,*
15252 *and also have given them unto the Levite, and*
15253 *unto the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the*
15254 *widow, according to all thy commandments*
15255 *which thou hast commanded me. I have not*
15256 *transgressed thy commandments, neither have*
15257 *I forgotten them”. (Dt 26:12-13)*
15258

15259 As we can see **the Old Testament’s religious**
15260 **system was highly charitable.** It gave 33% (one
15261 third) of the benefits received from the believers to
15262 charity; in other words, approximately 33% of the
15263 budget of the Old Testament’s religious

15264 organization had to be dedicated to charity, **to**
15265 **loving their neighbor**. That is why it is so hurtful
15266 the foolish accusation of many who, in talking
15267 uncontrollably and thoughtlessly, say stereotypical
15268 phrases such as, “The Old Testament is a harsh
15269 scripture, the New Testament is the love scripture;”
15270 “under the law everything was cruel, under the
15271 grace there is love”, etc., blah, blah, blah...

15272 **I would like to know if, in the sects or religious**
15273 **organizations to which these charlatans belong,**
15274 **this loving law of the Old Testament is emulated.**

15275 Under “the law”, under the “an eye for an eye”,
15276 under the “harshness”, they dedicated 33% of the
15277 funds that the religion managed, to charity work.
15278 My question is, and now, “under the grace”, “under
15279 the law of love”, in organizations where the prime
15280 directive is “I want mercy, not sacrifice”, etc., what
15281 percentage of the income is directly dedicated to
15282 **charity, in other words, to love?** Anyone, whose
15283 organization or church has dedicated at least 33% of
15284 its income to charity, let him cast the first stone!

15285 Perhaps this reasoning is good to stop the wordy
15286 ego of many fools. See also in Dt 15:7-8 the
15287 charitable inclination of the Old Testament.

15288
15289 *“⁷ If there be among you a poor man of one*
15290 *of thy brethren within any of thy gates in thy*
15291 *land which the LORD thy God giveth thee,*
15292 ***thou shalt not harden thine heart, nor shut***
15293 ***thine hand from thy poor brother;** ⁸ but thou*
15294 *shalt open thine hand wide unto him, and*
15295 *shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need, in*
15296 *that which he wanteth”.* (Dt 15:7-8)

15297
15298 **Something similar happens with the rejection**
15299 **of God’s law.** All these Neo-Testamentarians (those

15300 who believe that the Old Testament is obsolete and
15301 we only have to follow the New Testament,) those
15302 who reject God's law, admit **the precept of tithing**
15303 **as good, which does not appear anywhere in the**
15304 **New Testament**. All these neo-testamentarian sects
15305 accept and recognize that part of the law that
15306 mention tithing; apparently, the only one that they
15307 consider is not obsolete, the only law that to them,
15308 is still valid.

15309 **But the discordance in their belief system is not**
15310 **only in such admission. There is still discordance**
15311 **in the way they admit such exception.** Not only do
15312 they take into their bosom the tithing law, **which is**
15313 **not a New Testament law**, rather it is an Old
15314 Testament law, but by doing so they do not accept it
15315 as God established it, since **they do not encourage**
15316 **their followers to take one third of the tithe and**
15317 **use it for charity**, as established in the passages we
15318 have read. They don't go that far in admitting God's
15319 law, which would be "heresy" for them; that would
15320 be to be under the law and not under the grace.
15321 Therefore... "let us recognize the tithing, yes; but let
15322 us reject that every giver ought to use 33% for
15323 charity work on his own; that is obsolete".

15324 There are those who, in order to get away from
15325 the entire issue, come up with the euphemism that
15326 his sect does not ask for the tithe, rather more,
15327 because the Christian ought to give more than the
15328 ten percent; (pretty clever, eh!) But that drives me
15329 to ask if he believes that under the law of love, his
15330 sect should not dedicate to charity **more** than 33%,
15331 and not the same was given under the "harshness"
15332 of the law, since they ask for **more than the tithe**.

15333 **I am not condemning the sects for receiving the**
15334 **tithe from the churchgoers, something which I**
15335 **believe in**, but I am bringing into evidence the lack

15336 of concordance of their beliefs and words on one
15337 hand, and their actions on the other. What I am
15338 trying to show is the compartmented mind they
15339 have; how in their pigeonholed mind they have a
15340 concept or idea box B-4 and an antagonistic idea or
15341 concept in D-8, without realizing such a thing.

15342 I am not trying to be annoying either with my
15343 words (although I know that what I say annoys) to
15344 those who believe the opposite thesis, or who
15345 belong to sects that sustain the opposite thesis.
15346 What I am trying to do, through this technique of
15347 showing internal discordances of the belief system
15348 of the anti-law doctrine is that **the law is still good**
15349 **for that for which it always was:** to know right
15350 from wrong, to establish our beliefs and behavior on
15351 a solid foundation, not on tradition and whims.

15352 About those “smarties” who say that Christians
15353 ought to give the **tithe and more**, I would
15354 encourage them to read Dt 4:1-2; 12:32; Prv 30:5-6
15355 and Rev 22:18-19, where it says that God’s
15356 commandments should not be altered.

15357 *

15358

15359

15360 **Summary of chapter 17.** There are those who
15361 seem to think that God was “harsh” and Jesus was
15362 merciful. They don’t realize that Jesus Christ
15363 always did the Father’s will and therefore, what is
15364 preached in the Old Testament and what is preached
15365 in the New Testament is God’s will.

15366 Not only that, but we also see that the Old
15367 Testament legislated in favor of mercy, love,
15368 compassion, etc., which allows to see that these
15369 things were not “invented” for the first time in the
15370 New Testament. We saw the charity towards the

15371 poor and the foreigner, toward the worker in the law
15372 about not keeping his salary, etc..

15373 Some brothers believe that the Old Testament
15374 taught hate and “harshness” because in order to
15375 think that they followed only what is said in Mt
15376 5:38 and 43, without reading the Old Testament,
15377 where we see that **those “commandments” did not**
15378 **exist**, they were only sayings of old, not God’s
15379 laws, and that is why Jesus reprimands them in that
15380 passage.

15381 In the Old Testament is established the right to
15382 exile, respect for the elderly, charity toward the
15383 orphan and the widow, and it even legislates that a
15384 hungry person could go into someone else’s field
15385 and eat. Another commandment ordered to leave
15386 some leftovers behind for the poor to gather, such
15387 measure benefited Ruth and Naomi.

15388 **An eye for an eye was a ruling for the judges,**
15389 when there was not a specific law for the crime they
15390 were judging, in other words, **it was not a license**
15391 **for the believers** to hate, as many believe.

15392 We even saw that, according to the law, one third
15393 of the tithes collected were given to the poor,
15394 something that the churches do not do today.
15395 Therefore, it is not fair for the churches to say that
15396 the Old Testament was “rash” and unmerciful.

15397
15398 ***
15399
15400
15401
15402
15403
15404
15405
15406

15407

15408

15409

15410

15411

15412

15413

15414

15415

15416

15417

15418

15419

15420

15421

15422

15423

15424

15425

15426

15427

15428

15429

15430

15431

15432

15433

15434

15435

15436

15437

15438

15439

15440

15441

Chapter 18

Advise and suggestions for those who wish to obey God's law

God's laws were made to be obeyed

Remember that Jesus said: "If you love me, keep my commandments". Do you believe that the Lord was referring to certain of his own particular commandments, opposite to those of his Father God? **No, his commandments are the same as his Father's.** That is clearly evident in the Lord's Prayer, and in the Garden of Gethsemane. In both cases Jesus was yielding to his Father's will. Did he not say that he always did his Father's will? Therefore, if we want to be in good terms with Jesus Christ and his commandments, we have to be in good terms with God and his commandments.

To break God's laws is to sin, as said by John, in I Jn 3:4. **God loved us even when we were sinners, but precisely because he loves us, he does not want us to continue being sinners.** That is why he teaches us the divine laws, so that as we obey them by God's grace, we no longer be sinners. If we are not strong enough to leave the lust that drags us to sin, we have Jesus Christ, who gives us the strength, because I can do all things in Christ who strengthens me, as Paul said. But God does not force our will; if we don't want to stop sinning, He does not force us.

There is no justification to continue sinning once we are saved, once we have known God, his omnipotence, his kindness, and his Christ.

15442 Not obeying God's commandments once we
15443 know him, is to him more insulting than not
15444 obeying them when we were unbelievers. Not
15445 inquiring about God's commands is to reject them,
15446 or at least treat him with contempt.

15447 *

15448

15449

15450 **How to know which commandments are valid**
15451 **and which are obsolete**

15452 First of all, the way of obeying God's
15453 commandments is not the one established by the
15454 Pharisees and Sadducees, because they were
15455 hypocrites who distorted the divine commands to
15456 the point of making them unrecognizable, heavy,
15457 and impossible to obey. The character of the
15458 Pharisees and Sadducees is perfectly noticeable in
15459 the Lord's description of them in Mt 23:1-33. If you
15460 want to know more about what our Lord Jesus
15461 Christ thought about the Pharisees and Sadducees,
15462 see "**Appendix C**", page 455.

15463 Jesus tells us the complete opposite to what the
15464 Pharisees did with the divine commandments.
15465 Pharisees made God's laws observance something
15466 distasteful; on the other hand Jesus teaches us that
15467 his yoke is easy, and his burden light. John also says
15468 that God's commandments are not burdensome.

15469

15470 "*For my yoke is easy, and my burden is*
15471 *light*". (Mt 11:30)

15472

15473 "*For this is the love of God, that we keep his*
15474 *commandments: and his commandments are*
15475 *not grievous*". (I Jn 5:3)

15476

15477 All this states clearly that God's commandments
15478 are not something impossible to bear; on the
15479 contrary, once we have learned to obey them, it is
15480 easy and light.

15481 **The solution to the matter is knowing which**
15482 **commandments refer to rituals and ceremonies,**
15483 which are obsolete, and which refer to human
15484 behavior, which are still valid and will be as long as
15485 heaven and Earth exist.

15486 **Circumcision, sacrifices, and Temple**
15487 **ceremonies, Passover,** which had to be observed in
15488 Jerusalem, the annual feasts, which also had to be
15489 celebrated in Jerusalem, all of these have been
15490 abolished, since they referred to the first coming of
15491 our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore are obsolete.

15492 Not only through reasoning can we realize that
15493 Passover was a ritual, but it is so declared when
15494 established. We clearly see that Passover was
15495 considered a ritual through these two verses I am
15496 about to present. Verse 25 says, "You will keep this
15497 **service**", and in verse 26 it says, "When your
15498 children tell you, 'what is this **service** you are
15499 doing?'" So we see that in both verses the Passover
15500 celebration is classified as a ritual. In Reina-Valera
15501 version it is used the word "ritual" instead of
15502 "service".

15503
15504 *"²⁵ And it shall come to pass, when ye be*
15505 *come to the land which the LORD will give*
15506 *you, according as he hath promised, **that ye***
15507 ***shall keep this service.** ²⁶ And it shall come*
15508 *to pass, when your children shall say unto*
15509 *you: **What mean ye by this service?"***

15510 (Ex 12:25-26)

15511

15512 We must consider something else in qualifying
15513 Passover as a ritual; that is the fact that, as it says in
15514 Ex 12:44 and 48, if a Gentile wanted to celebrate
15515 Passover, he had to circumcise himself, and without
15516 a doubt, circumcision was a ritual.

15517
15518 *“But every man's servant that is bought for*
15519 *money, **when thou hast circumcised him,***
15520 ***then shall he eat thereof”.** (Ex 12:44)*

15521
15522 *“And when a stranger shall sojourn with*
15523 *thee, and will keep the Passover to the LORD,*
15524 ***let all his males be circumcised, and then let***
15525 ***him come near and keep it; and he shall be***
15526 ***as one that is born in the land; for no***
15527 ***uncircumcised person shall eat thereof”.***
15528 (Ex 12:48)

15529
15530 However, the behavioral laws, those that refer to
15531 how a human being is to react to life, are still valid,
15532 for as our Lord said, he did not come to abolish the
15533 law.

15534
15535 *“¹⁷ **Think not that I am come to destroy the***
15536 ***law, or the prophets; I am not come to***
15537 ***destroy, but to fulfil.** ¹⁸ **For verily I say unto***
15538 ***you, Till Heaven and Earth pass, one jot or***
15539 ***one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,***
15540 ***till all be fulfilled.** ¹⁹ **Whosoever therefore***
15541 ***shall break one of these least commandments,***
15542 ***and shall teach men so, he shall be called the***
15543 ***least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever***
15544 ***shall do and teach them, the same shall be***
15545 ***called great in the kingdom of heaven”.***
15546 (Mt 5:17-19)

15547 *

15548

15549

15550

How to obey God's laws

15551

15552

15553

15554

15555

15556

15557

15558

15559

15560

15561

15562

15563

15564

15565

15566

15567

15568

15569

15570

15571

15572

15573

15574

15575

15576

15577

15578

15579

15580

15581

15582

15583

We have been saved from the moment in which we accepted Jesus' sacrifice. Therefore, we do not keep the law **in order to be** saved; we keep it because, after we were saved we saw the importance that God assigns to keeping his commandments. If God made such great sacrifice when he gave his only begotten son, for our salvation, are we going to continue sinning and making our Father God suffer? Are we going to be so ungrateful that we are going to despise Him by treating his commandments with contempt?

Who is he that wants us to **not** keep God's commandments and continue sinning? Are we going to satisfy that filthy degenerate more than our Holy Father God?

The apostle Paul says that God gives us help when we are tempted, of course, if we want to be helped.

"There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it". (I Co 10:13)

Therefore, with God's help through the blood of Jesus Christ, God's laws can be obeyed.

Now, as it is always with everything of God, we cannot be arrogant of what we have obeyed with God's help, but just take it as something natural that we are asked to do, not as something by which we have placed ourselves in a higher category as the

15584 rest of the brothers. Remember what the Lord Jesus
15585 Christ had to say in that regard.

15586

15587 *“So likewise ye, when ye shall have done **all***
15588 *those things which are commanded you, say:*
15589 ***We are unprofitable servants; we have done***
15590 ***that which was our duty to do”.***

15591

(Lk 17:10)

15592

15593 That is to say, the only thing I have done is
15594 what was required from me, nothing else.

15595

*

15596

15597

15598 **Summary of chapter 18.** God’s laws are to be
15599 obeyed, no talked about to no end about them.
15600 There is no justification for not knowing God’s laws
15601 for human behavior, or to disobey them once we
15602 know them.

15603

15604 **In order to know which of God’s laws we must**
15605 **obey, we just need to know which ones referred**
15606 **to rituals and ceremonies, and which ones are**
15607 **about people’s behavior.** Circumcision, Passover,
15608 sacrifices, feasts to be celebrated in Jerusalem, were
15609 all ritual laws. The Ten Commandments and the rest
15610 of the behavioral laws are to be obeyed.

15611

15612 God’s laws can be obeyed because the blood of
15613 Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin, and because
15614 God gives us the way out when we are tempted.
15615 Now, after God helps us obey them, let’s not brag
15616 or show off as if we were much better than the rest.

15617

15618

15619

15620

15621

15620

15621

15622

15623

15624

15625

15626

15627

15628

15629

15630

15631

15632

15633

15634

15635

15636

15637

15638

15639

15640

15641

15642

15643

15644

15645

15646

15647

15648

15649

15650

15651

15652

15653

15654

Appendix “A”

Entering the Holy of Holies, supplement

“In addition to the other passages I showed in the first example, in chapter 8 of this book, if we go to Lev 4:3-7 (especially seven) and 4:13-18, (especially eighteen), we see that when a priest sinned, or if the entire assembly sinned, the sacrifice and the ceremony had to be done implied entering the Holy of Holies and put the blood of the sacrifice in the horns of the altar of sweet incense. Let us see what the first passage says:

“³ If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people; then let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned....⁷ And the priest shall put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the LORD, which is in the tabernacle of the congregation...”.

(Lev 4:3-7 abbreviated)

The second passage says:

“¹³ And if the whole congregation of Israel sin through ignorance,¹⁸ And he shall put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar which is before the LORD, that is in the tabernacle of the congregation,...”.

(Lev 4:13-18 abbreviated)

As we can see, there are several passages where we can prove that **they went into the Holy of Holies often**. The only thing that is still true is that

15655 in order to purge the sins that the people committed
15656 during the year, in the ceremony that symbolized
15657 the sacrifice of Christ, only the high priest entered
15658 with blood, **and this was done only once a year.**
15659 However, as we already saw, there were other
15660 ceremonies that required the priests to enter the
15661 Holy of Holies.

15662 **If we go to the New Testament** we will see in Lk
15663 1:8-9 that **Zachariah, who was not the high**
15664 **priest,** was given by lots the task of **putting the**
15665 **incense.** The incense was placed in the altar which
15666 was in the Holy of Holies. If Zachariah put it
15667 without being the High Priest, that shows that **there**
15668 **was daily entrance in the Holy of Holies, and**
15669 **that not only the high priest had access to it, but**
15670 **any other priest.** What only the high priest could
15671 do, was to enter with the blood of atonement for the
15672 people and the sanctuary, but for other ceremonies,
15673 other priests could enter, and this often, not just
15674 once a year.

15675 Besides, according to the Bible itself we see that
15676 **the Tabernacle of Testimony was taken apart**
15677 **every time that the Jews had to move camp,** and
15678 therefore young men had to come in, take it apart,
15679 and carry it.

15680 It is not logical to think that Aaron, who by then
15681 was more than 83 years old, would be the only one
15682 that could take apart and reassemble the Holy of
15683 Holies.

15684 **As we can see, what Paul says, if it goes against**
15685 **the rest of the Bible,** or what any other Bible writer
15686 says, has to be analyzed in the light of the rest of
15687 Scripture and common sense; we shouldn't believe
15688 that Paul is the Pope that modifies everything and
15689 authorizes everything.

15690 In this issue of entering the Holy of Holies, many
15691 believe erroneously that Paul said that only the high
15692 priest could enter, and that, only once a year. Just as
15693 well many also believe that Paul abolished God's
15694 laws for human behavior, but they are wrong,
15695 because Paul never did such a thing.

15696 ***
15697
15698
15699
15700
15701

15702 Appendix "B"

15703 Paul's speaking style, supplement

15704

15705 He was not perfect, but he was perfect

15706 I have previously said that Paul, perhaps due to
15707 his extraordinary intelligence and knowledge, often
15708 spoke in a highly philosophical and hyperbolic
15709 manner. Therefore, his statements have to be
15710 interpreted keeping in mind not only these
15711 peculiarities of his, but also what he is trying to say,
15712 what he wants to emphasize. In this verse we will
15713 see next, **we could understand from his statement**
15714 **that he considered himself to be perfect**, and that
15715 he also considered others that talked to him as
15716 perfect. This comes from the fact that he used the
15717 phrase "**we speak**", considering himself as one of
15718 those speaking, to later allege such conversation is
15719 taking place among those who are "**perfect**".

15720
15721 *"Howbeit we speak wisdom among them*
15722 *that are perfect, yet not the wisdom of this*
15723 *world, nor of the princes of this world, that*
15724 *come to nought" (I Co 2:6)*

15725

15726

15727

15728

15729

15730

15731

15732

15733

15734

15735

15736

15737

15738

15739

15740

15741

15742

15743

15744

15745

15746

15747

15748

15749

15750

15751

15752

15753

15754

15755

15756

15757

15758

15759

After considering himself as perfect in First Corinthians, we see that in **Philippians 3:12 he says the opposite, he says he has not yet reached perfection.** So, when is he telling the truth? I think **he did in both occasions;** what happens is that we need to understand what he is talking about when he talks about perfection.

One may say that Mr. So-and-So is perfect, because we are talking about who can be trusted with a certain task. In this case, to say that he is perfect does not mean that Mr. So-and-So has no fault in his life. It only means that, for the task at hand, this is the man most suited for the job. It doesn't even mean he is the most adequate in the world for the job, just the best that we can find or can contract. The same way we can interpret in everyday language these hyperboles, we have to try to understand Paul, who speaks in a manner that can be confusing at times for the superficial reader.

“Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus”.

(Phil 3:12)

In this same chapter of Philippians, three verses later, we see Paul again contradict himself (apparently) from the previous statement and repeat the first. We see him assure us that both he and those to whom he is sending the letter, are perfect, something he denied three verses before. Let's see.

15760 *“Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be*
15761 *thus minded; and if in any thing ye be*
15762 *otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this*
15763 *unto you”.* (Phil 3:15)

15764

15765 As we can see, we can’t just fabricate a solid
15766 Christian doctrine from one statement that we have
15767 read in one of Paul’s letter, if that affirmation is
15768 contrary to what has been said in other passages, by
15769 the prophets, by other apostles, by Paul himself, or
15770 by our Lord Jesus Christ, as in the case of Mat 5:17-
15771 19.

15772 **Most probably, when Paul said he was not**
15773 **perfect,** he is referring to, for example, in
15774 comparison with Job; when he says that he and
15775 those he is speaking with are perfect, he is referring
15776 to having reached an acceptable degree of purity
15777 and holiness.

15778

*

15779

15780

15781 **He who knows doesn’t know**

15782 We see again Paul’s peculiar speaking style,
15783 which confuses many people, in the following
15784 verse.

15785

15786 *“And if any man think that he knoweth any*
15787 *thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to*
15788 *know”.* (I Co 8:12)

15789

15790 In a rhetorical and hyperbolic manner, what Paul
15791 says is acceptable, but if we take it, merely on the
15792 grammatical meaning of the words, it is a blunder.
15793 He is saying here that anyone who thinks he is a
15794 know-it-all, has not yet reached the humility that a
15795 Christian must have. **Grammatically speaking,**

15796 **that is not what he is saying**, but in the context of
15797 the discourse one realizes what that figure of speech
15798 means.

15799 On the contrary, if we are going to stick to the
15800 grammatical meaning of the sentence, and not its
15801 rhetorical meaning, we have an absurdity, because
15802 then **he would be saying that he that thinks he**
15803 **knows something, it means he really doesn't**. In
15804 other words, if you ask a mechanic if he knows
15805 about mechanics, and he answers yes, then we have
15806 to assume that in reality he know nothing about
15807 mechanics. If we ask a doctor if knows about
15808 medicine and he said, yes, we would have to come
15809 to the conclusion that according to Paul, he knows
15810 nothing about medicine, because if any man think
15811 that he knows any thing, he knows nothing.

15812 **Something similar would happen if we ask a**
15813 **Christian if he knows how we get salvation**. If he
15814 said he knows, we would have to say that he really
15815 does not know how to get saved, and therefore, he is
15816 a false Christian.

15817 As you can see, Paul's speaking style is very
15818 philosophical and full of hyperboles and figures of
15819 speech, which is why it is sensible to try to
15820 understand what he means, when we can't make
15821 logical sense of his phrasing; or when it seems that
15822 what he says is contradictory to what is said in other
15823 parts of the Bible by other apostles, prophets and by
15824 Jesus Christ himself, as it is the case in the
15825 supposed abolition of God's law on the part of Paul.

15826 *

15827
15828
15829
15830

15831 **Let's not send our kids to college, because this is**
15832 **foolishness**

15833 Here is another good example of how we have to
15834 be careful when we make a doctrine strictly out of
15835 Paul's words only.

15836
15837 *“¹⁸ Let no man deceive himself. If any man*
15838 *among you seemeth to be wise in this world,*
15839 *let him become a fool, that he may be wise. ¹⁹*
15840 *For the wisdom of this world is foolishness*
15841 *with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise*
15842 *in their own craftiness”.* (I Co 3:18-19)

15843
15844 If we were to take what Paul said without
15845 analyzing it, we would have to come to the
15846 conclusion that the more ignorant one is, the wiser
15847 one becomes before God. In this case, in order for
15848 our children to be acceptable and wise, **we should**
15849 **not send them to college, because the knowledge**
15850 **of this world is foolishness for God.** That would
15851 be the foolishness we would reach if we took Paul's
15852 words as the only light for our faith. That is what
15853 the Christians who consider God's law obsolete do.

15854 *

15855

15856

15857 **God's weakness, according to Paul**

15858 Paul used many rhetorical and impressive
15859 hyperboles that, even when they were good to instill
15860 up the concepts that he taught, they also confused
15861 the inconsistent and unlearned, as Peter says in II
15862 Pet 3:15-16. If we were to take Paul's hyperboles
15863 and philosophical examples as real doctrine, we
15864 would have to think that God lacks sense and is
15865 weak, which is blasphemy.

15866

15867 *“Because **the foolishness of God** is wiser*
15868 *than men; and **the weakness of God** is*
15869 *stronger than men”.* (I Co 1:25)

15870

15871 It is because of that type of rhetorical statements,
15872 that type of hyperboles, which Paul has been so
15873 misunderstood always, to the point that they ascribe
15874 to him the abolishing of God’s laws for human
15875 behavior, something he never did.

15876

*

15877

15878

15879 **Nothing is unclean, but yes some are**

15880 Remember that Paul uses hyperboles to
15881 emphasize a certain doctrinal point, but that does
15882 not mean that in fact the hyperbole is true. That is
15883 why sometimes, to the superficial reader, it looks as
15884 if Paul contradicts himself. In Rom 14:14 **he used**
15885 **one of those hyperboles when he said that there**
15886 **was nothing unclean of itself.** However, in this
15887 next verse he says that children born out of mixed
15888 marriages between Christians and non-Christians
15889 could be unclean, given certain circumstances. So
15890 therefore, there are things that are unclean.

15891

15892 *“**I know, and am persuaded by the Lord***
15893 ***Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself;***
15894 *but to him that esteemeth any thing to be*
15895 *unclean, to him it is unclean”.* (Ro 14:14)

15896

15897 *“For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by*
15898 *the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified*
15899 *by the husband; **else were your children***
15900 ***unclean;** but now are they holy”.*

15901

(I Co 7:14)

15902

15903 As we can see, Paul had a speaking style that
15904 confused the superficial reader. This is the type of
15905 statement that is used by those who consider, **by**
15906 **order of Paul himself**, God's laws for human
15907 behavior abolished.

15908 *

15909
15910
15911 **Is Paul of the opinion that if we lust after**
15912 **something it is because we do not belong to**
15913 **Christ?**

15914 Paul says here that those who belong to Christ
15915 have crucified the flesh and all its lusts. In my
15916 perception what he is trying to say is that such is the
15917 attitude we must have, not that we have already
15918 done it necessarily. My basis for thinking that way
15919 is that if this is exactly what he wanted to say, **then**
15920 **every Christian who is struggling with some kind**
15921 **of lust, would not belong to Christ**, because he has
15922 not crucified it yet. That is what we would have to
15923 believe if we were to take this verse as the only
15924 truth, and didn't try to harmonize it with what the
15925 rest of the Bible says, and the rest of the apostles, or
15926 even Jesus Christ himself.

15927
15928 *"And they that are Christ's have crucified*
15929 *the flesh with the affections and lusts".*
15930 (Ga 5:24)

15931
15932 As we can see, the words of the Great Apostle to
15933 the Gentiles have to be taken very carefully.
15934 Especially when what Paul says seems to contradict
15935 what God, Christ, the Holy Spirit and the other
15936 apostles and prophets have written in the Bible.

15937 **The Holy Spirit inspired all the Bible writers,**
15938 **so it is not logical to think that he said one thing**

15939 **to some, and just the opposite to others.**
15940 Therefore, let's consider carefully when we think
15941 that Saint Paul is abolishing God's laws for human
15942 behavior.

15943 *

15944
15945

15946 **Paul's speech is rather confusing, let's see other**
15947 **examples**

15948 This apostle, especially in the letter to Romans,
15949 talks in a way that seems contradictory. The
15950 problem is that he wrote in a highly philosophical
15951 and complex manner mostly due to his education
15952 and knowledge, and he uses a very personal
15953 nomenclature. If the reader does not catch the
15954 personal or figurative meaning Paul gives to the
15955 phrases, he can get confused.

15956 Let us first read Rom 7:5-6, and then we will
15957 comment on it, as someone who does not believe
15958 that this great apostle wrote in the rhetorical and
15959 philosophical manner that he does, but rather as if
15960 we believed that Paul uses words in their strict
15961 sense.

15962

15963 ***“⁵ For when we were in the flesh (*a), the***
15964 ***motions of sins, which were by the law (*b),***
15965 ***did work in our members to bring forth fruit***
15966 ***unto death. ⁶ But now we are delivered from***
15967 ***the law (*c), that being dead wherein we were***
15968 ***held; that we should serve in newness of***
15969 ***spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter”.***

15970 (Ro 7:5-6)

15971

15972 **Let's see now which would be the thoughts that**
15973 **could come to the mind of a reader** that does not
15974 know who Paul was, how he spoke, his use of

15975 hyperboles (rhetorical exaggerations) and figures of
15976 speech.

15977

15978 (*a) Verse 5: “*For when we were in the flesh....*”.
15979 What? Were not Paul and the others in the flesh
15980 when he wrote these things? Were they only spirit,
15981 no flesh and bones?

15982

15983 (*b) “*...the motions of sins, which were by the*
15984 *law....*”. What? Are there sins that come because of
15985 God’s law? Does not Paul say in verse 12 that the
15986 law is good, just, and holy? How can a good
15987 Christian say that sins come because of God’s law?

15988

15989 (*c) Verse 6: “*But now we are delivered from the*
15990 *law...*”. Really? Is society its own referee? Does the
15991 church support the idea that each citizen can do as
15992 he pleases?

15993

15994 “⁷ What shall we say then? Is the law sin?
15995 God forbid. Nay, **I had not known sin, but by**
15996 **the law** (*d); for I had not known lust, except
15997 the law had said: Thou shalt not covet. ⁸ But
15998 sin, taking occasion by the commandment,
15999 wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.
16000 **For without the law sin was dead.** (*e) ⁹ For
16001 I was alive without the law once, **but when**
16002 **the commandment came, sin revived, and I**
16003 **died.** (*f) ¹⁰ And the commandment, which
16004 was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.
16005 ¹¹ ***For sin, taking occasion by the***
16006 ***commandment, deceived me*** (*g) and by it
16007 slew me. ¹² Wherefore the law is holy, and the
16008 commandment holy, and just, and good. ¹³
16009 Was then that which is good made death unto
16010 me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear

16011 *sin, working death in me by that which is*
16012 *good; that sin by the commandment might*
16013 *become exceeding sinful” (Ro 7:7-13)*
16014

16015 (*d) Verse 7: “....*I had not known sin, but by the*
16016 *law....*”. So if we don’t know the law we don’t
16017 know sin? Well, you see, what you are now saying
16018 goes against what you said a little while ago in Rom
16019 1:19-21 and 2:14-15. Which statement is true? And
16020 if what you now say is true, I am going to tell all my
16021 friends not to read the Bible so they don’t know the
16022 law and therefore don’t have sin.

16023

16024 (*e) Verse 8: “....*without the law sin was dead...*”.
16025 So, how come in the times of Abraham, Abimelech,
16026 Pharaoh, etc., in Genesis, even though Moses had
16027 not given the law, there was still sin? I can’t believe
16028 what you are telling me.

16029

16030 (*f) Verse 9: “....*but when the commandment came,*
16031 *sin revived, and I died*”. And before the
16032 commandment came through Moses, wasn’t it the
16033 same, or did those people not sin? What you want
16034 to tell me is that it is because of God’s
16035 commandment that sin lives again? Then, how
16036 come you say that the commandment is good? I
16037 don’t understand, you are contradicting yourself too
16038 often.

16039

16040 (*g) Verse 11: “....*For sin, taking occasion by the*
16041 *commandment, deceived me*” Then, when there was
16042 no commandment, or those who still don’t have the
16043 commandment, can’t they be deceived by sin? If
16044 that is true, it would be best that no one knows the
16045 commandment, so he can’t be deceived.

16046

16047 “¹⁴ For we know that the law is spiritual: but
16048 I am carnal, sold under sin. ¹⁵ For that which
16049 I do I allow not (*h) for what I would, that
16050 do I not; but what I hate, that do I. (*i) ¹⁶ If
16051 then I do that which I would not, I consent
16052 unto the law that it is good. ¹⁷ Now then it is
16053 no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in
16054 me. ¹⁸ For I know that in me, that is, in my
16055 flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is
16056 present with me; but how to perform that
16057 which is good I find not. ¹⁹ For the good that
16058 I would I do not: but the evil which I would
16059 not, that I do. ²⁰ Now if I do that I would not,
16060 it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth
16061 in me. ²¹ I find then a law, that, when I
16062 would do good, evil is present with me (*j).
16063 ²² For I delight in the law of God after the
16064 inward man: ²³ But I see another law in my
16065 members (*k), warring against the law of my
16066 mind, and bringing me into captivity to the
16067 law of sin which is in my members. ²⁴ O
16068 wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me
16069 from the body of this death? ²⁵ I thank God
16070 through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with
16071 the mind I myself serve the law of God; but
16072 with the flesh the law of sin. (*l)”
16073 (Ro 7:14-25)

16074
16075 (*h) Verse 15: “...For that which I do I allow not”
16076 Really? Why then should I continue reading? I
16077 came to you because I thought you were well
16078 guided and could guide me. But if what you do you
16079 can’t understand, how can you help me?

16080
16081 (*i) “.....what I would, that do I not; but what I hate,
16082 that do I..”. Does that mean that what Paul did,

16083 preached, etc., is what he did not like doing, and he
16084 hated it all?

16085

16086 (*j) Verse 21: “.....*I find then a law, that, when I*
16087 *would do good, evil is present with me.* Is that a
16088 law? Don’t they say that the law is that of the Old
16089 Testament?

16090

16091 (*k) Verse 23: “.....*I see another law in my*
16092 *members....*”. Ah, but, is there another law? How
16093 can there be a law inside the members of someone’s
16094 body?

16095

16096 (*l) Verse 25: “.....*but with the flesh the law of*
16097 *sin....*”. I did not even know there was a law of sin!

16098

16099 Evidently, if we take every one of Paul’s words in
16100 the strictest form and his phrases with the meaning
16101 we would normally give them, the result is a
16102 chaotic, senseless discourse, with blazing
16103 contradictions. On the other hand, trying to interpret
16104 and explain what he meant may result a little daring,
16105 and even dangerous, because the Bible should not
16106 be altered. If I were to paraphrase this passage, it
16107 would be as follows:

16108

16109 “5-As long as our loved things and wishes
16110 were of the flesh, the sins the law denounced
16111 was what we did. 6-But now, having been
16112 united to Christ, the law cannot demand from
16113 us, as a condition for salvation, that we earn it
16114 through its letter and its rituals, but in the
16115 newness of the Spirit that is received when we
16116 believe.

16117 7-The law is not sin, don’t think it so, it
16118 simply says what is a sin for us. 8-You know

16119 that according to the Roman law, where there
 16120 is no law there is no crime, that is why since
 16121 there was a law given by Moses, sin grew. 9-
 16122 For without the law I could have alleged
 16123 “chicanerily” that there was no sin, but once
 16124 the law came, I did not even have that
 16125 chicanery defense. 10-So the commandment
 16126 that was given to us so we could live by
 16127 obeying it, what it really did was to hurt us
 16128 sinners by not leaving us a legal escape, 11-
 16129 because sin took advantage of it and made me
 16130 guilty.
 16131 12-The law and the commandments are holy,
 16132 just, and good. 13-What happens is that if
 16133 before the legislation, evil was bad, after the
 16134 legislation came, evil is even worse. 14-The
 16135 law is spiritual, but I, in the flesh, cannot obey
 16136 it without Christ; therefore I find myself,
 16137 much to my dismay, enslaved to sin. 15-
 16138 Should I demonstrate that I (and every other
 16139 sinner) am enslaved to sin? Well, the things I
 16140 found myself thinking or doing, I don’t
 16141 understand why I did them or thought them,
 16142 because in reality, I would have never wanted
 16143 to think them or do them. However, what I
 16144 really would have wanted to do or think, I did
 16145 not do or think, hence I did that which I hate.
 16146 16-That shows you that if, when I sin, I do
 16147 what I don’t wish to do; it is because
 16148 internally I can recognize that the law is good.
 16149 17-So if we are going to analyze deeply this
 16150 phenomenon, we can conclude that it was not
 16151 “I” who committed those sins, but the satanic
 16152 influence that lives in our flesh, and from
 16153 which we did not yet know how to be free
 16154 through Christ.

16155 18-I realized that good did not live in my
16156 flesh, because I saw that my soul wanted to
16157 do good, but could not, without Christ's help.
16158 19-Because, repeating what I already said, I
16159 did not do the good that my soul desired. 20-
16160 And if I did what my soul did not want to do,
16161 without a doubt it was not my soul, but my
16162 flesh that was at work. 21-So, even when I
16163 desperately wanted to do good, I found
16164 myself facing the phenomenon that evil lives
16165 in my flesh. 22- I say this because in my soul
16166 I take pleasure in God's law, 23-but in my
16167 flesh there is an evil tendency to rebel against
16168 that law that my soul loves. This tendency
16169 enslaves me to my flesh. 24-Oh, this tragedy
16170 of mine! Who can free me from this enslaving
16171 and mortal tendency?

16172 25-Well, this question of "who will free me",
16173 is a figure of speech, because, thanks be to
16174 God for Jesus Christ who does free me. I
16175 know that with our minds we have no
16176 problems, we serve God's law with our
16177 minds, but unfortunately, our flesh wants to
16178 drive us out of the path".

16179
16180 **I don't know if this paraphrase is totally**
16181 **correct,** but I figure that in general terms that is
16182 what our beloved brother, Paul meant to say. As we
16183 can see, **it is not easy to be coming to absolute**
16184 **doctrinal conclusions from such obscure**
16185 **passages** of Paul, especially if, at first sight, what
16186 he is saying seems to contradict himself or other
16187 parts of the Bible.

16188
16189
16190

16191
16192
16193
16194
16195
16196

16197

Appendix “C”

16198

The Pharisees were not faithful keepers of God’s law as people think, supplement

16199

16200

16201

16202

16203

16204

16205

16206

16207

Many erroneously believe that the Pharisees put great effort in walking righteously in God’s path; they believe they were strict and honest keepers of God’s law. Even in their sermons and Sunday school classes they set them as examples, that if anyone could be saved through their works, it was the Pharisees.

16208

16209

16210

16211

16212

16213

16214

16215

16216

On the contrary, the Pharisees were hypocrites, who pretended to obey God’s law, but did not. The only law that they obeyed, and that out of social and political convenience, was the ceremonial law, and the tithing, because that was what gave them “political leverage” among the priesthood for their own personal advantage. That allowed them to put the priests, the Levites, judges, etc., on their side.

16217

16218

16219

16220

16221

16222

I am going to copy here almost all of Matthew 23, so you can see what the Pharisees really were; and that is not my personal opinion, but Jesus Christ’s, who knew them from the inside out. Note what I have bolded or underwritten so it will be easy to see

16223

16224

16225

Christ called them “hypocrites” seven times: in verse 2 he says that **they say but do not do**; in verse 4 he says that they bind heavy burdens and

16226 grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's
16227 shoulders but **do not lift them with a finger**; in
16228 verse 5 he tells them that everything they did in the
16229 religion was **to be seen by men**; in verse 13 he says
16230 that **the Pharisees will not come into the kingdom**
16231 **of God**; in verse 14 says they **stole and swindle the**
16232 **widows**; in verse 15 declares that the **Pharisees**
16233 **were sons of hell**; in verses 17, 19, and 24 he tells
16234 them they are **fools, blind and dumb**; in verse 25
16235 he says that **they are full of theft and**
16236 **unrighteousness**; in verse 28 he tells them they are
16237 full of **hypocrisy and iniquity**; and lastly, in verse
16238 33 he tells them that they are **serpents and a viper**
16239 **generation, and that they would not escape the**
16240 **judgment of hell**.

16241 Now, after reading the description that Christ
16242 himself makes of the Pharisees, can you even think
16243 that they were people that strictly kept God's law?
16244 Why then, do so many brothers want to make an
16245 example of the Pharisees as people who were
16246 righteous and strict followers of God's law? Why
16247 don't they mention Job, Moses, Samuel, Josiah,
16248 Daniel, the prophets, etc.? Let us now read Christ's
16249 personal testimony about who were the Pharisees.

16250
16251 *"¹ Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to*
16252 *his disciples, ² saying: The scribes and the*
16253 *Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. ³ All therefore*
16254 *whatsoever they bid you observe, that*
16255 *observe and do; but do not ye after their*
16256 *works, for they say, and do not. ⁴ For they*
16257 *bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne,*
16258 *and lay them on men's shoulders; but they*
16259 *themselves will not move them with one of*
16260 *their fingers. ⁵ But all their works they do for*
16261 *to be seen of men. They make broad their*

16262 *phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their*
 16263 *garments, 6 and love the uppermost rooms at*
 16264 *feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, 7*
 16265 *And greetings in the markets, and to be called*
 16266 *of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. 8 But be not ye called*
 16267 *Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ;*
 16268 *and all ye are brethren. 9 And call no man*
 16269 *your father upon the Earth, for one is your*
 16270 *Father, which is in Heaven. 10 Neither be ye*
 16271 *called masters, for one is your Master, even*
 16272 *Christ. 11 But he that is greatest among you*
 16273 *shall be your servant. 12 And whosoever shall*
 16274 *exalt himself shall be abased; and he that*
 16275 *shall humble himself shall be exalted.*
 16276 *13 But woe unto you, scribes and **Pharisees,***
 16277 ***hypocrites,** , for ye shut up the kingdom of*
 16278 ***heaven against men, for ye neither go in***
 16279 ***yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are***
 16280 ***entering to go in.***
 16281 *14 Woe unto you, scribes and **Pharisees,***
 16282 ***hypocrites, for ye devour widows' houses,***
 16283 ***and for a pretence make long prayer,***
 16284 ***therefore ye shall receive the greater***
 16285 ***damnation.***
 16286 *15 Woe unto you, scribes and **Pharisees,***
 16287 ***hypocrites, for ye compass sea and land to***
 16288 ***make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye***
 16289 ***make him twofold more the child of hell***
 16290 ***than yourselves.***
 16291 *16 Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say,*
 16292 *Whosoever shall swear by the Temple, it is*
 16293 *nothing, but whosoever shall swear by the*
 16294 *gold of the Temple, he is a debtor! 17 **Ye fools***
 16295 ***and blind;** for whether is greater, the gold, or*
 16296 *the Temple that sanctifieth the gold? 18 And,*
 16297 *Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is*

16298 *nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift*
 16299 *that is upon it, he is guilty.* 19 ***Ye fools and***
 16300 ***blind,*** *for whether is greater, the gift, or the*
 16301 *altar that sanctifieth the gift?* 20 *Whoso*
 16302 *therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth*
 16303 *by it, and by all things thereon.* 21 *And whoso*
 16304 *shall swear by the Temple, sweareth by it, and*
 16305 *by him that dwelleth therein.* 22 *And he that*
 16306 *shall swear by Heaven, sweareth by the*
 16307 *throne of God, and by him that sitteth*
 16308 *thereon.*
 16309 23 *Woe unto you, scribes and **Pharisees,***
 16310 ***hypocrites,** for ye pay tithe of mint and anise*
 16311 *and cummin, and **have omitted the weightier***
 16312 ***matters of the law: judgment, mercy, and***
 16313 ***faith;** these ought ye to have done, and not to*
 16314 *leave the other undone.* 24 ***Ye blind guides,***
 16315 ***which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.***
 16316 25 *Woe unto you, scribes and **Pharisees,***
 16317 ***hypocrites,** for ye make clean the outside of*
 16318 *the cup and of the platter, but **within they are***
 16319 ***full of extortion and excess.*** 26 ***Thou blind***
 16320 ***Pharisee,*** *cleanse first that which is within the*
 16321 *cup and platter, that the outside of them may*
 16322 *be clean also.*
 16323 27 *Woe unto you, scribes and **Pharisees,***
 16324 ***hypocrites,** for ye are like unto whited*
 16325 ***sepulchres,** which indeed appear beautiful*
 16326 *outward, but are within full of dead men's*
 16327 *bones, and of all uncleanness.* 28 ***Even so ye***
 16328 ***also outwardly appear righteous unto men,***
 16329 ***but within ye are full of hypocrisy and***
 16330 ***iniquity.***
 16331 29 *Woe unto you, scribes and **Pharisees,***
 16332 ***hypocrites,** because ye build the tombs of the*
 16333 *prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the*

16334 *righteous, 30 and say: If we had been in the*
16335 *days of our fathers, we would not have been*
16336 *partakers with them in the blood of the*
16337 *prophets. 31 Wherefore ye be witnesses unto*
16338 *yourselves, that ye are the children of them*
16339 *which killed the prophets. 32 Fill ye up then*
16340 *the measure of your fathers. 33 Ye serpents, ye*
16341 *generation of vipers, how can ye escape the*
16342 *damnation of hell?* (Mt 23:1-33)

16343
16344 As you can see in this passage we just read, **the**
16345 **Pharisees did not obey the law, they only “said”**
16346 **they did and pretended to do so,** while fabricating
16347 ridiculous and heavy doctrines, adding to what the
16348 Law said, and imposing new “interpretations” to
16349 what God had said. This way **they made it**
16350 **impossible to tell between the true laws and those**
16351 **fabricated by the Pharisees,** which in turn made it
16352 impossible to follow God’s laws.

16353 The only thing they followed strictly was tithing,
16354 in order to have the priesthood on their side for their
16355 traps and schemes. **They kept the exterior rituals**
16356 **to pretend religiosity, but did not obey the**
16357 **behavioral laws that God had established.** They
16358 had fabricated horribly twisted doctrines, based on
16359 twisted interpretations of God’s law.

16360 As we can see, some people’s beliefs about the
16361 Pharisees being perfect, and faithful to God’s law, is
16362 a completely erroneous belief **of those who have**
16363 **allowed themselves to be deceived by the modern**
16364 **Pharisees, instead of paying attention to the**
16365 **words of Christ.**

16366 ***
16367 **
16368 *