

Is The New Testament Scripture?

TEACHING TRANSCRIPT

Finding the Ancient Path

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=44UUqD0KaU0>

Formatted from the transcript supplied by the user. Filler words and spoken wording are retained; YouTube timestamp metadata has been removed for readability.

Amen. Thank you, David. Okay, here we are. Our lesson, our discussion this morning entitled, "Is the New Testament scripture?" And as always, I asked the question, why am I teaching this lesson? Well, our first slide will kind of tell us this. My shock and confusion. I'm teaching this lesson because I was genuinely shocked to discover how many Torah pursuant believers have drifted into positions that would have been unthinkable to me when I first came to a knowledge of the ways of Yahw. I've encountered people who openly call Paul a heretic within the Torah pursuant community. Hence my series that Paul taught nothing but Torah. I've encountered those who question or outright deny that the New Testament is scripture, hence this lesson. And now you know my position already. And who in their zeal to return to Torah have begun to lose sight of who Yeshua actually is according to the apostolic witness.

That realization forced me to step back and ask some hard questions. Primary among them is this. How did an awakening that we are all experiencing that claims to honor the fullness of Yahw's word arrive at a place where large portions of that word are treated with suspicion and/or rejection? Now, before I read the next paragraph, I recognize that some people who don't believe the New Testament is scripture don't necessarily treat it with suspicion or rejection. It's just a position that they have. I understand that this lesson is an attempt to confront that question directly. It's not an attack on Torah, on the desire to walk in Yahw's commandments, but rather a call to examine whether our pursuit of Torah has led us to unintentionally sever the very foundation that testifies about the Messiah. If the New Testament is scripture, then dismissing it carries

serious consequences for how we understand Yeshua, the apostles, and the continuity of Yahw's revelation. If it's not scripture, then we have to be honest about what that means for our faith. And that's the tension that is the reason for this study. When we all came to the understanding that the entire Bible was authoritative in our lives and that quote, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God. It is profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction, and righteousness. We were amazed and we were humbled by how easily we were misled by modern-day Christianity. Our minds and hearts had been opened to a completely new paradigm of understanding and we felt freed. I think all of you would agree with that statement. However, for some, something else was awakened. a hyper sensitivity to and fear of ever being misled again. And that's actually a pretty good thing. But it can and has quietly crossed some lines.

The desire to guard ourselves from error can become so strong that we begin to distrust anything that resembles the system we left behind. And the system that we left behind was New Testament centric. In that process, caution can harden into suspicion. Suspicion can lead us to question parts of scripture itself rather than our individual interpretations of it. When that happens, the pendulum does not stop at balance or at center. It swings all the way across to the other side. It swings past it. In trying to escape one form of error, we risk creating another by fragmenting the very authority of the word that first set us free. So the challenge before us this morning is to pursue discernment without allowing fear to dictate our theology and to hold fast to the full council of scripture without selectively shrinking the canon to fit our comfort or our new paradigm. In my

research, I came across videos like this one from person who calls himself the black heretic showing everyone how Paul is a false apostle. We have videos like this, why the New Testament is not scripture with Rabbi Michael Scobach. And these are messianic individuals, not just rabbis. Here's another one. The New Testament is simply not scripture by Pastor Dael. I watched this particular video. I didn't watch the other two. I watched this particular video and was just shaking my head because it's plain to somebody who knows

their Bible that the positions he's using is just sinking sand. And then I found this one because this is where it all leads. This is a video called From Rejecting Paul to Rejecting Christ. This fell on the left came into a knowledge of the Torah like all of us. And unlike all of us, he took a position that Paul was

indeed a heretic. And he went from that to completely rejecting Yeshua as the Messiah. That's the slippery slope in some of these what I might call extreme positions on certain things and certain issues. At the end of the day, the reason this happens is because people do not know their Bibles like they should and they are led away by deceiving spirits. We're going to look at that verse here in a second. Sad thing about this is people think they're they've discovered some secret truth and the rest of the world has been blinded to. What's that? What's a word for that in the Bible there? Glenn, number two, it's actually not in the Bible, but we know it asgnosticism, right? People who have secret truth that nobody else has, but in their pride, they elevate their supposed insight above the clear testimony of scripture.

What begins as a pursuit of the ways of the Lord hardens into a posture of superiority where the Torah is no longer honored as God's instruction that points to the Messiah, but it's lifted up as an end in itself. What do I mean by that? When my wife and I were exiled from our current or I should say our old fellowship after 35 years, we wanted to find a group of people, a church that was more in line with our new convictions about Torah. So, we went on a hunt and we visited two or three Torah centric, Torah observant congregations uh in our neighborhood. We walked out of all three of them. And the one that stands in my memory is the one we sat down. We're watching everything. And at the beginning of the service, these white guys come out dressed like Pharisees holding the scroll above their head,

walking through the crowd and the scroll of the Torah, walking through the crowd and people reaching up to touch it. That that was the moment we got up and left. Why? Idolatry. Idolatry. Not long before we were exiled, my old congregation decided it would be fun to have some big wooden cross at the front of the congregation where people would come up and nail their sins to it. I treated that the exact same way. Idolatry for some in the Torah group. The Torah is not just the instruction that points us to Messiah. It's lifted up as its own thing. It's lifted up as some kind of idol and everything pales in comparison. Even oh yeah, Yeshua, yeah, he's over there somewhere, but he's not the focus. And in doing this, they reverse its purpose. turning what was given to testify to the Messiah into a standard by which they judge and even diminish him.

This is not deeper faithfulness, but a grave misplacement of devotion where zeal for the law eclipses the one whom the law bears witness. When the Torah is treated as an idol rather than a servant of God's redemptive plan does not lead to greater truth, but to a blindness that obscures the very Messiah that was given to reveal. Our devotion should not be all about Torah. Torah, Torah, Torah, Torah this, Torah that. Our devotion should be directed to him, Yeshua, whom the Torah reveals, to Yeshua, who gave us freedom from what the Torah demands. What does the Torah demand, Glenn? Number two, death if we break it. Right? If we break life if we live it, death if we break it. And that's what the Torah demands. And that's what Yeshua freed us from that consequence. So we have to have a right perspective about this. And who or what bears witness to uh how this redeemer walked, spoke, and taught?

Where are the firsthand testimonies that preserve not only his words, but the record of life he willingly gave in order to deliver them? These accounts are found in the written testimonies of those who saw him, heard him, and followed him, preserving for us a faithful record of his life, his teaching, and his sacrifice. Here's the scripture that I told you was coming. 1 Timothy 4, Paul says to Timothy, the spirit expressly says that in later times or latter times, some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons. So when we take a false position on certain things like Paul, like the New Testament, it's us leaving the faith, stepping outside the path. And the scary thing is it's a result of listening to deceiving spirits somewhere somehow. And it's a real deal. It's a real thing. Where does one heed a deceiving spirit?

Well, in our day and age, it usually comes as a result of somebody landing on a video somewhere and listening to some person like me teaching something about Paul, about the New Testament, about Torah. That sounds really interesting. It sounds almost convincing, but you didn't test it against the scripture. You just embraced it and then you shared it. So, this is a very real thing that we have to address. Okay. So, what is scripture? As of late, we've been re-examining certain words that have come to mean something in our culture, but ultimately do not have a definition that matches our contemporary understanding of the word.

Finding the Ancient Path | Is The New Testament Scripture?

Words like heretic and unity have a very different biblical meaning than what we've come to understand. The same is true with the word scripture. Over time, we have inherited assumptions about this word that are shaped more by tradition and modern usage than by how the Bible itself defines and applies it.

If we are going to have an honest conversation about the authority of the New Testament, we must first slow down and ask what the writers of scripture meant when they used this term. Only then can we evaluate our conclusions against the standard of the text itself rather than against the weight of inherited definitions. So before I go on, let me ask Glenn, David, Randy, I want to just get your initial response. When I ask you, when you hear the word scripture, when you think of the word scripture, how do you define that in your brain? The Bible is canonized. The Bible is canonized writings, right, David? No, I think that's a good definition. That being said, definitely in the in the New Testament. So the canon is obviously something that happened later on in the New Testament. Every time that there's reference to the word scripture, it's referring to, you know, the Hebrew Bible, right? And so the whole canon or

addition of the New Testament was something that was added or defined later on. So if you're looking at, you know, 2 Timothy 3:16, all scriptures God breathed, you know, Paul was obviously not referring to his own letters as scripture at the time. That is something that was defined later on. Okay, go ahead, Randy. What about you? I I don't know that I have any more to add than what's been said. You know, second Timothy 3:16. And I think one of the things we talk about a lot, Ed, is, you know, scripture interprets scripture. So, I would define scripture as all 66 books. Okay, that's good. Well, let's look at the etymology of the word scripture in its Latin root. It's Greek background and it's transmission in English. It's Latin root. The Latin noun scriptor comes from the verb scribere meaning to write. From this same root come English words such as scribe, script, inscription and manuscript. In classical Latin, scriptura

referred broadly to anything written, not specifically to sacred text. And we're going to look at that phrase too, those that word sacred. So in the in the Latin root, scriptor is not just what you and I might call scripture, but it's broad. It's applies to anything that is written in the Greek background. When Latin speaking Christians translated the Bible, scriptura was used to render the Greek word graph from the verb grapho meaning to write. Same exact thing in ordinary Greek usage. Graph could mean again anything written, any writing or document. In the New Testament, however, it developed a technical sense referring to sacred writings. So, it shifted in the New Testament sense to mean something sacred that is authoritative text recognized as coming from God. its transmission into English from Latin scriptor. The word passed into old

French as a scripture escripture from there into middle English as scripture. By the time it entered English in the med medieval period, it had already acquired a specialized religious meaning referring specifically to the sacred writings of the Bible rather than just writing in general. So what I want you to get from this, its meaning is simple. to write to write anything to write a document including what would become known as scripture. So now that we understand its etymology, we can see that the traditional and modern usage of the word scripture as supported by all three of our brothers in the panel this morning means divine text as coming from Yah. That's the tradition and modern usage of it. However, the actual etymology and meaning simply means to write anything and not just what we call sacred texts. I want to harp on that whole idea of sacred text for a moment because in this discussion it's important to

note that Hindus, Muslims, Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses all consider their books to be scripture as we currently understand the term. To them, it's sacred text. So it's important for us in this argument in this discussion to not only have a foundation of what these words actually mean but try to put them in their appropriate place. What is sacred? What is scripture? What is divine? Therefore our discussion this morning shouldn't be titled is the New Testament scripture i.e. writing or what some might call sacred text. Our discussion this morning should be titled, "Is the New Testament Holy Spirit inspired?" Because there's a difference. Holy Spirit inspired is the same as coming from God. Would you agree, Glenn? Number two. Amen. Okay. So that makes it scripture in the traditional sense of the word. If we use the word scripture in the it traditional sense the way all three of you brothers just defined it, then it safe to say if

so facto if you will that divine text as coming from God is indeed scripture. So let's look at the first mention of the word scripture. Where would one presume to find the very first mention of the word scripture in the Bible? David, Randy, Glenn, anybody want to toss an answer out to that question specifically like book, Bible, verse

or just in general? Probably in the New Testament. Just just in general. New Testament. Matthew 21 is the first recording of the word scripture in the Bible. Jesus said to them, "Have you never read in the scriptures?" That's the word graph for document and or writing. The stone which the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone. This was the Lord's doing and it's marvelous in our eyes. So the fact that the word scripture does not appear until the first book of the New Testament should create a major problem for those who claim that the New Testament is not

scripture as opposed to the Old Testament where the word scripture is never used. I find that incredibly ironic. There are some out there who want to claim that only the new the only Old Testament is scripture and yet the word scripture never appears in the Old Testament. You have to study your Bible. You have to flesh these things out. You have to know what's what. There is no occurrence of the English word scripture as a defining term inside the Old Testament itself. The Old Testament refers to Yahw's written revelation using descriptive phrases rather than a formal title equivalent to scripture. Things like this, Exodus 24:4. And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord. Would you agree, David, that that would be considered scripture? Of course. Yes. Joshua 8. And there in the presence of the children of Israel, he wrote on the stones a copy of the law of Moses which

he had written. Very similar. So these writings that we see became known as the book of the law in scripture. We see that from time to time like in 2 Kings 22 the high priest said to Chaan the scribe, "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord." That word book in the text is the Hebrew word sephair or scroll. So these are the writings of Moses, copies of it written on stone and scrolls, scripture as we define it today. So, aside from the stone that we see in Exodus 32 where the Bible says that it was the work of God and the writing was the writing of God engraved on tablets. I think all of us would agree that that's actually scripture as we understand the term in today's vernacular. Aside from the stone, the divine text was written on scrolls from Yah's mouth to Moses's cut reed pen. Deuteronomy 12 uh 31. So it was when Moses had completed writing the words of this law in a book. That word is scroll.

Exodus 17. And the Lord said to Moses, "Write this for a memorial in the book and recount it in the hearing of Joshua." This is how we arrived at the Torah at the very least becoming what is known as scripture or divine text. And I want to ask this question because this is going to come full circle at the end of our lesson. Can we all agree that this verse, Exodus 33:11, the Lord spoke to Moses face to face as a man speaks to his friend, fits the criterion required for anything that this man wrote to be called scripture as we understand the term. Ben's nodding his head. Yes, Randy, can we agree? David. Yeah, I think it's safe to say we would all look at this verse and go, "Oh, well, yeah, this is the father speaking to Moses face to face as a man speaks to his friend." And anything that Moses writes as a result of that would be considered divine text. So, we know how the Torah came to be divine text. And I keep harping on that phrase

divine text because in our contemporary language when we hear the word scripture that's what we think. We think divine text. We think as coming from God. Well, what about the prophets and the writings? The prophets were explicitly commanded to write but not all of them. Some examples. First simple 1st Samuel 10. Then Samuel explained to the people the behavior of royalty and wrote it in a book and laid it up before the Lord. Isaiah 8. Moreover, the Lord said to me, "Take a large scroll and write on it with a man's pen." Jeremiah 30. Thus speaks the Lord God of Israel, saying, write in a book for yourself all the words that I have spoken to you. Ezekiel 24, son of man, write down the name of the day this very day. Habach 2, the Lord answered me and said, write the vision and make it plain on tablets. Daniel 12, that you, Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book until the time

of the end. So we have these, what is this? 1, two, three, six examples of prophets being explicitly commanded to write down the things that Yahw is telling them. Interestingly enough, the Bible does not record the rest of the prophets as being commanded to write. And I provided for you the list down below. So if that's the case, how did the prophets, these prophets writings become known, accepted as divine text? That's the question I have. How did their books become canon with Israel? So you look at 1st Samuel 10, that very first verse that we presented there, it says he wrote it in a book and laid it up before the Lord. The question is, what does that mean? What does it mean to lay these words that were written up before the Lord? Well, we're going to get into that a little bit and speculate some uh to see what what that means. The Bible mentions

the names of several scribes whose job it was to record the words and acts of the prophets. So, we're answering the question, how did the prophets writings become divine text and/or scripture? Well, they had these men, right? that followed them that were witnesses to the things that were happening with them. Firsthand witnesses. Yeah, I would say firsthand witnesses of men who were writing these things down through history. And then we have to get into these two little issues. The prophetic authority of their writings was recognized by a couple of things. by fulfillment and its divine origin. We know in Deuteronomy 18 that the Torah says a true prophet is known when his word comes to pass. Right? That's how you know when a prophet is true by whether or not the things he says actually come to pass and that they align with what's already written. So the messages are recognized and or tested as coming from Yah and then they were

preserved. How were they preserved? How were they quote unquote laid up before the Lord? Well, again, there is some speculation that just as Moses was instructed to put his things in uh the ark, that these additional writings were likewise kept near the ark. Not necessarily in the ark. Maybe there was a compartment on the outside where they could keep them. This is all historical speculation. Uh so it's not thus sayeth the lord. This is just the things that I came to discover and understand and this is where I say this prophetic words were preserved as covenant testimony. Uh Deuteronomy 31 shows that written revelation was kept beside the ark as a witness. This practice was a pattern of preserving authoritative revelation within Israel's worship life but not before it was tested. So the biblical criterion for authority as it pertains to the prophets is its divine origin

as coming from Yahw. Its binding force rest on its tested divine source having been laid up rather than on the manner in which it was recorded or transmitted. What am I trying to say? Well, these scribes were all writing things down in real time as it was happening with the prophets. What then happened to these scrolls? What then happened to these writings? Well, I imagine that they were tested as coming from Yahw. And when they were tested and found to actually be coming from Yahw, they were then preserved somehow along with the stone tablets of the Torah, thus kind of creating a collection, if you will, of quote unquote scripture. So, the big question is, because we're talking about the New Testament after all in this lesson, I had to go through all of this stuff to kind of get you to where I need you to be as I present issues of the New Testament.

After looking at all of this, the question is, by that same standard, what same standard? the standard that we just looked at in the red box. Should the writings of the New Testament authors be regarded as possessing the same binding authority on the grounds that their message likewise proceeds from Yahw and has been tested like the prophet's letters were and received as divine revelation independent of the particular manner in which it was recorded or transmitted? That's the question we're trying to answer. Why are we trying to answer that question? Because that will help us determine whether or not the New Testament is scripture as we understand the term today. So, we start with a verse in the New Testament, which is not lost on me, by the way, if you're a New Testament doubter. Second Peter 1 says, "Knowing this verse, that no prophecy of scripture or prophetic writing is of any private interpretation.

For prophecy never came by the will of man, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." So here we have in the New Testament itself by a New Testament author in this case an apostle making the claim that no prophecy of scripture came about as a result of the man's own thoughts the man's own invention the man's own opinions but they were by the Holy Spirit thus make it Holy Spirit inspired thus must make it divine text. But like I said, I recognize that this is a New Testament author. Can we find similar writings in the Old Testament? Yes, we can. Jeremiah 1. But the Lord said to me, "Do not say, I am a youth, for you shall go to all to whom I send you, and whatever I command you, you shall speak. Behold, I have put my words in your mouth." Does this match second Peter 1? Yes, it does. What about Ezekiel 2? You shall speak my words to them. Whether they hear or whether they refuse, they are rebellious.

And then finally, my favorite, one of my favorite verses, Amos 3. Surely the Lord God does nothing unless he reveals his secret to his servants, the prophets. A lion has roared who will not fear. The Lord has spoken. Who can but prophesy? If you know my book, you know that this verse is key. It's one of my three walls. This verse in my opinion summarizes everything we have discussed up to this point because we've answered the question a moment ago. How does the prophet's writings get included into what we call scripture? Divine text comes as the result of Yahw communicating directly with his prophets. He does nothing. How vague is

the word nothing? It's not vague at all. It's absolute. So the whole process of the father revealing secrets to the prophets that they would then write down is the process by which we get to scripture to divine text. That's how we arrive at scripture, otherwise known

as scripture. This is all going to come together at the end. You're going to see this how this works. Bear with me here. And by the way, if some of you are listening to this and scratching your head going, "Wow, this is so crazy. Where's he going?" This is the kind of research and diligence and study that you have to put into your Bible when you test things like the notion that the New Testament is not scripture. It may seem boring or may seem kind of yawnish, but this is the work that you have to do. So everything that we just looked at about the father revealing his secrets to the prophets and thus their writings becoming scripture. Now let's read Matthew 13. He answered and said to them, who's to them? The 12. Because it has been given to you to know the what? The mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. What's another word for mysteries, Glenn? Secrets.

Amos 3. He does nothing without revealing his secrets to the prophets, which they then write down, which then become scripture. Matthew 13, it's been given to you, 12, to know the mysteries, the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it's not been given. John 15 No longer do I call you my servants, for a servant does not know what his master is doing. I've called you friends. For all things that I have heard from my father, I have made known to you. Just like Amos 3. This verse is going to come back around again. We're going to look at it again. But we see the same thing here. So I ask, are the apostles prophets whose writings would also be scripture? How would you answer that question, Glenn? Number two, most of the gospel is in fact prophecy. And when we see the prophecy fulfilled over and over and over again, then that puts a stamp on it.

Well, yeah. I mean, to me, this the answer to this question is simple. Based on what we just looked at in Amos 3, he reveals the secrets to the prophets. Those prophets didn't write things down. Those things that they they wrote down were considered to be scripture, i.e. divine text. It's the exact same thing here in the New Testament. Yeshua revealing the secrets, revealing the mysteries of the kingdom of God to his 12 and then they write those things down. So the question is, are the apostles prophets? Well, yeah, they are prophets. They're they're new covenant prophets. Matthew 23, a very interesting verse. Therefore, indeed, this is Yeshua speaking. I send you prophets. Who's he talking to? Israel. I send you prophets, wise men and scribes. Some of them you will kill, future tents, and crucify. And some of them you will scourge in your synagogues, future tents, and persecute from city to city. But on you may come

all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, son of Barakiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar. Assuredly I say to you, all these things will come upon this generation. Who are these prophets that they will kill and crucify and that they will scourge? They are unnamed. But it's an interesting verse nonetheless when you think about what happened to the 12. They were scourged. They were crucified. they were killed. Doesn't come right out and say that Yeshua is referring to them. But it's an interesting verse nonetheless for us to give thought to when we try to answer the question, are the apostles prophets with the same authority that say in Isaiah or Ezekiel or Amos had? Although Yeshua never directly says to the 12, "You are prophets," he assigns them the functions of

prophetic envoys who speak by divine inspiration and are sent by Yahw just as the Old Testament prophets were. We see in John 20 that Yeshua, the father in the flesh, sends them like he sent Jeremiah, like he sent Ezekiel. Matthew 10 speaking about the 12. They will deliver you up. Don't worry about what you're going to say or speak. It'll be given to you in that hour what you should speak or it's not you who speak but the spirit of your father who speaks in you. Is it safe to say that these men are holy spirit inspired that they like the old testament prophets have been sent? And then we have this interesting little thing here intra canonical attestation. This is a phenomenon in which a biblical author identifies another contemporary writing as scripture within the canon itself. 1 Timothy 5, for the scripture says, okay, who's talking here? This is Paul. Who's he

talking to? He's talking to young Timothy. And he says, "The scripture says, you shall not muzzle an ox while it threads out the grain, and the laborer is worthy of his wages." This is an interesting verse. Why? Well, because that first part that Paul mentions is found in the book of Deuteronomy. The second part is not found in the Old Testament. Do you know where it is found? Luke's writings. Now, you might be thinking, well, wait a minute. Was Paul aware of Luke's gospel when he wrote this letter to Timothy? Historically, they're about five

years off. They think that Luke wrote his gospel early 60 ADish 60 63 ADish and Paul his letters to Timothy around 65. So there's a couple year difference but Luke was a traveling partner with Paul. So Paul was probably very aware of the things that Luke had written down and he's calling it scripture in this verse.

scripture as in the term that you and I have come to understand as divine text as coming from Yahw. Then we have here in Peter, second Peter 3, consider that the long-suffering our Lord of salvation is also our beloved brother Paul according to the wisdom given to him has written to you also in all of his epistles. So Paul Peter's are recognizing that Paul's writings have reached the people. He's calling them epistles, speaking in them of these things in which are some things hard to understand. We know this verse which untaught and unstable people twist to their own destruction as they do what? The rest of the scriptures. So here Peter is calling Paul's writings scriptures because he's putting them on the same plane as the rest of the scriptures intra canonical addestation. So Peter places Paul's letters in the category of scripture.

Paul identifies Luke's gospel as scripture even as it was only beginning to circulate among the believers at that time that his letters were written. This shows us this phenomenon of intracononical recognition within the New Testament itself. Apostolic writings are identified as scripture by other inspired authors while the documents were still active in circulation. This shows that their authority was acknowledged contemporaneously and not assigned retroactively by later councils. Why is that an important point to make? Because there are those in the Torah community and elsewhere, not just the Torah community, who want to tell you that, oh yeah, the New Testament was canonized by a bunch of old farts and some council somewhere somehow. And although yeah, we do have historical record of such old farts coming together to discuss these these writings. We don't need them because of this phenomenon right here.

We have one of the 12 identifying the bastard apostle Paul as he calls himself an inspired author. We have Paul recognizing Luke as an inspired author. So in one sense we don't need this retroactive canonization so to speak created by councilss. Let's move along. Holy spirit inspired equals divine text. I've been harping on this all morning but just for the sake of driving it home. We we understand that something that is Holy Spirit inspired is the same thing as being divine text is the same thing as being scripture as we understand it today. Matthew 10 again it's not you who speak but the spirit of your father who speaks inside of you or in you. John 14, the helper, the Holy Spirit will teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all things that I have said to you. This is a pivotal verse in this argument. Yeshua himself tells the 12 that the spirit is coming and the spirit is going

to teach them all things. What does that mean? Well, there's these words found at the end of the book of John that say there are many other things that Yeshua did which if they were written one by one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that would be written. That's the all things that the Holy Spirit was going to be reminding them of which is a great deal of content. So if if this is all happening and the spirit is quote unquote guiding them into all truth, why would he do that? Why would the Holy Spirit make sure that these men, these 12, and that they were going to understand and be reminded of all the things that Yeshua did and said, and that they were going to be guided into all truth. What was the purpose of that? just so these guys could have all this wisdom. No, the purpose was the reason was that it was going to be disseminated to the ends

of the earth that it was going to be witness to Yeshua in all the earth. And then I have this Exodus 33. We looked at this verse at the beginning of the lesson. The Lord spoke to Moses face to face as a man speaks to his friend. This verse, this singular verse shows us a very unique mediatorial relationship that the father had with Moses for one purpose, covenant revelation. Moses was going to be the voice of covenant revelation. And that's why it was important for Yahw to have this friendlike relationship with Moses. For that very reason, John 15, Yeshua to the 12, I have called you friends. For all things that I have heard from my father, I have made known to you. So for the very same reason that Yah had this friendship with Moses face to face, what was that reason? Covenant revelation. Yeshua had the same exact relationship with the 12 because he had made all

things known to them. And they would in turn be able to reveal the covenant, speak about the covenant, attest to the covenant. And these things are written down where? These things that testify about this new covenant, about the man who ratified the new covenant with his blood are recorded where? In the gospels, in the

epistles, in the writings or the divine text that we have in the New Testament. So we conclude with these thoughts. Can we trust the New Testament as scripture on the same biblical grounds by which the Old Testament was recognized as scripture? The answer is yes. Scripture is identified in the Bible not by later tradition or institutional decree but by its divine origin which we looked at its reception as the word of God by covenant community and its internal testimony. The New Testament

writings preserve or present themselves as revelation given by God through chosen witnesses just like it was done with the Old Testament prophets. The apostles testify that they received their message by revelation. They consciously delivered commandments to the Lord or of the Lord and their writings were recognized by other inspired authors as scripture. These texts were preserved, circulated, and read among the assemblies as or authoritative instruction from God. Therefore, by the same scriptural criteria used to recognize the authority of the Torah and the prophets, the New Testament stands as divinely sourced, apostolically witnessed, and communally received revelation on biblical terms alone. It belongs with the category of scripture. And by the way, we really should not have anything called Old Testament or New Testament in the Bible. What we should have are the Hebrew scriptures and the apostolic scriptures. That is my

discussion on the New Testament and whether or not it's scripture. Glenn, you've been feverishly typing and studying and while I've been teaching, do you have something just just dying to come out? Yeah, I've got a couple things uh that I can add. um in in second Peter uh 1 13-15 I think would add to what you've said where Peter says yes I think it is right as long as I am in this tent to stir you up by reminding you knowing that shortly I must put off my tent just as our Lord Jesus Christ showed me. Moreover, I will be careful to ensure that you always have a reminder of these things after my deceased. So, made some promises there. Uh it's it's from what I understand it's kind of agreed that if if you combine Old Testament books like first and second Samuel into one book that the Old Testament ends up being 22 books and the New Testament ends up being 27 books

which is a total of 49 7* 7. So the the one book that would be have been added after Peter would have been revelations that John wrote at a very very very old age and that capped off scriptures and that's where John wrote in revelations that whoever adds to these or takes away from these get all the curses that are described in the book. That's awesome. Thank you, brother. Okay, now it's time for you guys sharing your thoughts, your questions, your rebuttals, your rebukes. I take them all. I want to hear from you. Brother Baronson, you got your hand up. Go ahead. Yeah. Um, thanks. I had a couple. Well, why don't you go first? Go ahead. Oh, okay. So, since we've established that um the New Testament is scripture because it is spiritfilled, is that to say that we are also to discern what part of the New Testament isn't or isn't part of Torah or isn't a command like um you know the question that I had asked you the other day. Um

how do we know is that from is that do we treat that as a um since it is spiritfilled which is from God don't we treat that like a command? Uh well yes of course you treat it as a command. It's all if it's Holy Spirit inspired if it's got a divine origin. How do we know whether or not it's got a divine origin? Because it all lines up with the rest of scripture, especially the Torah, then yes, it's a divine command, and we should treat it with the same respect. Does that make sense? Yeah. And by the way, just so you know, I mentioned the old farts a second ago, kind of jokingly. Yes, there have been men in in history that have gathered together to discuss what should be canon and what shouldn't. One of the things, one of the criteria uh of of whether or not a book should be uh added to canon was did it have the same um stories? Did it did were were they talking with us about the same people at the same places at the same

time? Were these things in line? Can we see historical relevance that everything kind of matches it? Does the teaching of any one particular book line up with Torah line up with what the scriptures actually the the Hebrew scriptures actually say? So those those were what's one of the criteria in which the books were considered to be canon. It's the reason why other other books and I know I'm going to get all kinds of heat from this from the YouTube internet gallery. It's why certain books like Enoch and Joshuer and and Jubilees weren't considered to be canon because they deviated from that criteria in some in some fashion or another. So it was kept out. Does it mean they're not important? No. Doesn't mean that at all, but they they weren't included as canon. But I I hope that answers your question. David, do you want to continue on that?

Yeah. I mean to well just to refer to that comment you just made right now and that was the point that I was going to make is that one of the things that uh were critical in validating the New Testament of scripture is the consistency as you said and like Glenn said you know the fulfillment of prophecy but just that consistency which is something that you've mentioned in many many lessons before of the fact that you know they they do uh there is no contradiction between them right and So that's a a critical component of giving it uh that um or treating it as as inspired by God. Um a point just to to kind of complete your your conversation earlier in this regarding um validating the books of the prophets and the Old Testament as scripture. uh Jesus himself gives a stamp of approval to the prophets as being scripture

because he says in Matthew 22 he says uh when he's asked about you know the great the greatest commandments he said uh you shall love uh when they were when the when the Pharisees asked him which is the great commandment he said Jesus said to him you shall love the lord your god with all your heart with all your soul with all your mind this the first and great commandment the second is like it you shall love your neighbor as yourself On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. Right? So Jesus himself gives credibility or a stamp of approval that's saying prophets are uh scripture are inspired by God. So um that's just another point to to bring up to wrap up that point that you were saying in the in the lesson. And then the other point that you brought up earlier um or that you brought up is I don't know if this is a good topic for

continuation or a follow- on study on this one is how do we treat or what quoteunquote disqualifies the other books the external books what the Roman what the what the uh I don't know if it's Catholic Church or whatever defined as the Apocrypha what disqualifies them as being inspired by God does the fact that a book in the Apocrypha references the Old Testament. Does it automatically make it inspired or things like that? Right? So, um I don't know if it would be something worthwhile doing some type of a study regarding that to say here are the criteria that we've defined or that the Bible defines that God defines what constitutes scripture and here's how these additional books match up with that or not. Amen. That that does sound like it might be a fun study. Okay, brother Snow, you're up next. Um, I wondered, you know, I know we were talking about the framework or the lens of Torah people disqualifying New

Testament and, you know, because New Testament people disqualify the Torah and even Tanakh. Um, but I wondered if I might be able to throw a different angle in there. Um, if that's okay. Um and that's and that's if it's okay. And that's basically um well I'm coming from where uh us who who believe in in Torah um you know when we want to when we want to correctly you know correct mis uh you wrong views is the fact that it's it's the lens of of viewing the New Testament scripture as you know that they view it as a self-contained constitution versus um the shaman ad that's that's more of a covenantal declaration. Um, so, you know, my my point is is basically, you know, we're talking about I'm I'm getting more into the weeds here from the 30,000 foot down into 5,000 ft. But I I I believe that even even, you know, Yeshua talks about that in, you know, Mark 12, he re he restates the shama uh here, O Israel. you know, it's in

Deuteronomy 6:4. Um, you know, here, O Israel, Yahweh is our God. Yahweh is is Ehod or one. And I think that he's declaring covenantal authority versus um what people do or Christians do. And and and and they they they basically it it becomes a slogan, you know, oh, that's just a nice slogan. And it removes uh instead of Jesus defining loyalty and allegiance um and covenantal identity um that that Christians minimize that and and it becomes a slogan. You know, love becomes an emotion um instead of obedience. And so it's a different angle that I'm talking about. Um you know, EU is is talking about really exclusive lordship in the covenantal eyes versus just a belief statement. um uh faith is more of, you know, it's supposed to be allegiance versus a mental ascent of of of your mind. So, and and because of that, they they sideline Torah or what have you. So, I felt like I just wanted to just come up with a little bit

different angle that the flow in Deuteronomy as it pertains to our lens of scripture is, you know, we confess where we're loyal, you know, that, you know, Yahweh is one. You know, he's the only Lord. It's we're he's loyal. we're loyal to him. We obey him and we practice him daily. Uh versus a New Testament lens is saying, "Hey, I just salvation. I have a legal transaction. I'm done. I don't have to do anything else." And so, I just kind of just wanted to throw that out there. Well, amen, brother. I appreciate that as always. Uh, Brother Samuel, Super Samuel. Shabbat shalom. Um, excellent teaching. Um, and I don't want to split hairs. Um, so here

here's here's the thing. What defines a prophet? What defines a sent one, an apostle? What defines whether or not someone is a prophet which is faithful to Yahovah? What defines an apostle is the fact that they have been given a direct commission

in revelation where they have seen and spoke with Messiah or heard from Yahovah directly. That is what determines whether or not you are a prophet or an apostle. In addition to that, nothing that you state is going to be in contradiction to the Torah. So the Torah is fundamental and essential to all of this. Why? Because you have to look at this from a covenant lens. Messiah is our bridegroom. You can't say Messiah is my bridegroom and be a faithful fiancé and you're committing adultery and you're sleeping around with other Elohim. If you're going to say that Messiah is your bridegroom, you have to honor his cuba. That cuba is Torah. They're not separate. They're together. The Torah comes with the covenant. It's not separate from it. It's a part of it, an essential aspect of it. 1 hour, 4 minutes In addition to that, there was one thing that you said, Brother Ed, that that I disagree with, and that is that we are

free from the wages of sin. We are not. We may not. There may be some contention or disagreement in terms of the curses, but the wages of sin are still death. So if you're eating roadkill, things that are already dead of themselves, or you come across something that's slain and you take it and you grill it up and you eat it, you can be subject to various viruses and other bacteria and germs that will hurt you, that will make you sick, and that will kill you. If you commit adultery or if you fornicate with a prostitute, it's possible that you going to come down with some type of venereal disease or some other illness or sickness. So the the wages of sin are still there. But when we come into covenant, because we are going to be faithful to our bridegroom, we obey the instructions because that's what we're told to do.

And there are still consequences for breaking Torah. Make no mistake about it. You can't eat whatever you want and think that you're going to be healthy. There are certain laws that are built into this reality that will bring you down and destroy you because you're not walking in step with the covenant that was given. So, it's not just, you know, some obedience thing for obedience sake. Because when you read Deuteronomy, it says, "Do these things because they're given to you for your own good." That doesn't end with the revelation of our Messiah, his his death, his resurrection, and ascension to the right hand of the father. Those things still stand because they're still meant for our good and to help us. So, I completely disagree with you when it comes to obedience to Torah. That's going to be essential. 1 hour, 6 minutes Um, here's an interesting thing. It's it's not that

it's just that Messiah affirms the prophets in the Torah. See, this is the problem that the Judaism has because they think that Messiah is separate from it because Messiah didn't adhere to the takenote of the Pharisees. He did not subject himself to every aspect of their doctrine. And and what we get more or less is we get a portion of what of the residue that remains from the traditions of the Pharisees with respect to the collection and the canonization of what we call the Jewish Bible that comes from one particular sect at a time of the second temple period that made his way here. There are other writings that other Yahouden viewed as being essential and what we call inspired and they are quoted within the New Testament. The brick kadesha for example when you talk about demons that are exercised and go to dry places you don't see that in Torah. Where do you see that? But when we talk about

what Jude indicated, when we talk about Paul mentioning the name of the magicians, Jennis and Jambre, that information isn't in Exodus, is not in Numbers. It's not in Deuteronomy. It's not fair. Where did they get that? Are they just pulling something out of thin air? No. They had a body of scripture of set aart writings where they drew this information and shared it. When it comes to their commission, what they're doing is they're saying the kingdom is now here. This is what you need to do in order to be brought into the covenant. Their job was to go out and to bring Israel back into the covenant so the two houses can be rejoined into one. That was the purpose. That's the purpose of all of this. It's the it's the rejoining of Israel into covenant. And that's all that the prophets were about. It was to shuva everything that they preached. Return to the covenant. Return to the covenant.

The apostles didn't say anything different. They said, "Come on back, Israel. Return to the covenant." Ephraim that had been scattered is being brought back. That was their purpose. And to bring Judah into repentance and back in alignment with the totality and the spirit and the letter of the Torah as opposed to the

taken note of the Pharisees. So we know we get you know 66 books and we think that you know somehow through some numerological miracle that it should only be 66 based on a number of things. But let me tell you something. The father can work with anything that's given. Anything that's given. No matter what man intends. When the father has a plan he will still work something out even though man has something else in mind. No man can stop that. And no man is going to just say you only have these 66 books and that's it. However, I'll say this in closing

with those 66 books. With those books, the one thing that that I heard from someone and I and I say it all the time, there is much and little when the father is in it. The father is in the 66. There's a lot to be drawn from it, but we don't get to determine and to cut off what the father has given us for the fullness of his revelation, but things come when they come. Thank you for letting me share. Shabbat shalom. Amen, Samuel. Thank you. You you're we lost your video somewhere along the line, but uh appreciate your thoughts as always. Uh okay. And I think Daria was up next. Shabbat shalom. Uh I have actually question which is the David Baronson already mentioned and it's about this uh this writings you call apocrypha which are not uh in the bible but uh there are many like things that uh like for example in Mcabes when you

read about the Jeremiah when we he was he hide the ark of the covenant that it's actually not in the bible But it's in the makabees. So I would like to ask if it these books uh which are not in the Bible but they were there before uh if they are also important for us and it's worth uh reading reading it and uh because when I was in the church um I was told that these are not uh these are not important and that I should not mess up with them. So that's something I would like to ask if if I can also rely on these uh on of these books or at least to to read them and to know what is written there. uh and and there is one request I have a when uh you are asking something the to share with us uh he is somewhere in the distance and he is hardly heard and especially for me when I am not English speaking you know I have I don't know what he is actually saying so that's something for the

future if he can be heard more clearly for me to know what he is saying because I think what he says it's also very wise and important that's what I wanted to ask and add thank you well thank you Dar appreciate that um so 1 hour, 12 minutes I have a quick answer Glenn says he has a quick answer but before I give my quick answer um it I just want to acknowledge how how funny it is that when we have discussion like the one we're having today uh how all these other it blossoms comes into all these other questions about uh extra biblical writings which I understand I I haven't got a problem with that. Um to answer your question Daria I personally have a problem with any authority figure saying don't read that only read this. I struggle with that mostly because I'm a prideful guy and a bit rebellious and I would never tell you don't read that. Um, no, I think you should read it. I think you

can read things like Enoch, like Joshua, like Jubilees, like the Apocrypha. There there's a great deal of of accurate biblical history in some of these things, especially in the Apocrypha, that you should read and that you should learn from that you can use in your Bible study. Compare the things that you read in these books to what you see in scripture using your wisdom as psalm uh Solomon said in uh Ecclesiastes. You can you can read these things and I encourage you to read those things. I've read those things. There's a number of websites online that will give you a full list of extra biblical writings and I've gone through many of them. The book of the giants, the book of Adam, uh the the gospel of Peter, the gospel of Thomas, these things are all out there and they they all exist. And should you ignore them? No, I don't think you should ignore them. Use your wisdom. Pray for wisdom as you're as you're reading those things and get a

good feel for this. Now, a lot of these things have known authorship dates that would automatically put them outside of anything that you and I would call divine text. Um, and so you just got to go through those things without fear. and and and if there's something that you can glean from it that does not stand in contradiction to what is written in Torah or what is written in the prophets or the rata, then yes, it's it's fine. Glenn, did you want to jump on that? Yeah, I I can just add that um if if you want to understand the Roman Catholic point of view, you want to know where their opinions came from, if if you're not educated in, you know, what what they believe, then you won't be able to counter it. Um on the other hand if you look at books like uh Josephus you know great historian it's it's not it's not the Bible uh and

it's not a part of scripture but it's its history and you know he was alive during that time when Jerusalem fell and can give a whole lot of insights into what what society was like. So it's all beneficial. uh some of it is pure fantasy uh because it's it has been written and rewritten and made more and more interesting over the years. Uh but if you're ca if you're comparing it to scripture then then and you know your Bible then you you know what is true and what is not true. I don't think any of it is dangerous. Um although with our Bible study we have time constraints and so I would say don't you know don't you know be trying to read uh Pho and Josephus and the apocryphal books until you got a real good handle on on the Bible on what scripture and what why each of these books is written and what they're trying to communicate and how the puzzle all fits together. Um, and and so that that's kind of my comment.

Okay. I hope that answers your question. Uh, Laura, you are up next. So, I just want to agree with you first of all, I got a couple of things to say, but first of all about reading the extra I don't know what to call them extra canonical non-cononical books. They really they really do connect a lot of dots and they are very informative. But, you know, let the reader be aware that, you know, not everything could be like as accurate as, you know, the holy writings. So, I wanted to say that. The other thing I wanted to say was in in my I have two Bibles that I one I write in and one I preserve, but one of them I I do all my little notes and stuff. It has the first covenant and the renewed covenant. And the second Bible that I have, it has uh the Torah, the teaching commonly known as the law, the Nabim, the prophets, the cath cuim alpha, the first writings, and then the me messianic scriptures. So this is Cthum,

the second writing. So it's divided into four parts, not just the two. So, it has, you know, the Torah, the prophets, um I don't know who those Oh, the um those are prophets and the um the renewed covenant. And the last thing I wanted to say, oh no, this next thing I wanted to say is you mentioned Jehovah's Witnesses. This is where I come from. And so I just wanted to say the reason why Jehovah's Witnesses refer to their writings as scriptures is because they've appointed themselves the faithful and discreet slave that Yeshua has appointed over all of his household. And so they have taken that responsibility. They have kidnapped Yeshua's responsibility giving us a Holy Spirit to rely on. And they have taken that from Yeshua. um a as well as taking on uh the cla the class of being the bride class. So they've already appointed themselves before, you know,

and when you ask them, "Well, how do you know that?" They just say, "Well, we just know." And none of that is true. It's just and and they also have a history of prophesying falsely. And then I have a now I have a problem. So, um you know, when you were talking about um uh the blessings and the curses and saying, uh that um well, I just want to say that I'm like stuck in a brainwashed teaching of those blessing and curses. So, like I have three people in my head, me, myself, and I. And two of them condemn like everything. you you you're going to be wiped away and all of this stuff. And I know none of that none of that stuff is true, but two of these beings that are in my head, you know, the reasonable me, the rational me, and the crazy me, they fight with each other like on on the daily. And um I I just want to know how do we how do you scrub the brainwashing besides reading a lot cuz I do I read quite a bit and I write

I'm writing out the Torah also. But how do you scrub these teachings? These are from childhood these teachings come from. How do you scrub them from your memory? That's that's a great question. Uh I address this uh in much of my teaching and my book. It's called unlearning. You have to be willing to unlearn that which you've been taught. And it's not easy. It's something that you have to continually um continually test against scripture. Everything that you thought you knew and you pray for wisdom. You pray for a lot of wisdom and understanding as you're reading. And you begin to change. your heart begins to adjust to the things that you're learning become elevated above your tradition in your past. Uh so that you can identify what is what. Uh so thank you Laura for those thoughts and your question. Now uh I want to say one more thing before we close. I don't normally um read chat,

but for fun, I looked over at chat this morning, and there's two things that I feel like I have to address. Um, first, Jared asked Samuel, "Do you believe that there are things said by Paul that cannot be found in the Torah as commands?" I didn't look to see how Samuel answered that question. But my answer to that question is in our New Testament, there are at least one thing that I've identified that Paul said that is not in the Torah. And that goes back to Paul and Laura's question about women being silent. In first Corinthians 14,

Paul says women should be silent as the law also says. The law never says the women should be silent, but Paul is saying it does. Initially, that's a problem. for somebody who wants to believe Paul's a heretic unless you do your study unless you dig into that and we did in this group long before it was 40 50 60 people large we had like 10 and we did a study on women's roles unfortunately it wasn't recorded

short answer many believe that that verse 3435 I think it does in 1 Corinthians 14. It's called an interpolation. What's an interpolation? An interpolation is an is a scribal addition. It means that a scribe somewhere, a translator somewhere inserted those words, and they're not necessarily the words of the author. Why did he insert those words? Well, because that's probably what he believes. When you look at Timothy's uh Paul's words to Timothy about women, the word silent is two different words in the Greek. Why did he use a different word in Timothy than he did in first Corinthians? He's talking about the same thing. Well, when you look at the Paul's words to Timothy, that more accurately expresses what I believe Paul is saying in 1 Corinthians 14 when he removed the scribal error or the scribal addition. Why am I saying all that and why did I want to point that out in this lesson?

Well, because I want to invite um a sister on our show uh to talk with us. Her name is Melissa Schilling. And some of you may know her from the internet. Um, I believe her to be a prophetist. I believe the New Testament Paul Peter affirms Joel's words, his prophecy about women rising up and being prophetic in the last days. I believe she's probably one of them. Um, but I think because that video that I did or that lesson I did on women's roles wasn't recorded, it would be a great opportunity to rehash some of those things using someone like Melissa Schilling as a backdrop to teach some of these things. She's a phenomenal teacher. I think she was recently um on Michael RDE's channel. So, you can go find that if you want to. So, I'm that's coming up in, you know, on our channel soon. As soon as I can make that

happen. Uh, but I hope that answers your question, Jared, and your question, Paul and Lori, in the chat. We are running long, guys. Thank you for being here as always to be a part of this little group of ours. I pray that you have a wonderful rest of your Shabbat. It's pouring rain out right now as where Glenn and I are sitting so we can hear the rainfall. It's going to be a quiet day for us. I pray it's a quiet day for you. Thank you for those those of you who are here for the first time. Um I think I know I think Damian is here for the first time. I'm not sure if the sister who just shared is here for the first time. Her face doesn't look familiar to me. Maybe she she's new. If you're here for the first time, welcome. We're so grateful that you're here and we look forward to seeing you again uh next week and I'll 1 hour, 26 minutes

keep you in the loop as to how soon I can have Melissa Schilling on the channel so we can retalk re rehash women's roles in this time get it recorded. Shabbat shalom everybody. Have a great day. Shalom. Thank you everybody. Shabbat shalom. Shabbat shalom. Have a great week. Shabbat shalom. Be blessed all. Thank you, Ed. Yes. Thank you. Take care. See you next week. Okay. Love you. Love you too, brother. It's Daria. It's not Daria. It's Daria. Brother Ed. Remember that. Daria. Daria. I'm sorry. I'll I'll I'll remember that. Thank you. That's okay. I love you anyway. Love you. And Emily, I love you, too. I love you. Awesome, Daria. Hallelujah. Bye, everyone.