

THE MELCHIZEDEK TWO-BOOK THEORY DEBUNKED

Book of the Law vs. Book of the Covenant

(Torah to the Tribes Response)

First Published on Torah to the Tribes online Blog:

<https://www.torahtothetribes.com/project/the-melchizedek-two-book-theory-debunked-torah-to-the-tribes-response>

READING KEY:

Black text: authors original.

Purple text inserts: Matthew Nolan - Torah to the Tribes in response.

Blue text inserts: Wally Bergen - oversight for Torah to the Tribes

Right out of the gate the title “DEBUNKED” suggests that the author believes that the opposing view is not merely untrue but a *‘laughable sham and foolish nonsense’* (Webster’s dictionary). Titling a paper about differing biblical viewpoints (the study of theology) in this manner reveals an offhanded, disparaging and cavalier approach by the author to the serious subject of distinction in law - *“a change of law”* (Genesis 49:10, Hebrews 7:12).

If the book of the covenant and the book of the law are one and the same as our author assumes, then what ‘Torah’ sanctioned change of law does our author actually recognize?

Throughout this article the author takes the position of a ‘NO change of law’ which is a contradiction to the written Word of both the Old Testament & New Testament (Genesis 49:10 & Hebrews 7:12).

Adding ‘Jesus’ to Judaism is not the answer and is rightly rejected by both Christianity and Judaism itself.

“The Melchizedek two-book theory debunked” position is one of propagating the status quo ‘one book theory’ accepted by both Christianity and Judaism for the past 2000 years which denies the ‘Torah’ and ‘New Testament’ sanctioned *“a change also of the law;”* which leads both religions to draw opposite but equally erroneous conclusions about the redemptive work of Messiah.

Torah to the Tribes position, in contrast, is one of viewing Torah as applicable in its New Covenant administration under Melchizedek Yahusha recognizing *“a change also of the law”* which is uniquely distinct from both Judaism and Christianity. Torah to the Tribes believes this

position should be at least studied with merit before being dismissed offhand. **Hebrews 7:12**
For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.

A) Either the law has changed with Yahusha

<OR>

B) The law was not changed. If B) is true (which our author believes) then we're left with one of two choices:

1. To be lawless (the law in its entirety is done away with, Christianity's position - a status quo position)
2. To be Judaized (the law is unchanged and we're to keep it in its entirety, including animal sacrifices - The Judaizing of 'Jesus' - a status quo position)

I offer a final and third option; *but* it is contingent on accepting the truth of A):

3. The New Testament has been given as MalkiTzedik Book of the Covenant-Torah based upon the better promises given to Abraham (Hebrews 8:6 Gk: '*nomotheteō*', Ephesians 2:12, Galatians 3:16).

Torah to the Tribes believes A) and 3.

We find B) 1. and 2. to be unacceptable, against the written testimony of The Word; either lawless pagan syncretism or Judaizing.

We have chosen the narrow way A) (3): The law has changed, the New Testament has been given as MalkiTzedik Book of the Covenant-Torah based upon the better promises given to Abraham (Hebrews 7:12, 8:6, Ephesians 2:12, Galatians 3:16).

Hebrews 8:6 But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was given as torah based upon better promises.

Torah to the Tribes believe the bible demands us to thoroughly investigate its language and context; especially in the light of the High Priesthood of Yahusha before we dismiss offhandedly a distinction between the Book of the Covenant and the Book of the law - a distinction in law.

The Exodus 24:7: **Book of the Covenant:** Hebrew: **Sepher ספר Brit ברית** - proposed, accepted, blood ratified, and meal confirmed brit given as torah (Hebrews 8:6,10 Greek: *diathēkē*)

Deuteronomy 28:6: **Book of the Law:** Hebrew: **Sepher ספר torah תורה** - torah void of a proposal, acceptance, blood ratification and covenant confirming meal (NT Greek: *nomos*)

Linguistically, textually we have unconnected and disparate words in the Masoretic Text, Septuagint and New Testament - three textual witnesses to these *Sepherim*/books NOT being one and the same!

Both are torah: one is Melchizedek covenant; the other is the “added” and “imposed” “school master” - law contained in ordinances (Ephesians 2:15).

Deuteronomy 31:36 ***Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of YHWH your Elohim, that it may be there for a witness against thee.***

Hebrews 7:11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,)

But the Book of the Covenant law/torah was given at Sinai in Exodus 19-Exodus 24 before there was ever a Levitical priesthood. So another; separate and distinct law (the book of the law) was given as a result of the Levitical Priesthood; which was a result of the Golden Calf breach.

Hebrews 7:12 For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.

Galatians 3:10 For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

Galatians 3:12 And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them.

But in Exodus 19.8 & Exodus 24:3 the children of Israel answered; “all that יהוה has spoken we will do.” and they accepted the Book of the Covenant law IN FAITH, so Galatians 3:12 CANNOT be referring to Book of the Covenant but a SEPARATE law that was NOT OF FAITH.

The Book of the law wasn't added by faith, but for transgression:

Galatians 3:19 Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions.

A clear distinction in books. A clear distinction in law!

One accepted in faith - the book of the covenant.

One imposed for transgressions at the Golden Calf and the added Levitical priesthood - the book of the law, No longer a nation of priests but denigrated to a nation WITH A priest.

Galatians 3:24 Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Messiah, that we might be justified by faith. 25 But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

Romans 3:21 But now the righteousness of Elohim (Malki-Tzadik) without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.

Romans 3:31 Do we then make void the law through faith? Elohim forbid: yea, we establish the law. (We establish the Book of the Covenant - law)

Hebrews 10:8 Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law.

Hebrews 10:9 Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O Elohim. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.

'First' - 'Second!' Another clear separation and distinction.

Those of you who have come into the Hebraic roots of your faith and have embraced the "front of the Book," as I like to call it, have come to appreciate and love the Torah (Author assumes that the Torah pertains to the 5 books of Moses. According to whom?) and its incredible connections to both our Messiah and our lives today. Its rich principles powerfully transform the soul into the image of the Creator through the power of the Holy Spirit. Unfortunately, a fairly new doctrine threatens to undermine one of the foundations of our faith—the Law of God.

It's written about in the New Testament over 2000 years ago:

Galatians 3:10 For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

Galatians 3:24 Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. 25 But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

This teaching is a doctrine founded upon a single theory: that there is a difference between the "Book of the Law" and the "Book of the Covenant." We will prove there is no difference at all and that the teaching is completely contrived by the authors of the doctrine. Proving no difference between the two, but that they are, in fact, used interchangeably and synonymously, demonstrates the falsehood of this teaching.

There are many different ways to disprove this theory but let's limit our approach to three main categories for our focus so that this article doesn't end up being a book. These are:

1. No Historical Theological Support from Extra-Biblical Sources
2. Old Testament Proof
3. New Testament Proof

This is a clear and easily refutable false statement of facts (see 1-10 below) that the author uses to try and establish a false premise. A false premise in which to entice the reader into drawing a false conclusion. Making false statements like 1, 2 & 3 above now brings into question all subsequent statements made by the author throughout the rest of the article.

1. I for one don't like to look to extra biblical sources to validate a biblical belief, but since the authors first point requires it: The Book of Jubilees penned after the Golden Calf Breach starts in V.1 with V.1 of the Book of the Law: *'Come up to Me on the Mount, and I will give you two tables of stone of the Torah and of the commandment, which I have written, that you may teach them.'* Why would Jubilees start at exactly the correct opening verse of the book of the law if the book of the law is nothing more than a run on from the book of the covenant with no beginning/opening verse? The chances of 1 verse being exact in its placement out of all the verses of all of scripture is remarkable and should cause one to take pause and reconsider by this fact alone.

2. Christianity has heavily documented 'a change in law' post resurrection of Christ and has used the unbiblical terms, "moral law" and 'ceremonial law' as terms of distinction of law due to it accepting the change and distinction written in the NEW TESTAMENT Scriptures (Hebrews 7:12) and noting the clear and distinct NEW TESTAMENT usage of the phrase 'book of the law' (Galatians 3:10).
3. OLD TESTAMENT PROOF of a change and distinction in law: Genesis 49:10 states there will be a change in the law: *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. Until* means impending change, 'a change of law' (Hebrews 7:12).
4. Even Rabbi Rashi distinguishes between the 2 of them. http://www.chabad.org/library/bible_cdo/aid/9885/jewish/Chapter-24.htm#showrashi=true
5. Jewish Encyclopedia <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/book-of-the-covenant>
6. **Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages and Literatures at the University of Pennsylvania Jeffrey Tigay** teaches they are two different scrolls. Question posed by a theology student to Professor Jeffrey Tigay, Q: *'It seems to me that the Book of the Covenant (BoC) is different than the Book of the Law (BoL), because in the verse-A leads me to think that BoC already done/finish/complete that time when Moses took the blood and threw it on the people and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant that the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words." On the other hand, BoL is still being written - it's the book where Moses is writing verse-B. So then there are two books, the BoC and the BoL'.* **Answer** from Professor Jeffrey Tigay Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages and Literatures at the University of Pennsylvania: *Ans: Book of the Covenant refers specifically to what was given in Exodus 20:19-23:33, which begins The Lord said to Moses: Thus shall you say to the IsraelitesSo in a sense I think you are right...they are two different scrolls...although the Book of the Covenant is a subsection of the greater Torah Teaching.*

7. **The Elohist (“E”)**: According to the modern documentary hypothesis, the text of the Book of the Covenant was originally independent, but later embedded by the Elohist (“E”) in their writings.
8. **Oxford University Press, England**: It is much debated within academic circles whether the Ritual Decalogue, or the Covenant Code, was the original form, as they have a strong resemblance to one another. It is certainly the case that the Covenant Code resembles an expansion of the Ritual Decalogue, but conversely, the Ritual Decalogue resembles a summarizing of the Covenant Code. Nevertheless, it is equally possible that both of these codes were independently constructed. Raymond Westbrook, “What is the Covenant Code?” in *Theory and Method in Biblical and Cuneiform Law: Revision, Interpolation and Development*, ed. B.M. Levinson (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 15-36. [^] **a b** Coogan, Michael D., *A Brief Introduction to the Old Testament*, Oxford University Press, 2009, p. 424. [^] **a b c d** Coogan, pp. 109–110
9. Dr. David Perry Th.d. received his Doctorate of Theology from a nationally accredited university; his doctrinal dissertation was based upon the distinction of the book of the covenant compared to the book of the law and the dissertation obviously underwent thorough peer review for him to receive a Doctorate on the subject.
10. **Book of the Law is first alluded to in Deuteronomy 17:18, “write a copy of this law in a book”** Why? Moses already had the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 24:7-8). Then in Deuteronomy 28:61 **“Book of this Law.”** First mentioned by name (Book of the Law) in Deuteronomy 29:21. this is a red flag because It states “..according to all the CURSES of the Covenant that are written in this Book of the Law,” this proves that we are looking at two distinctly separate books because there were NO curse’s’ (plural) mentioned before, during, or at the initiation of the covenant of Exodus 19:5, concurrent through to its ratification of Exodus 24:8. Some might say, ‘what about Exodus 20:5? “...visiting the iniquities of the father to the third and fourth generation...” (from the 10 Commandments). But this is a ONE specific individual family limited curse. This isn’t the personal and national curse’s’ for covenant breaking, contained in the Book of the Law, Exodus 25 – 40, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Our authors three points easily refuted with ten clear and concise facts!

It is unnecessary to go head to head with all of the points made from those who teach this theory.

The author has already gone *'head to head'* with Torah to the Tribes twice and has yet to make our responses public.

If it can be proven without a shadow of a doubt through these above three categories that the two books are actually one and the same book, referenced from just two different perspectives, then every point proceeding from their premise becomes null and void. Let's first deal with the easiest point, category one.

Thus far there are over twenty-five scriptures to support two distinct and separate books and the *"The Melchizedek two-book theory debunked"* has yet to offer one scripture verse to support a synonymous relationship, but is instead directing the readers to extra-biblical sources which is a definite red flag.

No Historical Theological Support from Extra-Biblical Sources

As Solomon once said, "There is nothing new under the sun." Our first red flag: there appear to be no historical references anywhere which suggest or even hint at its validity. In other words, in the last 3400+ years since the Torah was given, one would think that there would be at least a handful of ancient extra-biblical resources available where this theory was at least discussed by some credible Jewish source.

The Book of Hebrews, Ephesians and Galatians are just three biblical books that validate a clear distinction. Citing 'the Jews' who didn't even believe Yahusha when he taught before them, the people who've established a whole false religion based upon denying His claims is not sound biblical reasoning. Are we really to look to the Ashkenazi "Jews" (Rev. 2:9, 3:9) who blaspheme Yahusha for validity?

By the mere absence of such discussion throughout the annals of time that the Book of the Covenant and the Book of the Law are two distinct books, this theory becomes extremely suspect at best and a modern day theological invention at worst. This alone is significant and should not be easily dismissed. If there is one group of people on earth who study the Old Testament more than any other group—slicing it, dicing it, and stretching its meaning beyond the text at times to meet every conceivable idea and doctrine imaginable—it is the Jews.

Relying of Anti-Christ testimony to establish truth is unstable and unsound reasoning.

Their skills and talents for digging every possible notion from the Scriptures has been proven throughout time, yielding volumes and volumes of commentary from ancient sages and modern alike with the exhaustive Talmud as proof of their laborious study and discussion.

Pointing to Talmud to establish validity is unstable and unsound reasoning and is sounding familiarly like Judaizing. Assuming the same people missing the coming of Messiah the 1st time, because they were stuck in studying Talmud instead of Scripture. It is unfortunate that we have to rely on Talmud now.

Yet with countless thousands of commentaries, discussions, rabbinic dialogue and literature on every subject imaginable, there isn't a single discussion anywhere from anyone mentioning the idea of the "Book of the Law" and the "Book of the Covenant" phrases being two separate books. You will find discussions on everything from the two Yahweh's in heaven to why the Sanhedrin has the power of God on earth, to why people shouldn't walk on grass on the Sabbath, yet there is no discussion on this two-book theory.

Dr. David Perry Th.d. received his Doctorate of Theology on the subject of the distinction of the Book of the Law and the Book of the Covenant and sent the author his doctrinal dissertation on the subject and the author failed to read it in its entirety and admitted to me personally that he did not comprehend Dr. Perry's writing style.

Admittedly Dr. Perry's dissertation was a scholarly read but it was very in depth and deeply rewarding and was subsequently put into two easy to read book forms for the armchair reader.

As stated previously Christianity has heavily documented 'a *change in law*' post resurrection of Christ and has used the terms, "*moral law*" and '*ceremonial law*' as terms of distinction of law due to it acknowledging some kind of change and distinction; yet accepting Judaism's "one book" determination without further examination Christianity was forced to either accept the whole law which it couldn't (that would of been Judaizing) or conclude in error that 'law was nailed to the cross'. Neither Judaism or Christianity is aware that Paul names the distinction in law and identifies the law that is in view in the New Testament that has been concluded, the Book of the Law at Galatians 3:10 which answers all the troubling law verses that have so many confused in their New Testament theology.

Although an argument from silence is normally a weak argument, in this case it demonstrates the doctrine's suspicious nature as there really is "nothing new under the sun." Any doctrine or

proposed theory that has bypassed thousands of years of theologians, Bible students and ancient rabbis is either totally new divine revelation, locked up only for the end days, or is simply not true.

From here, let's allow the Scriptures themselves to speak to the authenticity of this modern day theory so we can determine its veracity.

Old Testament Proof

It is important to disclose that proponents of this theory suggest the Book of the Covenant begins at Genesis 1:1 and ends at Exodus 24:11. This distinction is not made from any authentic exegetical (extracted from Scripture) principle but is instead eisegetically read back into the Scriptures to make their theory more plausible.

We find covenant can only be broken - never disannulled or added to by using **Exegesis:**
Galatians 3:15 Even if a brit is a man's brit, yet still if it is confirmed, no man disannulls it, or adds to it.

The Book of the Covenant was proposed to Israel, accepted by Israel and ratified with blood and confirmed with a covenant confirming meal in Exodus 19-24:11. Galatians 3:15 you can NOT add to a ratified covenant.

In Exodus 24:12 Moshe is informed by YHWH that, ***"I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written."***

This has to be a completely separate and distinct law from the book of the covenant.

On the surface, this distinction appears valid as Moses had the people take an oath to the "Book of the Covenant" in Exodus 24, complete with a blood sacrifice. To a linear western Greco-Roman mindset, the evidence seems clear because with this western mindset, the reader looks at things from a linear perspective.

Torah isn't linear- always chronological; the narrative is chronological but the mitzvot/ commandments are often achronological.

For an indepth look on the subject, 'Torah is not chronological but achronological' see: <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2015/11/28/mystery-melchizedek-part-6/>

This is how books are written today. But in ancient cultures, especially Hebrew, they often did not write every single detail in linear format. Instead, they would give a short synopsis and then go back and fill in the details later in other passages. For example, Genesis 1:28 tells us "Then God blessed them and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it...,'" yet in chapter 2 we find the details of how they were made and where they were placed in the Garden. In other words, it is very traditional Hebrew writing style to give a macro view first and then fill in the details of that same story later in the text.

This is exactly what is happening here. The macro short version of what Moses received in his first encounter with Yahweh on the mountain was told to the people from Exodus 20:1-23:33.

Our author is mistaken! Exodus 20:1-23:33 is NOT Moshe's first ascent and encounter with YHWH on The Mountain, but his FIFTH. Our author is using the very linear western Greco-Roman mindset that he's levying that others use and stringing an erroneous linear chronology together failing to distinguish between Moshe's accents; which of course would cause one to draw a faulty conclusion, by using a faulty premise to begin with.

1. Exodus 3 (the Elohim of the Malki-Tzedek calls Moshe into the priesthood)
2. Exodus 19:3 ('tell the house of the Malki Tzadok/Yaacov')
3. Exodus 19:8 (Moshe brings back the words of the people)
4. Exodus 19:20 (go warn the people of the covenant boundaries)
5. Exodus 20:21-23:33 (includes the blood ratification of the BoC. Nothing can be added e.g. accents 6-10! Don't lump accents strung together with a Greek chronology)
6. Exodus 24:9 (BoC confirming meal)
7. Exodus 24:12 the first set of tablets and imposed (can't be added) law of commandments along with tabernacle instructions.
8. Exodus 32:1 (after the sin of the Golden Calf)
9. Exodus 32:31 (Moshe, the last kadosh Malki Tzedek intercedes)
10. Exodus 34 second set of tablets (*placed inside the ark of the what? And the Book of the law is placed outside the ark in a pocket as a what? A witness against Israel for breaking the BoC housed inside the ark of the covenant*).

He then went back up the mountain for the full forty days and received the rest of the Covenant (24:18).

I hope you can see that skipping over five ascents of Mt. Sinai could cause someone to misinterpret the text quite easily and draw faulty conclusions.

It is interesting to discover that in the first (third!) encounter Moses received instruction that dealt directly with the people and did not include any priestly laws or plans for the temple (tabernacle) which had little to do with the common Israelite. And it was the forty day encounter where the rest of the details were given, details that are more executive or administrative in nature. In modern language, Moses made the "employees" (the people) swear to the part of the Covenant that had to do mainly with them and then in the second encounter Yahweh gave him the details that dealt with the "managers" and administration.

Here's a 'tell', our author is dividing people up into classes of people like religion has done for millennia with clergy and laity-the disqualified common folk; "employees" versus "managers." whereas the bible teaches us that YHWH ordained all the children of Israel in equality: "**a kingdom of priests and an holy nation**". **Exodus 19:6**. No managers and employees. **1 Peter 2:9**.

And the New Testament teaches: **Galatians 3:28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Messiah Yahusha**. No managers and employees.

Exodus 25-31 is addressing the Priests and Israelites. The priestly garments, the altar, courtyard, tabernacle, etc.

Levites were not even in the Picture yet. The so called "Managers" didn't show up until after the Golden Calf event. Regarding Leviticus: It addresses the Israelites for the most part and not the priests. Leviticus 1:2 "speak to the Israelites..." Fellowship Offerings, Food laws, Clean & Unclean, Holy & Profane.

Furthermore, when we look at the parallel passage to the Sinai encounters in Deuteronomy we see that it is impossible for the Book of the Covenant to **only** be Genesis 1:1-Exodus 24:11. The reason is because from Deuteronomy 5 and foreword, Moses in one breath spoke to the people all of the terms of the Covenant that were given to their fathers forty years prior, and in this version Moses goes into far more detail than he did in the Exodus account, adding dozens of commandments that do not exist in the Exodus account. Why?

Because Deuteronomy means "*deuter*" "*second*" "*nomos*" "*law*" "*second law*" or a retelling and repetition of what went before, condensed. Thousands of years ago Christian translators acknowledged by changing the Judaism's title of the book "*Devarim*" to "*Deuter nomos*" that it was a second law.

Deuteronomy contains additional commandments because it's the Book of the Law which was added because of the transgression of the Golden Calf until Messiah would come and usher in a New Covenant ***“given as torah based upon better promises” Hebrews 8.6. “Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made. Galatians 3.19.***

Because this is Hebrew writing. The Exodus account of the "Book of the Covenant" is a macro account and the Deuteronomy account fills in the rest of what was said. In other words, both accounts have to be taken together, just like the creation story in Genesis, in order to get the fuller picture. This fact alone disproves the notion that the supposed Book of the Covenant is only found from Genesis 1:1-Exodus 24:11. If we were to be technical, the Book of the Covenant that Moses was referring to started from Exodus 20 when God started speaking the Ten Commandments and ended at 23:33.

It started in Exodus 19 not Exodus 20 with a proposal (***“Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant.”***) and ended at Exodus 24.11 with a covenant confirming meal (***“And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand: also they saw Elohim, and did eat and drink”.***)

Deuteronomy is part of the Book of the law and is a retelling of historical accounts that went before hand and quotes from the Book of the Covenant; but that doesn't make it the Book of the Covenant. No proposal, acceptance, blood ratification or covenant confirming meal that connects back to Abraham is contained in any law or covenant from Exodus 24:12 - Deuteronomy 34:12. The Book of the Law does contain covenant but they are not Malki Tzedek covenants of promise.

Additionally, as we will discover from this point forward, we cannot use Greek linear logic or western writing style patterns when reviewing the Scriptures at this level. We cannot put chunks of Scripture into nice little boxes and then label them to fit our theories just because they don't follow our linear thought pattern. The Covenant that the Israelites agreed to was not just the words that were specifically for them and spoken to them in the Exodus 24 passage. It included all of the corporate, administration, and ceremonial laws by extension.

Not true! You cannot add to a ratified covenant see above in Galatians.

You cannot agree to something that has not been presented yet. How will the bride agree to a marriage ketuba if the bridegroom doesn't bring it up?

From the Hebrew perspective, Moses viewed the Covenant rules for the people as well as all the instructions for the tabernacle, etc. as one book—the "Book of the Covenant"—which was also called the "Book of the Law" because the "Covenant" contained the "Laws." This is why as Moses retold and reconfirmed the Book of the Covenant—what he had told their fathers in Exodus 24—in Deuteronomy. He literally states in 28:58, "If you do not carefully observe all the WORDS OF THIS LAW that are written in this book..."[Emphasis mine]. Moses uses the phrases "words of this Covenant" and "words of this Law" synonymously.

Not true. Look at the quote of our author again: *"If you do not carefully observe all the WORDS OF THIS LAW that are written in this book..."*[Emphasis the authors]. COVENANT is glaringly absent from the text, yet BOOK and LAW are evident!

In the mind of Moses and the people, the Covenant is made up of laws, no different than a marriage covenant made up of the vows (laws) or a contract made up of the laws within it. The "Book of the Covenant" is made up of the "words of this Law" and that is why the two are interchangeable.

The author is leading the reader to believe that one can know the mind of Moses and the children of Israel from over 3500 years ago!

Vows are promises and not laws. If I promise to be faithful and don't uphold it, I will fall into the full force of the law.

Let's prove this further, starting with one of the most powerful passages demonstrating that the two phrases are synonymous.

SYNONYMOUS PASSAGES

Joshua 8:30-31 "Now Joshua built an altar to the LORD God of Israel in Mount Ebal, as Moses the servant of the LORD had commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the Book of the Law of Moses."

There are two things interesting about this passage. In the story line, this passage immediately follows the speaking of the commandments starting with Ten Commandments of Deuteronomy 5, which is undoubtedly referred to by those who teach the theory in question, as the "Book of the Covenant."

This is another false statement. Deuteronomy is not, 'referred to by those who teach the theory in question, as the "Book of the Covenant."'

Fact: Deuteronomy is part of the Book of the Law, a retelling of all that went before (hence the title 'deuter nomos', retelling of the law that went before), but not a Melchizedek Covenant 'torah'. Therefore the authors false premise now collapses before the reader and alerts us to the false conclusion we're being led to just ahead!

This "Book of the Covenant" goes all the way through the rest of Deuteronomy and finds itself consummated and renewed, exactly like Moses commanded, with Joshua, here in Joshua chapter 8. The difference is that this time it is called the "Book of the Law."

The second, and far more profound fact about this passage, is the content of what these two verses say. It tells us that Joshua built an altar exactly as Moses commanded from THE BOOK OF THE LAW. The glaring problem is that the commandment to build an altar is found back in Exodus 20:25, in what both Moses and proponents of the two-book theory call the "Book of the Covenant." Here it is for reference:

Exodus 20:24-25 "An altar of earth you shall make for Me, and you shall sacrifice on it your burnt offerings and your peace offerings, your sheep and your oxen. In every place where I recorded My name I will come to you, and I will bless you. And if you make Me an altar of stone, you shall not build it of hewn stone, for if you use your tool on it, you have profaned it."

The altar in Exodus 20:25 was pre Golden Calf breach and under the MelchiZedek priesthood administration of the Book of the Covenant.

Burnt and Peace Offerings are NOT sacrifices. Big difference. Offerings were giving in Genesis 4 account already. We could imply that an altar was built. Another account is Genesis 22 (Abraham building an altar, etc.)

Joshua 8:31 is post Golden Calf breach and the law of the altar and sacrifices have been transferred under an Aaronic administration of the Book of the Law in accordance with Deuteronomy 11.29 and Deuteronomy 27.2 in the BOOK OF THE LAW as Joshua 8:31 clearly states without forcing the text: "Book of the Law."

The law of the altar and it's priestly attendance was transferred from Malki-tzedek Exodus 20.25 (Book of the Covenant) to the order of Aaron (Exodus 32.28, Numbers 3:12-Book of the Law; to which Joshua's clearly refers) post Golden Calf and has been transferred back to Malki tzedek with Yahusha attending as High Priest today (Hebrews 9&10).

Hebrews 7:12 For the priesthood being transferred, there is made of necessity a transference also of the law. 13 For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar.

To be honest, this one scripture from Joshua proves without a shadow of any doubt that the original leaders of Israel considered the Book of the Covenant and the Book of the Law the same book, as this commandment is found in what Moses called the "Book of the Covenant" (Exodus 24:7) but Joshua refers to it as the "Book of the Law" in 8:31. Case Closed. **Not really.** To do justice to this study all parties must take time and care to unbiasedly investigate the biblical text before dismissing it out of hand.

Joshua quotes the Book of the Law because he's referencing the law of the altar from the Book of the Law (as he states). Why try to force the text to say something it doesn't (Book of the Covenant) when Joshua was clearly under a Aaronic/Levitical administration not a Melchizedek/Abrahamic administration?

But let's continue for the sake of leaving no stone unturned.

2 Kings 14:6 "But the children of the murderers he did not execute, according to what is written in the Book of the Law of Moses, in which the LORD commanded, saying, 'Fathers shall not be put to death for their children, nor shall children be put to death for their fathers; but a person shall be put to death for this own sin.'"

This commandment about the sins of the fathers is stated in this passage to be from the "Book of the Law" yet when we go back to where that commandment was actually given, it was given in the Book of the Covenant in Deuteronomy 24:16.

Deuteronomy is not the Book of the Covenant it is part of the Book of the Law stated seven times for clarity: Deuteronomy 17:18, Deuteronomy 28:58, Deuteronomy 28:61, Deuteronomy 29:21, Deuteronomy 30:10, Deuteronomy 31:24, Deuteronomy 31:26. Not once is Book of the Covenant referenced or found past Exodus 24:11 until 2.Kings 23:2.

Our authors false premise (Deuteronomy being the book of the covenant; disproved by seven scriptures), leads to a false conclusion (synonymous books) which in turn creates unnecessary confusion.

And there can be no doubt that the words given in Deuteronomy 24 are part of the Book of the Covenant because Moses starts this entire monologue of commandments in chapter 5 with the giving of the Ten Commandments and continues through virtually the entire rest of the book of Deuteronomy. Note that in chapter 29 it is called "the Covenant" multiple times.

There are numerous covenants including the Exodus 34 post Golden Calf breach covenant. These are not 'covenants of promise' they come after the original Malki-Tzedik covenant and the break of the Golden Calf. As does the balance of Exodus. From Exodus 25 on, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy {27-28-29}, the balance of the TaNaK, etc. These are all Levitical concession actions not "covenants of promise". They are emergency patch and bandage or an enactment of Law, till the time of reformation (Hebrews 8). They do not contain the 4 elements of the Covenants of Promise (Ephesians 2:12).

4 elements must be present:

1. A proposal
2. An agreement
3. A blood ratification
4. A Covenant confirming meal

These four things directly attach back to Abraham's Promise Covenant at Genesis 15. It would be a mistake to confuse the oath covenant with Phineas, salt covenants, shoe covenants and threshold covenants with The Covenant of Promise, to which our author is mistakenly doing which seemingly gave cause (*in our author's viewpoint*) to write this article, which is now completely understandable based upon that flawed scriptural worldview.

Deuteronomy 29:1 "These are the words of the Covenant which the LORD commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, besides the Covenant which He made with them in Horeb."

Not only does this prove that the entire set of commandments given in this book is called "the Covenant," but it also proves that there was more added to the Covenant than what was spoken to Moses in his first encounter in Exodus 24:7. This point is important because it proves that the Book of the Covenant, which is also called the Book of the Law, was not complete in the first acceptance by the people in Exodus 24:7.

Not true. Read 2 Chronicle 34 info at the end of the document. Both are not synonymous.

Our author is not understanding the foundational requirements needed in identifying the covenant parameters for the Book of the Covenant or Covenants of Promise (Ephesians 2.12, see above). You cannot add to a sealed covenant Galatians 3:15. This is a complete and sealed covenant as the scripture clearly testifies to.

The terms "renewal" or "updating"(below) are not scripturally sanctioned terms regarding covenant, but a doctrine invented by man.

This concept of renewal and updating the Covenant can be found throughout the Bible, including such powerful passages of Jeremiah 31:31 where the New Covenant is prophesied to be placed on men's hearts, as well as the entire gospel of Yeshua being another renewal of the original Covenant.

You cannot renew a covenant you can only make a New Covenant (Galatians 3. 15). The idea or a renewed Covenant is a Messianic fabrication. B'riyt means covenant, which is the equivalent for the word *testament*. Chadash in the context of Jeremiah 31:31 does not mean *renewed* but *new*, and in this passage the adjectival form for *renewed* would have to appear as "*mechudeshet*" to make it mean *renewed*, and not chadashah as found in the Hebrew text. We can determine that the meaning is something *completely new* because following verse 31, the negative "*lo*" appears in the Hebrew text (*lo kabriyt*). Contextually, this makes it clear that the writer is differentiating between an *existing* and a "*new*" covenant. The new covenant referred to in verse 31 is referred to in the Hebrew of verse 32 as *lo* meaning "*not*" the previous covenant and is defined in the passage below as not being:

“. . . the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; my covenant which they broke . . . “

There are two separate and distinct forms of chadash listed in the Hebrew lexicon for *new* (H2319) and *renewed* (H2318). Another Biblical Hebrew form for *renewed* is *mechudash*, the pu`al participle from the root (*shoresh*) chet-dalet-shin. *Chidesh* is a modern Hebrew word that is also used for *renewed*. Here is also the Hebrew lexicon listing of the word that is translated as *renewed* (H2318).

H2319	H2318
שׁדן	שׁדן
châdâsh	châdash
BDB Definition: 1) new, new thing, fresh Part of Speech: adjective A Related Word by BDB/Strong's Number: from H2318 Same Word by TWOT Number: 613a	BDB Definition: 1) to be new, renew, repair 1a) (Piel) 1a1) to renew, make anew 1a2) to repair 1b) (Hithpael) to renew oneself Part of Speech: verb A Related Word by BDB/Strong's Number: a primitive root Same Word by TWOT Number: 613

Yashua himself speaks of a NEW covenant. www.scripture4all.org - Matthew 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:20

Let's continue with Deuteronomy 4:44, which sets up the beginning of the renewal of the Book of the Covenant from Exodus 24.

Deuteronomy 4:44 "Now this is the Law which Moses set before the children of Israel."

From the very beginning of the speaking of the Book of the Covenant, he calls it "the Law" of Moses, which contains the "testimonies, the statutes, and the judgments." This is the same language used throughout the Pentateuch regardless of whether it is referred to as the "Book of the Law" or the "Book of the Covenant." This "testimonies, statutes, judgments" phrase is used

throughout the book of Deuteronomy as Moses outlined more of the details of the Covenant. But Deut. 28:58 says, "If you do not carefully observe all the words of this law that are written in this book..." Did you catch that? "[T]he words of this law that are written in this book." What could a book be called that is filled with "words of this Law?" You got it—the Book of the Law. Yet these same "words of this Law" only eleven verses later in 29:1 are called "words of the Covenant." Then again, it is called the "Covenant" in verses 9, 12, 14 and in verse 21 it is called a "Covenant" AND the "Book of the Law": "And the LORD would separate him from all the tribes of Israel for adversity, according to all the curses of the Covenant that are written in the Book of the Law." Those "curses" are found in Deuteronomy 27, which is the same Book of the Covenant speech that started in chapter 5 but here it is called the Book of the Law AND "the Covenant" Why? Because they are one in the same.

The fact that the Book of the Law does contain non MalkiTzedik covenants easily explains this.

KING JOSIAH

In 2 Kings 22-23 we find another section of Scripture where the Book of the Law and the Book of the Covenant are used interchangeably. After Josiah becomes king in Judah, in his eighteenth year of being king, the high priest informs him that they have found the "Book of the Law" but then the same book is also called the "Book of the Covenant." Let's take a look.

2 Kings 22:8 "Then Hilkiah the high priest said to Shaphan the scribe, 'I have found the Book of the Law in the house of the LORD.'"

After finding the "Book of the Law" he takes it to King Josiah in verse 11 and the king tears his robes. Then he inquires of the prophetess of what is to be done and repents before Yahweh on behalf of the people. He then does the next logical thing—he calls his elders and all the men of Jerusalem together to tell them what was found—just like Moses did (Exodus 24:3-8) and Joshua did (Joshua 8:34,35). But right after he finished calling it the "Book of the Law" he turned around and called it the "Book of the Covenant." Take a look:

2 Kings 23:8 "...And he read in their hearing all the words of the Book of the Covenant which had been found in the house of the LORD."

Did you catch that? The VERY SAME book that was found in the temple that was called the "Book of the Law" in 22:8 was called the "Book of the Covenant" in 23:8 when it was presented before the people. It is interesting to note that there seems to be a pattern developing that when

it was presented before the people it is called the Book of the Covenant and when it is referenced in general it is called the Book of the Law or the Law of Moses. In any case, this passage is clearly referencing the same book that found in the temple and called by both titles.

Hilkiah the High Priest found the Book of the Law and thereby the Book of the Covenant. Why? Because the Book of the Law was in a pocket outside the ark as a witness against them Deuteronomy 31:26. If you found one you found the other! This does not prove a synonymous relationship. Hilkiah gave it to Shaphan the sofer who showed it to Melech Josiah. Josiah took a stand for the covenant and reinstated the Book of the Law Levitical ordinances and Passover sacrifices thereby removing any traces of the Malki-Tzedik Book of the Covenant rites. In his zeal for a return he had to deem anything non Levitical impure.

The way that the two-book theorists attempt to get around this fact is by saying that two different books were found. This theory not only fails both the common sense test of the plain reading progression of the story but also fails the textual evidence. For instance, this would force the reader to believe that Josiah read a different book to his own elders and men of Jerusalem than the one that caused him to tear his clothes.

Our author is reading his ideas into the text exercising Eisegesis. ***Deuteronomy 31.26 Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the YHWH your Elohim, that it may be there for a witness against thee.***

It's not called the ark of the law because it contains the tablets and the scroll of the covenant and outside is the book of the law. One will be found with the other.

Secondly, the Hebrew text itself prevents this reading due to the word "book" being in the singular and not the plural. For instance, in 22:3 it states: "this book," in 22:8 it says "Book of the Law," in verse 11 it says, "Book of the Law," in 13 it says, "concerning the words of this book," in 16: "all the words of the book, in 23:2 it states: "the Book of the Covenant," etc... Over and over again in the discovery of this book or the dialogue surrounding it, the book is always in the singular. If there were two books found, 22:13 would not say, "concerning the words of this book that was found," but would instead say, "these books." But it doesn't because only one book was found and it is called the Book of the Covenant that IS the Book of the Law, which IS the Law of Moses.

One cannot use the confusion of Hilkiah and Shaphan finding what they hadn't been keeping for decades (under Kings Amos & Manasseh) to reinterpret the text to another conclusion!

To make that huge assumption based on a singular usage when referencing two singular books is neither balanced nor honest and an attempt to lead the readers in a thought unsupported by the text alone. The text uses two different Hebrew words, not one! To say that 'two' is 'one' is the exercise of Eisegesis and disingenuous.

JOSHUA VS. MOSES

Joshua 1:7-8 "Only be strong and very courageous, that you may observe to do according to all the law which Moses My servant commanded you; do not turn from it to the right hand or to the left, that you may prosper wherever you go. This Book of the Law shall not depart from your mouth, but you shall meditate in it day and night..."

Joshua equates the "Book of the Law" with the "Law of Moses." He tells them that they need to keep the Book of the Law as delivered through Moses when they heard it from him. And when did they hear it from Moses? When Moses started giving them the details of the Book of the COVENANT in Deuteronomy 5, which was a retelling of Exodus 20-24 where Moses called it the "Book of the Covenant" (Exodus 24:7).

Here our author admits that Deuteronomy is a retelling of what went before. Which is correct.

Furthermore, there are two academically and scripturally undisputed facts:

1. The "Book of the Law," the "Law of Moses" and "the Law" are used interchangeably. **Correct.**
2. The "Law" that is being referred to throughout the New Testament would certainly not, from the viewpoint of those who believe the two-book theory, be connected to the Book of the Covenant, but surely the Book of the Law without a doubt.

Incorrect. Nomos, law in the New Testament has 20 different meanings (see below) and context must be applied. *Law of sin and death, law of adultery, legal laws, torah, book of the law, law of sin. Etc etc.*

Two-book theorists suggest that New Covenant believers are no longer under the Book of the Law but only under the Book of the Covenant. With the above two facts as a given, those who hold to this theory are faced with insurmountable problems as the New Testament supports "the Law" in the most positive and binding way.

The book of the covenant is torah just as the book of the law is torah. One is blood ratified covenant the other isn't. We must learn to rightly divide the word (torah) of truth (2 Timothy 2:15). Abraham kept Yahweh's torah and never saw a Levite or heard of the Book of the Law.

And although I have written an entire 350 page book on the subject defending the Law of God, (that will, Lord willing, be available early to mid 2018), I will present only a few of the scriptures directly supporting the fact that the Book of the Law (aka "the Law") is still in effect.

The historic Christian definition of one who propagates a 'no change of law' is a Judaizer. Teaching believers in Yahusha to adhere to all Jewry's 'Law of God', an unchanged law is in fact a New Testament violation (Hebrews 7:12) thus termed heretical Judaizing by the early believers and historians alike. Reader beware! There truly is nothing new under the sun! (*Hebrews 7:12 'change of law', Gen. 49:10 'until' a change of law when Shiloh/Yahusha comes*).

But before we continue we need to prove that the "Book of the Law" = "The Law of God" = "Law of Moses" = "The Law." In other words, we need to establish that all of them are interchangeable and synonymous terms. Although there are literally hundreds of times where these terms are used interchangeably, here are a few to establish this point.

Joshua 8:31 "...as Moses the servant of the LORD had commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the Book of the Law of Moses."

The "Book of the Law" is equal to the "Law of Moses."

Joshua 24:26 "Then Joshua wrote these words in the Book of the Law of God."

The "Book of the Law" is equal to the "Law of God."

2 Chronicles 17:9 "So they taught in Judah, and had the Book of the Law of the LORD with them; they went throughout all the cities of Judah and taught the people."

The "Book of the Law" is the same as the "Law of the LORD."

Nehemiah 8:1-2 "Now all the people gathered together as one man in the open square that was in front of the Water Gate; and they told Ezra the scribe to bring the Book of the Law of Moses, which the LORD had commanded Israel. So Ezra the priest brought THE

LAW before the assembly of men and woman and all you could hear with understanding on the first day of the seventh month. (emphasis mine)”

In verse 1, it is called the "Book of the Law" and in verse 2 it is just called "the Law."

The "Book of the Law" is the "Law of God" is the "Law of the LORD" which, hundreds of times, is referred to as "the Law." This point is critical as every single scripture presented from this point forward will be predicated on this fact. Since two-book theorists suggest that New Covenant believers are not subject to the Book of the Law (the Law), then all one needs to do is prove that the Prophets and New Testament authors, in fact, supported and promoted the Law, the very "Book of the Law" that two-book theorists say has been abolished. Let's start with the most popular scripture in all the Old Testament that deals with the New Covenant.

Jeremiah 31:31-33 “Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah— not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day *that* I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, My covenant which they broke, (context: they broke the book of the covenant) though I was a husband to them, says the Lord. But this *is* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put My law in their minds, and write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.

Context is the book of the covenant which is torah will be made new and put on our hearts.

Jeremiah says that Yahweh would again renew the Covenant but this time He would "write the Law (Torah) on their hearts." "The Law" refers to the Book of the Law.

Not true, not in the context of *“the day I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt”*, read Exodus 19-24:11 context demands the Book of the Covenant is in view here.

Again, we see the Book of the Law and Covenant language side by side. Yahweh would write the Book of the Law, which IS the Covenant, on their hearts. Incredibly, Yahweh used this same language in Deuteronomy 6 in the Shema immediately after the Ten Commandments. Two-book theorists admit the Ten Commandments are a part of the Book of the Covenant. He wanted them to love Him with all their heart and to keep the Covenant through keeping His commandments, which He calls "the Law."

Isaiah 2:3 “Many people shall come and say, ‘Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; He will teach us His ways, and we shall walk in His paths.’ For out of Zion shall go forth the law (Torah), and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.” (Parenthetical notations mine)

Book of Covenant is still the law/torah, the covenant law that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob kept and they were not lawless and they never knew the Book of the Law or a Levitical priest.

Genesis 26:5 Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my TORAH.

There was no Book of the Law in existence here, no Levitical Priesthood in existence only the Book of the Covenant, promise of Abraham, yet it's clearly identified as Torah.

This passage concerns the Second Coming of Christ after He arrives for His millennial reign.

Our author's making assumptions here, assuming that we all believe the status quo in regard to a pre-millennial reign of Messiah, which is not the only interpretation open to us. I believe scripture teaches a post millennial reign of Messiah. Assumptions and sound biblical reasoning don't go hand in hand and we should all avoid making them, myself included and rely on the biblical text.

Note the subject of this passage is the Law being taught to the people of the world, the same Law referred to throughout Scripture as the Book of the Law. If the Book of the Law was abolished there would be no reason for Christ to teach it when He returns.

Proverbs 6:23 “For the commandment is a lamp, and the Law a light; Reproofs of instruction are the way of life.”

If the Book of the Law is no longer relevant then one must conclude that the Law is no longer a light. That is a statement I'm not sure any believer would be comfortable making.

Proverbs 7:1-3 “My son, keep My words, and treasure My commands within you. Keep My commands and live, and My Law as the apple of your eye. Bind them on your fingers; Write them on the tablet of your heart.”

This is a clear reference to Deuteronomy 6 Shema language—instructions given within what Moses called the "Book of the Covenant," yet it is called here "My Law."

This is pure fabrication. Nowhere in the bible does Moses call Deuteronomy the book of the covenant. There is no scripture to substantiate such a broad brush stroke false statement.

Proverbs 28:4 and 9 “Those who forsake the Law [of Moses, aka the Book of the Law] praise the wicked, but such as keep the [Book of the] Law contend with them.” And “One who turns away his ear from hearing the [Book of the] Law even his prayer is an abomination.”(insertions mine)

These two scriptures are powerful. To believe the Law of God is abolished and separate from the Book of the Covenant is to praise the wicked and to hinder your prayers. For those who believe in the two-book theory, this subject could not be more serious as their very prayers could be hindered.

Malachi 4:4-6 “Remember the Law of Moses [The Book of the Law], My servant, which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments.

Context again is so important. The book of the covenant was given at Mt. Sinai Exodus 19-24.11 to all Israel; no scripture record of the book of the law being given can be found to substantiate such a false claim, again!

Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD. And he will turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, lest I come and strike the earth with a curse. (insertion mine)

This scripture has no ambiguity. It speaks about the Second Coming of Christ and the final judgment of mankind. And what is the one thing that the prophet said that everyone in the last days must do? "Remember the Law of Moses," which over and over again is also called the Book of the Law, or just "the Law" for short. If the two-book theorists are correct, then why did the prophet tell us to remember the Book of the Law in the end days? In their view, the Book of the Law was abolished on the cross. Either Malachi was a false prophet or the two-book theory is simply not true.

Or, more plausibly, the book of the covenant was given to Moses because the children of Israel requested that they not hear from yahweh and Moses go in their stead to receive the book of the covenant which is torah/law (Exodus 19-24, Hebrews 8.6) thus by definition also the law - "the law of Moses!" Rightly divide the torah/word of truth (2.Timothy 2:15). Is the text referring to the law of Moses contained in covenant or the law of Moses contained in ordinances? One was agreed to by faith (Exodus 19:4) the other imposed for transgressions (Galatians 3:19). To miss this most important scriptural reality is to miss the mark and fall into a world of confusion about the very polemic to begin with.

Furthermore, the text refers to "Horeb" as the place where the "Law of Moses" was given. We know that Horeb is simply another name for Sinai which puts us back in the Exodus 20-23 encounter that two-book theorists say is the Book of the Covenant. So if Exodus 20-23 is the Book of the Covenant, then why is it here called the "Law of Moses," which we have already established is synonymous to the Book of the Law?

Context, date and establishing which ascent of Mt. Sinai is in view must be established to determine whether law, book of the covenant or book of the law is in view.

New Testament Proof

There is much evidence proving the validity of the Law of God in the New Testament, but space doesn't allow us to go through all of it. There are four chapters on this subject alone in my upcoming book "Case for the REAL Covenant," For now, here are a few.

If we could all show pause for a moment before running headlong into trying to disprove another's theology offhand. A more balanced approach would be to examine wholeheartedly the opposing view in light of what has been presented by Torah to the Tribes thus far coupled with what does and what does not constitute a covenant in scripture. Once established only then should one drill down further into what does and does not constitute the Malki-Tzedek covenants of promise (Ephesians 2:12). To which our author and many people may not even have an awareness of.

Recommend research material: <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2015/04/04/clearing-covenant-confusion/>

Acts 21:20 “And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord. And they said to him, ‘You see, brother, how many myriads of Jews there are who have believed, and they are all zealous for the Law.’”

Which law? There is only one in the first century, the Law of God, aka...Law of Moses/Book of the Law.

Totally incorrect: Paul identifies 17 of 20 categories of law mentioned in the New Testament. The word *nomos* occurs in the New Testament 165 times in 162 different verses of Scripture. In each of these instances, the context presents clear indication of this usage and interpretation. Paul's day possessed no word-group corresponding to our “legalism”, “legalist” and “legalistic” “. We should, therefore, always be ready to investigate further than the surface level of scripture regarding Pauline statements regarding “law.”

There are 20 *law of* phrases that need to be defined. You cannot whitewash The Word and simply refer to “the Law of Moses” when presented with the biblical phrase translated as “law.”

1. Law of Faith (Romans 3:27)
2. Law of Works (Romans 3:27)
3. Law of marriage/husband (Romans 7:2)
4. Elohim (Romans 8:7)
5. My members (Romans 7:23)
6. The mind (Romans 7:23)
7. Book of the Law (Galatians 3:10)
8. Sin (Romans 7:25)
9. Death (Romans 8:2)
10. The Spirit (Romans 8:2)
11. Righteousness (Romans 9:31)
12. Moses (Acts 13:39)
13. Christ (Galatians 6:2)
14. Commandments contained in ordinances (Ephesians 2:15)
15. Under the Levitical Priesthood (Hebrews 7:11)
16. Carnal commandment (Hebrews 9:10)
17. Civil (1 Corinthians 6:6)

James adds 2 more

18. The perfect law of liberty (James 1:25)

19. The royal law (James 2:8)

The writer of Hebrews adds another:

20. Covenant law (Hebrews 9:19).

Are we to believe that James, the leader of the Jerusalem council was unaware that the death of Messiah destroyed the Book of the Law? No, the New Covenant's foundation IS the Book of the Law.

Not true. Another false statement.

Hebrews 8:8 I will make a NEW covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: NOT ACCORDING to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. (Caps mine).

It is important to keep in mind that there was no such doctrine as the two-book theory in the first century.

This is a brand new invention of the 21st century.

Galatians 3:10 For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

Hebrews 7:11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? 12 For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.

The abundant reference of scriptures thus far; including but not limited to the opening points 1-10 shed considerable doubt, at the least upon this statement, but more plausibly utterly refutes it.

Because Torah to the Tribes is truly endeavoring to teach and live the bible based faith that was once delivered to the saints we also find ourselves being falsely accused and levied with the same charges as the disciples:

Acts 6:11 Then they suborned men, which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against יהוה (see authors statements above) 12 And they stirred up the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon him, and caught him, and brought him to the council, 13 And set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law: 14 For we have heard him say, that this Yahusha of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.

Hebrews 7:11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? (i.e destroy this place)

Hebrews 7:12 For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law (i.e change Moses' law)

The author of Hebrews could easily be accused and in fact has been by certain Hebrew Roots teachers of doing the same thing. We find ourselves humbly privileged to be among this great company of saints which witnesses to our journey being in the right scriptural direction; upon the narrow less traveled road.

These were Jews who kept the **entire** Torah and knew nothing else. Think about that for a minute. If this theory is true today, then, it was true in the first century, and would undoubtedly be one of the greatest revelations of all time, yet there is not a single discussion, explanation, extra-biblical writing **anywhere** on the subject? If not a single rabbi taught this theory, then not a single Jew knew it existed. The two-book theory would mean that James is wrong for being excited that his converts are desiring to keep the Law. Consider also the following scriptures:

1 John 3:4 "Whoever commits sin also commits lawlessness, and sin is lawlessness."

Israel sinned; transgressed YAHWEH's torah; they broke the Book of the Covenant. The book of the law had not been added yet (Hebrews 7:11).

In other words, the only definition of sin in the entire Bible is breaking the Book of the Law. It does not say that sin is covenantlessness. It says "lawlessness" because to not keep the Law of God **was** the definition of sin.

1 John 2:3-4 “Now by this we know that we know Him, if we keep His commandments. He who says, ‘I know Him,’ and does not keep His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.”

And which commandments did John refer to because this is a pretty serious statement? There is no qualifier to which Book he referred to.

Hebrews 7:13 For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.

Should I keep the commandments of the Book of the Covenant or the Book of the Law? The author gives not a hint about which one I should keep, yet says I'm a liar if I don't keep them. The reason is simple. There is only one Torah, the all-encompassing Book of the Covenant which **is** the Book of the Law.

Mathew 22:40 “Then one of them, a lawyer, asked Him a question, testing Him, and saying, ‘Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?’ (Notice the Lawyer asks him about “the Law,” which we have already proved is equal to the “Book of the Law.”) Jesus said to him, ‘You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind.’ This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like it: ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.”

No problem here! This is pre New Covenant. Israel was still “under the Book of the law” the New Covenant given as covenant torah had yet to be inaugurated (Hebrews 8:6)

Let's take a look at the parallel passage to what Yeshua said in Mathew with the one in Joshua:

Joshua 22:5 “But take careful heed to do the commandment and the Law which Moses the servant of the LORD commanded you, to love the LORD your God, to walk in all His ways, to keep His commandments, to hold fast to Him, and to serve Him with all your heart and with all your soul.”

Again, we have already established the fact that the "Law of God" is the same as the "Book of the Law" which is also the same as the "Law of Moses" as well as just "the Law." Furthermore, we have already documented that there was no such theory in the minds of the first century Pharisee that would allow for "the Law" to mean anything other than what the Scriptures already define it as.

The mind of the first century Pharisee killed Yahshua's followers, couldn't understand Messiah's words and had no new revelation. This is not something to aspire to and shows you our authors slant.

This means that the Pharisee asked Yeshua what the greatest commandment is from the Book of the Law and the answer given comes directly from Deuteronomy 6:5, which is the beginning of the Book of the Covenant! **Incorrect**. If there were in fact two books, then that means Yeshua didn't answer the question. The question was which one was the greatest from the Book of the Law and not from the Book of the Covenant. If anyone should have known that there were two books, it would have been Yeshua. But like the text says, He answered correctly because there is only one book.

There is only one book that is administered at a time. And Yahusha answered appropriately quoting from the book of the law that was currently being administered. Pre resurrection of Yahusha the book of the law was in effect and was supposed to be administered by the Aaronic High Priest (of which Caiphus was not). You cannot have two different laws and covenants running simultaneously anymore than you can have two Presidencies in one administration. ADMINISTRATION OF TORAH is the key point that our author is not comprehending throughout the article and the sole cause of confusion (Hebrews Chapter 7 explains this).

Also, we know that the two golden commandments were given in the Book of the Covenant and yet Yeshua says "ALL of the Law" hangs off of them. Since two-book theorists admit that there is law in both books, and Yeshua says that ALL of the Law and the Prophets hang off of the two greatest commandments, then wouldn't that mean that ALL of the Law (including both books) are intimately connected to these commandments and still valid? They certainly are in the mind of Yeshua.

Mathew 5:19 "Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

Which commandments should we keep? The Book of the Law commandments or the Book of the Covenant commandments? Again, the reason there is no reference to which book is because there is only one Book, one scroll, one covenant for the one Kingdom. The risk to those who teach against the book of the Law is that they, by default, teach people to ignore the commandments, and thus position themselves as least in the Kingdom.

1 John 5:2-3 "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 burdensome."

Again, which commandments should we keep? The ones in the Book of the Law or the Book of the Covenant? Friends, these are Jews that only have one definition for "commandments" and that is the Torah, the Law of God.

Acts 24:14 "But this I confess to you, that according to the Way which they call a sect, so I worship the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and in the Prophets."

In this context, Paul is accused of teaching against the Law of Moses (Book of the Law) and his response was that he believed ALL THINGS that are written in the Law and in the Prophets. Not some things. All.

There are literally scores of scriptures I could continue to bring up. Here is a final montage.

Paul said in Romans 3:31 that he "upholds the Law (Book of the Law)," in Romans 7:22 he "delights in the Law," in 7:25 he said that with his mind he desires to keep it, and in 8:7 he said that only those who are carnally minded are not subject to the Law. He also said in Romans 6:1 that we should not continue to break it just because Christ came and that it is good if it is used lawfully (1 Timothy 1:8). James said that we should not be mere hearers of it but actually do it (James 1:22-25) and in 2 Timothy 3:16 it says that "ALL SCRIPTURE" is to be used for doctrine, reproof, correction and training in righteousness—our standard of living.

Proponents of two-book theory are left with only one option: that every single time the Law of God is mentioned in the New Testament it must be referring to the Book of the Covenant law. This is nothing more than a complete assumption to fit the two-book theory and rests on no academic or scriptural foundation whatsoever. We have already proved that when the

Pharisees, Yeshua and the disciples said "the Law" they were referring to the Book of the Law which in reality is all part of the "Covenant."

It is hermeneutically irresponsible to read into the text a suggested interpretation beyond the clear and textually supported intent of the authors themselves. And this intent is clear through the myriad of scriptures in both the Prophets and the New Testament. They repeat the phrases found in the Tenakh, such as "Law of Moses," "Law of God," "the Law," etc., all referencing to the same Book of the Law that consists of the instructions of the Covenant.

IN SUMMARY

There is simply no supporting documentation of this theory existing outside of this 21st century theological invention. And now you know why. The Scriptures offer no supporting documentation. Furthermore, because historically the first century Jews had no idea of this two-book theory, we can conclusively rely on the fact that every time the Law of God is mentioned in the New Testament, it refers to the only thing that their entire religious culture believed it meant: The Torah, the first five books of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Our author vacillates between the Torah being all of Scripture including the New Testament (see below **) to it here being just the first five books of the bible. Which is it? The answer is neither:

Galatians identifies what law was added at Exodus 24:12 after the ratified BoC. Galatians doesn't mention 'the five books of Moses' as the traditional anti 'nomina' church would have you believe nor does it mention the 'Oral law' as Messianic's would have you believe NOR does it mention a separate 'Law of Moses'. It identifies by name the BoL in Galatians 3:10. V.17 informs us that the law (now identified by V. 10) came 430 years later and was after the covenant (BoC) . This identifies that the law that was added in Exodus 24:12 after the blood ratified covenant was confirmed was.....V.10 the BoL! No gymnastics, no esoteric twisting, no emotional pleas just line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little there a little! The law added in Exodus 24:12 can only be the BoL according to Paul's communication to the Galatians and confirmed by Hebrews 7:11.

The 'Law of Moses' can't be some separate 'law' from the BoL. The phrase 'Law of Moses' comes from 'the Book of the Law of Moses' appearing in the Bible 4 times with the totot of 1st mention Joshua 8:31. Neither phrase, 'law of Moses' or 'Book of the law of Moses' appear in Galatians 3. The phrase 'Book of the Law of Moses' Never appears in the NT but the phrase 'Book of the Law' appears 1 time in the NT at Galatians 3:10! So the context of Paul's writings is.....BoL in totality! Galatians 3:10.

What gives away the game is the phrase 'The Law of Moses' is found in John 7:23 & Acts 15:5 and it's in reference to the land entrance sign of circumcision in Joshua 5:2. **The point:** 'The law of Moses' cannot be its own law or limited to just the book of Deut or to the first 5 books of the bible because the phrase it's attached to (circumcision) is in text outside of those parameters (Genesis 17:10 & Joshua 5:2). Then to compound that Joshua 8:31 & Joshua 23:6 are outside of the first 5 books with Joshua 'adding' to "the Book of the Law" (of Moses) at Joshua 24:26. All mentions of the 'Book of the Law' and 'the Book of the Law of Moses' are synonymously interchangeable and begin in 'law' Exodus 24:12 extending past Deuteronomy into Joshua with additions and changes!

We learned that the "Book of the Law" and the "Book of the Covenant" are synonymous and used interchangeably throughout the Biblical text. One of the most powerful examples we visited was Joshua 8:31 where Joshua built an altar according to the instructions that Moses gave "as it is written in the Book of the Law." The problem we discovered is that commandment was given in Exodus 20:25, which is in what both Moses (in Exodus 24:7) and the two-book theorists call the "Book of the Covenant." So either Moses was wrong in calling it the Book of the Covenant, Joshua was wrong in calling it the Book of the Law or both "books" are actually one book called by multiple titles. We have substantially documented the latter to be the truth.

Finally, we not only proved that the two book titles are used interchangeably, but we corroborated that the "Book of the Law," the "Law of God," the "Law of Moses," the "Law of the LORD," and "the Law" are all synonymous phrases. We then applied this truth to several New Covenant prophecies as well as a variety of New Testament scriptures on the topic and discovered that both the Prophets, Yeshua and all the disciples not only supported the Law of God, they encouraged others to learn to keep it, telling them that the only way to truly love God is to actually keep the laws of the Covenant (1 John 5:3).

(** Conflicting statements) My friends, do not be deceived. The Torah (which means "instructions" in Hebrew) is from Genesis all the way through Revelation. The entire Book is the revelatory instruction manual for the believer's life. Every commandment and statute may not be able to be kept perfectly today for a variety of reasons (there is no temple, not in the land, not under a theocratic government, no Levitical priesthood, etc...), but "not one jot or tittle shall in no way pass away until heaven and earth pass away."

"Not one Jot and Tittle" except that which is inconvenient or impractical today. Here the truth comes out; the 'Hebrew Roots Movement' are not *"Torah observant"* at all, in reality, 'Hebrew Roots Movement' is selective in which parts of the Law they do obey. Are there not parts of the Law that require a parapet on your roof, a High Priest and a Temple? What about animal sacrifice? Did YAHWEH become flesh and spill His blood simply to spare people the inconvenience of sacrificing animals?

What about penalties for those who violate the parts of the law for which the punishment is death? Who will take on the "responsibility" of making sure that appropriate punishment is administered according to the Law? The apostate Ashkenazi "Jews" who hate Yahusha and want to kill His followers? You'll find no justice administered justly there!

The above statement is hypocrisy and picking and choosing no different from the traditional church. Do not Deuteronomy 27:26 and Galatians 3:10 say that *"cursed is everyone who does not continue to do EVERYTHING written in the Book of the Law?"* (Caps mine.)

How is it, in this selective view, that grace exempts one from observing/performing the parts of the Law that one finds inconvenient or impractical today (*animal sacrifices, courts of justice, Niddah after childbirth 40/80 days abstinence-Leviticus 12*) but does not exempt one from observing/performing the more palatable parts of the Law (*tzitzit, beards*).

I really wonder how those who lay claim to being "Torah observant" can reconcile these obvious problems with consistency in obedience to the whole Law doctrine.. If you do go ahead and decide to perform sacrifices or build a parapet on your new home to be consistent, then of what use is the Cross?

Have you not left the Cross, rejected the redemptive work of the Blood that was shed there for you by the Lamb of YAHWEH? Yes; you've left the Cross and rejected the redemptive work of the Blood, you've chosen the wrong altar, the wrong sacrifice and the wrong High Priest. And herein lies the great deception: Judaizing!

Hebrews 13:9 Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines. For it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace; not with meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein. 10 We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. 11 For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. 12 Wherefore Yahusha also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. 13 Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach. 14 For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come.

Following this “Melchizedek two-book theory debunked” theology to its logical conclusion leads you to animal sacrifices under a Levitical High Priest, on a altar of apostate Ashkenazi “Jews” who hate Yahusha and deny His High Priesthood.

A believer who ends up here is no longer a believer and has ‘*no right to eat of Yahshua's body and blood*’ (Jn.6). Looking to a carnal Jerusalem and carnal temple and carnal priesthood demonstrates one is still following ‘*the law of a carnal commandment*’ and rejecting ‘*Yahshua's power of an endless life.*’

Hebrews 7:15 And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, 16 Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. 17 For he testifieth, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. 18 For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.

A “Jew” living in Israel on a good day could only fulfill about 240 of the ‘so called’ “ 613 commandments” established by the rabbis (*613-rabbinic fable*). That’s because there is no Temple, no Priesthood, and other various excuses. If you do the math on that, it means that a person living in Missouri could probably only fulfill 40 +/- percent of the Law on a very, very good day: ***If you truly fulfill the royal Law according to the Scripture, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself,” you do well. But if you have partiality you work sin, being reproved by the Law as transgressors. For whoever shall keep all the Law, but stumbles in one, he has become guilty of all. (James 2:8-10)***

To believe that you are keeping the whole torah (which one is clearly, by the authors own testimony not capable of) and then conveniently switching to grace when someone points that out, is a terrible witness for the price that Yahusha paid (*in my personal opinion*).

Truly, then, if perfection was through the Levitical priestly office (for the people had been given Law under it), why yet was there need for another priest to arise according to the order of Melchizedek and not to be called according to the order of Aaron? For the priestly office having been changed, of necessity a change of law also occurs. For, indeed, an annulment of the preceding command comes about because of its weakness and unprofitableness. For the Law perfected nothing, but a bringing in of a better hope, through which we draw near to Elohim. And by how much it was not without oath-taking; for they truly becoming priests are without oath-taking, but He with oath-taking, through the One saying to Him, The Lord swore, and will not care to change, "You are a priest to the age according to the order of Melchizedek;" by so much Yahusha has become Surety of a better covenant. (Hebrews 7:11-12,18-22)

The whole Judaizing 'one book' torah doctrine is agenda driven. Those who teach this are alluding to the fact that we are still under the Old, imposed law - the book of the law, with no change (not recognizing the "until the time of reformation" clause of Genesis 49:10 & Hebrews 9:10). Since the book of Hebrews proves unequivocally that to be incorrect, many of the Hebrew Roots teachers are now saying that the book of Hebrews is not authentic, and should be removed from the canon. What's next Galatians and Ephesians, Yahusha and the entire N/T? Sadly for thousands this has become their testimony and many in the Hebrew Roots Movement will be held accountable for leading them down that road to destruction.

Hebrews 9:8 Animal sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; 10 Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. 11 But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; 12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. 13 For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: 14 How much more shall the blood of Messiah, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to Elohim, purge your conscience from dead works.

The book of the law was not an agreed to covenant but an imposed law for breaking the book of the covenant at the Golden Calf.

We DO have a legitimate mandate for change from Torah (Genesis 49:10, Exodus 32, Numbers 3:12, Numbers 8:15-17, Joshua 5:5 – and Hebrews 7:11-12 evidences it) a change our author denies – on the reverse side Jews (Rabbinic to Anti-Missionaries) deny a 'change' (like our author) yet act on a change they have NO legitimate Torah mandate for.

The point to understand is Genesis 49:10 – It is not a 'change' OF Torah; to enact the 'change' IN Torah; that has always been right there IN Torah.

The truth of the matter becomes; to refuse the change that has always been there in Torah as prophecy is to 'diminish ought' (jot and/or tittle) from Torah (Matthew 5:17-18; Luke 16:17; Deuteronomy 4:2; 12:32)! What irony!

When Yahweh made covenant with the first couple in the Garden, He gave them the rules of the Covenant (i.e.. "Don't eat from the forbidden tree."). Those rules were not separate from the Covenant. They **were** the Covenant.

Here again is a demonstration of a lack of understanding of covenants which carries through the whole article: The word '*brit*' occurs 286 times in the Masoretic text. Despite extensive research on its etymology its verbal root remains unidentified and its meaning must be determined from its usage alone. Depending on the context it can be translated as "treaty", "pact", "agreement", "solemn promise", "obligation" or more familiarly as "covenant". You have to use the chapter and verse alone to determine the meaning of berit don't assume it's a covenant.

Adam was in relationship with יהוה but it was NOT a covenant. The relationship had boundaries or imparted laws. Adam broke those imparted laws but that doesn't mean it was a 'covenant.' A 'covenant' is an agreement by 2 or more. – It requires, at a minimum a Proposal and an Acceptance. This is absent. There was a relationship and a condition placed upon it but it was imposed – you cannot impose an agreement. We didn't exchange one taskmaster for another. While you can impose law you cannot impose an agreement on which a covenant is based. This is an oration/a decree by יהוה. I would state that Adam was the first Malki- Tzedik but this would have been performed more by an oath similar to Psalms 110. There's no evidence that a covenant agreement was ever made between Adam and יהוה.

It's what the Covenant was made up of. When a man and a woman get married they make a covenant at the altar, making vows to keep the rules of the marriage covenant. Are we to believe that those are the only rules of the Covenant and every rule created after that is irrelevant? Anyone that has been married knows that the "Ten Commandments" (the marriage vows) are only the beginning. The rest are learned along the way. In the same way, the Israelites were given their marriage covenant over time as well.

There is **one** scroll of the Covenant that contains all the scrolls of the Laws and the Prophets, just as Yeshua said in Mathew 22:40. And it was this "Law Book" called the Book of the Covenant, that was placed on the side of the Ark of the **Covenant** as a witness to the people that they would be held to this standard. In other words, it would stand as the Judge against them if they broke it. Notice the "Book of the Law" was actually **part** of the Ark of the Covenant.

It was not called the Ark of the Law. It was the Ark of the Covenant that contained the Law in categories (the stone tablets) and in detail in scrolls on the side. The "Book of the Law," the Cherubim, the jar of manna, the staff of Aaron, the Mercy Seat—all of it—was part of the Ark of the Covenant. You could not separate the Book of the Law from the Ark of the Covenant any more than the Cherubim themselves. Each part makes up the whole. One Ark, many pieces. One body, many members. One God. One Book. One Covenant. One set of rules. Period. CASE CLOSED.

The author is trying to wrench a position from the text; Matthew 22:40 does not say, "*There is one scroll of the Covenant that contains all the scrolls of the Laws and the Prophets.*"

Matthew 22:40 does indeed refer to the Book of the Covenant which quoted correctly says: '*On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.*' The Book of the Covenant where the first and greatest commandments are contained, Yes! But as Moses wrote the law contained in covenant by faith (Exodus 19:4-The BoC) to which Matthew 22:40 *is* referring, but that does not exclude the later separate '*law contained in ordinances*' (Ephesians 2:15) which Moses also wrote; nor the even later PROPHETS, to which our author conveniently didn't apply his same standard of reasoning but left it out completely.

Anyway, OUTSIDE the ark of the COVENANT is separate from what's inside the ark of the COVENANT.

Deuteronomy 31:26 Take this book of the law, and put it in the side the ark of the covenant of the YHWH your Elohim that it may be there for a witness against thee. For I know thy rebellion.

Note what our author stated in contradiction to the text: “*And it was this "Law Book" called the Book of the Covenant, that was placed on the side of the Ark of the Covenant as a witness to the people.*”

Our author *truly* believes that it was the book of the covenant that was placed on the side of the Ark of the Covenant as a witness to the people when we just read: “***Take this book of the law, and put it in the side the ark of the covenant.***”

How do we reconcile such a mazed statement from our author and wonder why there is such skepticism throughout the article where the difference between covenants contained in law, as opposed to ordinances contained in law, both with differing administrations, isn't even observed by the writer?

For more information on the subject of the Book of the Law and administration see: <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2018/01/20/book-law-part-1/>

Rebellion from the Golden Calf; which happened quite some time after the giving of the Book of the Covenant brought about the imposed Book of the Law till the time of reformation (Hebrews 9:10).

The Book of the Law is outside the Ark of the COVENANT!

Galatians 3:10 For as many as are followers of the works of law are under the curse: 6 for it is written, Cursed is everyone that continues not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law to do them.

It's so distinct and completely separate that Paul calls it out and identifies it by name!

Though this article may seem long, it only addressed three of the numerous paths to disprove this theory. For example, we could have looked at the “proof texts” these teachers took out of context and contorted to support their theory. They use Ezekiel 20:25 to demonize the “Book of the Law.”

"Therefore I also gave them up to statutes that were not good, and judgments by which they could not live; and I pronounced them unclean because of their ritual gifts, in that they caused all their firstborn to pass through the fire, that I might make them desolate and that they might know that I am the LORD."

They used this verse to say that the "statutes that were not good" refer to the "Book of the Law" which they say was given after the Golden Calf incident (also untrue). Their theory says that the Book of the Law was a curse to them for their sin of the Golden Calf. This accusation contradicts countless scriptures. Everyone from King David to Yeshua to the apostle Paul calls it good, holy, perfect, a lamp unto our feet, etc...

Historically, this prophecy in Ezekiel occurred almost 900 years after **all** of the Torah commandments were given, so it is impossible for verse 25 to refer to God giving them the "Book of the Law." The truth is that Yahweh was not talking about His Law at all. God is not the only one who has statutes and judgments. He gave them over to the statutes of their enemies—statutes that were not good.

This is a flagrant deviation from the text;

Ezekiel 20:24 Because they had not executed my (Melchizedek) judgments, but had despised my (Melchizedek) statutes, and had polluted my (Melchizedek) sabbaths, and their eyes were after their fathers' (Pagan) idols.

Ezekiel 20:25 Wherefore *I* (Yahweh) gave them also (Levitical) statutes that were not good, and (Levitical) judgments whereby they should not live;

Now how much sense would it be that Yah 'gave (pagan?) statutes that were not good, and (pagan?) judgments' after lamenting that 'their eyes were after their fathers' (Pagan) idols'? Yah is Not the author of confusion!

It makes much more sense to realize and accept that both the Melchizedek and the Levitical are both Torah given by Yah. The Melchizedek is the perfect will; the Levitical is the permissive fix.

The authors use of Eisegesis leads us away from the text. The text does not state 'statues of their enemies' - what our author incorrectly states above. It actually says: V. 25 ***Therefore ** I ** [YHWH] also gave them up to statutes that were not good, and judgments by which they could not live - Therefore ** | **.***

This is before the Genesis 49:10/Hebrews 7:12 change. Ezekiel is teaching the people like all the other prophets that wayward Israel is to turn back to the Book of the Law which they are under. He's not teaching against keeping the Book of the Law.

Ezekiel is simply recounting history. That after their rebellion that culminated at the Golden Calf, ***“Therefore I also gave them up to statutes that were not good, and judgments by which they could not live.”***

“Therefore I also” seems pretty clear that YAHWEH gave them up to (Levitical) Statutes that were not good after the Book of the Covenant breach!

The alternative to the imposed Book of the Law was YHWH instituting genocide on Israel, so yes, the Book of the Law is both a blessing (*you're not dead*) and a curse (*you're not in the Book of the Covenant blessings and now have to live under multiple curses and some blessings depending on your works*).

Deuteronomy 30:1 And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither YHWH thy Elohim hath driven thee.

Deuteronomy 29:21 And YHWH shall separate him unto evil out of all the tribes of Israel, according to all the curses of the covenant* (Book of the Law is Levitical covenant not a Melchizedek Book of the Covenant of promise) ***that are written in this book of the law:**

Curses plural are not good! There are no curses, plural in the Book of the Covenant, only ONE, SINGULAR limited family curse (5th commandment) so here is ANOTHER SCRIPTURE PROOF of distinction between books!

Every single time the phrase ‘*commandments*’ is used in the Torah (63 times in the KJV) it always refers to YAHWEH's commandments NOT statues of enemies or pagan nations, EVER!

We have to be careful of reading one's own beliefs into the text – first off Ezekiel is speaking a fact not against keeping certain commandments in Torah (at that time – before Yahshua – before the Genesis 49:10 advent, before the change of the Law Hebrews 7:12), he is not a false prophet – our author is jumbling concepts that have to be sorted out with respect to time instead of injecting his own suppositions that were not stated.

There is a difference between giving them over – and giving 'them also' – both are true – to overlook that is not honest. The point is they broke the 'good' Melchizedek Book of the Covenant – they were also given the 'not good' Levitical Book of the Law which they also did not keep – YHWH then gave them over to the heathens.

The context of the chapter and even surrounding verses prove this out. Let's go back to verse 23 to get the immediate context.

"Also I raised My hand in an oath to those in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the Gentiles and disperse them throughout the countries, because they had not executed My judgments, but had despised My statutes, profaned My Sabbaths, and their eyes were fixed on their fathers' idols. Therefore I also gave them up to statutes that were not good (not Mine), and judgments by which they could not live (because He said His bring life)." (Parenthetical inserts mine)

Since they did not keep HIS statutes, He gave them up to the statutes and judgments of their enemies. That is why He says that He is going to scatter them among the Gentiles, which we know from history meant captivity. The next couple of verses also prove that He is not talking about His own Law and statutes: "and I pronounced them unclean because of their ritual gifts, in that they caused all their firstborn to pass through the fire, that I might make them desolate and that they might know that I am the LORD."

In other words, because they transgressed against the Law of God and decided to serve other gods of wood and stone (v. 32) He gave them over to the very statutes and judgments of the other nations that would enslave them. Basically He was saying, "Since you have abandoned MY Law, MY Sabbaths, MY statutes and MY Judgments, and have decided to keep the statutes and judgments of other nations and other gods, I am giving you up to them and you will find out they are not any good and they don't produce life."

FINAL WORDS

This theory fully rests on the existence of two different books, yet we have concluded that there can only be one book. All other interpretations of Scripture that flow from this theory are not supported, as demonstrated above in Ezekiel 20:25. Once the foundation has been removed the house cannot stand on its own. In other words, all additional doctrine flowing from this theory must be considered false and irrelevant if the foundation of the theory is proven spurious—as in this case.

In the end, after careful examination of the evidence put forth by the proponents of the two-book theory, it can conclusively be said that both the "Book of the Law" and the "Book of the Covenant" are, in fact, synonyms of the one and the same book.

Let us all return to the REAL Covenant of our ancestors—that is founded upon ONE Law that forms ONE Covenant, stemming from His love for ONE people, led by ONE King, and forming the ONE new man.

Shalom,

Jim Staley

One Book. One Covenant. One Kingdom.

Let's take a look at 2 Chronicles 34:14 & 30 (Apostolic Polyglot)

The word "Law" in Verse 14 is G3551 and used as the 'law' with this particular numbered assigned in the following verses: Exodus 12:43 & 49 in reference to Pesach, which is included in the BoC AND the BoL so it fits.

Exodus 27:21, 28:43; 29:38; 30:21, Leviticus 3:7 = All of these passages deal with things pertaining to Aaron and his sons and/or offerings in the tabernacle.

Fast forwarding to the use of G3551 in Galatians:

Galatians 2:16, 19, 21; Galatians 3:2, 5, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24; Galatians 4:4, 5, 21; Galatians 5:3,4,14,18,23; Galatians 6:2, 13 = All referring to the 'law' Paul says we are no longer under.

Now taking 2 Chronicles 34:30 the word "Covenant" is G1242: A Contract, a Will, a Testament: [only good when the testator dies] and is used as the word "Covenant" in the following verses:

Genesis 6:18; 9:9-11, 13, 15, 17,; Genesis 15:18; 17:2-4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19, 21; 21:27:32; 26:28; 31:44.

Exodus 2:24; 6:4-5; 19:5; 23:22; 24: , 8; 25:15; 27:21; 31:7, 17; 34:10, 12, 15, 27, 28

Galatians 3:15, 17; Galatians 4:24.

Now if you take the Strong's numbers for those Greek words they are used in other verses. However, in the context of "law" and "covenant" as used in the 2 Chronicles 34, they are not used that way in the Exodus and Galatians passages that would make the BoL and BoC the same, in fact, it does just the opposite, it is referring to TWO DIFFERENT books.

The New Covenant is so vastly superior; a better covenant built upon better promises, with a Perfect Sacrifice and a Perfect, Forever High Priest! I pray none settle for or strive to live under the book of the law which leads to Judaism, a Levitical High Priest and animal sacrifices. Tie a string around the polemic and one end will end up in Judaism the other at the feet of our savior under His right administration of law.

To walk in the torah of Abraham is a beautiful thing, Abraham, who never knew of a Levite or a Levitical temple (Hebrews 7:9).

Scripture clearly identifies two books:

The Exodus 24:7: **Book of the Covenant - Sepher ספר Brit ברית** - proposed, accepted, blood ratified, and meal confirmed **Brit** given as torah (Hebrews 8:6,10 **diathēkē**) connecting to Abraham at Genesis 12 & 15.

AND THE SEPARATE AND DISTINCT Deuteronomy 28:6: **Book of the Law - Sepher ספר torah תורה** - a IMPOSED torah VOID of a proposal, VOID of an acceptance, VOID of a blood ratification and VOID of a covenant confirming meal (NT **nomos**) unable to connect to Abraham.

Why did YHWH use two totally different words that are linguistically and textually unconnected and disparate if they're the same?

We close with three witnesses that these *Sephers*/books are NOT one and the same: the Masoretic Text, Septuagint and New Testament. Or, we can choose to rely on men's opinion and reasoning supported only by years of tradition and dogma all the while being unconnected and unsupported by the Hebrew and Greek languages of the bible!

Acts 15:10 Now therefore why tempt ye Elohim, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? This had to do with the "Book of the Law" identified at Galatians 3:10.

Matthew Nolan - Torah to the Tribes

Educational Resources:

- <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2015/04/04/clearing-covenant-confusion/>
- <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/teachings/mystery-of-the-melchizedek-series/>
- <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2013/05/29/the-melchizedek-connection/>
- <https://www.torahtothetribes.com/2018/01/20/book-law-part-1>

Reference Material:

Jim Staley Family Ministry Blog (2018) Book of the Law vs. Book of the Covenant: Are they two separate books? - The Melchizedek Two-Book Theory Debunked [Online]

<https://staleyfamilyministries.com/the-melchizedek-two-book-theory-debunked.html>

Torah to the Tribes|Writings (2015-2018) Articles referenced include blog posts that can be found at this resource. [Online]

<https://www.torahtothetribes.com/writings/>