

SENIOR BIBLE CLASS DISCUSSION ON THE LAW

by Mr. Herman Hoeh

1. Why did Mr. Hoeh entitle his article, "Old Testament Laws in Force Today," rather than, "Which Old Covenant Laws are in Force Today?"

Because O.T. laws were NOT necessarily all contained within the Cov. The law was quoted from the O.T. because that was given as God's Word and not just because it was a part of the O.T.

2. Who is the Law-giver today?

There is just one Law-giver -- James 4:12.

3. What did Jesus tell us about His policy in respect to His Law of O.T. when He was on the Mount with His disciples in audience of the people?

The servant is not greater than his master. He should be called greatest in the Kingdom who would keep and teach even the least of the Commandments. Matt. 5:19; 5:17.

4. Now why did Jesus give that as an introduction to the next two verses?

As a foundation so they would understand what he was about to say -- as he was to show he wasn't abolishing the law but expounding it and making it of more effect -- Matt. 5:17.

5. Give example and place in Scripture to show the Ten Commandments were in effect from Adam to the days of Moses.

Death reigned from Adam to Moses--Rom. 6:23, Wages of sin is death. Sin is transgression of the Law--I Jn. 3:4. If you break one point you break them all--James. The principle is there, God's law was in effect or death could not have reigned from Adam to Moses, but was not imputed into their conscience. They didn't understand it. David said, All His Commandments are righteousness and they are perfect. (Rom. 5:14; 4:15-- No law, no transgression.)

6. Which chapter in O. T. is devoted to all of God's law and Ten Com.?

Ps. 119; 111;7-8-- They are established forever. Rom. and James-- They are binding from day of Creation till Moses.

7. Where in N.T. is proof that we are not merely to keep the Ten Com. but other laws as well?

Matt. 28:19-20 -- teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you..... I Cor. 5:8--Let us keep the Feast, not with old leaven.... Heb. 7-- tithing.

8. Shall we eat blood? This not one of the Ten Commandments.

A son who was a drunkard and wouldn't obey his parents was stoned. We cannot be a drunkard and get into the Kingdom. Zech. 14 shows we will keep the Feast of Tabernacles during the Millennium. Then we have many other places (or laws) that are obligatory for Christians, besides the Ten. There are many other places showing that meats are unclean, other than Peter's vision where he said he did not eat any thing common or unclean.

We have to understand Paul's teaching, where he said, we should eat those things sanctified by the Word of God.

9. How can you prove which O.T. laws are in force today?

By examples of Christ and the teaching of the disciples. You can go to the O.T., but which ones DO we keep? KEEP ALL LAWS CHRIST'S SACRIFICE DIDN'T DO AWAY WITH. Christ didn't become a law, Holy Day, Feast or anything of the kind; He only became a sacrifice. Therefore, His sacrifice can only do away with the sacrifices. They are in force unless altered or abolished--abrogated.

10. Did the O. Cov. establish the Ten or bring them into being?

No. Death reigned from Adam to Moses-- is the general principle. For a specific principle to prove the Ten were in force previous to O.Cov., go to O.T. and analyze each point of the law. It was sin to transgress each law. The law of the Sabbath is the main one to prove. Ex. 16:27-29, "And it came to pass on the Sabbath, seventh day, that there went out some of the people to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep My Commandments.... This was BEFORE Mt. Sinai.

11. How do we know other than Ten were in force before O.Cov. that we keep today?

Ex. 16:16 -- Moses was instructing the people, "When they have a matter, it cometh unto me; and I judge between a man and his neighbor, and I make them to know the statutes of God, and His Laws." V. 20, "And thou shalt teach them the STATUTES and the LAWS, and the WAY wherein they must WALK." Abraham also kept "My Com., My charge, My statutes and My laws (Gen. 26:5).

12. How do we know that they would not be contrary laws to the ones He later set in motion? (Adventists say those laws were different laws than God later gave to Israel.)

Mal. 3:6, For I am the Eternal, I change not.... God's policy does not change -- He alters not. Moses taught them as God's Com. We find some specific cases with respect to the Passover before hand -- with respect to trusting God with healing.

13. Why were the Gentiles driven out of Palestine?

God said, because of the Gentiles' wickedness He would drive them out before Israel. Deut. 9:4-6, "Do not say in your heart... Deut. 18:10-12; Lev. 18 and Gen. 15:16. God gave Israel the Ten and the Civil Law (statutes and judgments) so Israel would not sin as Gentiles did. If God gave laws only to Israel and does not punish us for breaking these laws, as some teach, He would have been unfair to punish the Gentiles for breaking those laws when they didn't have them in the first place.

Principle: The principle is this: If we get by today without punishment because we do not have the laws, but God punished the Gentiles who didn't have them, as well as Israel who did, He would have been unfair! (He that is without law PERISHES without law in this world, and he that has the law PERISHES by the law -- Rom.) That is the general principle to understand that the ~~the~~ statutes and judgements were prior to the Old Cov. and that they were not brought in by it. David says these statutes and laws were for ever and ever. So far, we have seen that the Ten and the other laws were in force prior to the Old Cov. and, the principle: They are eternal.

14. What place in the N.T. will prove to us we are to have more than just Ten written in our hearts and minds?

II Cor. 3:3 (Important) v. 2 -- "You your selves.... For example: These individuals were the same as though Christ had recommended Paul with a specific letter. Just as now, those who go on baptizing tours need letters of recommendation from Mr. Armstrong. In those days they sent letters proving a man -- Paul said, "I do not need a letter from Christ proving me; you are my epistles, you individuals; as proof of the fact that you are indications that I am approved of Christ for in your hearts and minds are certain things written." We have mentioned the Ten written on tables of stone and the civil code, written in a book with ink. There Paul is implying that the SPIRIT OF GOD IS WRITING IN OUR HEARTS that which once had been written on the two tables of stone as well as that which had been written in the book with ink. We will have the book of the Cov. written in our hearts. The book of the law is actually to be written in our hearts and minds. That is different than the law of Moses. The book of law did not include rituals. That is a mistake. There was a book containing the law and in one place it could be called "Law of Moses," "Law of the Lord," "The Law" or "The Book of the Law," and it would be all right; but in another place, the "Book of the Law" refers specifically to the civil code -- not including the sacrifices -- repeated by Moses to the Israelites in the land of Moab, just before they came to the land of Palestine.

This book had the civil principles and is now called the "Book of Deuteronomy." And you do not find details concerning sacrifices in it -- more on that later). In II Cor. 3:3, Paul is actually comparing both sections of that law -- the smaller laws written with ink in the book and the Ten on tables of stone. That is what is administered to us, then he goes on to prove that the administration of death penalty for the violation of these laws has now been replaced by the administration of God's Spirit. The eye and tooth for tooth was a part of that which was originally written in ink, but has been altered since by Christ. And all that has not been altered by Christ is NOW IN FORCE. Now, if the law in the letter specifically is in force today as it was, Christ would not have had to change some of those points. He specifically went thru it to give us the principle. That "eye for eye, etc." is here what Paul calls "The administration of death" and that was directly included in the "Civil Law" as ~~mentione~~ the method of administration.

15. In the Civil Law, which was the only sacrifice given?

The Passover, as a part of the Old Cov. Now, as the Civil Law was later magnified to include, shall we say, the amendments to the Cov., they had the sacrifices as well.

16. How do we know it was only the Passover?

First there is the account where they were to kill the lamb and strike the blood on the door posts, and then in Jer. 7:22 we find "For in the day that....I did not speak to your fathers or command them concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this command I gave them, 'Obey my voice... and walk in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you.'"

17. Between Ex. 21 and 23, inclusive, do we find the reference of a sacrifice in the civil code?

Yes! "The blood of my sacrifice." That is also about the Passover. Also in Deut. 16 it is about the Passover, and none of the others. The civil code again! And yet you find that sacrifices and burnt offerings, as such, were not commanded when the Passover was commanded, and it is a part of the civil law, distinguished from that which expiated, or was the expiation of, sin, because the Passover was looking forward to the sacrifice of Christ who would come, and the other sacrifices were only a reminder of sin. For instance: If you had sinned, you offered the Passover but once a year, you offered the Passover regardless of sin. Passover had nothing to do with your sin, it was merely to point out that Christ would come, offered as a special memorial to keep us in mind of that, irrespective of our own particular sins. Be sure to understand Jer. 7:22.

18. Were some of the ritualistic sacrifices to remain for ever?

Yes, but first let's understand what "forever" means. "Forever" in Hebrew means, "only so far as the existing conditions prevail" or, "continuous without interruption in so far as the factors involved remain."

19. What are the factors of sacrifices? There are two reasons for sacrifices. How long are sacrifices necessary?

Heb. 10:18 -- When a sacrifice comes that forgives sin, then there is no longer a need for a sacrifice. (When we ask for forgiveness now, our conscience is clear and there is no need of sacrifice as a reminder of our sin, as our sin is taken away. So, one factor is: When a sacrifice came that would take away sin there was no longer any need for sacrifice. And, the other factor in respect to the sacrifice offering is what? The priests!
^

20. If Christ had not come and the priesthood had ceased, or, if something had happened to the Levitical priesthood and still Christ had not come, would sacrifices have continued?

No. Nobody else was allowed to offer them under the law. Then the two major factors were "the priesthood and the need for a sacrifice." When both of them are altered do we have to maintain sacrifices? No, Heb. 10:4, "For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin."

Now, originally, "forever" or "eternally" meant, "continuous without interruption, so long as the factors exist." So, in a sense, the "eternal obligation" ceased when the circumstances were altered.

In a sense, then, God has the power to repeal the laws that he sets in motion if He wants to. Also, He is going to alter the physical laws -- the earth turning on its axis, etc. We won't have the laws of birth, growth and decay. In the same way these carnal death laws are altered because of circumstances.

There is also one principle to remember: In the Spirit, or in the principle, of these carnal laws, do we still see an eternal obligation? Or, what is our sacrifice? "Ourselves!" But that does not replace the Passover. "That is our reasonable service," says Paul, "That is our spiritual service." So, in a sense, the spiritual principle behind those carnal laws are everlastingly obligatory, but in the letter God rescinded or amended the law, shall we say. In this case He abolished them -- they are no longer necessary. The eternal obligation of those has passed away.

21. But, how do you know in principle, that our eternal obligations of others has not passed away? Laws, that is.

In principle, they were not changed. We have the example of Christ keeping them as well as the early Church; or, as long as time goes on as it is, and human beings are related to one another as we are, those laws will remain. They go on into the millennium. Zech. says they will come up to keep the Feast of Tabernacles. As long as there are parents, children will have to honor them. That is eternal, as long as there are parents and children. Otherwise, it could be dropped from the law. It is no longer necessary if parents weren't here, but the principle is -- that, whenever the circumstances come, you need it. That is why, in a sense, we have to offer ourselves as a sacrifice to God. The eternal principle underlying it, is there. But in the letter it has actually been altered or abolished. Those are important matters for us to understand.

22. We mentioned ourselves being a sacrifice. Now, in a sense, do we offer a sacrifice today?

Yes, we offer a sacrifice of praise and of thanks. For example: Suppose you have given above your income. In a sense you are giving thanks for all He has given you, by giving Him a gift. You don't have to tithe your gifts. The Levites were never told to tithe their gifts, but to tithe their income. We give gifts or offerings as we are able. That is one way we give God thanks for what he gives us. We are to give ourselves, that is another matter.

23. Are we called a spiritual priesthood?

I Pet. 2:5-9 -- READ! We are a priesthood because we offer these things ourselves, so you see those principles are still there. That is an important matter.

24. What place is most specific in the N.T. to show us a distinction between the carnal laws that have passed away and the laws which were given as a civil code and are actually small applications of the great over-all spiritual principle?

In Heb. it says, "only carnal ordinances." Heb. 9:10, "...but deal only with food (meat) and drink and various ablutions (washings), regulations for the body imposed until the time of reformation. Carnal ordinances--meaning this which was imposed was carnal ordinances, only until the time of

reformation. But he implies that with the meat and drink and various washings, there were other carnal ordinances, besides these. That then includes burning of incense, the shew bread they had on the table; it included many other rituals they went thru other than the meat, drink and various washings, it actually means there are more carnal ordinances than just these.

Now, this gives us a principle. How then do we apply Heb. 9 in principle? Thus: Meats and drinks and various washings and rituals of the Levitical priesthood, carnal ordinances, that which pertains only to matter; such as, where you were to put matter -- where was the shew bread to go, were you to burn matter or not, should you burn incense and what were you to light. All these were carnal physical things.

25. Now, is circumcision in the flesh a carnal ordinance?

Yes, it is. It pertains just to flesh. But it has a spiritual principle behind it. You will find many such additions in the O.T. Some people, however, are not able to correctly distinguish the laws concerning that, and, shall I say, the laws concerning adultery. That is a principle concerning human conduct. This other merely pertains just to matter of self, what you were to do with it. Now, there is a distinction there that people do not always grasp.

26. Is ordaining a man a priest, because he was born of another man, a fleshly matter?

Surely, it is fleshly, carnal. And it plainly says, the Levitical priesthood was ordained by a carnal commandment. There are many places in the N.T. where those things are called carnal commandments, carnal ordinances. So the principle is, that those things which had to do with carnal, physical things in that time were not carried over into the new dispensation. Such that if they are not included under this category they were not among the carnal ordinances or carnal rituals abolished. Then you can go to the O.T. and see that, if they were not a part of those added rituals, they do not fall under the condemnation of that one text. Then you can go to Jer. 7:22 and prove that these things were not given with the first; they were added later. Jer. 7:22-23 gives specific details. Connect with Heb. 9:10 and you have a very, very sound basis for that section of the law. Now then let's understand the Law of Moses and what it is.

27. Is the law of Moses called the Law of the Lord?

Yes. Everything that God gave is the Law of the Lord. (The 7th day Adventists make the mistake of saying "we keep the law of the Lord, but not the law of Moses." Why do we read that we should offer two burnt offerings of pigeons or doves for purification according to that written in the law of the Lord? (Luke 2:22 and II Chron. 31:3). Remember the birth of Jesus and the purification of Mary. Is it all the law of the Lord? Yes. Everything that God gave was the law of the Lord. But, is everything the Law of Moses? As speaking of it to the point of view of the law, not the point of view of the first five books of the Bible. No, the law of Moses actually includes one section of the law. All that which was given thru Moses. That is one principle.

Now, we know that the law sometimes includes the whole testament, sometimes the first five books and sometimes more than that. But more specifically it includes the laws that God gave Moses to give to the people -- that is, all the law of Moses.

Now, how do we know that another part of the law was called the law of Moses? And it did not mean everything that Moses gave. (Are Gentiles to keep the law of Moses?).

Gentiles are not to observe the Law of Moses except for four points. But, are there other places in the N.T. where there are definite Scriptures as Paul gave them, that show the Gentiles are to keep different laws than the Ten? And yet, that are not called one of these four points?

Yes. Now, if there are laws besides the Ten, but not one of the four points, and if the law of Moses was not to be kept, the term "Law of Moses" in that connection could not be the same as all the Law given thru Moses to the people, could it? That is an important point and is one of the big controversies. If the Law of Moses means everything but the Ten, and if the Law of Moses is not to be kept, save for the four points, why does Paul in other places saddle other points than those four on Gentiles as things they ought to keep? Tithing, for instance. It is not specifically one of the Ten. You would never guess that a tenth belongs to God, and yet it is not one of these four points, but it is obligatory, is it not? Yes, and yet you read the law of Moses is not for Gentiles to keep save for those four points. And yet you read in another place the law of Moses included everything but the Ten. Therefore, are there two definitions for "law of Moses?"

28. How do we know the term "Law of Moses" is applied to a section of the law, other than the Ten, and not to all the law besides the Ten? Exodus says, "The commandments which I gave," but how do we know that there is another division of the law that is also called the law of Moses and definitely is separated and segregated?

Defs. In Acts ... All that God gave to Moses is one definition of "Law of Moses." Another definition included the first five books of the Bible. Another includes all the laws that God gave to Moses other than the Ten.

In one sense, as it is finally written in Ex. and Deut., you can say it includes them, too. That is not specifically given, but how do we know in one case that it did not include the civil statutes in general? Let me ask, now, are we to keep in principle the law of Moses? (Let's exclude the 15th chapter because we are to have the civil code written in our hearts and minds, as far as it goes in spirit.) Therefore, we are actually to have the Law of Moses.

What did Malachi say about the Law of Moses? "Remember ye the law of my servant Moses, with statutes and judgements which I commanded him at Horeb." Now, that shows that the law of Moses was to be remembered and it is specifically mentioning the statutes and judgements here.

So, when the controversy about the law arose in the 15th chapter of Acts, was that a controversy concerning the Civil Law? No. It was the physical law. How do we know? It involved Acts 21:21, "And they have been told about you, that you teach all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or observe customs." It involves neither spiritual nor physical -- but customs that were not to be imposed

on the Gentiles -- customs that God had given Moses to distinguish them from the Gentiles. That was a matter of customs then and actually it had to do with the four points. (Not original Civil code, but what was added.)

Now, those four points, when you turn to the O.T. are connected to what set of laws? What portion of the civil law? These four points, if you go to the O.T., you will actually find them as a part of the ceremonial law that was added after the civil code was complete. Turn to Lev. 17:7-10. (Phy. matter, Ceremonial rituals.) Lev. 17:10, "if any man of the House of Israel or of the strangers that sojourn among them eats any blood, I will set my face against that person who eats blood;..." Lev. 17:7, "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils after whom they have gone a whoring, this shall be a statute for ever unto them thruout their generations." (They used to have actual whoredom, fornication in their rituals.) You will notice here these are spiritual principles, but a part of ceremonial law, because spiritual principles regulated the method of offering sacrifices. So, they were not to offer sacrifices strangled, they were not to eat blood of the sacrifice, they were not to commit fornication along with a sacrifice, they were not to offer sacrifices to idols. Now these four principles are spiritual principles, connected with the ceremonial law and, hence, the law of Moses here must have been what? Acts 15. Not the book of the Covenant. It said you must keep the annual Festivals, you must keep tithing, it said you must rise up before the hoary head. Ex. 21-23. Actually, the Book of the Law referred to the book of Deut. specifically. Anything after Ex. 24 was not specifically a part of the Book of the Covenant. It was just the Book of the law, or Law of Moses. But here the important point is: The Law of Moses included the book of the Covenant and the Book of the Law as civil statutes. The Law of Moses included also the rituals, but the specific term "Law of Moses" could include all or it could include specifically only the rituals that were added later.

How do we know? Because we can turn to Acts 15 and there we find only four points of that law obligatory, and yet we find other points of the law of Moses obligatory which should be a contradiction...do you see that? Unless that law in Acts 15 is different, than the law of Moses recorded in other places, which included the statutes and judgments.

Def. The term "Law of Moses" (All but the Ten...also anything that God gave to Moses...also what was added after the Old Cov...., therefore the Law of Moses included in the first case, judgments and civil statutes and in the second case it included ceremonial statutes, as a civil law telling us (now here's another way to look at it) the Law of Moses, meaning all but the Ten defines sin. The Ten define sin and the law of Moses defines sin in the form of civil statutes and judgments; that defines sin. But, the law of Moses, those rituals added after, which are also called statutes and ceremonial statutes do not define sin, but too, were a REMINDER of sin. Does that make it clear? And yet, they are both called the Law of Moses. (Distinction between.)

In one sense the Law of Moses includes them both, and in another sense it includes only the civil statutes, and in another sense it includes all those added statutes in Acts 15. Now, then, that is what most people do not understand.

Prove: Then the Law of Moses means EVERYTHING! And they say the term Law of Moses can only mean everything in every case. Now, to prove that the Law of Moses means different things at different times, you must go back to Acts 15 because there are the the tings not saddled on the people, and yet in other

places you will find things not mentioned there that are absolutely necessary to salvation.

(Now, there would be a contradiction in the Bible unless the Law of Moses meant different things at different times mentioned. It, therefore, means the CIVIL STATUTES and JUDGMENTS in one case and in another it means the FIRST FIVE BOOKS of the O.T. Again, it may mean the CEREMONIAL STATUTES, or it may INCLUDE ALL OF THE STATUTES BUT THE TEN, which in this case could include the ceremonial laws too. Now, I do not know of any specific term applied to Lev. and Num., that is ALL INCLUDED in the term "The Law", "Is it not written in the law?" I do not find the term "Law of Moses" applied to either of them specifically. Nor the term "The Book of the Law" (when it is mentioned, it refers to Deut.).

A student asked, "What about I Cor. 9:9, "For it is written in the Law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn," taken from Deut. 25:4, that then is civil code law of Moses?" Mr. Hoeh answered: "No place that I know of does the Law of Moses refer to Lev. and Num. except Acts 15. Now Acts 15 does bring that out though; that those laws are called "Law of Moses" in there, as distinguished from the civil statutes which define sin. And those two books (Lev. and Num.) are not called "Law of Moses" or "The Book of the Law," as I see. The Book of the Law is always the civil code and the Book of the Covenant is from Ex. 21 thru Ex. 23 inclusive. So, you have the book of the Cov. that portion; then you have the book of the law, Deut.; you have the Law of Moses including it all except for the Ten; you have the Law of Moses including just the ceremonial laws which actually means then, the books of Lev. and Num. (That's what it amounts to then) and the Law must mean every thing from Gen. to Deut. inclusive. *

But, the one simplest case is in Acts 15. You find the Sabbath being kept by Gentiles, because they were meeting ^{on} the Sabbath and hearing the rituals explained; and Paul said, "We wouldn't have to write you these things except for the fact you are hearing Moses read every Sabbath in the synagogues." So the Sabbath was obligatory and you can find other laws obligatory besides the Ten. Laws obligatory on the Gentiles, festivals, unclean meats; all those in general principles are given, as well as many others. Now, fornication might be included there but that won't be a good example. All these laws are not included there in Acts 15 under the term "law of Moses." So, what we get down to is this, the judgments are binding today. The civil judgments are binding with one exception. We'll come to that. We have to know which ones. But of the statutes, the civil statutes, are binding, but the ceremonial statutes are not.

Very
Impt.

And to determine which are which, you have to understand which are carnal ordinances and which are those added after the Old Cov. that were carnal ordinances. That is very important. A good starting point is: To show that there was the "Book of the Cov." and the "Book of the Law," which is Deut. That those laws of Moses, Malachi says, "we are to remember" and points of them we are to keep. But we find a law of Moses in Acts 15 which we are not to keep; four points of that law are connected with ceremonies of the O.T. Therefore, the Law of Moses there, pertains to customs, and it specifically says so and must refer to these carnal customs, ~~and is~~ added after the Old. Cov. and imposed for just a period of time. Spoken of as the WORKS OF THE LAW in the N.T.

I'm leaving out of this the book of Gal., because ~~X~~ I'm not totally satis-

fied -- I cannot teach that which I am not thoroughly sold on myself. And in some places there, I think you can see in it a wider application than just the ceremonies. But that is beside the point here -- it doesn't effect this one bit. I mention that because Mr. Meredith taught it to some of you, but as teachers, we can't be dogmatic until we are convinced. So I'm leaving that out until I get it perfected. Certainly it does include the ceremonies. The question is, "Does it include some more?" Because in a few places it implies it might, though not in every instance.

A student asked, "Why only four points and why were those four necessary?" Answer: Suppose Paul had said that every bit of the law of Moses must not be kept by Gentiles. Then they could have disobeyed those four and they would have sinned. But God shows them specifically so the Gentiles would understand they are spiritual principles connected with the ceremonies and would not get mixed up. Now study the article on it thoroughly.

29. Now, where are the Ten called the Law of Moses?

No where, never! The term "Ten Commandments" is never synonymous with the single term law of Moses. Only in some cases may they be included among them, depending on which definition of "Law of Moses" you use. But NEVER is the Law of Moses called the "Ten" as such. It may include them at times (and only because of the way the O. T. is written out is it included among them.) Because of the way the O.T. is written out, the Ten Com. are included in the Law of Moses, to be more plain, I (Marguerite) would say.

30. When was the Lev. priesthood established, before or after the Old Cov. was made?

After. All right, that shows the priesthood was one of those carnal ordinances prior to that time, or during the O. Cov. confirmation. Who offered the sacrifices? Young men -- Ex. 24:5.

31. Do we find the civil statutes and judgements are right and good?

Yes. And yet we find ceremonies are called statutes, therefore, there must be two kinds of statutes. Is there a Heb. word which means statutes? ordinances? judgments? The English words are interchangeable, but the original Hebrew had only one. Therefore, we must know that everywhere the word "ordinances" appears (with two exceptions where the word should be "judgments" or "just law") the term should be rendered consistently "statutes." *

A ceremony is a statute. A statute is what kind of law? It is an involved law (Lev. 16:29). A judgment (Ex. 21:1) may be a decision, but it is a decision, rendered into a simple short law, that often can be memorized. As you go thru the books of the O. T. you find a judgment is capable of memorization. *

The statutes are more involved and are not given in the form of rhythm. But there are civil statutes and ceremonial statutes. The term "statutes" applies to the law. There is no term which is different that applies to ceremonies called ordinances. Therefore, the problem is to determine which statutes are binding and which are right and good. So what you actually find is that those statutes that are not binding are those that are included in the ceremonial law of Moses -- they are included in the term "carnal ordinances." That is the problem.

32. Now, is the administration of death in force today?

No, as far as God's laws are concerned, it is not a part of Church administration any more. What is meant by the administration of death? Administration means "carrying out." It would be killing or stoning someone who had sinned -- as in Exodus when a son disobeyed his parents., etc.

33. How do we know the Ten are not the administration of death? Could the Ten written on two tables of stone do anything themselves?

No, people don't even stop to analyze what the meaning of the word is. The Ten on two tables of stone would be just so much statuary; they were absolutely powerless except as they were administered. But, "the administration of death penalty" is what the administration of death means -- is now replaced by what administration? The administration of the spirit. (That's what Paul was administering.)

Does the spirit kill? No, it makes alive. God sets his ministers today to explain to the people how they can have God's spirit and keep the law, while in the O.T. they were to judge the case and condemn the guilty.

Now, the administration of death, the laws administering the death penalty, under certain circumstances, were they in general judgments or statutes? (The eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth law.) Judgments -- they were a decision. You can tell then that the administration of death penalty is not in force today...the judgments part of them aren't either (as far as the letter) Ø -- Jesus said, "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, or what? No, he said, "Love your enemies, do GOOD to those that curse you and PRAY for those who despitefully use you." NOTICE! Then you have many places in the N.T. that show you which civil statutes and which judgments are binding and which are not. You accept all those that have not been altered and then you look thru the Old and N.T. to find which principles altered them. Carnal ordinances, Acts 15, Jesus' statement, "You've heard it said, but I'm telling you," and Jer. 7:22 -- those are the basic principles we have.

It is a matter then of application, in most cases there often is a little difficulty to determine the specific details. I would say this: to know something about warfare and slavery, you have to go to other places in the N.T. that are not very important. There is something in Paul's writings that tells us, "should we be the slaves of men? Is our warfare carnal?" Now there are other places than these I've mentioned where Paul says, "our warfare is not carnal, we do not wrestle against flesh and blood and our weapons are not carnal, but spiritual, to the pulling down of principalities and powers, and to bringing every thought unto captivity to Christ."

Which means our warfare is against wicked spirits in high places and not flesh and blood, who are merely influenced by them. All of those can be applied as principles. You can go to ever so many places in N.T. and then you can take those principles and go to the O.T. and you will find that probably 98% of the law will fall easily into place just at first sight and you will have to understand by thorough study of a few other points. After analyzing it, there is nothing wrong in say, mixing nylon and wool, it was just so no one would undersell someone else. I assume the people had no way of telling whether it was all wool or wool with cotton or linen mixed in. So God made the law so it would be all wool. But I overlooked the fact there is one way of telling: You could burn a thread of it and tell whether it was wool,

cotton, or one of the new synthetics. Therefore, it could not have applied to the fact that the state had to guarantee there was no mixture. And since we have to mark them as to the mixture, so now, we can have them mixed. Now that is what I thought for a long time. So, once I analyzed the fact any one could tell if you had a mixed garment and God said you shall not mix them and it is in connection with God saying you shall not mix different grains, such as cucumbers and watermelons and different corns that could mix, and also that man shall not wear that which pertains to a woman. And then the other similar laws, it becomes an actual principle.

I took, I guess, two different Sabbaths studying that thru, and I took some books from the library on clothing and put out by manufacturers and I found there are two principles why people mix goods; it looks better, it sells better. By putting our modern synthetics with wool it sells better because it is shinier, and the other is, they can sell it for less. People always want to get more or have something better than their station in life will permit them to own, so instead of waiting until they have enough money to get a wool garment, they want a mixture to get it cheap and just so they get some wool. It mentioned that every case of adulteration was based on the fact that people wanted more money in selling their goods or the people that bought it wanted something they couldn't afford. For example: We have oleo for butter, and the orlons and nylons in place of wool; and they are always of less value. So we should be careful in choosing our clothes. It is a principle. We are to get our hearts set on the better things -- it is better to have only two garments than a lot of cheap ones. Anyone knows the better the material, the longer it wears. Now that is one of the secondary laws that shows me it is in force today.

Now there is nothing wrong with good dress nylons -- but not for work -- just as the Levites, you are not to wear wool when ^{you} are laboring (sweating), wear linen garments. So, as I see, there is nothing wrong in good dress nylon, it ~~looks~~ all right and it does wear well.

END OF FIRST TAPE

1. Define "Grace."

Grace is unmerited pardon in so far as it involves the law.

2. Why do we need grace -- if we have the law?

Because no man can be justified by the "works of the law" by doing something physical and earning salvation -- salvation is the gift of God.

3. Why do we need the law if we have grace?

So that we have the knowledge of sin, because it is the written record showing us first how to love God, and secondly, how to love our neighbor. Showing us the principle of love.

4. Wasn't the law to show what sin was until grace came, and then we have grace since?

No, not the spiritual law. The spiritual principles are the Ten -- they are in force from everlasting to everlasting. But the physical law that was added because of transgression is our school master to bring knowlege of sin.

5. Why, then, did Paul say, "We are not under the law but under grace?" Isn't that contradictory?

No, if you are under the law you are under the penalty of the law and subject to death. You are free if you are not breaking the law -- If obeying the law and not under its penalty, Paul uses the expression "within the law." He is within the law to Christ.

6. What does "As many as are of the works of the law are under the law" mean?

That "because they were using the ceremonies as works of the law to justify, which could not justify them, they were under the penalty of the law. The term "under the law" has been misconstrued to mean under the obligation to obey the Ten. It is that legal term which has been obscured in almost all commentaries Mr. Hoeh has read and also Eng. Lit. because he shows that if you are under the "works of the law" you are under a curse. Yet, "he is cursed who does not obey all points of the law," showing that "if you are under the law means they are breaking it; that is how they get under it. And, if we are under grace, we should not sin.

7. Then, grace is necessary with the law?

Absolutely. If there were no law there would be no sin or transgression. Paul says in Rom. 4:15, "sin is the transgression of the law and where there is no law there is no transgression." So, if there had been no law, there would have been no transgression, and grace is of no value unless there is transgression, because grace is needed only because of transgression, to put it aside. Now when you see that, any thing like this little booklet here, "Law or Grace Which?" -- it will fall through.

8. What is meant by the "end of the law?" "The end of the law is Christ?" When Christ came did he end the Law? Isn't that what it says?

No. See Rom. 10:16, the word "end" here does not mean the cessation. Notice Rom. 10:3 "Being ignorant of the righteousness of God" now maybe we should have another word in there when we translate it. "To the end that" or "the purpose of Christ in a sense is to fulfill the law." That is exactly what he had in mind there, not to do away with it, because the Jews seeking to establish their own righteousness did not submit to the righteousness of God. "For Christ is the end of the purpose of the law to righteousness;" you see, to everyone that believes. Rom. 10:5-6, Moses writes that the man who practices the righteousness which is based on the law shall live by it. But the righteousness based on faith comes thru Christ, you see. If you could just obey the law in the letter as they did under the O.T. you could be righteous, but you couldn't. "But that which comes by faith" is: God puts it into your heart and mind, you don't have to say, "I have to go to heaven to find it or down beneath, but Christ who died and rose again is the one who can live in us." And it is in our very mouth, in our heart, (that is a matter of faith) it is put inside of us. So Christ is the end or purpose of the law for righteousness. That has been woefully misunderstood -- look in Webster's Dictionary.

9. What is meant by "the law of liberty?" Are we at liberty to do as we please?

No, the law of liberty merely defines what makes a man free from sin. The law of liberty is the Ten. It means all the other points of ramification

and branches of it. The idea of a law of liberty means a law that makes you free, not a law that binds you and is hard. Freedom is that which gives us peace. It is truth. Jesus came to set men free, not to make them bound to the traditions and ways of the world. The law of liberty there is defined as the Ten. You can prove that in the very book of James itself.

10. Now that we are under grace, shall we sin? That grace may abound? That is a common argument.

DeHann says, "Of course we are not to sin if we are under grace, but we automatically do that which God puts us in: A new kind of life, as he calls it, or we obey the law of Christ which is a higher law than the law of the O.T." Now, how do they interpret the law? What is the law to them? The law of Christ, they think. The sermon on the Mount.

They also say they believe in loving neighbor and loving God. Who defines how to love neighbor and God? As they see it, the N. T. and their reasoning. Now they do what the Catholics did in early times... The Cath. said the Ten were in force, but the Ten contained within them certain ceremonial principles. The moral principles are obligatory, the moral principles are in human nature. That is, the Ten define what a reasonable man would come to a conclusion. They define what the REASONABLE would think is right. Thus they say, "A reasonable man or a man reasoning that looks on the world can see that it is wrong to break the Ten, but they contend that since he cannot see that it is wrong ~~to break the Ten~~ for a man to worship idols that it is wrong for a man to worship a God that is an idol. And since a man cannot see that the 7th day is any different than the first day it is a period of time set aside for the worship of God." Therefore, they do away with those principles and they turn to Rom. 2 where it says, "How can you Jews who know the law and do not keep it be reckoned better than the Gentiles who don't know the law and yet show the work of the law written in his heart?" You see, he had knowledge of that which was right ~~in his~~ and could be told -- human experience. Notice Rom. 2:14, "For when nations that have no law by nature do the things of the law, these, not having the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or excusing; in the day when God judges the secrets of men."

Now Paul did not mean that the Gentiles which have no law knew how to keep the Sabbath. But those things which could be known by man they did. If they followed that thing which their conscience bid them into and did that which seem right to a man, they would not hurt their neighbor. And here were some Gentiles who actually showed the law of God written in their hearts. Whereas, here were these Jews who knew the law, doing everything to gain money, to cheat their neighbor, to live in adultery, and KNEW that it was wrong. Now, that does not mean, as the Cath. contend, that the Ten are written in the hearts and minds of men. As you can know, the moral precepts and anything you cannot know by nature, is NOT a part of the Ten. That is their argument. The point is: God defines what His law is and man, by nature, can only guess at some. Now some people could understand that it is wrong to murder, but most people know it is wrong to get a divorce in case of adultery. Now they might see that you should not leave a wife if she is obedient to you and not going out with other men, but do not see if she does they could not get a divorce and remarry, that they do not understand. So actually, no human mind could come to detect all of the Ten thru the point of human reasoning.

A student remarked: "Now if they keep all of these principles, it seems they would be conscientious objectors, how can they go to war?" Answer: The Methodists and others had an article in their advocate saying, "How you can kill your neighbor and not hate him." "If you kill him, Jesus said it wasn't wrong to kill him, it was wrong to hate him, so the idea is you can take his life and still you don't have to hate him while you are doing it. They feel that he is going to hurt your nation and the assumption is, he is your enemy and is in the wrong, and ~~th~~ since he is in the wrong the instinct of life preservation demands that his life be taken, but Christianity demands, don't hate him." That actually appeared in the article. It was during the war. Another fellow wrote a piece in answer to it, he couldn't agree with it and had sons to go off to war. They just excuse themselves, that's what happens.

They look into the N.T. and they reason from it and then do what seems right to man, that is the whole idea. They see these texts which seem to deny the law. It is merely a misunderstanding and so they do away with the whole law of the O.T. as such and then they try to find principles in the N.T. that seem right and seem philosophic and nice, ~~te~~ and those are the ones they follow, and any that seem to be related to the O.T. they try to get around in any possible way.

Now you know they get around ^u the Sabbath even though it is written plainly in the ~~N~~.T. You wouldn't have to go to the O.T. to find out about it. You can find enough in the N.T. to know. So that and many other principles they get around. And when you analyze it, the only one they are getting around is the Sabbath. The protestants anyway. Because, if you ask them, "Do you believe that you should worship idols?" "Oh, no!" You can go down all the Ten. Now with respect ~~with~~ to tithing, that isn't as clear in the N.T. except in Heb. and you have to really look at that to understand it, because Paul was not arguing from the point of tithing, he was arguing from the point of Christ's priesthood. And you can show that tithing now has been altered insofar as to WHOM the tithe is to be given. But they read the N.T. and try to apply it, and then use THEIR OWN REASONING, and that way get around the law and they say that you don't have to obey any law, that Christ's Spirit in you does it and when you are converted everything is law.

As Paul said, they misconstrue that to say you don't have a battle on your hands. The idea is you automatically do what is right. If you are converted and believe in Christ, you have no more problem at all, but you automatically do what is right and God puts in you His law, which is the law of Christ, the law of liberty, which is supposed to do away with all the ceremonies, all the real action, so now you just live. As their one law is, you must not hate your neighbor, but you can go kill him under the circumstances, that's the whole idea. So you see, when they use the term "law," that we are under the law of Christ, the law of liberty, what they mean is, they have interpreted the teachings of Christ in their own way. And anything they could abolish or didn't seem right to them, they throw aside, anyway it appeared ceremonial. They think the Com. we are to keep are the ones the Father gave to Christ. They don't realize Christ said, "I didn't come to change the law."

So, now getting back to our review: We can prove that the Ten are eternal, that they existed before the Old Cov. and so with God's statutes and His

judgments, Moses was judging. So the statutes and judgments also existed before, they were merely incorporated into the Old Cov.; they were the TERMS of it God set down as a husband should, so that his wife would know what he expected of her. And in ther Israel could expect that He would provide for her, and He loved her. He said, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated." Truly, Jacob was just as much a sinner as Esau was, but God chose the one who merited election (Paul shows) not by what one of them did, but there was one character: Jacob wanted to do what was right, he wanted to do it his own way and Esau didn't bother to care anything about it at ALL, that is the difference. One has respect to it and the other did not, and so it goes. Jacob was the stubborn and self-willed one but he was the one that had respect. It was a matter of electing and choosing, because of certain characteristics. God loved him. Now, when we understand thst these laws existed in times past before the O. Cov. was made, then we can understand when they were incorporated into the O. Cov. That merely is necessiated because those are God's laws and any nation that comes to obey Him is going to have to obey them. That did not begin it, neither did it end it.

11. In which chapter in the Bible are the Ten enumerated specifically.

Ex. 20.

12. What is the book of the Covenant?

Ex. 21, 22 and 23.

13. The book of the Law in general refers to Deuteronomy.

14. The "Law of Moses" may include what definition first of all?

All of ~~these~~ laws, statutes and judgments which were given by Moses as a mediator. Another: First five books of the Bible. Find this in Lk. 24:44, "Then He said to them, These are My words which I spoke to you, while I was still with you, that everything written about Me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled." He believed all the things in the Law of Moses. He taught them, you see, and He asked the disciples why they were so dull of hearing. And Paul said in Acts 28:23, "When they had appointed a day for him, they came to him at his lodging in great numbers. And he expounded the matter to them from morning till evening, testifying to the Kingdom of God and trying to convince them about Jesus BOTH From the LAW OF MOSES AND FROM THE PROPHETS."

Notice, he read from the law of Moses and the Prophets, so the law of Moses may include all things that were added after the Ten were given. All things given thru ~~Gen--to-Deut~~ Moses. Then it may include that which was written by Moses -- from Gen. to Deut. The Law of Moses may include what other? The Statutes added after the O. Cpv. which included the ceremonial and ritualistic additions, which not only include the sacrifices and various washings, drink offerings, and burning of candles and incense, the ordination of the Levitical priesthood and clothing they should wear, the tabernacle and what was to go into it, etc. All of these statutes added after the O. Cov. was made.

So you see, the book of Genesis may be included in the law of Moses, and Lev. and Num. may also be included in the law of Moses. Now, in general, you will find the Law of Moses written up in the last portion of Ex. and in Num. and Lev. The Law of Moses is written up in them, but the books in general are historical portions and are included in the whole Law of Moses. So that when ~~you-find-them-in~~ we have a controversy in Acts 15, what does the Law of Moses mean? The statutes added after the Cov. was made. And in what books will you find them in general? The last portion of Ex. and Lev. and Num., from the 25th chapter of Exodus on.

Now, it doesn't mean every portion in there is part of the added law of Moses because we have the Sabbath Cov. mentioned in it. But wherever there is a statute that is a carnal ordinance that is included in it. Now, the historical portions weren't in question at all.

Now, what were those four precepts that were considered obligatory? Are they ceremonial or spiritual principles? Spiritual principles containing ceremonies! Why would these spiritual principles in the first place be incorporated into the ceremonial law? It was referred to in the book of Lev. Why were they a part of the so-called law of Moses, or a part of the added statutes as well as the civil covenant? They were both. Why were they added in the first place to the ceremonial law? They were prohibiting involved and carnal practices by the pagans that Israel in offering her sacrifices needed to have included in their mind. In other words, they needed to know not only were they to avoid fornication in general, and also to avoid eating the blood in general, or the eating of things offered to idols in general, they could buy any meats in markets, and also concerning things strangled. They also needed to have that incorporated because in offering of sacrifices this told them what kinds and how they were

So this would be a contradiction unless the law of Moses did not include all but only the added statutes. This, then, is the law added because of transgression in Gal...The law the Jews were serving. (Mr. Hoeh is not satisfied, that in Gal. it is wholly the ceremonial additions, it seems to him the Cov. itself is implied, that is the law in the letter, is given there. Just as where Paul mentions in Rom., "For until the law sin was in the world." Now, he didn't mean until the ceremonial law. He meant until the law of the Cov. came, sin was still in the world, because sin is not imputed where there is no law, and he was actually showing that there was literally a law there and if that law had not come, there would have been no transgression imputed to the people. So, he was not referring to the ceremonial but to the law which defines sin, the civil law. But there it does appear very definitely that, that law which was added because of transgression, is that law which could be called the law of Moses and it was just until Christ the promise should come. I'll leave this chapter of Gal. out until later, wherever it says "the works of the law" it always means ceremonial law of Moses, but sometimes where it used the term "law," it may include more than that. I haven't been convinced yet just what it does mean in some of these places in Gal. because it is very hard to understand as Peter said, and nothing has seemed wholly satisfactory because I've always seen to that and to the works of the law always means ceremonial law and that can be proved. It always has to do with justification and we know the Jews used it for that purpose, they never used obedience to the law.

Where you find the expression, "by deeds to the law shall no one be justified," where did the word "deeds" come from there? Ergon, it should be rendered, "the works of the law." And it did not mean "by the deeds of the Ten shall no one be justified," that is true, but that wasn't even in Paul's mind. So we should know how that is properly rendered.

17. What was Jesus' basic principles in approaching all the laws of the O.T.?

They were all always obligatory except -- Matt. 5. "I didn't come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it," but these are the changes, "you have heard it said, but I tell you now" -- and he magnifies the law.

Now there is the basic principle. If we have that in mind then we can go to other places -- and how are we going to interpret that law which is beside the Ten, that is the civil code, is that obligatory? How do we know in principle besides Jesus' statement in Matt. 5, that it is to be written in γ our hearts and minds? II Cor. 3:3, "And you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the Living God, not on tablets of stone, but on tablets of human hearts." Also Ps. 119. None of the laws have been changed -- "They stand fast forever." The whole 119th Psalm is explaining the statutes and the judgments and not just the so-called immortal Ten; whereas, the 111th Psalm speaks of the Tables of Stone: "The works of His hands are truth and judgment, or right decisions..." the truth here having to do with spiritual and moral principles and not physical and chemical laws. It has to do with God's law and not just physical creation.

18. How do we differentiate then, if the book of the law and the book of the Cov. are obligatory?

We understand that the ceremonial law really was the one which passed away, because it was added because of transgression. The Ten and Civil code define sin...the ceremonial law was meant to expiate sin as far as the community was concerned. It would not justify your sin according to conscience. Now, part of the civil code said, "If your enemy will not make peace with you, you go surround his cities and break down his walls and put him to death."

19. How are we to understand those laws pertaining to warfare?

Jesus said, "Love your enemy." He said, "You have heard it said of old times you shall hate your enemy and love your neighbor, but I say to you, Love your enemy and do good to those which persecute you." Also, where Peter cut off the servant's ear, and Paul says the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but spiritual. This is the main principle. He mentions we are not after flesh -- we don't use a sword, literally, or any of the modern inventions -- II Cor. 10:4. So we can understand all of those laws which pertain to warfare.

20. How do we explain if we take in slaves, etc.?

"If any buy a woman you shall pare her nails and clean her up and she can be your wife, but if you don't take -- like -- her you must not sell her, but let her go free." Paul mentions in the N. Cov. that if you can gain freedom, do not become the servant of another man. In the N.T. times were

were Christians slave holders? Yes, and the term does not mean a servant whom you have hired, it means a bond servant whom you own. In Philemon, he was a minister, perhaps no more than an elder, he was a fellow-worker -- Phil. 1 and 17. Paul calls him a partner -- he was apparently an elder. Now notice verses 10-16. That proves there is nothing incompatible with Christianity with slavery. It doesn't say that that is the best form, it just said there is nothing incompatible. Are men, today, slaves of their machines and their jobs? Yes. You will find in many of these countries, at that time, that a master treated his slaves so well they were treated better and had more than some free man who worked and eked out a living. This does not mean just Negro slaves, because, here, this man has a Greek name. Romans made slaves of conquered peoples, that's all -- just like in the last war. Israel is going to make slaves, because most of the Israelites will be converted to the truth. A lot of them will actually be converted after they have been made slaves by their captors.

No, there is nothing wrong or incompatible with slavery, but use your freedom if you can. So, as far as the laws of the O.T. go, if slavery exists, then we are to regulate slavery, that's all. But, if you have had slaves of your own, there is nothing in N.T. saying you must give them up to become a Christian. If you deal with your slave just as you deal with any other man, he is just as well off, but you should try, when he is capable of running his own family, to give him his freedom. Now, a man who had slaves was a man with plenty of money, so his slaves always had a job. They wanted and had security, and our people do today. They are becoming slaves to a materialistic government. So the slave had nothing to worry about -- his master had plenty and so he always had work and gold or silver. They were always well off. That is God's principle. We, in fact, made a mistake in freeing the slaves before they were capable, but it is better for the South, or it wouldn't have been as advanced as it is, because, then the white man was put on his own. *

But here it shows, and that is how we should understand N.T. teaching and interpret O.T. laws, we should do^u our neighbors as we would have them do to us. Therefore, we are to interpret those laws which mention, "You shall take usury of someone that is a Gentile, or you may take usury from him if he wants to pay it," we should know that is Jesus' teaching. Mr. Henion deals in a little real estate -- they always pay 6% interest. He collects it, he didn't force them to pay. But that is the way they draw up a contract. They deem it proper and he just let it go. That is all right. But we should never take it from a Christian. Technically, we are allowed to take it from someone else if he is willing and we don't force it on him -- that's all right -- they expect it. Now, if they are poor people and can't pay it, I wouldn't press it. I would show him a Christian attitude -- love -- that's Jesus' teaching. *

Now, for adultery or getting a divorce. All you have to do is go to Jesus' explanation on that.

There are many laws that relate to being clean externally and you can tell if it is a matter of washing ~~your body~~ because you've touched something unclean, or a matter of washing your body to keep it clean. It shows they were to be externally clean as a type that we are to be internally clean by God's Word now, having our minds and hearts cleansed from sin, wrong ideas

and wrong thoughts. Now this has come up -- whether a woman should stay out of the church after birth 80 days for a female child, and 40 days for a male child. Technically, that is in the ceremonial law -- it is not in the other. It was one of the rituals, as far as I can see, it was a carnal thing because there the congregation was a physical thing and as long as a woman was susceptible to that it was an external impurity. As I have explained, they can if they want to because there is nothing in the N.T. that says you must not. If you want to stay away that long, it's okay. It's based on good principle that a woman should not strain herself after birth. Likewise, where it mentions menstruation.....

We should wash if we touch something unclean or a dead body, just as a baby needs to be washed when it needs its diapers changed. We are to be externally clean but we do not need to be set apart from the congregation and be unclean until sunset. That was just to point out the necessity of being clean internally.

As for clothing -- that is one of the factors, and there are other principles. That can be looked at, in one sense, as a carnal law, but it was not included among the additional statutes. It was included in the original as a repetition, it wasn't in the Covenant but really an amplification of the book of the law, that is, the book of Deut. and there it is directly connected with spiritual principles and applied in different ways and there is quite a spiritual principle underlying that, when you really see it. People who live by that principle, in respect to clothing, are a lot happier with what they are, and what they are wearing and in their own home. Because, people squander money on what they can't buy and always have something cheap, they are actually doing harm to their character, setting their affections on that which is adulterated. Everyone should buy one very good suit instead of several cheaper ones. An average person can see its quality. They won't know how much it cost, but will see its quality and how nice it looks -- where something cheap might look gaudy to them. That goes along with people wanting to dress better than able, (in previous tape.) A good suit will wear a long time. You can wear it into a poor home and not appear snooty to them, or you can wear it into an Ambassador's home abroad and be better dressed than he. (Mr. Hoeh met ambassadors abroad with shirt sleeves rolled up, etc. He was dressed in a nice suit and commanded respect and they respected him. He dressed very meagerly in college, had one suit, it was two years old then, and he wore it three years to college. He had no money to get it cleaned but about every 4 or 5 months, and it didn't have any crease in it. It was a \$25 suit -- he was thankful for it and now that he has a nice one, he is thankful for it.) That is one of the principles that is obligatory. It's a small thing, a least commandment.

Mr. Hoeh is not sure of one thing in O.T. laws. He knows what Mr. Armstrong says -- but he would not say it is dogmatic (Deut. 14:8 -- "Their flesh you shall not eat, and their carcasses you shall not touch."). Here it is speaking of these animals -- now frankly I cannot say whether that should be followed literally. I have felt that there is a possibility that Moses added that for the time being, the same as he added the one in civil code, and many things in the civil code were in the letter.

There is one other case that follows closely on this; if, in wearing of garments, that you should make a cord around the edge of the garment to

keep you in the knowledge of the law. That is not obligatory today. That is a carnal commandment. We can just see that if we understand God's principles. You see, in the law, the annual Holy Days were given to be a sign and, for carnal unconverted people, that was to be a sign, as well as the other. They were to make pictures of the things written and carve them in the lintel on the door post as a sign, and that's all external, to keep it in knowledge -- but now we can have it in our minds. I feel that it is one of the additional laws, just a carnal thing and when we really understand what the signs are -- that they are God's annual Holy Days to keep us in line and that they are actually hallowed days, at times -- that is another matter.

As for this, I cannot see how I can be dogmatic as yet and say that you must not touch the carcass of any unclean animal. Here is why. John the Baptist wore camel's hair -- that much I know -- which means someone had to clean it and if God permitted the wearing of camel's hair it means He could just as well permit for us to use swine's bristles. That is the question, if the body actually absorbs bad matter. Anyway, bear this in mind. If possible I would advise you not to touch it, but I have never been dogmatic on this. I have always explained I'm not sure and quote the one principle of John the Baptist.

Now, here is the only way I can see He may have meant it. You know He says you shall not kindle a fire on the Sabbath. Now that's not absolute. If that is a spiritual principle, we couldn't have any heat and we know better than that. My opinion is, that you are not to eat their flesh and that they were not to touch their carcass in the sense that they were not to deal in the business of selling their bodies to someone else, even though they didn't eat them themselves. But, God allowed you to touch the carcass of other animals that were good to eat. If you touched that carcass, it was all right. In fact, any dead body was taboo -- it was all considered unclean. Now if I were to look at it that way -- it says in Deut. that you would be unclean for burying your parents, why? Because to touch a dead carcass was to touch something dead and anything dead was considered fouled up -- decomposing -- and you weren't to touch anything decomposing. Now if we were to interpret it that way -- this means happens to be a ceremonial law. If I say that was attached here so that they knew they were not to handle the carcasses of those animals for trading or any such thing. Now, I'm just saying that because I'm not sure. It's just one of those things and until we can be sure we cannot be dogmatic because we just don't know. (One of the students suggested that perhaps that was why Christ allowed the evil spirits that He had driven out of the man to go into the herd of swine.) Mr. Hoeh said, "Yes, because they had no business selling them to any one anyway. Anyone in hog or rabbit business should get out of it unless they are raising rabbits only for the fun of it and I doubt that they are that profitable. There is nothing wrong with rabbit skin any more than camel's hair. (Ted wondered about touching pork-wrapped cellophane to get to steak in meat markets. Mr. Hoeh doesn't believe that enters in.)

God's principle is, do like the ant. We should have one year's supply of staple groceries stored ahead. The ant doesn't hoard up -- he just keeps a year ahead -- if we have enough stored up to live well for a year, you can live meagerly for two years. And the next two years can take care of themselves. The work is always so in need it does not always work though. The money just doesn't come in and we use up what we have saved.

21. Now, is capital punishment God's way with respect to the U.S. Govt.?

Yes, as far as this government is concerned, we are not to intervene in its affairs as a worldly government. God instituted that government actually, and He has set them as administrators to take care of the material needs of the world. When He had a material nation He had capital punishment.

22. What happens to a nation when they do away with capital punishment? *

Crime just zooms. Since the socialist government got into power in England they have done away with capital punishment in all except a few cases. The little Lindberg law on kidnapping almost did away with kidnapping and it is capital punishment. In cases like these juvenile delinquents tearing up things, God didn't use capital punishment. He fined them seven-fold; or if they could be publicly whipped that would stop it. Unless they were repentant and willing to go to work and pay for it. In a way, that is what has happened when a person is repentant...he is already whipped. So, when God is dealing with a carnal people, capital punishment is His way. Now, * if a person becomes converted, that is, a state executioner, can he continue with his job? No! God is the one who takes out vengeance. It is good to mention here that Christ will stamp out crime. Crime is the result of not having capital punishment in dealing with carnal human beings, and God is going to do it. Will He always let criminals loose? No, He won't. Now I think we understand how God dealt in O.T. times.

23. What is the term "administration of death" referring to?

It is administering death for breaking the law. II Cor. 3:6-7. We have one man in Church who doesn't understand it -- IICor. 3:7. Now he contends that when Moses had the light shining from his face, he brought down the two Tables of Stone off Mt. Sinai. That's what he had. You know it says the light shone about him. (It is the glory of old being done away.) This man says, "Now look here, the administration of death" -- he really understands the end result of it but he contends we misunderstand this -- really we don't when we analyze it correctly and he says, "this has reference to the Ten in the letter on the Two Tables of Stone." Now, what we actually see here is the administration of death engraven on stones (which I believe we understand now) came to be in glory so that the children of Israel could not look upon Moses for the glory of his face. The administration of death was enacted and carried out as a result of breaking the letter of the law, the Ten, and when Moses came down off Mt. Sinai -- was the administration of death just the Ten? That is where he makes his mistake. Moses was called up into the mountains -- Ex. 34 -- he wrote upon the tables of stone all that law (Ten) which had been broken before and, v. 10, "Behold, I make a covenant. Before all your people I will do marvels such as have not been wrought in all the earth or in any nation; and all the people among whom you are shall see the work of the Eternal; for it is a terrible thing that I will do with you." And then he gives a group of laws lest you forget the Cov.... You see, this is talking about the whole covenant itself. Moses shows he was repeating it. And, "It came to pass that Moses came down from Mt. Sinai with the two Tables of Testimony in his hands.... Now his face shone when

he came down because he had been with God and showed the glory, that God had done that to him to have it radiate from him. Now what he was bringing down here of course was the two Tables of Stone, because he didn't have time there to write all those things in the Covenant -- he wrote them later, or he told Joshua apparently to write them later and some of them had been written before. He had already written the Book of the Cov. and it was already sanctified. Then he broke the tables and they were rewritten.

But, what made the glory of Moses' appear was the fact that the Old Cov. was glorious. It was so much better than any other constitution or material code of law than there had ever been, that there was no comparison. Now it doesn't mean that this which was glorious was only the administration of death, of course. Now the administration of death penalty there, was by comparison glorious because it was carried out justly. That is, the guilty were condemned and the innocent were left free. You cannot say that of any human code. As God gave it, the whole code of law was glorious and when Moses came down from the Mount, part of the Cov. was, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." That was the death penalty or whatever might be regarded a portion of it. Now that was engraven on stones. What stones were these? II Cor. 3 -- It was the custom to write national code or law on pillars. You'll find in ancient history that this is so. Now these stones were not the two Tables of Stone, because the administration of death WAS NOT written on the two Tables of Stone, this is not two tables of stone, it is stones -- uncut stones. See Joshua where it was done and Deut. where it was commanded. Now, that administration written there was glorious. Now, undoubtedly, the book of the law was written there also. We do not believe the Ten were written there, they were on other stones, TWO TABLES OF STONE. But the glory which Moses brought down which he retained, that shone in his face, was really the Old Cov. and the administration of death was part of it. It was glorious but it is NOT TO BE COMPARED to the ministration of God's Spirit which can give life instead of just killing. So, that's the whole argument there and the administration of death had nothing to do with that which defines sin -- it is merely administering the law. That is made so plain in reading through it once you grasp it.

Now, check up. The Ten Com. were not written on whole stones, they were written on two tables of stone. When you turn to Deut. 5 you will find a distinction made. Notice how it is worded. God gives Moses the Com., then, v. 17, is a simple short form -- "Thou shalt not kill." Now, this is a reiteration, isn't it? Com. by com. But, is the book of the law a direct duplication of the book of the Cov.? No. The book of the law has many additional laws that are not found in the original book of the Cov. and some laws in the book of the Cov. such as judging your neighbor -- if your stock harms anything of your neighbors, you pay him for it, etc. -- they are not repeated again. Because they didn't have to be, it wasn't so important. They already had the other code, but some were repeated again. This book of Deut. is actually based on what? How did Moses deliver these? By word of mouth. He was an orator. He was giving an oration and what you have here is not a code actually, as we would write down. It was a shorthand compilation of Moses' orations and now he says, "These are the Com., the Statutes, the Judgments which the Eternal your God commanded to teach you that it might be well with you. Hear, O Israel, etc." Now, v. 8 -- these

are just general exhortations as you go through here. Now, v. 12, "These are the statutes" -- up to this time he is just giving an oration of what God did for them at Mt. Sinai and some exhortation; you shall follow God, and don't do this, that or the other -- . Just general principles. But all of the words of this law that Moses told Joshua to write, in a sense, had to do with the civil code based on the Ten and once they were repeated by Moses they were written by Joshua and the repetition of the Ten in Deut. 5 was merely a matter of historical repetition.

Now here's the reason. Can we commit to memory the Ten? Surely. They didn't have to be repeated; the simple little Judgments in Ex. 21-24 didn't have to be repeated. Now, I have a book where a lawyer went through the O.T. and he found that the law was based in three forms: Commandments, Statutes and Judgments and he found that all the Judgments were little simple laws and in the Hebrew were rhythmic, that they could be memorized simply and you'd never forget them. So that did not have to be repeated, people just learned them by heart. The Ten can easily be learned by heart. So God didn't have to have them written on the whole stones -- they were on the tables of stone -- people heard them and they remembered them, Ten basic principles. You can remember Ten points. Now that should show that the Ten were not on there, it is the administration of God's Holy Spirit that now replaces the administration of the death penalty. Now remember in Cor. the glory shining in Moses' face when he came down off Mt. Sinai is, the Old Cov. was glorious and it was the Old Cov. that was done away, not the Ten. But what they do not see is that now the law is in the Spirit, not just in the letter and they were in existence before and Paul is talking about the administration of the death penalty under that Old Cov. People contend that since it is connected with Moses' face shining and since he brought the Ten down that's done away, too. But in II Cor. 3:9-12 actually speaks of the administration of death engraven on stones. From Panin: "For if the ministration of condemnation is glory, much rather doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For verily what hath been made glorious hath not been made glorious in this part, by reason of the surpassing glory. For if what was being done away was through glory, much more what remaineth is in glory. Having, therefore, such hope, we use great boldness, and not just as Moses put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel should not look stedfastly on the end of what was being done away but their hearts were hardened for until this very day at the reading of the Old Cov. the same veil remaineth, it not being revealed to them that it is done away in Christ."

Now II Cor. 3:1-12 actually speaks of the administration of death engraven on stones, then it speaks of the glory that was to be done away, which was being done away, there he is referring to the administration of death to be done away which is glorious and that glory was to perish away because, how shall not rather the administration of the Spirit be with glory -- (how much more, you see). For if the one is glorious the other is so much more glorious, for what had been made glorious had not been made glorious, in this part for reason of surpassing glory. V. 11, for if that which was being done away was through glory, much more that which remains is through glory -- . The Old Cov. in itself was being done away gradually by being replaced with the New -- when people come to see it, and it will be after Christ's ministry is yet complete, you see, v. 11, "that which is being done away." Here ~~is~~ he is ~~is~~ speaking of the administration of death, but it could apply to the Old Cov. as well, and it actually means every law in the letter as we have it.

Ted says he read literature printed by the Catholics saying they changed the Sabbath to Sunday and actually asked, "Why do Protestants keep it?" Someone else said he read one by Catholics entitled "Protestants Squatters on Catholic Territory."

Mr. Armstrong always says, as sermon material, the law of Moses is done away and he always uses the subject "The law of Moses and the Ten," and he has never given one on "The book of the law and the Cov." that we are to keep and how we are to distinguish the two. And, after Mr. Hoeh was wondering -- where does he get his basis for keeping these things and yet he always says, "The law of Moses is done away," he finally saw that Mr. Armstrong uses that as his evangelistic sermon outline because there he is dealing with the Ten and he just forgets about the others for the sake of the other people!!!

Discussion of the Law in Senior Bible Class

By Herman L. Hoeh

“Keep all the laws Christ’s sacrifice didn’t do away with” (p.2)

Those without law will perish without law and those who have the law (Jews) will perish by the law (Romans...).

2 Cor. 3:2-3 – There were laws written on tables of stone and others written in a book, the “Book of Law” that didn’t contain rituals. In some places it refers to the civil code. Basically it is the book of Deut. The Passover is the only sacrifice in Deut. (p.3)

Jer. 7:22. Sacrifices replaced by JC. “forever” is defined. (p.4)

1 Peter 2:5-9 – Priesthood. Heb. 9:10 – “carnal ordinances = circumcision (pp. 5-6)

“law of Moses” defined. SDA quote. Luke 2:22 and 2 Chr. 31:3 = law of the Lord. It is all law given through Moses specifically. (p.6)

“Law” = OT or Pentateuch and sometimes more. Tithing is not one of the Ten Commandments Exodus... “commandments which I gave.” In Acts, 1) All that God gave Moses, 2) all other laws except Ten. Includes civil statutes? “Are we to keep in principle the law of Moses?”

Mal. 4:5 – “with statutes and judgments”

Acts 15 – was that controversy concerning the civil law that was physical?

Acts 21:21 – About customs, not spiritual or physical. Four points were emphasised (p.7)

With what set of laws. Part of the ceremonial law was added after the civil code.

Lev. 17:7-10 – About rituals.

Anything after Ex. 24 was not part of the Book of the Cov. The law of Moses (Deut.) included the Book of the Cov and Book of the Law as civil statutes. How do we know. See Acts 15. Does “law of Moses” mean everything? No. “It means different things at different times” (Acts 15). (p.8)

1 Cor. 9:9 and Deut. 25:4. The judgments are binding today. Civil judgments are binding with one exception. Civil statutes are binding but ceremonial statutes are not. We must understand which are carnal ordinances and which were added after the Old Cov. (very important). “carnal customs” or ceremonies = “works of law” in NT. (p.9)

Acts 15 – Four points were emphasised because they are spiritual principles connected with the ceremonies and should not be mixed up. The Ten Com. Are never called the law of Moses but may be included. There are two kinds of statutes, but there is only one Hebrew word for “ordinances” or statutes. A judgment is a decision that can be memorised. What are the “carnal ordinances”? (p.10)

2 Cor. 3 -- Administration of death is not carried out by the church today. It is now the administration of the spirit that makes one alive and enabled to "love enemies." Should we be slaves of men? Is our warfare carnal? (p.11)

Fabrics: Nothing wrong to mix nylon and wool. The law was given so people wouldn't undersell goods. Could they tell that it was all wool by burning a thread? Today clothes are labelled and mixtures are identified. Fabrics are mixed to look better or sell better as a cheaper product. The better the material the longer it wears.

Grains: Some can mix and produce an inferior product. The law is based on a principle "that is in force today." (p.12)

"works of law" = ceremonies used to justify. "under the law" = under the penalty. Grace is needed because of transgression (p.13).

Deut. 14:8 – Dr. Hoeh is not dogmatic about its application regarding touching a dead carcass of unclean animals. (p.21)

Tassals: The cord around the edge of garment was to keep you in the knowledge of the law and is not obligatory today. It's a "carnal commandment" about something external. God's signs are in the observance of the Sabbath and Holy Days. Don't touch dead carcasses that are decomposing or are for trade. (p.22)

Deut. 5 – the Book of the Law has many additional laws not found in the original Book of the Cov. Some laws in the Book of the Cov. aren't repeated such as judging neighbour and paying for cattle damage. Verse 12 says, "These are the statutes..." (p.24)