

a thesis  
concerning  
the Old Testament

examining a portion  
of the church of Christ hermeneutic:  
“The Old Testament has *no* authority for church practices”  
for consistent use of the Old Testament

Raymond Harris

2012

Dedicated to  
God the Father  
YHWH God  
God who is One

I count myself among the other servants who have been called by God,  
and that God has seemingly made me worthy to be a minister of the Gospel.

I offer this book at His glorious altar of righteousness.  
May this labor be judged worthy before him.

## Abbreviations

CENI represents the hermeneutic of: Command, Example, Necessary InfERENCE, to include Silence of the Scriptures, No Old Testament Authority, and Expediency.

OT Old Testament

NT New Testament

KJV King James Version

ASV American Standard Version

NIV New International Version

AD *Anno Domini*, Latin for “The year of our Lord”

## Scriptures Quotations

All Scripture quotations and references within the Thesis are King James Version, unless otherwise specified.

## Emphasis Mine

When quoting from the Bible, there are times that I want to bring the reader’s attention to a particular word or a particular phrase. In these instances, I show emphasis in one of the following ways:

- a. bold, italics, underline  
“...then shall the ***scriptures*** be fulfilled, that thus it must be?”
- b. bold, underline  
“...from a child thou hast known **the holy scriptures**...”
- c. underline  
“...king of Judah Jeroboam the son of Joash...”

When the reader comes across quoted Bible verses and sees words or phrases having only *italics*, this font format should be understood as being original to the King James Version, and/or other Bible translation(s).

## Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>My Love</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>My Lament</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>In My Defense</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>My Assessment of CENI</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>CENI Hermeneutic Defined</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>At Best, CENI is Problematic</i>	<i>13</i>
NT Identification	13
Biblical Pattern for Covenant	14
Where Does the NT Begin?	14
How Does the Bible Refer to Itself?	15
How Should the Law of Moses Be Interpreted?	16
Then, What about Sacrifices?	20
To What Extent Is the OT To Be Used?	20
<i>Demonstrating the Incoherency and Inconsistency of CENI</i>	<i>21</i>
CENI and Amos	22
CENI and Context	22
Amos in Context	24
CENI, Amos Conclusion	25
<i>Addressing Expediency</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Addressing the Authority of the Silence of the Scriptures</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Addressing the OT Having No Authority</i>	<i>28</i>
Learn from the OT	28
Proper Use of the OT	30
Rethinking Paul “Nailing” the OT to the Cross	30
What Is To Be Learned?	32
Some Final Thoughts About the OT	33
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>34</i>
A Contextual Hermeneutical Method	34
Context: the Original Languages and Jerusalem Culture	35
Context: the Theology of Covenant	36
Context: the Theology of Romans Eleven	36
Three Final Thoughts	36
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Endnotes</b>	<b>45</b>

## **Preface**

Words and how they are used within a language are vitally important. Oftentimes arguments arise simply because two parties are using the exact same word, but using different viable definitions of that word. As such, writing in order to make one's thoughts known and understandable is no easy task. The Scriptures attest that so much power resides in words, that words themselves can give life or take it.<sup>1</sup> Such power is found in the manner in which God created the world, "And God said".<sup>2</sup> By the power of words the world came to be, and the Hebrew writer confirms that by "the word of his power" all things are upheld.<sup>3</sup> Words are indeed powerful, and must be used with great care.

Knowing that my words are being placed in a document of this type has given me great pause. For more than two years I have pondered and prayed, hopefully more prayer than ponder, but the time has come to reveal my concerns and why the situation is as it is. For those who find my words difficult, I implore you to seek comfort in one thing, no, two things. First, our hope and trust is in our Father, our God, who gave the Messiah, in order for us to have not only redemption from sin, but also boldness to enter the holiest of places<sup>4</sup> and boldly come to the throne of grace,<sup>5</sup> all through the power of our Messiah, Jesus. Second, you and I are still on the same path of faith, and, additionally, seeking the first century church.

Yes, and unfortunately, there are those in the brotherhood who will not only reject my words, but also adamantly debate them. Such is the case – as lamentable as it is. But brethren, I am not giving my words in order to debate others attempting to persuade them, for some cannot be persuaded. Instead, I offer my words as a final message to those who have ears to hear.

Our church history, helped and assisted by Alexander Campbell and Barton Stone, has great successes and great failures. But, we are only imperfect disciples trying to always understand Jesus. May, our Father, bless us in provoking ourselves to love and good works.<sup>6</sup>

My words will be uneasy, but I am giving my best prayerful efforts to convey not only my thoughts but also my love for the brethren. My words, like anyone else's words, need to be heard and understood "in context". For the person who may chance across my material, I ask you to listen attentively, even though you may be in initial disagreement, search what I say, test it against the Scriptures, in their context, and test my spirit to see if it is from God.

**Blessings and Peace**

## My Love

I do so very much love the church of Christ. For nearly forty years it was my church home. The mainstream and conservative brethren instructed me in the paths of righteousness, helped cultivate my faith in Jesus, and to believe that God's word is really all we need to have faith and a properly ordered and obedient church. So, the things I offer, my words, are done with intense prayer, concern, and respect. Yet, my love does not mean that I am to withhold expressing my concerns remaining silent. Sometimes criticism is necessary, not to make another intentionally angry, but in order to realize the need to give attention to a matter.

We have had many derogatory remarks hurled our way, especially two terms: "legalists" and "cult". People who have not or will not appreciate the concept that God is just as concerned with how a human lives as a human having faith, do not always seem to understand that firm reliance on God's word is done because God demands and expects such. So this term "legalist" has been hurled at us in order to get us to become less demanding of God's goal of human righteousness. The term "legalist" was hurled simply to inflict hurt. Never, ever give up that the Scriptures *are* God's word. Additionally, the word "cult" has been hurled at us, because of the manner in which we hold each other accountable, we need to be our brother's keeper, and sister's too.

Our history is one that taught me well the value of honor and integrity, to love God is to stand up for righteousness, and to love God is the love of Jesus and others. For these things I will ever be grateful.

Another powerful truth that the church of Christ instilled in me is to search for the truth, that God's word is truth, and that God's word is always best understood by what the Holy Spirit, through the author's meant, and not by any potential definition of modern terminology. Such as evidenced by our defense that water baptism is not by sprinkling, but by immersion in water. Powerful truths: God is true, God's word is true, and humanity (even if good intentioned) can fail to properly interpret and/or translate God's word, and the TRUTH will set you free.

Another powerful love that the church of Christ gave me was the need, the scriptural need, to prove – to test – everything that every one said. Sadly, there are wolves in sheep's clothing and there are those who want to lead others captive. Sadly, they rarely make themselves known for whom and for what they truly are. This truth stands true for those in the church of Christ and those who are not. Just because someone speaks biblically does not automatically make that person truly Christian.

One final, intensely powerful truth that the church of Christ instilled in me was a great fear and reverence for God and his word. God is to be revered and feared.<sup>1</sup> His word is our guide and our Lamp<sup>2</sup> and Jesus is the way.<sup>3</sup> It is this reverence that I believe that the mainstream/conservative churches of Christ still have.

## My Lament

In the need to defend the truth, we have caused harm to our heritage, to each other, and to others. It seems that one thing is certain, we have problems and the problems, in large part, are of our own making. Our pride, our ignorance, have cultivated an atmosphere that has given rise to dogmatic knit-picking, sometimes spending far more airtime revealing the “sins” of other organizations, and Christians within our own ranks than provoking ourselves to love and good works.<sup>1</sup> While everyone and everything is surely to be tested, testing everyone and everything does not automatically mean that everything said is unbiblical or against God and his truth.

In my years of service, I have witnessed the tragedy that understanding truth is sacrificed to the altar of current understanding. It is a spiritual travesty that it seems that we have become complacent in our search for truth and stagnant in the restoration of the first century church.

I have been preached to, and have preached. The pews demand specific lessons; they expect the preacher to give them. If the preachers don't, some brotherhood paper demands the pews to influence the elders to influence the preacher to change. Brothers and sisters if a preacher simply preached one lesson for each Bible book, and one lesson for each Bible chapter, the preacher would preach over ten years and never repeat a lesson, unless the Bible itself repeated itself. Limiting sermons to yearly repeated pulpit lessons does not seem fitting. Fundamentals of faith are not to emanate from the pulpit; they are to originate in the home, then illuminated in youth and/or new converts Bible class.

The preacher's work is not to remind continually the pews of the fundamentals, but to add to the fundamentals leading the church into greater maturity. Anything less leaves the church anemic, immature, and incapable of fighting the good fight. Instead of building a body of Christ capable of taking on satan and his forces of darkness, becoming a body of believers capable of defending themselves against principalities, powers, rulers of darkness and spiritual wickedness,<sup>2</sup> many have become a body of believers who preach only what we know, and ridicule and disparage things that we do not understand.

Just because some of our people have gone “liberal” does not mean that all our people want to go “liberal”. Just because some of our people have gone “conservative” does not mean that all our people want to go “conservative”. Just because there are denominations does not mean that all people want denominations. There are honest, open-minded, open-spirited people who are asking honest, sincere, and needed questions. Those questions can sometimes feel threatening, can sometimes be perceived as unneeded, and other times maybe even feel unwanted. But, without questions, there is no growth. We must permit others, and ourselves to ask, to seek, and to knock.<sup>3</sup> Since God and Christ permit and encourage humans to question and investigate, then so should we. Truth does not fear being investigated, for truth, true truth, has no fear.

## **In My Defense**

First, I am no change agent. In fact, I remain fastly convinced that denominationalism is not what it should be, nor what Christ wants. I don't seek to "to change" the church of Christ in order to make it look like, or act like a denomination. I seek *to continue* our restoration of NT Christianity. However, in the manner in which Stone and Campbell operated, if becoming the NT church means rethinking and revising who we are and what we do, then so be it. The Truth of the Restoration Movement demands such. To be faithful to the cause of the Restoration Movement demands such. To be faithful to God, Christ and the Truth demands such.

I am so grateful that I heard messages about things like Christmas, and how Jesus could not have been born on December 25. These are hard truths; truths that some of Christendom does not yet accept. But True Truth, as its nature does, confronts the things we believe are true. Awareness of True Truth persuades away from non-truth. A person who desires True Truth may become angry when informed of the True Truth, but the heart of the seeker who wants True Truth will accept True Truth and change accordingly, this is called repentance. Repentance is a continual activity, and repentance is done in order to bring the individual's and/or the church's mind, spirit, emotions, and actions into perfect alignment with God, in essence becoming one with him.

A "change agent", as I understand the term, cares not for True Truth, but is willing to participate in an activity, without respecting God's desires, in order to influence a person into discipleship. In essence, if my understanding is correct, "change agents" are not too much different that those who established "Christmas" activities to reveal "Christ". True Truth invades the mind, and True Truth expects an answer. So, no, I am in no way a "change agent", but I seek restoration not stagnation.

In order to be attractive to "seekers," some have gone the way of "denominationalism" and others have gone the way of "sectarianism" but both have left the True Truth of the Gospel in hope of persuading others. While Paul certainly states that he became "like" others,<sup>1</sup> he never permits himself or believers (whether new to the faith or not) to stagnate in their maturation toward the fullness of Christ.<sup>2</sup>

While doing my studies at Bible School, one of the instructors encouraged us to become great preachers, like the great preachers of the past. But you see, great preachers don't simply repeat the understandings of past preachers. Great preachers are continually immersed in God's word seeking to understand God, Messiah, the Church, answering the needs of the church and the world. Great preachers challenge the church, not coddle it. Great preachers reveal failings and successes. Great preachers help set the church aright.

My last twenty years of service have convinced me that the mainline and conservative churches of Christ have become stagnant in biblical understanding and stagnant in the Restoration Movement. I consider myself a servant of God, Messiah, and the church; but also convinced and convicted that we are amiss, yet not permitted to proclaim this

message simply because I call the church to continue greater understanding – to pull herself out of restoration-stagnation and become the church fully restored.

Consider how Stone and Campbell broke new spiritual ground. They challenged Christendom to let go of creeds and articles of faith, and to unite under Christ. Furthermore, in the 1820s, Campbell published a NT translation that was followed by several editions (last I knew reprints were available through Gospel Advocate under “The Living Oracles”).

Campbell’s notes, along with the translators’ efforts, broke sacred ground. With the then new translation of the NT, they challenged Christendom through textual criticism (which Campbell termed “Spurious Readings”), and making updates to Bible words (like immersion *replacing* baptism; and congregation *replacing* church). And for their efforts, they received much criticism. Those men sought clarification of ancient ideas *and* new understanding. This is seen in this thought from Campbell:

“But another argument in favor of a new translation may be drawn from the fact, that we are now in possession of much better means of making an exact translation, than they were at the time when the common version [KJV] appeared. The original is now much better understood than it was then. The conflicts of so many critics have elicited a great deal of sound critical knowledge, which was not in the possession of any translators before the last century. But as this topic has been so well handled, and so frequently argued by eminent writers, we shall not dwell upon it.”<sup>3</sup>

Campbell’s First Edition came out in the late 1820s, nearly 80 years before the acclaimed 1901 American Standard Version. When Campbell incorporated textual criticism into a published Bible text, he did so nearly 150 years before modern translations began doing so. Campbell was years ahead, both in demanding a new translation and revealing greater truths of the Greek.

From Campbell’s statement above, we know that he used “up-to-date” translation and critical assessments in the early 1800s to understand and translate the Greek. We also know that Campbell considered that 1800s information capable of providing “much better means of making an exact translation”. Knowing this, then how much more capable are we, in the twenty-first century, having had the last 100 years of Holy Land archaeology, and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls? Campbell did not believe that Christians should stagnate in their Biblical study and understanding, neither do I.

But what I see today stands in contrast to the early 1800s. In my experience, we are not breaking new ground, or challenging the sacred. Many writings and many studies are primarily of things that uphold what has come to be “traditional” understandings. More often than not we cling to formalized structure; rarely allow modifications; preach primarily fundamentals, and conduct “speck” inspections – looking into the eyes of fellow denominations, Churches and Christians. These things have lead us to become arrogant and judgmental; not truly maturing into disciples demonstrating the love that Messiah demonstrated, nor the church that Campbell and Stone encouraged.

While some congregations continue to grow, and will grow; many are dying and dying because we are not truly living restored NT Christianity. Yet, truly living as the restored church does not mean becoming willing participants in unauthorized church practices. But, worship is the beginning of discipleship, not its maturation. Maturation of discipleship is living as Messiah. Living as Messiah means living selflessly, living uprightly before God and man, *and* suffering for God's will, knowing that true obedience is to love your neighbor as yourself without ever sacrificing obedience to Jehovah.

The preacher has a responsibility unlike anyone else in the church. While the shepherds nourish and nurture the flock, the preacher leads through proclamation of God's inspired word. As such, the preacher is accountable to God in ways even an eldership is not. As such, the preacher had better be very fearful of a wrathful and vengeful God who can and will cast away<sup>4</sup> any preacher who is not upright before God, humbly doing the work of an evangelist.<sup>5</sup> An evangelist has to proclaim true truth even when it is hard to hear.<sup>6</sup>

During the past seven years I have endeavored to become a true servant of Christ and True Truth. I studied relentlessly, devoted hours to research, and devoured many first-hand journals and research materials in order to better learn the True Truth and proclaim it.

I am still convinced that a preacher can not *and* does not properly fulfill his role before God *and* humanity when the preacher simply studies English translations, Bible commentaries, and sermons from other preachers – doing so is intellectual laziness and nearly borders on spiritual plagiarism. A preacher must be diligent to show himself approved,<sup>7</sup> first to God and Messiah, second to the people.

The preacher must be willing to challenge the proclaimers of the past – testing those spirits<sup>8</sup> just as vehemently as testing any spirit today – for uprightness and soundness of Gospel truth, not opinion. The preacher must be willing to challenge past misconceptions, no matter how long practiced, or how long defended.

While some see me as “liberal” and others see me as “conservative” I am neither. My plea is what the church of Christ taught me – “Seek ye the old paths”.<sup>9</sup> But those old paths are not found in the Ante-Nicene church fathers (the church leaders just after the Apostles and church leaders before the Council of Nicaea AD 325). The Ancient paths are found in the Ancient Jerusalem Church – the first church.

The Ancient Jerusalem Church is the New Testament pattern. Who the Jerusalem church was, *and* what she practiced is permissible by God. The Ancient Jerusalem Church is the Church to follow. We know this because Paul told the Thessalonians to follow the churches of Judea,<sup>10</sup> in other words the Jerusalem Church. I seek that church and I seek their pattern of worship. Is this not our Restoration Plea?

I am who I was taught to be – a seeker of first century Christianity. As such, I believe in the Restoration Movement and its desire to embody the church of the first century. To this, I give a presentation of my concerns and where I believe that CENI misses the

theological target. Afterwards, in brief outline, I will mention the hermeneutical direction that seems to aim for best complete understanding and hits closer to the theological target. Take my thoughts, examine them, test them, try them, verify them – if I am wrong may God have mercy upon me.

## My Assessment of CENI

### *Introduction*

Many years and many conversations have taught me many things, one of which is that there seems to be no easy way to discuss and discover essential truths that reside within disagreements and difficulties. So, I ask that the reader to accept that I am giving my best prayerful efforts to focus only theological issues and not drag ourselves into character destruction while dialoging.

While there are many specific issues that some will want addressed, those specifics and their ultimate resolution requires two things. First, accepting that the CENI hermeneutic (and all that it entails) does not permit coherent and consistent biblical interpretation. Second, accepting the first, one must find the solution.

In essence, how can there be discussion of particular issues when the universal principle of biblical interpretation is not in agreement. As such, I choose to forgo discussing the particular “problems” and focus on the universal issue (the CENI hermeneutic) that gives cause (as in birth) to argumentation, division about doctrine, and leads me to believe that CENI has caused the stagnation of the Restoration Movement.

### *CENI Hermeneutic Defined*

We use CENI (meaning: Command, Example and Necessary Inference) conjoined with three additional things to interpret the scriptures:

- 1) Silence of the NT Scriptures,
- 2) The Old Testament has *no* authority for church practices, and
- 3) Expediency (permits Church and/or Christian actions).

Where a Command, an Example and/or Necessary Inference are not clear, Silence of the NT Scriptures influences interpretation. However, CENI also relies on the postulation that the Old Testament has *no* authority for the Church. But, there is one more critical piece to this method of Biblical interpretation and it is Expediency.

Here is what this biblical interpretation means. We look for a Messianic or Apostolic Command; this command must be seen as a command in order to be followed. CENI then looks for an approved Example of how to carry out the Command(s). If an Example is not found, per se, then Necessary Inference is used to determine if a practice is Biblical.

If this Interpretation Method cannot find in the New Testament a Command, an Example, or what is believed to be a justifiably use of Necessary Inference, then CENI appeals to notion that the NT is therefore *Silent* about that issue. Subsequently because CENI interprets *the OT as having no authority* for the Church and Christian, if something was practiced in the OT, it matters little because the OT has no authority for the Church. This means some things are interpreted as “not authorized,” therefore sin, and not practicable by the Christian and/or the Church. This is *the* method for interpreting the Scriptures.

Over the years, many people have given much time and energy defending this hermeneutic, and others have given much time criticizing it. I limit my words because others have discussed and debated, ad nauseam. In this thesis, one of my points is that if CENI is the holistic (meaning truly integrated and comprehensive) biblical method it has been defended to be, then our divisions are unnecessary; however, the results of this biblical interpretation are many arguments, many divisions, and stagnation of the Restoration Movement.

### ***At Best, CENI is Problematic***

This CENI biblical interpretation method creates many conflicts because, as history has shown, CENI creates arguments and division: from missionary societies to Bible classes; from kitchens to using only one communion cup. Our particular issues arise from the very method used to understand the Scriptures. At the heart of the argument is the CENI method of biblical interpretation. So allow me to give a greater example.

### **NT Identification**

Throughout my years, I have heard the refrains:

- “We are a New Testament Church.”
- “We are only New Testament Christians.”
- “People do not know where the OT ends and the NT begins.”

It is fervently argued that the NT, the New Covenant, does not begin until Pentecost. Brothers and Sisters, do we not understand the inherent problem? One of our brothers did.

He understood the NT problem. As such, he argued: since the New Testament begins at Pentecost, then the teachings of Jesus are Old Testament; therefore nailed to the cross, and no longer needing to be followed. What? The teachings of the Messiah, our Savior, do not need to be heard and followed?

Now my point is rather simple: either we actually believe our “NT refrains” or we don’t. Evidence is we don’t.

It is neither literally nor spiritually possible to be only New Testament anything, for one very important reason. Jesus is the last prophet *of the Old Testament*, having been born, having lived, and having died *in the Old Covenant*.<sup>1</sup> Jesus fulfilled all Messianic prophecy and sacrificial needs making atonement; yet, Jesus makes the bold claim to follow all of his teachings.<sup>2</sup>

Our brother is wrong in his conclusion, but his method of biblical interpretation is absolutely valid according to CENI. So, either he is correct, or CENI is correct. I submit that both have flaws. Hence, why we are all sinners having fallen short of the glory of God and that is why we all need God’s abundant and merciful grace offered through the

way, the truth and the life, our Messiah, our Redeemer, our betrothed husband, Jesus of Nazareth.

### **Biblical Pattern for Covenant**

According to biblical pattern (Abraham<sup>1</sup> and the Israelites<sup>2</sup>), a covenant is entered when the covenant testator sheds its blood.<sup>3</sup> According to this pattern, the New Covenant began when Jesus' blood was shed, his precious blood as God's Lamb, and thus his death ushered in the New Covenant. It is that humanity simply did not see the full manifestation of the power of the New Covenant until that first Pentecost following our Savior's ascension to the right hand of our God.

We can know this covenant motif carries into the New Covenant because Paul says, "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written *for our learning, that we* through patience and comfort of the scriptures *might have hope.*"<sup>4</sup> In other words, the "things written aforetime" reveal the pattern. The pattern is there. It is seen with Abraham; it is seen with Israel at Sinai and is testified by Jeremiah.<sup>5</sup> This means that when Jeremiah prophesied the New Covenant,<sup>6</sup> the New Covenant would have no choice but to fit into those established patterns.

However, if we accept as true the CENI assertion that the Old Testament has no authority, and that the NT begins at Pentecost, I am forced to agree with the brother who said Jesus teachings are Old Testament and are therefore "nailed to the cross". If for no other reason than because Jesus was born, lived, and died in and under the Law of Moses – period.<sup>7</sup> But you see, to accept that Jesus' teachings were "hung on the cross" I am forced to ask: then, how does the Church and Christians listen to Jesus' voice?

Jesus was not hanged on the tree to render his teachings only valid for the Old Testament and subsequently null and void for the New Testament. Jesus was nailed to the cross as a propitiation for our transgressions<sup>8</sup> making atonement for our sins.<sup>9</sup> Because Jesus is God's Anointed and *the* Messiah, his teachings are as valid in the New Testament as they were in the Old Testament. Since that is true, and since his teachings cannot be done away, the questions become: Where does the NT begin? and How do we interpret the Law of Moses?

### **Where Does the NT Begin?**

To begin answering the questions, it must first be stated that the NT does not and can not begin with the page *situated* between Malachi and Matthew. It matters not that tradition has put it there. In answering the question: when does the NT begin? we must understand that the modern concept of "old testament" and "new testament" has its root way back in the second century with a man named Marcion.

Marcion of Sinope was a Gentile convert who had trouble reconciling the God of the Prophets and the God of the Apostles. Therefore, Marcion reasoned an "old testament" and a "new testament" and therefore became the first person to reason and propose a "new testament". As such, Marcion subsequently began teaching the lack of necessity of

the “old testament” and formulated a “biblical canon” primarily consisting of Paul’s Epistles.

The Second Century Church responded to Marcion. In AD 144, the church labeled him a heretic, then the church worked to establish a biblical canon. They did such to include Genesis to Malachi, affirming the validity of the “old testament” to contravene Marcion’s influence. While their positioning was helpful, their affirmation of the OT does not address when a covenant begins.

The biblical pattern for the beginning of a Covenant is the death of a testator.<sup>1</sup> Animals were the testator between God and Abraham.<sup>2</sup> Animals also served as the testator between God and the Nation of Israel;<sup>3</sup> Jeremiah confirms that the testator was animal life.<sup>4</sup> But the blood of animal life is not sufficient,<sup>5</sup> thus the New Covenant needed the blood of a human testator, blood from the man Jesus.<sup>6</sup>

This means that the blood of the selected animals sealed the Covenant between God and Abraham.<sup>7</sup> The blood of the animals at Sinai sealed the Covenant between God and Israel.<sup>8</sup> This means that the blood of the man, Jesus of Nazareth, sealed the New Covenant between God and Israel *and* God and the World (to the Jew first, then to the Gentile<sup>9</sup>).

Thus for a covenant with God, a testator’s blood must be shed. For a Covenant to be sealed the testator’s blood is required, this is verified by Hebrews.<sup>10</sup> This means that the New Covenant began not with Jesus birth, and not with Peter’s sermon on the Day of Pentecost. The New Covenant, the New Testament, began being sealed when Jesus started shedding his blood, and was completely sealed at Jesus’ death. This means that New Covenant begins at Matthew 27.50; Mark 15.37; Luke 23.46; and John 19.30; which means that almost all of Jesus’ teachings were under the Old Law.

Since CENI affirms the OT as “nailed to the cross” and that the NT begins at Pentecost, our brother, using CENI, reasoned a valid conclusion asserting that Jesus teachings were OT. But his conclusion “nailing to the cross” Jesus teachings is *not* correct; but neither is CENI’s conclusion “nailing to the cross” the Law. There is one major reason for this, according to Jesus, his teachings are just as valid for the NT as they were for the OT.<sup>11</sup> In other words, the conclusions of the brother and CENI cannot be mutually exclusive: nailing Jesus’ teachings to the cross *is* to nail the OT’s teachings to the cross; or stated another way, nailing the OT’s teachings to the cross *is* to nail Jesus’ teachings to the cross. This brings me to the need for answering the question: How should the Law of Moses be interpreted? But before doing so, I must answer: How does the Bible refer to itself?

### **How Does the Bible Refer to Itself?**

Before I answer the question: How should the Law of Moses be interpreted? I must first answer the question: How does the Bible refer to itself? Neither the Messiah nor the Apostles routinely referred to “the things written aforetime” as the “Old Testament”. They referred to those sacred writings as:

- Scripture<sup>1</sup>
- The Scriptures<sup>2</sup>
- The Oracles of God<sup>3</sup>
- The Law<sup>4</sup>
- The Law and the Prophets<sup>5</sup>
- The Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms<sup>6</sup>
- The Scriptures of the Prophets<sup>7</sup>

While I have greatly abbreviated the list (a more comprehensive list is in the Appendix), the pages of the NT cannot be any clearer on the subject. I was taught to speak “bible things in Bible ways”. As such, it then seems proper to use terms like: *the oracles, the law, the prophets, the scriptures*. – terms used either by the Messiah and/or the Apostles.

For clarity, “The Law” has two applications: the first specifically refers to the Five Books of Moses; the second refers in a general sense to all thirty-nine books before Matthew. Additionally, I would like to add that “The Scriptures” encompasses all thirty-nine books occurring before Matthew.

However, there are two occurrences when the NT refers to the scriptures as “OT”:<sup>8</sup>

- But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which *veil* is done away in Christ.
- In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away.

Just because the term “old testament” is found, does not mean that Paul claims or insinuates that “old testament” is the primary means to refer to the writings before Matthew. Similarly, just because the Hebrew writer says, in context, “old covenant” does not insinuate that “old covenant” is the primary means of referring to the writings of Genesis to Malachi.

Consequently, any adamancy for demarcating “old testament” and “new testament” based solely on either one or both of those passages seems at odds with the multitude of examples where Jesus and the Apostles referred the “things written aforetime” as *the scriptures, the prophets, the law*. Since I was taught to embody the church of the first century, it seems proper to refer to the “things written aforetime” by matching the pattern exemplified by the Messiah and the Apostles.

### **How Should the Law of Moses Be Interpreted?**

My point brothers and sisters is that we uphold as sacred the Scriptures, both the “old” and the “new”. We also uphold the truth: to rightly divide the word of God.<sup>1</sup> As such, it behooves us to see how people in the New Testament writings used the Law of Moses.

Consider, Jesus. He taught from the Scriptures (Genesis to Malachi). Jesus used Psalm 118.22-23, and called them Scriptures when he said, “Did ye never read in the scriptures, ‘The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?’”<sup>2</sup>

After someone who was with Jesus, cut off the servant's ear,<sup>3</sup> Jesus reattached the ear, then asked, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?"<sup>4</sup>

After his resurrection, Jesus walked on the Emmaus Road with two individuals and then broke bread with them.<sup>5</sup> Luke states that as Jesus walked with the two, Jesus taught them "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."<sup>6</sup> While Luke is stating what happened, it is clear that Jesus taught the two individuals from the "old testament".

In partial response to accusations about breaking Sabbath, Jesus said, "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me."<sup>7</sup> However, Jesus in no way limited his use of the Scriptures as testimony of his Messiahship.

Jesus also used the Scriptures to clarify doctrinal issues. Regarding marriage, Jesus said, "Have ye not read, that he which made *them* at the beginning made them male and female, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?"<sup>8</sup> Jesus appealed to Genesis, and reasoned from Genesis God's expectations about marriage, Jesus thus revealed one manner of how to use the "things written aforetime" for doctrine.

Jesus provides, at least, in another example of how to interpret the scriptures for doctrine. When asked about the resurrection, Jesus first response is that it is possible to draw incorrect conclusions, by stating: "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God."<sup>9</sup> But, further in his response, Jesus specifically addressed the doctrine of the resurrection by saying "have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."<sup>10</sup>

It seems that Jesus challenged them, wondering if they had actually read the material; but to answer their question Jesus referred to Exodus 3.6, the moment at the burning bush when God addressed Moses. By this, Jesus teaches that one can know by the very way God expresses himself as "I am" – because God did not say "I was" – the phraseology becomes the very means for understanding that there is life after death. The phraseology of the "OT" itself insinuates that life continues.

Consider the Apostle Peter. In Acts Two, Peter quotes both Joel<sup>11</sup> and David<sup>12</sup> to prove Jesus on the Day of Pentecost. However, in his first epistle, Peter teaches that God wants Christians and the Church to be holy in everything<sup>13</sup> and refers immediately to Leviticus<sup>14</sup> applying those "OT" teachings to the NT by saying "Because it is written, "Be ye holy; for I am holy."<sup>15</sup>

Also, I find it of great interest that Peter exhorted his readers "to speak Bible things in Bible ways". Of course, he did not say it that way but that thought is definitely seen

when Peter said, “If any man speak, *let him speak as **the oracles of God***”.<sup>16</sup> We know this phraseology refers to the OT because both Paul and the Hebrews writer use the phrase “the oracles of God” when referencing the OT.

Paul said that the Jews had the advantage because they were given *the oracles of God*,<sup>17</sup> this cannot refer to anything but the “OT”. Additionally, the Hebrew writer said, “For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which *be* the first principles of *the oracles of God*”.<sup>18</sup> All three, Peter, Paul and the Hebrew writer exhort their audiences to understand “the oracles of God” meaning the “OT”.

Consider Stephen. In Acts Seven, Luke relates that Stephen referred to information found in the Five Books of Moses – specifically Genesis and Exodus,<sup>19</sup> and also to the Prophets,<sup>20</sup> with this information Stephen challenged the council. This gives new layers of meaning for “Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people.”<sup>21</sup>

Consider Apollos. In Acts Eighteen, Luke tells us that Apollos was powerful in the Scriptures,<sup>22</sup> as already evidenced, this means that Apollos used the Scriptures to prove Jesus as the Messiah.<sup>23</sup>

Consider Paul. To read Paul is to realize that he used the “old testament” for many things: to prove Jesus;<sup>24</sup> to reveal expected behavior for the Church;<sup>25</sup> and to reason and reveal theology.<sup>26</sup> But Paul cannot get any more direct that this statement:

“For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of *the scriptures* might have hope.”<sup>27</sup>

In that statement, Paul tells us to learn from the “OT” because the “OT” gives hope. Certainly, this passage implies that we should study, learn, and use the “OT”?

Many times I have heard appeals to Paul’s statement to Timothy:<sup>28</sup>

“All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.”

Yet, when CENI comes to Colossians 2.14, and portions of Galatians and Hebrews the method convinces us that the “old testament” is done away, having been abrogated – teaching that the OT has no authority for the NT church (See the article: Replacement (Supersession) Theology for some specifics about Colossians 2.14 [http://www.raymondharris.com/?page\\_id=980#Colossians](http://www.raymondharris.com/?page_id=980#Colossians)). But either “all Scripture” means “all Scripture” or it does not. Since I was taught that all means all, then what does this indicate about CENI’s position regarding the “old testament”?

My point is rather simple, when Jesus said,

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.”<sup>29</sup>

Jesus either meant what he said or he did not. Jesus meant what he said.

Jesus said the Law (the “OT”) will not, as in can not, ever be destroyed (not even through abrogation or nullification). The Law cannot be nullified by even one jot or tittle until everything is fulfilled. Everything has not been fulfilled because heaven and earth still exist, just as they did when Jesus spoke about the Law existing until heaven and earth pass away.

My point is rather simple. Either Paul nailed the “old testament” to the cross or he did not. If Paul nailed the “old testament” to the cross and believed and taught the “OT” as irrelevant having no authority, then two things now happen:

- 1) Either Jesus is lying, or Paul is lying – neither are lying; or
- 2) Paul misunderstood Jesus – this is not possible and Paul be Holy Spirit inspired.

However, it is possible, that CENI, by its “versifying,” a term coined by Campbell (for more see the section *CENI and Context*), has misunderstood Paul and his intentions. It is neither logically possible, nor spiritually probable for Paul to nail the “old testament” to the cross when Jesus taught that the “old testament” would exist until the end of time. However, it is possible that with the change in covenant, there comes a change in the priesthood,<sup>30</sup> and a reformation of sacrifices.<sup>31</sup>

The Hebrew writer seems clear about the priesthood reformation by a change in the law; however, a change in the law is not nullification, but modification. This modification of the law’s specific priesthood is seen when Peter said that all believers are part of the “royal priesthood”.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, the reformation of sacrifices is not abrogation of the “OT” for the “NT”, but a reformation of sacrifices, reforming the “OT” animal sacrifices by the perfecting sacrifice of Jesus.<sup>33</sup>

At this juncture, it is proper to clarify Hebrew 10.9. That verse has been quoted as support for OT nullification because it says “He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second” but doing so is, as Campbell said, “versifying”. The proposition of OT nullification is invalidated by the immediate Hebrews context, because the immediate literary and theological context is: the taking away of animal sacrifice and establishing the sacrifice of Jesus, not the taking away of the Law. This means that the Hebrew writer in no way teaches “OT” abrogation and neither does Paul.

Paul is very direct with his rhetorical question, “Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.”<sup>34</sup> Void equals abrogate; in no way did Paul abrogate and make void the law. Interestingly enough, Paul said, “I delight in the law of God after the inward man”.<sup>35</sup> This is one reason why Paul taught that by having faith in Jesus, Christians establish law<sup>36</sup> and Paul said the “OT” is fulfilled when Christians’ love.<sup>37</sup>

Jesus makes it very clear that the entirety of all the Law of Moses hangs on two conjointly equal concepts: one’s love for God, and one’s love for humanity.<sup>38</sup> To do assert that, Jesus referred to the “old testament” teachings found in Deuteronomy<sup>39</sup> and Leviticus.<sup>40</sup> By this, we know that Jesus taught that the “old testament” instructs us how

to love God and how to love people. This is exactly what Paul says in Romans 13.8-10 and Galatians 5.14:

“<sup>8</sup>Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. <sup>9</sup>For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if *there be* any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. <sup>10</sup>Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.”

“For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”

### **Then, What about Sacrifices?**

The biggest issue that I now must address is “old testament” sacrifices. When I hear the retort (which I have heard), “Ray you are teaching that we have to do the Law of Moses and therefore you are teaching us to offer sacrifices.” seems a blatant misunderstanding, and I am beginning to think intentional.

So let me say now very clearly: No one can be justified by their attentiveness to the Law, the “old testament”;<sup>1</sup> a person can only be justified through the blood of the Lamb that being the man, Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>2</sup>

If someone actually believes that I am teaching OT sacrifices, I am beginning to wonder if they actually understand that Jesus embodies and fulfills OT sacrifices:

- The grain offering<sup>3</sup>
- The peace offering<sup>4</sup>
- The sin offering<sup>5</sup>
- The trespass offering,<sup>6</sup> and
- The drink offering.<sup>7</sup>

Jesus did not simply fulfill OT Messianic prophecy. Jesus also fulfilled OT sacrifices. This is why we have the distinct privilege to come boldly to God’s throne of grace<sup>8</sup> and the boldness to enter in the holiest of holies<sup>9</sup> all through the Messiah.

### **To What Extent Is The OT To Be Used?**

I have heard it fondly said that nine of the Ten Commandments are repeated in the NT. If CENI already agrees that nine are in the NT, my question: Is why does CENI resist learning from the OT?

It is erroneous to conclude that advocating OT use is advocating salvation by circumcision. It is also erroneous to conclude that advocating OT use is advocating salvation by keeping the Law of Moses. Doing one, the other, or both would make one a first century Judaizer.<sup>1</sup> It is also erroneous to conclude that advocating OT use is advocating salvation by works. Advocating the use of the OT is not teaching salvation outside of Jesus. Salvation is found nowhere else but in Jesus; yet, even Jesus taught that keeping the commands give life.<sup>2</sup>

I am simply stating that the CENI hermeneutic is flawed, because CENI “versifies” it picks and chooses which examples to follow. Two divinely inspired examples immediately come to mind: 1) washing feet;<sup>3</sup> and 2) men lifting holy hands in prayer.<sup>4</sup> In my experience, both have been taught as unnecessary.

To what extent is the OT to be used? The OT should be used knowing that both Messianic prophecies and Sacrificial obligations are fulfilled in Jesus. Paul said that all scripture is profitable for teaching, correction, and instruction in righteousness,<sup>5</sup> this means all of the OT can be used, and according to Paul all the OT makes one “wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ”.<sup>6</sup>

CENI and its “versifying” is the problem because doing so gives mixed applications of doctrine. Until it is accepted that CENI is the problem, argumentation, division and stagnation of the Restoration Movement will continue. I now ask, when does the Church or Christian need a specific Command, an approved Example, or a Necessary Inference – even if the NT is Silent – in order to do good? Two aspects of the fruit of the Spirit are love and goodness, “against such things” Paul said, “there is no law”.<sup>7</sup> From this, Paul seems to be implying that specified examples are not always needed for accomplishing good things in the kingdom.

### ***Demonstrating the Incoherency and Inconsistency of CENI***

The CENI method of biblical interpretation conjoined with Silence of the NT Scriptures forces us (as in compels us) that in order to support an interpretation one must find a Command, an Example, or Necessary Inference from somewhere, even if that somewhere is from the “OT”.

First, since it is claimed the OT has no governing authority for the church, any appeal to the OT is, at best, a curiosity. If the OT has “no authority” then it has “no authority” even if an action was prohibited. But I am beginning to understand that CENI’s appeal to “no OT authority” is limited.

CENI appeals to the OT for ethical and moral teachings, and CENI appeals to the OT for doctrinal Commands of prohibition. For ethical teachings, I have heard CENI appeal to Joseph’s reaction to Potiphar’s wife.<sup>1</sup> In seeking to prove that God does not accept NT instrumental music, CENI has looked for Commands of prohibition by appealing to Amos (as we will discuss momentarily). Additionally, CENI has used the OT to reveal Necessary Inferences for following Patterns (in other words, Examples) like Noah’s Ark,<sup>2</sup> and the need to follow commands exactly, as seen with Nadab and Abihu,<sup>3</sup> and Uzzah.<sup>4</sup>

However, when CENI uses each of those OT references, the CENI hermeneutic violates its own supposition of “no OT authority”. This situation reveals a questionable application of “no OT authority”. In other words, the statement, “The OT has no authority” is negated by the practical matters of interpretation. It is claimed “the OT has no authority,” yet, the OT has authority when it supports some interpretations. Sometimes CENI uses the OT for affirmation, at other times the OT is used for

prohibition, but CENI does not routinely appeal to the OT for permission. This reveals another reason why CENI produces inconsistent and incoherent biblical interpretation, and religious practices.

### **CENI and Amos**

Please do not get side tracked with the instrumental music example because I am neither arguing for, nor against instrumental music. I only refer to Amos to show that it has been used in the instrumental music argument, and to reveal that the CENI hermeneutic is flawed.

At times, CENI has used Amos to prove that God does not accept instrumental music. This reason for this appeal is rather simple. Prove, scriptural proof, that God does not accept instruments of music solidifies the argument against NT instrumental worship.

As such, it seems that Amos 6.5: “That chant to the sound of the viol, *and invent to themselves instruments of musick, like David;*” makes it very clear: about the matter of instrumental music. This verse *appears* to prove two things. One, musical instruments are invented by humanity; and two, instruments of music were invented by David; which makes instruments of music man-made additions to worship.

Thus when Amos 6.5 is conjoined with the following verses from Amos 5:

<sup>21</sup>I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. <sup>22</sup>Though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. <sup>23</sup>Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. <sup>24</sup>But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.

it definitely seems that God despises instrumental music. Again, in this thesis I am not arguing for or arguing against musical instruments in worship; instead, I want to reveal that the CENI hermeneutic is flawed.

First, using Amos to establish an OT precedent as OT prohibition of instrumental music is by its very nature an appeal to “OT authority”. For the counterpoint, if another tried to argue that NT instrumental music is acceptable by appealing to King David, that position would be rebuffed with the refrain “the OT has no authority”. This situation is logically incoherent and inconsistent. In this situation: it is okay to use “OT authority” to argue prohibition, but somehow it is not okay to use “OT authority” to argue permission.

### **CENI and Context**

Even if CENI had consistent use of OT authority, using Amos to prove that NT instrumental music is not acceptable reveals another inherent flaw in CENI. CENI has, what Campbell coined, “versifying”. Versifying, by its nature, lacks concern for context – literary, historical, prophetic and theological contexts. Listen to Campbell’s words from his Preface to the Fourth Edition of *The Sacred Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ Commonly Styled The New Testament*:

“The verses are placed at the commencement of the paragraph, merely for convenience in referring to the common version [KJV]; and, although much called for by many readers, they are, in our judgment, of no advantage in understanding the book. We have, however, kept the connexion unbroken, before the eye of the reader, as in the former editions; and, it is to be hoped,

that but few now regard the verses, as so many detached precepts or proverbs. This custom of versifying is, we rejoice, yielding to the more enlightened judgment of the present age, and we were much gratified to see, the other day, a recent octavo impression of the common version [KJV], published at Boston, in the manner of our first edition.”<sup>1</sup>

From this information, we know that Campbell actively worked to reveal Biblical thought according to Biblical narrative, in essence he wanted to help reveal context. Yet, Campbell stated that he placed verses “at the commencement of the paragraph” for the sake of convenience. Based upon his statements, it seems Campbell yielded to compromise.

By giving verses at the beginning of the paragraph, Campbell compromised with some Bible readers because they were too engrained with what he termed “versifying”. Yet, Campbell also stated that while “many readers” wanted verse references, he postulated that verses provide “no advantage in understanding” because isolating verses make them function like “detached precepts or proverbs.” Herein lies the issue. Campbell, himself, knew that verses do not help Bible interpretation, and even our preachers have sounded the same message.

When preaching about a situation like Romans Chapter Two Verse One, I have heard it said, “When you see the ‘therefore’ one must ask, ‘what is it there for?’” This word play is done in order to help us back up and see the literary narrative; clarifications like these are to be extolled. Yet, I still hear sermons filled with what Campbell calls “the custom of versifying”. I want what Campbell believed he saw – a rejoicing because “the more enlightened judgment” yielded to the strength of context and away from the weakness of versifying.

CENI’s flaw is the very manner in which interprets the Bible. CENI’s flaw fails context. CENI does not assert that the NT is narrative and letters, not Law; even most of the OT is not Law – the OT also has a mixture of narrative, poetry, and wisdom. All the Gospels, all the Epistles, and the Revelation are narratives and letters that function differently than Law and must be interpreted as such.

For example, the Epistles were written to churches and/or disciples supporting, exhorting and/or correcting behavior. Therefore, using selected words from a Gospel, even if added to some words from an Epistle, disembodies the statements from God’s intended purpose, and thus is the practice of “versifying”.

This is why taking Biblical snippets, from here and there, in order to build premises in order to support a supposedly true conclusion (and then encouraging each other by saying that “the Bible is its own best commentary”) may very well be logically valid; *but* doing so is only completely true when all textual snippets are supported by completely valid contexts.

This means that Premise A and Premise B do not necessarily lead to conclusion C. In other words, if Premise A and Premise B do not have the same contextual foundation the logic structure may indeed be valid, but conclusion C cannot be fully substantiated.

Taking Premise A from one context, and taking Premise B from another context is “versifying” (i.e. proof-texting) to substantiate conclusion C.

### **Amos in Context**

As mentioned previously, CENI has used Amos as proof that instrumental music is not permitted in NT worship; but, because Amos is OT, using Amos violates CENI’s appeal of “no OT authority”. However, let us go ahead and use Amos, examining CENI’s appeal to this OT book for instructions against NT instrumental music. In doing this, it will be seen that CENI maintains little awareness of context. As such, we will see that using Amos cannot contextually substantiate the proposition of no instrumental music.

Historically, Amos was a prophet during the Divided Kingdom and prophesied to Northern Israel not to Judah (Southern Israel). This is significant because Northern Israel had been unrepentant since King Jeroboam established the two altars each with a golden calf, one in Dan and one in Bethel,<sup>1</sup> which happened shortly after Solomon’s death.<sup>2</sup> However, Amos is prophesying during the kingship of “Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel”<sup>3</sup> which is nearer to Assyria’s taking Northern Israel captive. Many decades have passed since Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin; but Jeroboam, son of Joash, did not bring Israel to repentance, this is confirmed by:

In the fifteenth year of Amaziah the son of Joash king of Judah Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel began to reign in Samaria, and reigned forty and one years. And he did *that which was* evil in the sight of the LORD: he departed not from all the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin.<sup>4</sup>

Theologically, using Amos to prove that God finds instrumental music unacceptable is simply not congruent with other OT teachings. God did not reject Northern Israel because of their use of instrumental music.<sup>5</sup> God rejected Northern Israel because of their idolatry; their rejection of the covenant at Sinai, and their lack of repentance of golden calves (all which have little bearing on instrumental music). This is known and verified by looking at the summary of why Israel was taken captive:<sup>6</sup>

<sup>7</sup>For so it was, that the children of Israel had sinned against the LORD their God, which had brought them up out of the land of Egypt, from under the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt, and had feared other gods,<sup>8</sup> And walked in the statutes of the heathen, whom the LORD cast out from before the children of Israel, and of the kings of Israel, which they had made.

<sup>9</sup>And the children of Israel did secretly *those things that were* not right against the LORD their God, and they built them high places in all their cities, from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city.<sup>10</sup> And they set them up images and groves in every high hill, and under every green tree:<sup>11</sup> And there they burnt incense in all the high places, as *did* the heathen whom the LORD carried away before them; and wrought wicked things to provoke the LORD to anger:<sup>12</sup> For they served idols, whereof the LORD had said unto them, Ye shall not do this thing.

<sup>13</sup>Yet the LORD testified against Israel, and against Judah, by all the prophets, *and by* all the seers, saying, Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep my commandments *and* my statutes, according to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets.

<sup>14</sup>Notwithstanding they would not hear, but hardened their necks, like to the neck of their fathers, that did not believe in the LORD their God.<sup>15</sup> And they rejected his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their fathers, and his testimonies which he testified against them; and they followed vanity, and became vain, and went after the heathen that *were* round about them, *concerning* whom the LORD had charged them, that they should not do like them.

<sup>16</sup>And they left all the commandments of the LORD their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made a grove, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served Baal.<sup>17</sup> And

they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments, and sold themselves to do evil in the sight of the LORD, to provoke him to anger.

<sup>18</sup>Therefore the LORD was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only.”

Historic-Theology reveals that God did not punish United Israel for instrumental music, because when Solomon dedicated the Temple, instrumental music was used.<sup>7</sup> At Solomon’s dedication, God gave his presence filling the Temple with his glory.<sup>8</sup> One can be absolutely theologically certain that God only gives his glory when he approves. This is verified true when God’s glorious presence manifested itself at the completion and dedication of the Tabernacle,<sup>9</sup> because the people did “as the LORD commanded Moses”.<sup>10</sup> God actions to the completion of the Tabernacle proves that we can know, by God’s glorious presence, that God is pleased with everything.

As for Northern Israel, God was not pleased with their worship since the days Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin. Northern Israel’s use of instrumental music was incidental. Instrumental music was not their problem; their unrepentant attitude toward worshipping God through golden calves was their biggest problem.

Prophetically, when Hezekiah restored worship at the Temple,<sup>11</sup> Southern Israel used instrumental music during their worship of God.<sup>12</sup> But Chronicles specifically states that the instrumental music was done, partly because of David’s commandment, but specifically because God himself commanded instrumental worship through his prophets.<sup>13</sup> This means that we can know with certainty that Southern Israel (Judah’s) use of instrumental music was not a Davidic invention; instrumental music was ordained by God, himself through his prophets.

### **CENI, Amos Conclusion**

I understand the doctrinal necessity for arguing NT instrumental music, and I understand the necessity to affirm and confirm biblical interpretation (doctrine). Yet, when Amos is examined for contextual completeness (Old Testament historical, prophetic and theological contexts of United Israel *and* Divided Israel), context reveals that CENI’s use of Amos contains contextual fallacy.

CENI has the premise that God rejects instrumental music, and appeals to similar sounding statements in Amos. But the contextual fallacy makes Amos invalid as proof for the CENI premise. As such, Amos cannot be used to prove God is against OT instrumental music; and subsequently Amos cannot serve as logically valid evidence proving prohibition of NT instrumental music.

The immediate difficulty is that Amos does not answer, nor resolve instrumental music in the NT. The above information simply reveals that using Amos is invalid for proving the argument. Because in using Amos, CENI demonstrates itself “versifying” making Amos serve as a proof-text in order to affirm a premise.

Please do not get side tracked with the instrumental music example because I am neither arguing for, nor against instrumental music. I only refer to how Amos has been used in

the instrumental music argument to reveal how the CENI hermeneutic is flawed. As shown, the major flaw of CENI is the negation of context(s). This example of Amos reveals why CENI fails to substantiate positions. This flaw leads to inconsistent and incoherent theology, which drives biblical interpretation.

The CENI biblical interpretation method seeks Jehovah's will, with heartfelt desire and complete and thorough sincerity to be upright spiritually, ethically, morally and biblically. But the CENI hermeneutic promotes out-of-context interpretation and doctrine, which gives birth to argumentation, division and a stagnation of the Restoration Movement.

### ***Addressing Expediency***

The notion of expediency is just as debated as doctrine, if not more so, because expediency results in doctrine that either permits or prohibits Church and Christian practices.

For example, one Christian and/or Church will interpret the use of many communion cups as expedient, but others will not. This is because they believe the "expediency" of many communion cups betrays the example given by Jesus when it says "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave *it* to them, saying, Drink ye all of it".<sup>1</sup> For these brethren, it matters little that many cups makes the distribution of communion expedient (as in easier).

Some churches and/or Christians, at some point, have use expediency for bible classes, kitchens, missionary societies, pitch pipes, praise teams and other things. In one situation a church believes expediency acceptable; but on a different item, and/or may be even about the same issue, another church finds expediency unacceptable. Thus is CENI history.

CENI's appeal to and use of expediency does not adequately provide coherent and consistent biblical interpretation. This issue of when and to what extent to use expediency reveals, in part, the root of the problem – it all comes down to an argument over how to interpret the Bible, even within our own ranks.

Again, I ask, when do we need a specific Command, an approved Example, or a Necessary Inference – even if the NT is Silent – in order to do good? Two aspects of the fruit of the Spirit are love and goodness, "against such things" Paul said, "there is no law".<sup>2</sup> From this, Paul seems to be implying that specified examples are not always needed for accomplishing good things in the kingdom.

### ***Addressing the Authority of the Silence of the Scriptures***

The CENI hermeneutic teaches that biblical authority is needed for everything a Church and/or Christian does. Therefore, if and when the NT is Silent about a topic, then "Silence" has authority, but authority of prohibition, which means that the topic cannot

be practiced. This is why some do not believe or interpret Expediency as authoritative permission.

While some would interpret many communion cups as Expedient, the NT is Silent about the issue, and as such others will not interpret permission for many communion cups. This seems to indicate that there are times that CENI has prohibited action when good could be accomplished, like kitchens for fellowship.

While some might reason that Expediency is appropriate, Expediency, by its nature, interprets “Silence of the Scriptures” as authority for permission. However, others will not always agree, this is because the Expediency arguments depend upon human reason for interpretation. As such, Expediency is not always interpreted as having authoritative permission. To reveal the power of this decision process, consider the Parable of the Talents.<sup>1</sup>

Both the five-talent and the two-talent servants went and doubled their talents – five became ten; two became four. We need to recognize that talents were not skills, as we consider the word *talent*, but talent was a value of money. We also need to recognize that the parable reveals the master’s silence about “how” his servants are to use his money. In other words, because the master was silent, each servant had to assume the master’s authority. We know this, because the parable does not provide any hint of how the servants reasoned “how” to use the master’s money in money-making endeavors. However, we do have an after-the-fact accounting, which reveals the master telling the one-talent servant he should have, at least, earned interest. Therefore, Jesus, by use of parable, teaches that the five-talent and the two-talent servants assumed that their master had given them broad enough authority to double the original quantity and doing so pleased their master. Again, the parable does not reveal *how* they achieved double, just that they did.

However, what the one-talent servant assumed became his ultimate reality. He assumed terrible fear of his master assuming that the master was too harsh. In essence, the one-talent servant Necessarily Inferred from his master’s silence as having “no authority” and subsequently became afraid. In response, the master clearly stated that the one-talent servant should have earned, at the very minimum, interest on the money. The master’s assessment cannot be any clearer – the one-talent servant inferred the wrong conclusion. It seems the one-talent servant rationalized “to error on the side of caution”. Consequently, the one-talent servant dug a hole, buried the money, then dug up the money, returned it to the master and claimed “I return to you that which you gave me – nothing more, nothing less – because I was afraid.”

It is absolutely true that God is to be feared. However, if I am so afraid of doing something wrong, that I don’t do something right, then that is not properly placed fear, but cowardice. CENI’s hermeneutical position interprets “Silence of the Scriptures” as authoritative prohibition, this encourages Churches and/or Christians “to err on the side of caution” out of the fear doing something wrong.

Because some churches will not allow fear of doing the wrong thing stand against them, they reason a solution through Expediency, sometimes to the dismay of others. However, other churches remain fearful of erring, but after careful cross-examination of their options they believe CENI and Expediency provided “no authority”. Therefore, when they find nothing, they do nothing – all because they have fear of not doing the right thing.

### ***Addressing the OT Having No Authority***

While time was given revealing some details about how CENI gives mixed interpretations, as I reflect on my conversations with others, the topic of “No OT authority” creates controversy, like no other; but CENI’s position of “No OT authority” must still be addressed.

It is of distinct interest to me that the first disciples used the “OT” to prove the Messiah, as evidenced by Paul using the Scriptures to prove Jesus was the Christ,<sup>1</sup> Apollos did the same,<sup>2</sup> even Stephen’s speech before the council<sup>3</sup> is filled with references to the OT.<sup>4</sup> We, and Christendom itself, have become so dependent on the NT writings to prove Jesus as the Christ that we all seem to have forgotten that the first century disciples used the OT to prove Jesus. I ask: When was the last time I, or you – the reader, defended Jesus as the Messiah by using only the OT?

But the first disciples did not limit the use of the OT for scriptural proof of Jesus, they also used the “OT” for doctrine and instruction, as evidence by Paul using the Scriptures to prove to the Corinthians that certain behavior was not pleasing to Jehovah.<sup>5</sup> The NT has many instances that tell us to refer to and to use the OT. From these NT references, we know that Churches and Christians are expected to use the OT to learn what is prohibited and permitted, in order for us to love God and love our neighbor.

### **Learn from the OT**

Previously, it was shown that CENI does use OT instruction; but CENI has the tendency to use the OT to prohibit, not permit. From the pages of Acts, we can ascertain that the first century church believed the OT to be authoritative, and in fact “OT” use was encouraged. At the Jerusalem Council, James stated,

“For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day.”<sup>1</sup>

From this passage we know that James stated directly that Gentile converts should understand Moses (specifically-the Five Books of Moses; generally-all the OT) by listening to Moses every week. Since Luke includes the Jerusalem Council and includes James’ statement, then we know that by James being at the Council, that the Council itself: the Apostles and the Jerusalem elders,<sup>2</sup> and the church<sup>3</sup> and the Holy Spirit,<sup>4</sup> desired the Gentile converts to understand the “OT”.

While the NT writings are certainly canon, and a tremendous blessing and revelation from God, ascribing the NT pages as the only authority seems to miss not only the Jerusalem Council’s decision, but also the following statement from Paul to Timothy:

**“All scripture** is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.”<sup>5</sup>

Paul’s statement cannot be interpreted, in any way, as limiting Church doctrine to only the pages of the NT, this is specifically known because of the context of Paul’s statement. The context of “all scripture” is 2 Timothy 3.15, which states,

“And that from a child thou hast known **the holy scriptures**, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.”

From these three verses, Paul specifically states that the OT is useful. According to this passage, Paul says the OT has five useful things for the Church and the Christian:

1. “to make one wise unto salvation through faith... in Christ”
2. “for doctrine”
3. “for reproof”
4. “for correction”, and
5. “for instruction”.

Therefore, according to Paul, the OT is needed, especially if one is to be wise unto salvation. But I specifically refer to Paul’s use of the word *all* – all means all – which means *all* scripture from Genesis to Revelation can and should be used for doctrine. From this passage we know that Paul expected the evangelist Timothy, and by extension all evangelists, to use the “OT” for Church and Christian doctrine. Why, as an evangelist, have I received disapproval for doing the same?

Another aspect to “Addressing the OT Having No Authority” is responding to the proposition: a Christian cannot be Christian and follow the OT. That proposition is true only under one condition, when one follows the OT and never becomes a “follower of Christ”. To the contrary, a follower of Christ does not automatically toss out the OT. We have one definite NT example that demonstrates that Christians can follow the OT, and that example is Paul.

We know from Paul’s confrontation with Peter<sup>6</sup> that Paul despises Christian hypocrisy. Yet, Paul, according to Luke, performed a vow showing that while Paul was a Christian he still followed the Law of Moses.<sup>7</sup> This either makes Paul a hypocritical disciple (where he in one instance follows the Law of Moses, and others renounces it); or Acts Twenty-One shows that Paul does not know what he is talking about.

We know that Paul cannot be a hypocrite. This means Paul knew what he was talking about and what he was doing. Therefore, it becomes true that a Jew can be a disciple of Jesus and still follow the Law of Moses; and it is also true that the Jewish Church (the Jerusalem Council) and the Jewish disciples told the Gentiles to use the OT for doctrine (as seen with Paul and James, both being Jews).

So let me say it again very clearly: No one can be justified by their attentiveness to the Law, the “old testament”;<sup>8</sup> a person can only be justified through the blood of the Lamb that being the man, Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>9</sup>

And let me also say that I seek the Ancient Paths, just as I was taught. Since Paul demonstrated that he walked orderly and kept the Law,<sup>10</sup> and Paul told Timothy that the Law is good if one uses it properly,<sup>11</sup> then it seems proper to conclude that Churches and Christians are to properly exegete, as in use, the “OT”.

### **Proper Use of the OT**

One of the ways in when we can properly use the “OT” is referring to the writings before Matthew, the way the pages of the “NT” reveal. Neither the Messiah nor the Apostles routinely referred to “the things written aforetime” as the “Old Testament”. They refer to those sacred pages as:

- Scripture<sup>1</sup>
- The Scriptures<sup>2</sup>
- The Oracles of God<sup>3</sup>
- The Law<sup>4</sup>
- The Law and the Prophets<sup>5</sup>
- The Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms<sup>6</sup>
- The Scriptures of the Prophets<sup>7</sup>

While the above list was greatly abbreviated (a more comprehensive list is in the Appendix), the pages of the NT cannot be any more clear on the subject. As I was taught, I seek to speak “bible things in Bible ways”, as such, it then seems proper to use terms like: *the oracles, the law, the prophets, the scriptures*.

For clarity, I would like to add that “The Scriptures” encompasses all thirty-nine books occurring before Matthew. Additionally, “The Law” has two applications: the first specifically refers to the Five Books of Moses; the second refers in a general sense to all thirty-nine books before Matthew.

However, there are two times when the NT refers to the scriptures as “OT”:<sup>8</sup>

- But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which *vail* is done away in Christ.
- In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away.

Just because the term “old testament” is found, does not mean that Paul claims or insinuates that the OT cannot be used for doctrine. Paul simply stated that when they read the OT, they did so with a veil over their eyes – in other words, they read the OT and did not see the spiritual meaning. Similarly, just because the Hebrew writer says, in context, “old covenant” does not insinuate that the OT cannot be used for doctrine.

### **Rethinking Paul “Nailing” the OT to the Cross**

To continue reflecting on “Proper Use of the OT,” one must consider Paul’s thoughts regarding “OT Authority”. Doing so, will show aspects of what Paul considered important about the nature and purpose of the Law. In lieu of giving my commentary on each passage, what follows are NT references that help highlight Paul’s thinking. Here are some highlights, which include some comments from me.

1 Timothy 1.8-11      The Law (OT) is good

	1.9-11	The Law (OT) is for the unrighteous
2 Timothy	3.15	The Law (OT) can make one wise unto salvation through Christ
	3.16	The Law (OT) can be used for doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction
Romans	3.27-31	With faith in Jesus, Christians establish the Law (OT)
	7.7	The Law (OT) is not sin
	7.7	The Law (OT) reveals sin
	7.12	The Law (OT) is holy
		The commandment is holy, righteous, good
	7.13	The Law (OT) is not to die to each person
		The Law (OT) reveals how bad sin is
	7.14	The Law (OT) is spiritual
	7.16	The Law (OT) is good
	8.3-4	Jesus became a sin offering in order for Christians to meet the requirements of the Law (OT)
Romans	13.8	Whoever loves others has fulfilled the Law (OT)
	13.10	Love does no harm; therefore love fulfills the Law (OT)
Galatians	2.16	The Law (OT) justifies no one
	3.2, 5	The Law (OT) does not give the Spirit
	3.10	The Law (OT) curses any one who does not keep all the commandments
	3.11	The Law (OT) justifies no one
	3.13	Christ redeems us from the curse of not keeping the commands (OT) and of not being justified (cf. 2.16, 3.11, 3.10)
	3.14	The entire Law (OT) is fulfilled in keeping one commandment: love your neighbor as yourself.
	3.21	The Law (OT) is not against God's promises
		The Law (OT) could not impart life
	3.23-25	The Law (OT), as a schoolmaster, reveals how bad sin is and how badly we need to have faith that Christ redeems us from the curse and the condemnation of failing to be justified by adhering to commandments
	3.24	The Law (OT) ( <i>e.g. works of righteousness</i> ) does not justify; Faith in Jesus justifies, but this in no way removes <i>the instructions of Law (OT)</i> , as seen by Paul in Romans Seven.
	4.4-7	God sent Jesus to be born under the Law (OT) to redeem those under the Law (OT) in order for the redeemed to have sonship. Therefore, if one believes that adhering to the Law (OT) justifies and/or gives Spirit, Life, and Redemption then one has forsaken faith in Jesus (Galatians 5.1).
Galatians	5.1-6	If one attempts to be justified by Law (OT) ( <i>attempting to earn righteousness through good works</i> ), then one has alienated themselves from Christ having fallen from grace. Yet, Paul never throws out Law (OT) as unneeded. Paul said the disciple could use the Law (OT) when used properly (1 Timothy 1.8). Paul also said that the Law (OT) is designed for sinners (1 Timothy 1.9-14) to show how bad sin really is (Romans 7.13).

From those highlights, it seems apparent that Paul expected disciples to use the Old Testament. Since Paul expected the church to use the OT, then it does not seem proper to

conclude that Paul nailed the OT to the cross making the OT non-authoritative for the Church and the Christian.

Sometimes, I have heard the statement that goes something like this, “we only have to do the OT commandments that are *repeated in the NT.*” While that sounds appealing and appeasing, there are difficulties with that aphorism. First, Jesus answers that keeping the commandments give life.<sup>1</sup> While one could retort that Jesus stated that prior to his ascension, it is just as true that Jesus stated after his resurrection “to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded;”<sup>2</sup> therefore the Holy Spirit through Matthew includes Jesus’ statement about commandment observation for a reason.

Secondly, the Apostle John says:

By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous.<sup>3</sup>

John’s statement seems to be clarifying Jesus’ statement of “keep the commandments” by saying “God’s commands are not grievous [as in burdensome or cruel]”. But by also showing that the disciple’s love is demonstrated when the disciple loves God by keeping God’s commandments. This concept is in alignment with Paul’s statement that the entire law is fulfilled when the disciple loves his neighbor.<sup>4</sup>

Thirdly, and most interestingly, when Paul states loving others fulfills the Law,<sup>5</sup> Paul specifically referenced five of the Ten Commandments:<sup>6</sup>

- Thou shalt not commit adultery,
- Thou shalt not kill,
- Thou shalt not steal,
- Thou shalt not bear false witness,
- Thou shalt not covet.

But, after specifically stating five commandments, Paul then gives this phraseology: “if *there be* any other commandment”.<sup>7</sup> With that one phrase, “if *there be* any other commandment,” Paul issued an all-encompassing statement referring to the entirety of the “OT”. This is something – not just for studying – but for the doing.

### **What Is To Be Learned?**

While it is certainly true that the Church and the Christian are “not under the Law”,<sup>1</sup> it is just as true that both are still under the need *to learn from the Law*. James understood this, when he stated that the Gentiles should learn from Moses because Moses was preached every week.<sup>2</sup> But, Paul also testifies to this with his own thought by telling the Corinthians to learn from Israel’s past problems.<sup>3</sup> When looking at the Corinthians passage, Paul mentions several specific issues that can only be understood when one reads the Books of Moses.

Even with the flaws of CENI, it seems clear that Paul’s exhortation to the Corinthians, “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope”<sup>4</sup> is an Example of Necessary Inference that they and we are to read the “OT” in order to learn and to have patience and comfort. Therefore it seems that the Corinthians is an example of learning

what to do (permission) and learning what not to do (prohibition). This supports Paul's command to Timothy to use "all Scripture"<sup>5</sup> which is contextually specific to the OT<sup>6</sup> thus making the "OT" acceptable for teaching and doctrine.

CENI acknowledges that all Scripture is by inspiration, yet CENI has difficulty interpreting that all Scripture is for doctrine. This is why I say that it CENI is the problem, part of this is CENI's insistence of "no OT authority". As previously discussed, CENI appeals to the OT for ethics and morality, and appeals to the OT for prohibition; but CENI fails to appeal to the OT for permission.

Because of CENI "versifying," it misses Jesus' Command to keep the commandments,<sup>7</sup> Paul's Example of how to use the OT,<sup>8</sup> and the Necessary InfERENCE of Apostle John's statement:<sup>9</sup>

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him. By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous."

The Apostle John does not insinuate that faith in Jesus opposes keeping God's commandments; to the Holy Spirit through John these are harmonious. This is why I argue that the hermeneutic is flawed and cannot produce coherent and consistent interpretation, because CENI practices "versifying".

From the evidence given, it seems quite obvious that the Messiah and his Apostles intended for the Church and the Christian to use that which was "written aforetime" to establish doctrine and to teach the church. The "OT" has authority, divine authority, for the church and it is incumbent upon both the Church and Christian to accept that authority, understand and properly use OT teachings.

### **Some Final Thoughts about the OT**

Since the NT proves that the OT is useful, then is a sinner required to have knowledge of the OT before having faith in Jesus? Based upon evidence from Acts Fourteen and Acts Seventeen,<sup>1</sup> it is not necessary to first teach a sinner Law, and then teach them the Messiah. When healing the man in Lystra, or presenting information at Areopagus in Athens, Paul did not quote or refer to the Scriptures in order to prove his teachings. Yet, and most importantly, Paul encouraged neither a preacher (e.g. Timothy) nor a church (e.g. Rome and Corinth) to think or believe that they can live as a Christian in ignorance of the Law (OT).

One last issue that needs to be addressed and it is OT abrogation. The Hebrew writer does not insinuate that the OT is abrogated.<sup>2</sup> The writer states that the old is "ready to vanish away" but never specifics when. In a very real sense the earth, is also "decaying and growing old and is ready to vanish away" but the specifics of when are not given, we simply know that we are in the last days. The two concepts are parallel.

That interpretation is congruent with Jesus statement that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail."<sup>3</sup> Whether partial nullification or complete

abrogation, both “fail” because they remove the influence of the Law. However, Messianic and Sacrificial fulfillment do not remove influence of the Law. This is because “fulfillment” is not “failing” – fulfillment is completing. The Law continues to fulfill (as in complete) its intended purpose by teaching us how to love God and humanity; and Christians continue to fulfill (as in complete) the Law when they love others as themselves<sup>4</sup> as Jesus stated, “On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.”<sup>5</sup>

I simply want what I was taught: to be a first century Christian, living in the modern world. Since Paul, John, James, and Apollos used the OT to prove Jesus, and since the Messiah and the Disciples all say to use the “OT” and use it for church discipline, then that is what I will do.

### ***Conclusion***

Because CENI practices what Campbell termed “versifying” the results have been arguments, division and stagnation of the Restoration Movement. A partial remedy of this situation is to find another method for biblical interpretation, which continues the motif of the Restoration Movement and helps promote forbearance of each other<sup>1</sup> and lives up to Jesus’ exhortation to love one another.<sup>2</sup>

But simply tossing out the CENI hermeneutic is not the answer. The replacement method must honor complete context (meaning being holistic – truly integrated and comprehensive). The contextual hermeneutic must seek: original intent and original lingual intentions. The replacement method must give attention to all contexts. The replacement method must take into account: world history, biblical history, literary styles and the means of understanding each style, and understanding of linguistics of the Ancient Near East including their idiomatic expressions. The replacement method must include an understanding of Covenant and Romans Eleven.

### **A Contextual Hermeneutical Method**

As I have studied exegesis and hermeneutics, I have read many books. Many have given their efforts to help ministers and Bible students seek clarity in and of Scripture. Each book, in its own way refines the exegetical process, increasing the hermeneutical skills of minister and student. But, none have a comprehensive method of looking at context like the book by Michael J. Gorman. His book entitled *Elements of Biblical Exegesis: A Basic Guide for Students and Ministers* provides a seven-step process that takes the Bible student, minister, and researcher through the means of achieving a thorough understanding of biblical text and context.

Gorman specifically focuses on history, society, culture, literature, and rhetorical contexts and how to best understand them. What I find lacking in his book, I will emphasize. Ministers and students need to return the Original Languages (both Hebrew and Greek OT, in addition to the Greek NT). Ministers and students need immersion in the Hebraic and Jewish culture. Ministers and Students need an understanding of the theological contexts of Covenant and Romans Eleven.

### **Context: the Original Languages and Jerusalem Culture**

I find it highly interesting that both Stone and Campbell were students of the original languages. Consider that sometime around 1812 Barton Stone “studied the Hebrew language under a Prussian doctor, a Jew of great learning and ability.”<sup>1</sup> When reading Campbell’s “Apology For A New Translation” it seems that he was familiar with the Greek NT and the Greek OT (Septuagint). These are significant, for when both Stone and Campbell presented their thoughts there are times when they would refer to the original languages.

In his preface for a New Translation, Campbell argued that English is a living language and as such, English continues experiencing changes in lexical meaning. Campbell stated “this constant mutation in a living language, will probably render new translations, or corrections of old translations, necessary every two or three hundred years.”<sup>2</sup> Because of what Campbell terms “constant mutation,” I ask: why argue constantly the superiority of one English translation over another, even Campbell’s translation? Arguments are best made from the original languages, not a translation, no matter how accurate the translation – to use a phrase: *ad fontes* (to the fountains or to the source).

So, following in Stone and Campbell’s footsteps as students of the original languages, I recommend that both members and leaders learn Hebrew and Greek, becoming fully capable of studying and presenting from the original texts. Doing so will uncouple both the Church and the Christians from the dependency yoke relying on arguments based on English translations. Consider the following from Campbell:

“There is no doubt but many smatterers in the original Greek, and some, who may be pretty well acquainted with the classical use and meaning of words and phrases, will think and say, that, in some passages, the common version is more literally correct than this translation. Indeed, we remember since we once thought so ourselves. But after forming a better acquaintance with the idiomatic style of the apostolic writings, and of the Septuagint Greek, we have been fully convinced, that what a classical scholar, or a critical etymologist, might approve, as a literal version of some passages, is by no means the meaning of the writer. And the King’s translators have frequently erred in attempting to be, what some would call, literally correct. They have not given the meaning in some passages, where they have given a literal translation.”<sup>3</sup>

Campbell clearly stated that “acquaintance with the idiomatic style of the [Greek] apostolic writings, and of the Septuagint Greek” will help give understanding to the Biblical author’s intended meaning. Campbell was also convinced that while scholars “might approve” a passage of scripture as literal, that the literalness of certain passages could “by no means [reveal] the meaning of the writer.” In other words, Campbell proclaimed that English translations might very well be “literal” but the “literal” translation is not sufficient to reflect the author’s intentions.

It is also of interest that Campbell makes a notation about “idiomatic style”. This seems groundbreaking for the 1820s, but more of a common understanding today. But, Campbell’s point supports the relevancy of better interpretation. We must continue to better understand the manner in which those ancients communicated, in order for us to better understand what they were communicating.

To accomplish an understanding of the ancients, we must study the original languages, the linguistics, and the cultural aspects of the Jerusalem area, both Hebrew and Hellenistic (Greek). In other words, for better understanding we need to immerse ourselves in the Hebraic Jewish culture in order to understand their spirituality. We do this process naturally when studying to understand the Founding Fathers of the United States. This simply means that to best understand the Messiah and the Apostles, we must immerse ourselves into their time frame grasping the world from their perspective, in order to become capable of better understanding what they were saying. Anything less infuses our perspective into their situation creating asynchronous interpretation leading to misapplication of God's revelation.

### **Context: the Theology of Covenant**

As discussed in the section *Biblical Pattern for Covenant*, Covenant is the theological pattern. Since we live in the New Covenant, knowing what covenant is helps Christians remain faithful. This means it is essential for us to learn how covenant works, how God relates to humans through covenant, and how important the human covenant relationship is with God and Messiah. Understanding Covenant contexts (Abraham, Israel and the New Covenant) provide spiritual assurance and wisdom for living in the New Covenant.

### **Context: the Theology of Romans Eleven**

The spiritual truths of Romans Eleven must be understood. By Holy Spirit inspiration, Paul states that the Gentiles believers are grafted into an existing system.<sup>1</sup> Paul also refers to the Gentiles as a wild olive being grafted into another olive tree that is contrary to the Gentile's nature.<sup>2</sup> But Paul's point is clear: things considered holy to the cultivated olive tree (Jewish Believers) become holy to the grafted in wild olive branches (Gentile Believers).<sup>3</sup> In other words, that which is permitted as holy in the Hebraic Scriptures is permitted in the New Covenant.

### **Three Final Thoughts**

Any replacement hermeneutic must stress complete context: including the contexts analyzed by Gorman's Method, the contexts of original languages (original intent, original lingual intent), the context of Jerusalem culture (both Hebrew and Hellenistic/Greek), the context of Covenant, the context of Romans Eleven, and three other things.

One. God's grace must be present. Present in the fact that when doing our best to walk in the light,<sup>1</sup> God's grace covers our misunderstanding and our misapplication of Scripture. Since it is not possible to interpret perfectly, it is not possible to act perfectly.

Two. God's Spirit works in some way on some level. God's Spirit helps believers and guides us into greater spiritual understanding and better biblical interpretation.<sup>2</sup>

Three. Every hermeneutic originates and is driven by human intellect, human reasoning. As such, human reasoning and human understanding always need constant verification. This means that the replacement hermeneutic cannot become static. The replacement

method must permit continual updating, remaining true to original intent and original lingual intent. Updates will come through things like: archaeological discoveries, better linguistics knowledge, sociological studies, further scripture research, and more spiritual understanding.

Any hermeneutic that relies solely on human reason, even if wanting complete context, will miss the reality of God's Grace, God's Spiritual guidance, not recognizing the limitation of human understanding. Awareness of these things is essential.

## Appendix

In the First Century, the OT was not commonly referred to as the OT, it was called:

Scripture	The Oracles of God
The Scripture	The Law
The Scriptures	The Law of Moses
The Holy Scriptures	The Law of the Lord
The Scriptures of the Prophets	The Law and the Prophets
The Law of Moses, The Prophets, and The Psalms	

While there are many NT references to the “OT” scriptures, it seems that the overwhelming term used for referring to the “OT” is ***The Law***. However, this list is compiled to confirm that the First Century Church searched the Scriptures (Acts 17.11), commonly known by modern Christians as the OT, to prove the Messiah, to understand their faith, and both individually and collectively spoke “as the oracles of God” (1 Peter 4.11).

### ***Scripture:***

Mark 12.10	And have ye not read this <i>scripture</i> ...
Luke 4.21	...This day is this <i>scripture</i> ...
John 19.37	And again another <i>scripture</i> saith...
Acts 1.16	...this <i>scripture</i> must needs have been fulfilled...
Acts 8.35	...and began at the same <i>scripture</i> ...
2 Timothy 3.16	All <i>scripture</i> is given by inspiration of God...

### ***The Scripture:***

Mark 15.28	And <i>the scripture</i> was fulfilled...
John 2.22	... and they believed <i>the scripture</i> ...
John 7.38	...as <i>the scripture</i> hath said...
John 7.42	Hath not <i>the scripture</i> said...
John 10.35	...and <i>the scripture</i> cannot be broken...
John 13.18	...but that <i>the scripture</i> may be fulfilled...
John 17.12	...that <i>the scripture</i> might be fulfilled.
John 19.24	...that <i>the scripture</i> might be fulfilled...
John 19.28	...that <i>the scripture</i> might be fulfilled...
John 19.36	...that <i>the scripture</i> should be fulfilled...
John 20.9	For as yet they knew not <i>the scripture</i> ...
Acts 8.32	The place of <i>the scripture</i> ...
Romans 4.3	For what saith <i>the scripture</i> ? ...
Romans 9.17	For <i>the scripture</i> saith unto Pharaoh...
Romans 10.11	For <i>the scripture</i> saith...
Romans 11.2	...[know] ye not what <i>the scripture</i> saith fo Elias? ...
Galatians 3.8	And <i>the scripture</i> ...
Galatians 3.22	But <i>the scripture</i> ...
Galatians 4.30	Nevertheless what saith <i>the scripture</i> ? ...
1 Timothy 5.18	For <i>the scripture</i> saith...
James 2.8	If ye fulfil the royal law according to <i>the scripture</i> ...

James 2.23                   And *the scripture* was fulfilled which saith...  
 James 4.5                   Do ye think that *the scripture* saith in vain...  
 1 Peter 2.6                  Wherefore also it is contained in *the scripture*...  
 2 Peter 1.20                 ...that no prophecy of *the scripture* is of any private interpretation.

***The Scriptures:***

Matthew 21.42   ...Did ye never read in *the scriptures*...  
 Matthew 22.29   ...Ye do err, not knowing *the scriptures*...  
 Matthew 26.54   But how then shall *the scriptures* be fulfilled...  
 Mark 12.24       ...because ye know not *the scriptures*...  
 Mark 14.49       ...but *the scriptures* must be fulfilled.

Luke 24.27       ...he expounded unto them in all *the scriptures*...  
 Luke 24.32       ...while he opened to us *the scriptures*.  
 Luke 24.45       ...that they might understand *the scriptures*...  
 John 5.39         Search *the scriptures*...  
 Acts 17.2         ...reasoned with them out of *the scriptures*

Acts 17.11         ...searched *the scriptures* daily...  
 Acts 18.24         ...mighty in *the scriptures*...  
 Acts 18.28         ...shewing by *the scriptures* that Jesus was Christ.  
 Romans 15.4       ...through patience and comfort of *the scriptures* might have hope.  
 1 Corinthians 15.3   ...Christ died for our sins according to *the scriptures*;  
  
 1 Corinthians 15.4   ...buried, and... rose again... according to *the scriptures*.  
 2 Peter 3.16       ...as they do also the other *scriptures*...

***The Holy Scriptures:***

Romans 1.2         ...promised afore by his prophets in *the holy scriptures*...  
 2 Timothy 3.15     ...from a child thou hast known *the holy scriptures*...

***The Scriptures of the Prophets:***

Matthew 26.56     ...that *the scriptures of the prophets* might be fulfilled...  
 Romans 16.26     ...is made manifest by *scriptures of the prophets*...

***The Oracles of God:***

Romans 3.2         ...unto them were committed *the oracles of God*.  
 Hebrews 5.12     ...the first principles of *the oracles of God*...  
 1 Peter 4.11       ...let him speak as the *oracles of God*...

***The Law of Moses:***

Luke 2.22           And when the days of her purification according to *the law of Moses* were accomplished...  
 Luke 24.44         ...all things must be fulfilled, which were written in *the law of Moses*, and in the prophets, and in the psalms...  
 John 7.23          If a man on the sabbath day receive circumcision, that *the law of Moses* should not be broken...  
 Acts 13.39         ...from which ye could not be justified by *the law of Moses*.  
  
 Acts 15.5           ...the Pharisees which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep *the law of Moses*.  
 Acts 28.23         ...both out of *the law of Moses*, and out of the prophets...  
 1 Corinthians 9.9   For it is written in *the law of Moses*...

### ***The Law of the Lord:***

Luke 2.23 ...As it is written in ***the law of the Lord***...  
Luke 2.24 And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in ***the law of the Lord***...  
Luke 2.39 And when they had performed all things according to ***the law of the Lord***...

### ***The Law and the Prophets:***

Matthew 5.17 Think not that I am come to destroy ***the law***, or ***the prophets***...  
Matthew 7.12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is ***the law*** and ***the prophets***.  
Matthew 11.13 For all ***the prophets*** and ***the law*** prophesied until John.  
Matthew 22.40 On these two commandments [22.37-39] hang all ***the law*** and ***the prophets***.  
Luke 16.16 ***The law*** and ***the prophets*** were until John...  
John 1.45 We have found him, of whom Moses in ***the law***, and ***the prophets***, did write.  
Acts 13.15 And after the reading of ***the law*** and ***the prophets***...  
Acts 24.14 ...believing all things which are written in ***the law*** and in ***the prophets***.  
Acts 28.23 ...both out of ***the law of Moses***, and out of ***the prophets***...  
Romans 3.21 But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by ***the law*** and ***the prophets***...

### ***The Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms:***

Luke 24.44 ...all things must be fulfilled, which were written in ***the law of Moses***, and in ***the prophets***, and in ***the psalms***...

### ***The Law:***

Matthew 5.18 ...one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from ***the law***...  
Matthew 12.5 ...have you not read ***the law***...  
Matthew 22.36 ...which is the great commandment in ***the law***?  
Matthew 23.23 ...have omitted the weightier matters of ***the law***...  
Luke 2.27 ...to do for him after the custom of ***the law***...  
Luke 10.26 ...what is written in ***the law***? ...  
Luke 16.17 ...easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of ***the law*** to fail.  
John 1.17 For ***the law*** was given by Moses...  
John 1.45 ...of whom Moses in ***the law***, and the prophets did write...  
John 7.19 Did not Moses give you ***the law***...  
John 7.49 But this people who knoweth not ***the law*** are cursed.  
John 8.5 But Moses in ***the law*** commanded us...  
John 12.34 ...we have heard out of ***the law*** that Christ abideth for ever...  
Acts 6.13 ...words against this holy place, and ***the law***.  
Acts 7.53 Who have received ***the law*** by this disposition of angels...  
Acts 15.24 ...certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying be circumcised, and keep ***the law***...  
Acts 18.13 ...this fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to ***the law***.  
Acts 21.20 ...Thou seest brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are zealous of ***the law***.  
Acts 21.24 ...but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest ***the law***.  
Acts 21.28 ...this is the man, that teacheth all men every where against the people, and ***the law***, and this place...  
Acts 22.12 ...a devout man according to ***the law***...  
Acts 23.3 ...for sittest thou to judge me after ***the law***...

Romans 2.12 For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in *the law* shall be judged by *the law*;

Romans 2.13 (For not the hearers of *the law* are just before God, but the doers of *the law* shall be justified.

Romans 2.14 For when the Gentiles, which have not *the law*, do by nature the things contained in *the law*, these, having not *the law*, are a law unto themselves:

Romans 2.15 Which shew the work of *the law* written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another:)

Romans 2.17 Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in *the law*, and makest thy boast of God,

Romans 2.18 And knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of *the law*;

Romans 2.20 An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in *the law*.

Romans 2.23 Thou that makest thy boast of *the law*, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?

Romans 2.25 For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep *the law*: but if thou be a breaker of *the law*, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.

Romans 2.26 Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of *the law*, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?

Romans 2.27 And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil *the law*, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress *the law*?

Romans 3.19 Now we know that what things soever *the law* saith, it saith to them that are under *the law*...

Romans 3.20 Therefore by the deeds of *the law* there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by *the law* is the knowledge of sin.

Romans 3.21 But now the righteousness of God without *the law* is manifested, being witnessed by *the law* and the prophets...

Romans 3.28 ...a man is justified by faith without the deeds of *the law*.

Romans 3.31 Do we then make void *the law* through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish *the law*.

Romans 4.13 For the promise... was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through *the law*.

Romans 4.14 For if they which are of *the law* be heirs, faith is made void...

Romans 4.15 Because *the law* worketh wrath...

Romans 4.16 ...to the end of the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of *the law*...

Romans 5.13 For until *the law* sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is *no law*.

Romans 5.20 Moreover *the law* entered, that the offence might abound...

Romans 6.14 For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under *the law*, but under grace.

Romans 6.15 What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under *the law*, but under grace? God forbid.

Romans 7.1 ...for I speak to them that know *the law*,) how that *the law* hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?

Romans 7.2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by *the law* to her husband; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

Romans 7.3 ...but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law...

Romans 7.4 Wherefore...ye also are become dead to *the law* by the body of Christ

Romans 7.5	...the motions of sins, which were by <i>the law</i> ...
Romans 7.6	But now we are delivered from <i>the law</i> ...
Romans 7.7	What shall we say then? Is <i>the law</i> sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not know sin, but by <i>the law</i> : for I had not known lust, except <i>the law</i> had said...
Romans 7.8	...for without <i>the law</i> sin was dead.
Romans 7.9	For I was alive without <i>the law</i> once...
Romans 7.12	Wherefore <i>the law</i> is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.
Romans 7.14	For we know that <i>the law</i> is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.
Romans 7.16	...I consent unto <i>the law</i> that it is good.
Romans 7.22	For I delight in <i>the law of God</i> after the inward man...
Romans 8.3	For what <i>the law</i> could not do...
Romans 8.4	That the righteousness of <i>the law</i> might be fulfilled in us...
Romans 9.4	Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth... the covenants, and the giving of <i>the law</i> ...
Romans 9.32	...because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of <i>the law</i> .
Romans 10.4	For Christ is the end of <i>the law</i> ...
Romans 10.5	For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of <i>the law</i> ...
Romans 13.8	...for he that loveth another hath fulfilled <i>the law</i> .
Romans 13.10	...therefore love is the fulfilling of <i>the law</i> .
1 Corinthians 9.20	And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under <i>the law</i> , as under the law, that I might gain them that are under <i>the law</i> ...
1 Corinthians 9.21	To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under <i>the law</i> to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.
1 Corinthians 14.21	In <i>the law</i> it is written...
1 Corinthians 15.56	...the strength of sin is <i>the law</i> .
Galatians 2.16	Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of <i>the law</i> , but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of <i>the law</i> : for by the works of <i>the law</i> shall no flesh be justified.
Galatians 2.19	For I through <i>the law</i> am dead to <i>the law</i> , that I might live unto God.
Galatians 2.21	I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by <i>the law</i> , then Christ is dead in vain.
Galatians 3.2	... Received ye the Spirit by the works of <i>the law</i> , or by the hearing of faith?
Galatians 3.5	He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of <i>the law</i> , or by the hearing of faith?
Galatians 3.11	But that no man is justified by <i>the law</i> in the sight of God...
Galatians 3.12	And <i>the law</i> is not of faith...
Galatians 3.13	Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of <i>the law</i> ...
Galatians 3.17	...the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, <i>the law</i> , which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul...
Galatians 3.18	For if the inheritance be of <i>the law</i> , it is no more of promise...
Galatians 3.19	Wherefore then serveth <i>the law</i> ? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.
Galatians 3.21	Is <i>the law</i> then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by <i>the law</i> .
Galatians 3.23	But before faith came, we were kept under <i>the law</i> ...

Galatians 3.24	Wherefore <i>the law</i> was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.
Galatians 4.4	But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under <i>the law</i> ...
Galatians 4.5	To redeem them that were under <i>the law</i> , that we might receive the adoption of sons.
Galatians 4.21	Tell me, ye that desire to be under <i>the law</i> , do ye not hear <i>the law</i> ?
Galatians 5.4	Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by <i>the law</i> ; ye are fallen from grace.
Galatians 5.14	For all <i>the law</i> is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.
Galatians 5.18	But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under <i>the law</i> .
Galatians 6.13	For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep <i>the law</i> ...
Ephesians 2.15	Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even <i>the law</i> of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace...
Philippians 3.5	...as touching <i>the law</i> , a Pharisee...
Philippians 3.6	...touching the righteousness which is in <i>the law</i> , blameless.
Philippians 3.9	And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of <i>the law</i> ...
1 Timothy 1.7	Desiring to be teachers of <i>the law</i> ...
1 Timothy 1.8	But we know that <i>the law</i> is good, if a man use it lawfully...
1 Timothy 1.9	... <i>the law</i> is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless...
Titus 3.9	But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about <i>the law</i> ; for they are unprofitable and vain
Hebrews 7.5	...the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to <i>the law</i> ...
Hebrews 7.11	If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received <i>the law</i> ),...
Hebrews 7.12	For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of <i>the law</i> .
Hebrews 7.19	For <i>the law</i> made nothing perfect...
Hebrews 7.28	For <i>the law</i> maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since <i>the law</i> , maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.
Hebrews 8.4	For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to <i>the law</i> ...
Hebrews 9.19	For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to <i>the law</i> ...
Hebrews 9.22	And almost all things are by <i>the law</i> purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.
Hebrews 10.1	For <i>the law</i> having a shadow of good things to come...
Hebrews 10.8	Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by <i>the law</i> ...
James 2.9	But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of <i>the law</i> as transgressors.
James 2.11	...Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou become a transgressor of <i>the law</i> .

James 4.11

...He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of *the law*, and judgeth *the law*: but if thou judge *the law*, thou art not a doer of *the law*, but a judge.

1 John 3.4

Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also *the law*: for sin is the transgression of *the law*.

## Endnotes

### Preface

1. Words themselves can give life or take it. Proverbs 18.21.
2. “And God said.” Genesis 1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 1.11, 1.14, 1.20, 1.24.
3. By “the word of his power” all things are upheld. Hebrews 1.3.
4. Boldness to enter the holiest of places. Hebrews 10.19.
5. Boldly come to the throne of grace. Hebrews 4.16.
6. Provoking ourselves to love and good works. Hebrews 10.24.

### My Love

1. God is to be revered and feared. Ecclesiastes 12.13.
2. His word is our guide and our Lamp. Psalm 119.105.
3. Jesus is the way. John 14.6.

### My Lament

1. Provoking ourselves to love and good works. Hebrews 10.24.
2. Becoming a body of believers capable of defending themselves against principalities, powers, rulers of darkness and spiritual wickedness. Ephesians 6.12.
3. We must permit others, and ourselves to ask, to seek, and to knock. Matthew 7.7-8.

### In My Defense

1. Paul became “like” others. 1 Corinthians 9.19-23.
2. Paul never permits himself or believers to stagnate in their maturation toward the fullness of Christ. Philippians 3.12-15; Ephesians 1.18, 4.13.
3. The Living Oracles, Alexander Campbell, Gospel Advocate Restoration Reprints, General Preface: An Apology For A New Translation, page vii. The Title Page of the NT translation is: *The Sacred Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ Commonly Styled The New Testament*, translated from the original Greek by Doctors George Campbell, James MacKnight and Philip Doddridge. With preface, various emendations and an appendix, by Alexander Campbell.
4. The preacher had better be very fearful of a wrathful and vengeful God who can and will cast away. 1 Corinthians 9.23-27.
5. The work of an evangelist. 2 Timothy 4.5.
6. An evangelist has to proclaim true truth even when it is hard to hear. 2 Timothy 4.2-3.
7. A preacher must be diligent to show himself approved. 2 Timothy 2.15, ASV.
8. The preacher must be willing to challenge the proclaimers of the past – testing those spirits. 1 John 4.1.
9. “Seek ye the old paths” based on Jeremiah 6.16.
10. Paul told the Thessalonians to follow the churches of Judea. 1 Thessalonians 2.14.

### NT Identification

1. Jesus is the last prophet *of the Old Testament*, having been born, having lived, and having died *in the Old Covenant*. Galatians 4.4-5.
2. Jesus fulfilled all Messianic prophecy and sacrificial needs making atonement; yet, Jesus makes the bold claim to follow all of his teachings. Matthew 28.20.

### Biblical Pattern for Covenant

1. Biblical pattern: Abraham. Genesis 15.7-21, cf. Genesis 15.18.
2. Biblical pattern: the Israelites. Exodus 24, confirmed by Jeremiah 34.18-20.
3. A covenant is entered when the covenant testator sheds its blood. Hebrews 9.14-21.
4. “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written *for our learning, that we* through patience and comfort of the scriptures *might have hope.*” Romans 15.4.
5. The Biblical pattern for covenant is there and is testified by Jeremiah. Jeremiah 34.18-20.
6. Jeremiah prophesied the New Covenant. Jeremiah 31.31-34.
7. Jesus was born, lived, and died in and under the Law of Moses – period. Galatians 4.4-5.
8. Jesus was nailed to the cross as a propitiation for our transgressions. Romans 3.25; 1 John 2.2, 4.10

9. Jesus made atonement for our sins. Romans 5.11; 1 Corinthians 15.3; Hebrews 1.3; 1 Peter 2.24.

### Where Does the NT Begin?

1. The biblical pattern for the beginning of a Covenant is the death of a testator. Hebrews 9.16-17.
2. Animals were the testator between God and Abraham. Genesis 15.7-21, cf. Genesis 15.18.
3. Animals were the testator between God and the Nation of Israel. Exodus 24.
4. Jeremiah confirms that the testator between God and Israel was animal life. Jeremiah 34.18-20.
5. The blood of animal life is not sufficient. Hebrews 10.4.
6. The New Covenant needed the blood of a human testator, blood from the man Jesus. Hebrews 9.14-21.
7. The blood of the selected animals sealed the Covenant between God and Abraham. Genesis 15.18-21.
8. The blood of the animals at Sinai sealed the Covenant between God and Israel. Exodus 24.8.
9. The blood of the man, Jesus of Nazareth, sealed the New Covenant between God and Israel *and* God and the World (to the Jew first, then to the Gentile). Romans 1.16.
10. For a Covenant to be sealed the testator's blood is required, this is verified by Hebrews. Hebrew 9.11-22.
11. According to Jesus, his teachings are just as valid for the NT as they were for the OT. Matthew 28.20.

### How Does the Bible Refer to Itself?

1. Scripture. Jesus-Luke 4.21; Paul-2 Timothy 3.16.
2. The Scriptures. Jesus-Matthew 21.42; Paul-Romans 15.4.
3. The Oracles of God. Peter-1 Peter 4.11; Paul-Romans 3.2; the Hebrew writer-Hebrews 5.12.
4. The Law. Jesus-Matthew 12.5; Paul-Galatians 4.21.
5. The Law and the Prophets. Jesus-Matthew 22.40; Paul-Acts 24.14.
6. The Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Jesus-Luke 24.44.
7. The Scriptures of the Prophets. Paul-Romans 16.26.
8. There are two occurrences when the NT refers to the scriptures as "OT". 2 Corinthians 3.14; Hebrews 8.13.

### How Should the Law of Moses Be Interpreted?

1. Rightly divide the word of God. 2 Timothy 2.15
2. Jesus used Psalm 118.22-23, and called them Scriptures when he said, "Did ye never read in the scriptures, 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?'" Matthew 21.42.
3. After someone who was with Jesus, cut off the servant's ear. Matthew 26.51 according John 18.10 Peter cut off the servant's ear.
4. Jesus asked, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?"<sup>4</sup> Matthew 26.53-54.
5. Jesus walked on the Emmaus Road with two individuals and then broke bread with them. Luke 24.13-35.
6. Jesus taught them "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Luke 24.27.
7. Jesus said, "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." John 5.39.
8. Jesus said, "Have ye not read, that he which made *them* at the beginning made them male and female, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?" Matthew 19.4-5.
9. Jesus said, "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God." Matthew 22.29.
10. Jesus said, "have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?'" God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Matthew 22.31-32.
11. Peter quoted Joel. Acts 2.16-21; cf. Joel 2.28-32.
12. Peter quoted David. Acts 2.25-28, cf. Psalm 16.8-11; Acts 2.34-35; cf. Psalm 110.1.
13. Peter taught that God wants Christians and the Church to be holy in everything. 1 Peter 1.15.
14. Peter referred immediately to Leviticus, either Leviticus 11.44-45 and/or 19.2.

15. “Be ye holy; for I am holy.” 1 Peter 1.16; cf. Leviticus 11.44-45 and/or 19.2.
16. Peter said, “If any man speak, *let him speak* as ***the oracles of God***”. 1 Peter 4.11.
17. Paul said that the Jews had the advantage because they were given ***the oracles of God***. Romans 3.2.
18. “For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which *be* the first principles of ***the oracles of God***”. Hebrews 5.12.
19. Stephen referred to information found in the Five Books of Moses – specifically Genesis and Exodus. Acts 7.2-37.
20. Stephen referred to the Prophets. Acts 7.42.
21. New layers of meaning for “Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people.” Acts 6.8.
22. Apollos was powerful in the Scriptures. Acts 18.24.
23. Apollos used the Scriptures to prove Jesus as the Messiah. Acts 18.28.
24. Paul used the “old testament” to prove Jesus. Acts 13.14-47; 1 Corinthians 15.3-4. 22.
25. Paul used the “old testament” to reveal expected behavior for the Church. 1 Corinthians 10.1-12.
26. Paul used the “old testament” to reason and reveal theology. Galatians 4.21-31.
27. Paul said, “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of ***the scriptures*** might have hope.” Romans 15.4.
28. Paul’s statement to Timothy: “All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.” 2 Timothy 3.16-17.
29. Jesus said, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.” Matthew 5.17-19.
30. With the change in covenant, there comes a change in the priesthood. Hebrews 7.12.
31. With the change in covenant, there comes a reformation of sacrifices. Hebrew 9.9-10.
32. This modification of the law’s specific priesthood is seen when Peter said that all believers are part of the “royal priesthood”. 1 Peter 2.5, 2.9-10.
33. Reformation of the sacrifices, reforming the “OT” animal sacrifices by the sacrifice of Jesus. Hebrews 10.1-12.
34. “Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.” Romans 3.31.
35. “I delight in the law of God after the inward man”. Romans 7.22.
36. Paul taught that by having faith in Jesus, Christians establish law. Romans 3.31.
37. Paul taught that the “old testament” is fulfilled when Christians’ love. Romans 13.8-10.
38. Jesus makes it very clear that the entirety of all the Law of Moses hangs on two conjointly equal concepts: one’s love for God, and one’s love for humanity. Matthew 22.36-40.
39. Jesus referred to the “old testament” teachings found in Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy 6.4-5.
40. Jesus referred to the “old testament” teachings found in Leviticus. Leviticus 19.18b.

### **Then, What about Sacrifices?**

1. No one can be justified by their attentiveness to the Law, the “old testament”. Romans 3.20a.
2. A person can only be justified through the blood of the Lamb that being the man, Jesus of Nazareth. Romans 3.24-25, 3.28; 5.1, 5.9; 8.30.
3. Jesus embodies and fulfills the OT grain offering for his body is food indeed. John 6.53-56, cf. Leviticus 2, KJV uses “meat” but by context we know that it is referring to grains use to make flour.
4. Jesus embodies and fulfills the OT peace offering. Romans 5.1, Colossians 1.20 cf. Leviticus 3.
5. Jesus embodies and fulfills the OT sin offering. Romans 8.3, cf. Leviticus 4.
6. Jesus embodies and fulfills the OT trespass offering. Leviticus 5.
7. Jesus embodies and fulfills the OT drink offering, for his blood is drink indeed. John 6.53-56; cf. “OT” drink offering.
8. Jesus is why we have the distinct privilege to come boldly to God’s throne of grace. Hebrews 4.16.
9. Through the Messiah we have the boldness to enter in the holiest of holies. Hebrews 10.19.

### **To What Extent Is The OT To Be Used?**

1. Judaizer identified. Acts 15.1, 15.5.

2. Jesus taught that keeping the commands give life. Matthew 19.17-19.
3. Washing feet. John 13.12-15.
4. Men lifting holy hands in prayer. 1 Timothy 2.8.
5. Paul said that all scripture is profitable for teaching, correction, and instruction in righteousness. 2 Timothy 3.16.
6. Paul said the OT makes one “wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ”. 2 Timothy 3.15.
7. Two aspects of the fruit of the Spirit are love and goodness, “against such things” Paul said, “there is no law”. Galatians 5.22-23.

#### ***Demonstrating the Incoherency and Inconsistency of CENI***

1. CENI appeals to Joseph’s reaction to Potiphar’s wife. Genesis 39.
2. CENI has used the OT to reveal Necessary Inferences for following Patterns like Noah’s Ark. Genesis 6.13-16.
3. CENI appeals to follow commands exactly as seen with Nadab and Abihu. Leviticus 10.1-2.
4. CENI appeals to follow commands exactly as seen with Uzzah. 2 Samuel 6.3-7.

#### **CENI and Context**

1. The Living Oracles, Alexander Campbell, Gospel Advocate Restoration Reprints, Preface to the Fourth, or Stereotype Edition, page lii-liiii. The Title Page of the NT translation is: *The Sacred Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ Commonly Styled The New Testament*, translated from the original Greek by Doctors George Campbell, James MacKnight and Philip Doddridge. With preface, various emendations and an appendix, by Alexander Campbell.

#### **Amos in Context**

1. King Jeroboam established the two altars each with a golden calf, one in Dan and one in Bethel. 1 Kings 12.26-30.
2. The calves happened shortly after Solomon’s death. 1 Kings 11.42-43.
3. “Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel”. Amos 1.1.
4. “In the fifteenth year of Amaziah the son of Joash king of Judah Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel began to reign in Samaria, and reigned forty and one years. And he did *that which was* evil in the sight of the LORD: he departed not from all the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin.” 2 Kings 14.23-24.
5. God did not reject Northern Israel because of their use of instrumental music. Amos 5.23, 6.5.
6. Summary of why Israel was taken captive. 2 Kings 17.7-18.
7. When Solomon dedicated the Temple, instrumental music was used. 2 Chronicles 5.1-14, esp. 5.11-14.
8. At Solomon’s dedication, God gave his presence filling the Temple with his glory. 2 Chronicles 5.13-14.
9. God’s glorious presence manifested itself at the completion and dedication of the Tabernacle. Exodus 40.33-35.
10. The people did “as the LORD commanded Moses”. Exodus 39.1, 39.5, 39.7, 39.21, 39.26, 39.29, 39.31, 40.19, 40.21, 40.25, 40.27, 40.29, 40.32.
11. Hezekiah restored worship at the Temple. 2 Chronicles 29.
12. Southern Israel used instrumental music during their worship of God. 2 Chronicles 29.25-30.
13. God himself commanded instrumental worship through his prophets. 2 Chronicles 29.25.

#### ***Addressing Expediency***

1. Jesus said, “And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave *it* to them, saying, Drink ye all of it”. Matthew 26.27.
2. Two aspects of the fruit of the Spirit are love and goodness, “against such things” Paul said, “there is no law”. Galatians 5.22-23.

#### ***Addressing the Authority of the Silence of the Scriptures***

1. Parable of the Talents. Matthew 25.14-30.

### ***Addressing the OT Having No Authority***

1. Paul used the OT to prove Jesus was the Christ. Acts 17.2-3.
2. Apollos used the OT to prove Jesus was the Christ. Acts 18.24-28, esp. 18.28.
3. Stephen's speech before the council. Acts 6.12.
4. Stephen's speech was filled with references to the OT. Acts 6.8-7.53.
5. Paul also used the "OT" for doctrine and instruction, instructing the Corinthians that certain behavior was not pleasing to Jehovah. 1 Corinthians 10.1-12.

### **Learn from the OT**

1. At the Jerusalem Council, James stated, "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day." Acts 15.21.
2. The Council itself: the Apostles and the Jerusalem elders desired the Gentile converts to understand the "OT". Acts 15.6, 15.22.
3. The Council itself: the church desired the Gentile converts to understand the "OT". Acts 15.22.
4. The Council itself: the Holy Spirit desired the Gentile converts to understand the "OT". Acts 15.28.
5. Paul to Timothy: "All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Timothy 3.16-17.
6. Paul's confrontation with Peter. Galatians 2.11-14.
7. Paul, according to Luke, performed a vow showing that while Paul was a Christian he still followed the Law of Moses. Acts 21.15-30.
8. No one can be justified by their attentiveness to the Law, the "old testament". Romans 3.20a.
9. A person can only be justified through the blood of the Lamb that being the man, Jesus of Nazareth. Romans 3.24, 3.28; 5.1, 5.9; 8.30.
10. Paul demonstrated that he walked orderly and kept the Law. Acts 21.24.
11. Paul told Timothy that the Law is good if one uses it properly. 1 Timothy 1.8.

### **Proper Use of the OT**

1. Scripture. Jesus-Luke 4.21; Paul-2 Timothy 3.16.
2. The Scriptures. Jesus-Matthew 21.42; Paul-Romans 15.4.
3. The Oracles of God. Peter-1 Peter 4.11; Paul-Romans 3.2; the Hebrew writer-Hebrews 5.12.
4. The Law. Jesus-Matthew 12.5; Paul-Galatians 4.21.
5. The Law and the Prophets. Jesus-Matthew 22.40; Paul-Acts 24.14.
6. The Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Jesus-Luke 24.44.
7. The Scriptures of the Prophets. Paul-Romans 16.26.
8. There are two times when the NT refers to the scriptures as "OT". 2 Corinthians 3.14; Hebrews 8.13.

### **Rethinking Paul "Nailing" the OT to the Cross**

1. Jesus answers that keeping the commandments give life. Matthew 19.17.
2. Jesus stated after his resurrection "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded". Matthew 28.20.
3. The Apostle John says, "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5.2-3.
4. Paul's states the entire law is fulfilled when the disciple loves his neighbor. Romans 13.10
5. Paul states loving others fulfills the Law. Romans 13.8.
6. Paul specifically referenced five of the Ten Commandments. Romans 13.9, cf. Exodus 20.13-17; Deuteronomy 5.17-21.
7. "if *there be* any other commandment". Romans 13.9b.

### **What Is To Be Learned?**

1. It is certainly true that the Church and the Christian are "not under the Law". Romans 6.14.
2. James stated that the Gentiles would learn from Moses because Moses was preached every week. Acts 15.13-21, esp 15.21.
3. Paul also testifies to this with his own thought by telling the Corinthians to learn from Israel's past problems. 1 Corinthians 10.1-12.

4. “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope”. Romans 15.4.
5. “all Scripture”. 2 Timothy 3.16.
6. The context of 2 Timothy 3.16 reaches back to, at least, 2 Timothy 3.15 where “the holy scriptures” is specifically the OT.
7. CENI misses Jesus’ Command to keep the commandments. Matthew 5.19, 19.17.
8. CENI misses Paul’s Example of how to use the OT. 1 Corinthians 10.1-12.
9. CENI misses the Necessary Inference of the Apostle John: “Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him. By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous.” 1 John 5.1-3.

#### **Some Final Thoughts About the OT**

1. It is not necessary to teach a sinner Law and then teach them the Messiah. Acts 14.8-18; Acts 17.18-34.
2. The Hebrew writer does not insinuate that the OT is abrogated. Hebrews 8.13.
3. Jesus statement “it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” Luke 16.17.
4. The Law continues to fulfill its intended purpose by teaching us how to love God and humanity, and Christians continue to fulfill law when they love others as themselves. Romans 13.10.
5. Jesus stated, “On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.” Matthew 22.37-40, esp. Matthew 22.40.

#### **Conclusion**

1. Promote forbearance of each other. Romans 2.4 and Romans 14.1-23.
2. Live up to Jesus’ exhortation to love one another. John 15.12, 15.17.

#### **Context: the Original Languages and Jerusalem Culture**

1. Works of Elder B. W. Stone, To Which Is added A Few Discourses and Sermons (Original And Selected) by Elder James M. Mathes, Volume I, Chapter III, page 28, 1859.
2. The Living Oracles, Alexander Campbell, Gospel Advocate Restoration Reprints, General Preface, An Apology For A New Translation, page iii. The Title Page of the NT translation is: *The Sacred Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ Commonly Styled The New Testament*, translated from the original Greek by Doctors George Campbell, James MacKnight and Philip Doddridge. With preface, various emendations and an appendix, by Alexander Campbell.
3. The Living Oracles, Alexander Campbell, Gospel Advocate Restoration Reprints, General Preface, An Apology For A New Translation, page vii. The Title Page of the NT translation is: *The Sacred Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ Commonly Styled The New Testament*, translated from the original Greek by Doctors George Campbell, James MacKnight and Philip Doddridge. With preface, various emendations and an appendix, by Alexander Campbell.

#### **Context: the Theology of Romans Eleven**

1. Gentiles believers are grafted into an existing system. Romans 11.13-18.
2. Paul also refers to the Gentiles as a wild olive being grafted into another olive tree that is contrary to the Gentile’s nature. Romans 11.24.
3. Things considered holy to the cultivated olive tree (Jewish Believers) become holy to the grafted in wild olive branches (Gentile Believers). Romans 11.1-25.

#### **Three Final Thoughts**

1. Walk in the light. 1 John 1.7.
2. Greater spiritual understanding and better biblical interpretation. Ephesians 1.16-19.