

## **IS MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE AND JOHN, Up Until The Cross, The Law Of Moses?**

The first person I ever heard teach that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, up until the cross, is the law of Moses, is Dan Billingsly. Recently, many have jumped on his bandwagon. The reason why bro. Billingsly came up with this idea was to get the teaching of Christ on marriage, divorce, and remarriage (Mt. 5:31, 32; 19:1-9) out of the New Testament and into the law of Moses. I doubt very seriously if there is one single person who has been swayed by his teaching that did not have the same reason! These brethren know that if they can convince themselves and others that Mt. 5:31, 32 and Mt. 19:1-9 is the law of Moses, they can discard this teaching as having been nailed to the cross (Col. 2:14). My dear brother, if you have jumped on Billingsly's bandwagon, you need to get off before it tumbles into the "*lake that burns with fire and brimstone*" (Rev. 21:8). On Billingsly's bandwagon are found "the fearful", because they are afraid to preach Jesus Christ on marriage and divorce (Mt. 5:31, 32; 19:9). On Billingsly's bandwagon are found "unbelievers", because they do not believe what Jesus Christ taught on marriage and divorce (Mt. 5:31, 32; 19:9). On Billingsly's bandwagon are also found "whoremongers", i.e. fornicators and adulterers, because they have violated the teaching of Jesus Christ on marriage and divorce (Mt. 5:31, 32; 19:9). This bandwagon is speeding toward the "lake that burns with fire and brimstone". I hope you will get off before it's too late!

Only one passage of Scripture is needed to show the fallacy of this position. Jesus said: "*The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it*" (Lk. 16:16). We learn from this passage that the law of Moses and the Prophets were preached until John the Baptist came and started preaching. Since John the Baptist started preaching, the Kingdom of God has been preached. The New American Standard version reads: "*The law and the Prophets were proclaimed until John; since then the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every one is forcing his way into it*" (Lk. 16:16). The very first verse, in the book of Mark, says: "*The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God*" (Mk. 1:1). My dear friend, the gospel of Jesus Christ is not the law of Moses. Those who are on this bandwagon headed for Hell, tell us Mk. 1:1, as well as all the book of Mark, until the crucifixion of Christ is the Law of Moses. Mark, under inspiration of the Holy Spirit says it is "the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God". I had rather believe Mark than to believe modern day preachers. How about you, my dear friend? If Mk. 1:1 is the "beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God", then you can be assured of the truth that Mt. 1:1, Lk. 1:1 and John 1:1 are also "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God". John came preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ, when he preached "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"(Mk. 1:4). After John was put in prison, Jesus Christ "came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God" (Mk. 1:14; Mt. 10:7). Jesus chose twelve Apostles and "sent

them to preach the kingdom of God" (Lk. 9:2). Jesus told a man who promised to follow Him, but wanted to go bury his father first to "let the dead bury their dead: but go thou and preach the kingdom of God" (Lk. 9:60). Jesus sent the seventy and they preached the kingdom of God (Lk. 10:9). There is no doubt about it! The law was preached until John the Baptist came. Since John the Baptist came, the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God has been preached (Mk. 1:1).

## **John The Baptist Did Not Preach The Law Of Moses**

*"John did baptize in the wilderness, and preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"* (Lk. 1:4). John was not teaching, or practicing the law of Moses when he baptized Jesus Christ (Mk. 1:9-11). John's preaching, *"Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"* (Mt. 3:2) is not preaching the law of Moses. People being baptized of John confessing their sins is not a result of preaching the law of Moses (Mt. 3:6). John was preaching the Kingdom of God, and not the law of Moses, when he told Herod it was not lawful for him to have his brother Philip's wife (Mk. 6:17, 18). The law of Moses allowed a man, because of the hardness of his heart (Mt. 19:8) to put away his wife, if he found some unclean or unseemly thing in her (Dt. 24:1). The husband could *"write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife"* (Dt. 24:1, 2). Therefore, Phillip may have found some unclean or unseemly thing in Herodias, and given her a bill of divorcement, sending her out of his house, and Herod married her with Moses's permission. Some argue that John was preaching the law of Moses found in Lev. 18:16, i.e. Herod uncovered the nakedness of his brother Phillip's wife, thus uncovering the nakedness of his brother. Those who take this position are assuming something they cannot prove. They are assuming that the expression uncovering nakedness means fornication. When committing fornication with someone, you would uncover their nakedness. However, you could uncover a person's nakedness without committing a sexual act. Moses said: *"She is thy mother; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness"* (Lev. 18:7). It was wrong, under the law of Moses; and it is wrong under the Gospel of Christ, to uncover and view the naked body of your mother, or father, or anyone else other than your wife. Noah got drunk and was *"uncovered within his tent"* (Gen. 9:21). Ham saw the nakedness of his father (Gen. 9:22). *"Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness"* (Gen. 9:23). When Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his son Ham had done, i.e. saw him naked, he cursed Canaan (Gen. 9:24-27). Ham did not perform a homosexual act with his father Noah, as I heard one preacher preach on T. V. He simply saw him naked. Moses is not talking about having sex with your mother, he is talking about viewing the naked body of your mother (Lev. 18:7). There is entirely too much nakedness in the world, and too many preachers have become adjusted to it, so it does not seem so bad to them.

## What Does Uncover Mean?

The Hebrew word translated uncover in Lev. 18 and 20 is galah. Young's Analytical Concordance defines it "To be removed, uncovered, revealed". Having sex is no part of Young's definition. Sex may occur with the uncovering of someone, but you can uncover someone without having sex, and the word uncover does not demand the idea of sex, and the context shows when sex occurs with the uncovering. For example, the word galah is found in Dt. 27:20. The passage says: "*Cursed be he that lieth with his father's wife; because he uncovereth his father's skirt*". Ham did not uncover the nakedness of his father Noah. Noah was drunk and thus uncovered himself. Ham did wrong by viewing the nakedness of his father. Ham did not have sex with his father. It is also wrong to view the nakedness of your father's wife. Dt. 27:20 adds a curse for having sex, that is lying with your father's wife. Dt. 27:20 is the only passage where galah is found where fornication is added to uncovering the nakedness of someone. The Hebrew word galah is also found in Ruth 3:4, 7. Ruth 3:4 says, "*And it shall be, when he lieth down, that thou shalt mark the place where he shall lie, and thou shalt go in, and uncover his feet, and lay thee down; and he will tell thee what thou shalt do*". When Ruth uncovered the feet of Boaz, there was no fornication committed, even though she lay down with him. Ruth 3:7 says, "*she came softly, and uncovered his feet, and laid her down*". She uncovered his feet, but no fornication was committed.

The word galah is translated uncover twice in Isa. 47:2, "*Uncover the locks*", and "*uncover the thigh*". There is no fornication stated, or implied in this passage. Isaiah said: "*Come down, and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground: there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans: for thou shalt no more be called tender and delicate. Take the millstones, and grind meal: uncover the locks, make bare the leg, uncover the thigh, pass over the rivers. Thy nakedness shall be uncovered, yea, thy shame shall be seen: I will take vengeance, and I will not meet thee as a man*" (Isa. 47:1-3).

The word galah is found in Jeremiah 49:10 "*But I have made Esau bare, I have uncovered his secret places, and he shall not be able to hide himself: his seed is spoiled, and his brethren, and his neighbors, and he is not*". The word galah is also found in Isa. 20:4, "*So shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, even with their buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt*". Young lists one other passage where the word galah is found. "*Therefore thou shalt set thy face toward the siege of Jerusalem, and thine arm shall be uncovered, and thou shalt prophesy against it*" (Eze. 4:7).

## Suppose Herod Had Married His Neighbor's Wife

Suppose Herod had married his neighbor's wife, instead of his brother's wife? Would not John have told him it was not lawful for him to have his neighbor's wife? Those on this bandwagon would be compelled to say so. After all Moses said, "*Moreover thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbor's wife, to defile thyself with her*" (Lev. 18:20). Those on this bandwagon teach to uncover one's nakedness means to have sex with them. In view of the fact that those on this bandwagon teach John the Baptist was teaching the law of Moses, they would thus make John the Baptist contradict the law of Moses. Moses taught that if a husband found some unclean thing in his wife, which could mean uncovering her nakedness, he could give her a writing of divorcement, and send her out of his house. She could then go and be another man's wife. Moses did not say, unless the man was his neighbor, or brother. No stipulations are found in Dt. 24. The truth of the matter is John the Baptist was preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ (Mk. 1:1). He was not preaching the law of Moses.

## **JESUS ALSO PREACHED HIS GOSPEL**

After John the Baptist was put in prison for preaching against the unscriptural marriage of Herod and Herodias (Mk. 6:17, 18), Jesus began preaching the same message John had been preaching (Mt. 4:17). In fact Jesus "*Made and baptized more disciples than John*" (Jno. 4:1). Mark 1:1 says, "*The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God*". Both John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were preaching the same gospel. Jesus preached the same gospel John the Baptist, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John preached. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John later wrote this gospel down, as a part of the New Testament. While Jesus was preaching this gospel, He taught His disciples to keep the law of Moses, which was in force until Christ died (Col. 2:14; Eph. 2:15). In fact Jesus said, "*Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled*" (Mt. 5:17, 18). It was all fulfilled when Jesus was nailed to the cross, and at that time abolished (Eph. 2:15). Jesus taught his disciples to do and teach the least commandments of the law of Moses, in order to be called great in the Kingdom of God, which was to come, which He preached (Mt. 5:19). Jesus insisted that all the law be kept, not just the weightier matters, "judgment, mercy, and faith", but also tithing the cheapest spices (Mat. 23:23). Jesus said, "*The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not*" (Mt. 23:2, 3). Jesus taught a man who inquired about what to do to have eternal life, to keep the ten commandments (Mt. 19:16-19). Jesus not only taught the entire law of Moses, He kept it himself perfectly (2 Cor. 5:10; Heb. 5:9). He was accused of all kinds of sins, yet no one could convict Him of sin (Jno. 8:46). It would be a serious mistake to say Jesus never taught men to keep the law of Moses. However, it is also a very serious mistake to teach that all of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; up until the Cross, is the law of Moses!

Jesus was not teaching Nicodemus the law of Moses when He said, "*Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*" (Jno. 3:3). Nicodemus did not understand this teaching, which he had never read in the law of Moses. Nicodemus had not read this teaching in the law of Moses, because this teaching is not the law of Moses. Jesus explained further, "*Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again*" (Jno. 3:5-7). The new birth is not the law of Moses. The new birth of Jno. 3:3-7 is the same new birth we read in the following passages: (I Cor. 4:15; Jas. 1:18; Eph. 5:26; Tit. 3:5; I Pet. 1:22, 23). Dan Billingsly, and everyone on his band-wagon, at one time used all of these Scriptures, while preaching on the new birth. Now, they can no longer use Jno. 3:3-7, since they teach this is the law of Moses. It would be interesting to hear them show the difference between "being born again" in Jno. 3:3-7, and "being born again in" I Pet. 1:23. I would love to hear their explanation. Also, I would like to know how they can use John 3:3-7 to justify themselves, without falling from grace (Gal. 5:4). Those who used the law of Moses to justify and bind circumcision were called "false brethren" by Paul (Gal. 2:4, 5). Paul said they fell from grace (Gal. 5:4). Why would not those on Billingsly's bandwagon fall from grace, using the law of Moses to justify themselves?

Jesus was not teaching the law of Moses to the woman at the well. The Samaritans worshiped in "this mountain", but the Jews taught "*Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship*" (Jno. 4:20). The law of Moses taught Jerusalem was the place where men ought to worship (I Kings 12:26-33), but Jeroboam changed the place of worship from Jerusalem to Dan and Bethel. Jesus taught the hour would come when the place didn't matter. The important thing was to worship God in spirit and in truth (Jno. 4:24). If John 4:24 is the law of Moses, then those on this bandwagon cannot use this passage as law without falling from grace (Gal. 5:4).

Jesus was not teaching the law of Moses in Mt. 18:15-18. Those on this bandwagon cannot call this prophecy. This is the preaching of the gospel of Christ (Mk. 1:1), a part of the last will and Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, which went into effect when Christ died (Heb. 9:16, 17). How could one tell it to the church, if the church did not exist? The church did not exist until the day of Pentecost (Acts 2). No one was added to the church until that day (Acts 2:41). No one could tell it to the church before the day of Pentecost.

## **Jesus Was Not Preaching The Law Of Moses In The Sermon On The Mount**

Dan Billingsly, and those on his bandwagon, along with many Denominational preachers teach that Jesus is quoting the Rabbis, in the sermon on the mount, and not Moses. They tell us that when Jesus said: "I say unto you", he was saying what Moses said in the law. They tell us when Jesus said "it hath been said", He was quoting the Rabbis. I

will show you that this cannot be the case. This position makes no sense! When people "*receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved*" (2 Th. 2:10); "*God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness*" (2 Th. 2:11, 12). In this case, the unrighteousness of adultery (Mt. 19:9).

Jesus said, "*Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Ra ca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire*" (Mt. 5:21-22). Now notice carefully! Those on this band- wagon would have us believe that the Rabbis were the ones of old time who said, "Thou shalt not kill". I am sure many of them did. However, Moses also said "*Thou shalt not kill*" (Exo. 20:13). They would have us believe that the Rabbis said, "whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment". I am also sure many of them said this. I am also sure Moses taught they would be in danger of the judgment (Joshua 20:1-6). The six cities of refuge were provided for the protection of one who accidentally killed someone (Numbers. 35:11). The murderer could flee to these cities as well, but he had to stand trial. He was in danger of the judgment (Numbers 35:12; Dt. 19:11-13). Also, those on this bandwagon, would have us to believe that when Jesus said "I say unto you" (Mt. 5:22-26) He was teaching the law of Moses. This is absurd and ridiculous. I have read the Old Testament Scriptures numbers of times and I have never read anything in the law of Moses Jesus could be quoting in those verses.

Jesus said, "*Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart*" (Mt. 5:27, 28). Those on this bandwagon tell us the Rabbis were the ones of old time who said "Thou shalt not commit adultery". I am sure some of the Rabbis did. If this is what the Rabbis said, they were not teaching "their tradition", but they were teaching the law of Moses, because Moses said "*Thou shalt not commit adultery*" (Exo. 20:14). If the Rabbis said what Moses said, then Jesus is teaching something different from what both the Rabbis and Moses taught! Moses and the Rabbis never taught what Jesus taught in Mt. 5:28-30. I have read the law of Moses many times, but I never read what Jesus said (Mt. 5:28-30). If I have overlooked it, I will be glad to look at it.

Jesus said, "*It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committed adultery*" (Mt. 5:31, 32). Those on this Billingsly bandwagon tell us Jesus is quoting the Rabbis, when he said "Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement". Some of the Rabbis taught the law and not "their tradition". Therefore, I am sure some of the Rabbis said exactly what Moses said. However, Jesus is quoting Moses. Moses said, "*When a man hath taken a wife, and married*

*her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the Lord: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance"* (Dt. 24:1-4). Those on this bandwagon would have us believe that Jesus taught exactly what Moses taught, and that He was taking issue with the Rabbis. This is absurd and ridiculous! Moses said "some uncleanness" (Dt. 24:1). Jesus mentioned only one uncleanness, i.e. "Fornication" (Mt. 5:31, 32). Moses gave the woman who was divorced permission to marry again (Dt. 24:2). Jesus did not give any divorced person permission to remarry (Mt. 5:32; Mt. 19:9; Lk. 16:18).

Jesus was not teaching the law of Moses when he taught about taking an oath. Jesus said, *"Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne; Nor by the earth; for it is His footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil"* (Mt. 5:33-37). Those on this bandwagon tell us Jesus is quoting the Rabbis about what was said "by them of old time". I am sure this is what some of the Rabbis taught. But it is also what Moses taught. To "forswear thyself" is to perjure oneself. To swear falsely is to be guilty of perjury. Moses said, *"Ye shall not swear by my name falsely"* (Lev. 19:12). Again, Moses said, *"If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth"* (Num. 30:2). Jesus said, *"swear not at all"* (Mt. 5:34). Those, on this bandwagon, need to find the verse of Scripture where Moses said, "swear not at all". Jesus said exactly the same thing James said, *"But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation"* (James 5:12). Any honest person can see that Jesus and James are teaching the same thing, i.e. New Testament doctrine. Both Jesus and James forbid taking oaths. Moses allowed oaths (Lev. 19:12). Jesus was not teaching the law of Moses in Mt. 5:34. Both James and Jesus were teaching New Testament doctrine!

Jesus was not teaching the law of Moses in Mt. 5:38-42. Bro. Billingsly, and those on his bandwagon, would have us believe Jesus is quoting the Rabbis, and not Moses. I am sure some of the Rabbis taught the law of Moses, quoted by Jesus, in Mt. 5:38-42. However, Jesus is quoting Moses and not the Rabbis. When Jesus quoted the Rabbis, He condemned them, calling what they preached their tradition (Mt. 15:1-14). It was Moses who said, *"An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"* (Mt. 5:38; Exo. 21:24). Moses said,

not only "Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth", but "hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" (Exo. 21:24, 25). After Jesus quoted Moses, He then said, "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away" (Mt. 5:39-42). If Jesus was teaching the law of Moses, those on this bandwagon need to give book, chapter, and verse where Moses said what Jesus said in (Mt. 5:39-42)! If they cannot show it, they have no argument, they cannot back up their teaching.

Jesus was not teaching the law of Moses in Mt. 5:43-48. Those on this bandwagon claim Jesus is quoting the Rabbis when He said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy" (Mat. 5:43). I am sure some of the Rabbis taught this, because some of them taught faithfully the law of Moses. However, the context proves Jesus was not quoting the Rabbis. It was Moses who said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy" (Lev. 19:18; Ps. 139:21, 22). The fact that Samuel could take a sword and cut Agag to pieces proves he could hate his enemy (I Sam. 15:33). David hated his enemies with "perfect hatred" (Ps. 139:21, 11). Jesus was teaching His gospel, and not the law of Moses (Mt. 5:44-48).

### **Jesus Was Not Teaching The Law Of Moses On Marriage And Divorce In Mt. 19!**

It was the Pharisees who tempted Jesus with the question: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause" (Mt. 19:3). In answering their question Jesus did not quote God through His prophet Moses, but He quoted God through His prophet Adam. God said, through His prophet Adam "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh" (Gen. 2:24). After quoting God through His prophet Adam, Jesus said "Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh, What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder" (Mt. 19:6). Jesus was saying that God joins them together, and no man should put them asunder, according to what God had said through His prophet Adam in the beginning, and not what God said through His prophet Moses years later, in Dt. 24. Jesus was clearly basing His teaching upon what God said, in the beginning, through His prophet Adam; and not what God said years later, through His prophet Moses. The Pharisees then questioned Jesus, "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement and to put her away?" (Dt. 24; Mt. 19:7). Jesus responded by saying, "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so" (Mt. 19:8). Jesus is clearly teaching what God ordained from the beginning, and not what Moses allowed, years later, because of the hardness of people's hearts (Mt. 19:8). Moses, years after the beginning, allowed a man who married a woman and later "she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her" he could "write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his



house, she may go and be another man's wife" (Dt. 24:1, 2). Jesus did not agree with what Moses allowed for the hardness of men's hearts, but taught what God ordained from the beginning that "*Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery*" (Mt. 19:9). "*Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever*" (Heb. 13:8). Jesus does not change. You will be judged by the words Jesus has spoken (Jno. 12:48). When Jesus was on earth He taught what God spoke through His prophet Adam, in the beginning, and not what God spoke through His prophet Moses years later, because of the hardness of people's hearts. Jesus continues today to speak what God spoke through His prophet Adam, in the beginning, and not what He spoke through His prophet Moses years later, because of the hardness of people's hearts. When we all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, we will be judged by the words that Jesus has spoken (Jno. 12:48); which is not what God said through His prophet Moses, because of the hardness of people's hearts, but what God spoke through His prophet Adam, in the beginning. I hope that all of you will soften your hard hearts and accept and teach the truth, which Jesus spoke, and by which He will judge us in the last day (Jno. 12:48).

Jesus taught a man could put away his wife for only one cause, i.e. fornication, and marry another without committing adultery (Mt. 19:9). Moses, because of the hardness of people's hearts allowed divorce when a husband "found no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her" (Dt. 24:1). Fornication is only "one uncleanness". "Some uncleanness" suggest more than "one uncleanness".

### **An Answer To "15 Times In The Book Of John..." by Dan Billingsly**

Dan Billingsly claims that "Fifteen times in the book of John, John the baptizer of Israel and Jesus declared openly and publicly to the Jews of Old Testament Israel that the teaching in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John before the cross...is not His "own words" or a revelation of His New Testament doctrine". This statement might seem brilliant to some babe in Christ, who is attempting to preach, and has thus jumped on this bandwagon. One would not have to study the Bible much to see the fallacy of such "logic". The truth is: "*God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son*" (Heb. 1:1, 2). The word Jesus spoke, after the cross in (Mk. 16:15, 16; Mt. 28:19, 20; Lk. 24:46, 47) is not His either, but the Father's. The word (law) of Moses, was not his either! The Old Testament Law is the "Law of God" (Exo. 16:4; Ezra 7:12). It is the Law of Moses, only in that God gave it through Moses. All of the teaching of Christ, either before the cross or after the cross, is teaching which God the Father gave Him (Heb. 1:1, 2). Jesus never spoke of Himself, before the cross or after the cross. The Apostles' doctrine is not their doctrine either! It is called the Apostles' doctrine, because they did the teaching (Acts 2:42). The doctrine did not originate with them. The Apostles' doctrine was revealed to them by the Holy Spirit (Jno. 14:26; Jno. 16:13). The Holy Spirit, who revealed it did not speak of Himself either

(Jno. 16:13). The truth is: The Gospel Of Christ began to be preached in the very first verse of Mt, Mk, Lk. and John (Mk. 1:1). This Gospel Of Christ which began to be preached in Mk. 1:1 and continued to be preached on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2 did not originate with Jesus Christ, though it is every word, the Gospel of Christ which God spoke through Him (Heb. 1:1, 2). Preachers should not be deceived by such sophistry! It is high time you get off of this bandwagon! According to Billingsly, Jesus came "to save 'only' the Jews of Israel" (Mt. 1:21), and to rule only Israel (Mt. 2:6). He was sent only to the lost sheep of the House of Israel (Mt. 15:24). Of course, Billingsly does not believe Jesus died on the cross only for the Jews. Jesus came to seek and to save that which is lost (Lk 19:10). I agree that Jesus and John the baptizer went only to the "lost sheep of the House of Israel" to prepare the way. God did not intend for the Gentiles to hear the gospel of Christ until He sent Peter to the home of Cornelius (Acts 10). However, Mk. 1:1 is the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Jesus and John the baptizer preached the "gospel of Jesus Christ" (Mk. 1:1). *"The law and the prophets were proclaimed until John; since then the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every one is forcing his way into it"* (Lk. 16:16 NASV).

### **An Examination Of The Fifteen Passages**

**John 3:34:** *"For He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him". This passage does not say "speaketh the law of Moses".*

Billingsly perverts the word of the Lord when he says this passage does! When Moses spoke his law, he was speaking the word of God (Heb. 1:1). When Jesus spake the Gospel of Christ (Mk. 1:1), he was also speaking the word of God (Heb. 1:1). When the Apostles preached "the Apostles' doctrine", they were also speaking the words of God (Jno. 16:13; 14:26). Consider this closely and you will see how Billingsly perverts the word of the Lord.

John 4:34: *"My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work"*.

Billingsly perverts this passage by telling us Jesus came as an Old Testament Prophet to preach the law of Moses. The truth is Jesus came preaching the Gospel of Christ (Mk. 1:1), preaching the "gospel of the kingdom" (Mt. 4:23), "to seek and to save that which is lost" (Lk. 19:10), to build His church (Mt. 16:18), to die on the cross and abolish the law of Moses (Eph. 2:15), and to nail the law of Moses to the cross (Col. 2:14).

**John 5:30:** *"I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me"*. Billingsly also perverts this passage. He would have us believe that it was the will of the Father for Him to teach the law of Moses. If Billingsly is right, Jesus did not do the will of the Father, because He taught the Gospel of Jesus Christ (Mk. 1:1; Lk. 16:16), just like John the Baptist did. According to Billingsly Jesus did not seek His own will before the cross, but did seek His own will after the cross. Who can believe such nonsense?

**John 6:38:** *"For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."* Jesus never sought His own will. He always has and always will seek to do the will of His Father.

**John 7:16-17:** *"My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me. If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself"*. According to Billingsly this describes Jesus before the cross, and not after the cross. This would mean that Jesus is now teaching His doctrine and not the doctrine of Him that sent Him! People would no longer do the Father's will, but the will of Christ. Who can believe such nonsense? The truth is there is no difference in Christ before the cross and after the cross. Jesus' doctrine is still not His, but God's who sent him. Today, if any man "will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether Jesus speaks of himself".

**John 8:26:** *"I have many things to say and to judge of you: but He that sent me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of Him"*. According to Billingsly this means Jesus spoke only the law of Moses which He heard from the Father. The truth is Jesus still speaks through the Apostles "those things which He heard from the Father". If Billingsly is right, Jesus, after the cross, no longer speaks those things which He has heard from the Father.

**John 8:28:** *"When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am He, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things"*. According to Billingsly, when they crucified Christ, then they knew that Jesus Christ was preaching the law of Moses, that which the Father taught Him. At that time He did nothing of Himself, i.e. He did not teach the Gospel of Christ, but only the law of Moses. Now He does everything of Himself and does not teach what the Father taught Him, but what He came up with Himself. The truth is there is no difference in Jesus before the cross, and after the cross. He still does "nothing of Himself", but only what the Father taught Him (Heb. 1:1, 2).

**John 8:38:** *"I speak that which I have seen with My Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father"*. I ask you, my dear honest reader, is there any difference in Jesus, in this verse, before the cross and after the cross? Does Jesus not still speak that which He has seen with His Father? Do not children of the Devil still "do that which they have seen with their father"? There is nothing in this verse to prove that all of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, up until the cross is the law of Moses! This is plain perversion of the Scriptures!

**John 12:49, 50:** *"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak"*. Bro. Billingsly is assuming again, that which he cannot prove, i.e. the Father gave Him the law of Moses to speak in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John up until the

cross. If Billingsly is right, the law of Moses is "life everlasting", because Jesus said "His commandment, He gave Jesus, is life everlasting". Paul said: "*By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified*" (Gal. 2:16). My dear reader, you better get off of the Billingsly bandwagon, because it is a bandwagon full of perversions of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It is a bandwagon that leads to hell!

**John 14:10:** "*Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works*". Again, Billingsly is assuming the words the Father gave Him were the words of Moses law up until the cross. This assumption he has not proved, and cannot prove.

**John 14:24:** "*He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me*". I remind you again, that the words which Jesus spoke in Acts through Revelation are not His either (Heb. 1:1, 2). All the words Jesus spoke were the words of His Father. If you love Jesus you will keep His words. The law of Moses is not His words, but the words of Moses.

**John 15:15:** "*Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you*". Again, Bro. Billingsly, you are assuming all things Jesus heard from His Father was the law of Moses. This would mean His teaching about the new birth is the law of Moses (Jno. 3:3-5). This would mean His teaching about how to worship God is the law of Moses (Jno. 4:24). This would mean His teaching "swear not at all" is the law of Moses. This is absurd! My dear friend, if you have boarded Billingsly's bandwagon, please jump off before it plunges into the lake that burns with fire and brimstone.

**John 17:4:** "*I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do*". According to Bro. Billingsly, and those on his bandwagon, the work God gave Christ was to be an Old Testament prophet preaching the law of Moses. According to Mark and Luke the work God gave Jesus and the Apostles to do was to preach the gospel of Christ (Lk. 16:16; Mk. 1:1). Jesus came to seek and save that which is lost (Lk. 19:10). Jesus came to fulfill the law of Moses (Mt. 5:17, 18). He nailed the law to His cross (Col. 2:14). He abolished the law (Eph. 2:15).

**John 17:8:** "*For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me: and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me*". Yes, Jesus gave Nicodemus the words which God gave Him about being born again (Jno. 3:3-5), which is not the law of Moses. Jesus gave the woman at the well the words which God gave Him about how we are to worship today (Jno. 4:24), which is not the law of Moses. Jesus gave unto the Apostles the words which God gave Him about the Lord's Supper (Mt. 26:26-29), which is not the law of Moses, and which was before the cross. Anyone who can swallow all of this as being the law of Moses is pretty gullible, and

will swallow about anything. I pray you get off of this bandwagon, before you "believe a lie and be damned" (2 Th. 2:11, 12), if you haven't already.

**John 17:14:** *"I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world"*. Bro. Billingsly and those on his bandwagon would have us believe that the only word Jesus gave the Apostles, up until the cross, is the law of Moses! Jesus did teach them to keep the law of Moses (Mt. 23:2, 3; Mt. 5:17-19; 23:23; 19:17-19), because the law of Moses was in force until the Testator died (Heb. 9:16, 17). However, Jesus put the emphasis upon something far more important than the law of Moses, sealed and dedicated with animal blood (Heb. 9:19-22). He taught men how to worship (Jno. 4:24). He taught men how to be born again (Jno. 3:3-5). He preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ (Mk. 1:1).

### **We Are Not In This World For Long**

My dear reader, and beloved brother, we are not in this world long. We cannot afford to pervert the entire Bible, by trying to rearrange it, in order to help us or some one we think we love to gratify their fleshly passions, in an unscriptural marriage. Marriage is a holy institution of God (Mt. 19:6-12). Life is too short for us to throw away our eternal home, or the eternal home of others in heaven by completely rearranging the word of God. I beg you to get off of this bandwagon while you can.

For those of you who may not know, I have already written a book in answer to the false teaching of Dan Billingsly. It is entitled "Marriage Divorce and Remarriage". It is an answer to Dan Billingsly's "Fundamental Bible Studies". I have several copies of this book. You may obtain a copy for \$5.00. You may also obtain the material from Bro. Bennie Johns of Russellville, Al. The book is on Bro. Johns web page. The address is: [www.theyyetspeak.com](http://www.theyyetspeak.com). You can download this material on your computer. If you would like to receive this book on a diskette you may email Bro. Johns at [bjohn@bellsouth.net](mailto:bjohn@bellsouth.net). It will cost very little to obtain the book on diskette. Bro. Johns has a wealth of information from preachers of years gone by. You should visit his web site. You can receive information either on cd or diskette.

---Windell Wisser