

Historical Progression of the role of “Lawgiver”

I will try to follow the progression in historical order with scriptures and minimal comment. As with most Bible subjects, many things are interrelated, and I don't want this to be too long or complicated.

The beginning of this historical journey, of course, begins in Genesis 49:10 where God says that the ‘scepter’ will not depart from Judah, nor a ‘lawgiver’ from between his feet until Shiloh comes. Shiloh is recognized by all to be a reference to the Messiah. This does not mean that the lawgiver role is given to Judah. “Between his feet” means that the lawgiver will remain associated with that particular tribe. The tribe who had the lawgiver role was Levi (Mal. 2:4-9). The lawgiver was not initially stationed in Judah, but they would be the only tribe to at least have some association with it until Shiloh comes. It was first stationed in Shiloh in the northern kingdom of Israel (Joshua 18:1).

What was the role of the lawgiver? There is much confusion about this. So let's clear it up. That role was originally given to the high priest and directly linked to the Urim and Thummim. The Urim was placed in the ‘breastplate of judgment’ worn by the priest, and covered his heart. By the use of this, one could ‘inquire of the Lord’. This role was given to Levi, not Judah (Deut. 33:8)

Moses wrote EVERYTHING God related to him and placed that book within a holder on the side of the ark.(Deut. 30:24-25). The ‘oral law’ is a myth and false judgment made up by the Pharisees, and later referred to by Christ as ‘their traditions’.

The assumption that God gave any individual the authority to decide or make a judgment on something that was not written or agreed upon, whereby He then was required to support, is a grievous error made by many. Whenever the matter was not clearly written so it could be sorted out by the priest, he was to ‘inquire of the Lord’, directly for His answer. The role of the ‘lawgiver’ resided solely with the proper keep of the “oracle”, a term which became associated with this individual. This Hebrew word means ‘load’, ‘or burden’, and is sometimes translated as such. It refers to the proper authority or role placed ‘upon’ someone. So they carry it as their job, role, burden, or responsibility. Please notice that when there was a question concerning something not previously addressed or written, even Moses ‘inquired of the Lord’. (Numbers 9:1-14, and Numbers 27:5-6). No one was ever given the right to ‘decide’ and that decision then bore God's authority.

The removal of this role from Aaron (who was given it by God in Egypt) and his sons, along with the priesthood, is first prophesied by God in I Samuel 2. This removal will be incremental (from beginning to end). The 'house of your father' (verse 27) can only refer to Aaron within the context. Only Aaron was given this role in Egypt. This chapter prophesies the removal of Aaron's house and Ithamar (Eli's house). First Eli's sons were killed, then Eli fell off his stool and broke his neck This left Ahimelech (son of Eleazar) as the high priest (I Samuel 21 and Mark 2:6). Samuel is often erroneously called a priest, but there is no Biblical support for this error. Later Saul killed all the priests at Nob, leaving only Abiathar (son of Ahimelech), and Zadok as priests. Abiathar, last priestly descendant of Ithamar was removed by Solomon due to his treachery in I Kings 2:27. This left only the lineage of Zadok as physical priests, according to God's promise to Phinehas at Acacia Grove (Numbers 25:7-13). But please notice in I Samuel 2 God states that a covenant that He makes "forever" only means that if the other party is faithful.

Finally, I Samuel 2 states that in the next succession of the priesthood, that an "enemy of God" will sit in His dwelling place. Compare this with Christ's confrontation with Satan's representatives sitting in that role in Matthew 23. Then, at last, the eternal priesthood of Christ will arise (a singular priest) who will walk before His "anointed" (people) forever (I Samuel 2:35).

When the two kingdoms were divided after Solomon, the Levites were expelled from Israel and role of 'lawgiver' resided only with Judah (Psalm 78: 67-70).

But did that 'lawgiver' always retain the authority to 'inquire of the Lord' or to determine God's will or judgment until the coming of Christ? NO! Now let us see how that story unfolds.

Hosea was a prophet to Israel (northern kingdom) at the time they were scattered. In chapter 1, God predict that Israel would be scattered, it would be said that they were not His people (Israelites). Then He would later come to them and restore them as His people while they were still in that scattered condition. The denial of them as His chosen would be started and perpetuated by Judah (Hosea 5:10, Ezekiel 11:16-17), among many scriptures. For a more thorough history of this battle between Judah in which Judah attempts to take all the birthright promises of Abraham from Joseph, please read "[The Prophecy of the Barren Wife](#)".

In Isaiah 65:17, God states that all of Israel has come to believe that they no longer need to inquire of Him, or come up to Him. This can only mean that they feel that He is bound to honor whatever they decree. Lest anyone claim that this only applies to the northern kingdom, the prophet Jeremiah also issues the same condemnation on Judah, long after Israel had been taken into captivity (Jeremiah 2:31). In fact, Judah became twice as bad as Israel in all their sins (a thorough reading of Ezekiel 16 is recommended). This lie that the priest is the 'authority' of the

Lord, and He has to honor what they decree is a lie perpetuated today by the Rabbis (Pharisees), by twisting the words of Deuteronomy 30:11-14 to say that at this point, God no longer has any authority but has turned it all over to them. This arrogant rejection of God was a part of what led to the downfall of both kingdoms.

When Judah reached the apex of their evil, the righteous king Josiah sent to the keeper of the 'ward', (this apparently being the place where the Urim was kept), to 'inquire of the Lord'. The prophetess, Hulda, was the only one sitting in that role at this time. The people had certainly perverted God's ways at this time. You can read God's response in II Kings 23:26-28. He says that Judah and Jerusalem will be cut off just as the northern kingdom was.

At this same historical time, God predicts His remarriage to Israel (heritage of Joseph) by a better covenant (Jeremiah 3 and Jeremiah 31). While they are still scattered (Hosea 1: 10-11). These are the ones that Judah has denied being Israelites because of their removal from Jerusalem, which Judah now has come to worship. (Ezekiel 11: 15-16).

At the same time, God removed His counsel from Judah and Jerusalem (Jeremiah 18:18 through Jeremiah 19. Note especially verse 7 of chapter 19).

Then in Jeremiah 23, God explicitly removes the 'oracle', or 'burden' from Judah, declaring that every man has become his own oracle. At the same time, the prophet Ezekiel (who is already in captivity in Babylon) predicts that those of the 'stick of Judah', or mindset of Judah and their beliefs will be blinded to see that all this is happening, and just go on in denial, drawing farther from God, and denying all who will not accept their narrative. Please read Ezekiel 24.

Please notice the time setting of Ezekiel 24 in verse one. Upon completing this chapter, turn immediately to Ezekiel 33:21 (three years later) and continue reading. The witness of Judah's idolization of that city which God has cut off and glorifying of themselves by association with it is abundant in the Bible. Also read Jeremiah 24 in this light. The false claim that the Jews alone are the true children of Israel and hold the promises of Abraham is a blindness which God gave them so that they would fill up the transgressions of Israel. Paul talks of this extensively in his letter to the Romans. Read chapters 9-11.

God, through Isaiah, had already predicted the removal of the 'lawgiver' role from Judah and Jerusalem in Isaiah 22: 15-25. In this text, it is revealed that the 'key to the House of David' is the 'key of knowledge' (lawgiver). Preserving this had been in the hands of Shebna, the chief scribe. Because he had defiled his duties, God took it and gave it to Eliakim, the housekeeper, who would retain it until he was also cut off. Now go to the 'Interlinear' Bible and read the

original text in its form (verse 25). Here it clearly states that 'she' (Jerusalem, or the 'daughter of my people') will be cut off, and the 'averment' (legal responsibility) will be removed from the 'sure peg', (Eliakim) and from her' as well. While you can clearly see this in the original text, it is not transferred to the margin in the English translation, and it is omitted from all Bible translations that I have read.

God then puts Judah to Babylon and predicts that from that time until it is finally restored at Christ's coming, Jerusalem is a place of sin and will remain so until that time. (Ezekiel 22 and Revelation 11: 8.) He decrees it as a cauldron of fire and trial which will purify them until that time.

However, they are to be brought back after 70 years, FOR THIS PURIFICATION TO BEGIN!

While in captivity, they are no longer allowed to inquire of the Lord, as the means and right to do so have been removed from them. Ezekiel 20 and Ezekiel 14 describe this and the reasons for it in detail. Please read these chapters.

After 70 years, Daniel erroneously believes that this 70 year return is the final return to glory described by God back in Deuteronomy, when ALL Israel, 'those near and far' will be completely restored. At the same time he acknowledges that they have never repented and are continuing in their sin "as it is this day" (verse 7). But he apparently read Ezekiel 36 wherein God predicts that they will not repent, but God will bring them back and clean them up 'for His name's sake". This is the content of Daniel's prayer. Please read every detail of Daniel's prayer carefully. The 70 weeks prophecy is God's answer. In it He reveals that what Daniel seeks will happen not after 70 years, but at a much later date. That is the theme of the prophecy. The return after 70 years is to put them in the cauldron of fire of Ezekiel 22, but of course all those who follow the narrative of Judah are blind to this, according to the edict of Ezekiel 24.

After the return, Ezra tried to reestablish the law just as it had originally been given. He refused to make any judgment or decision himself 'until a priest could stand up with the Urim and Thummim", as the ability to include God in what they did had been removed from them. (Ezra 2:63 and Neh.7:65). Of course, that has never happened to this day, as the progression of this role laid out in I Samuel 2 does not allow it to go back to the Aaronic priesthood. Instead, during the time from Ezra to Christ, the enemy of God comes to sit in His temple, in order that they may confront Christ at His coming. Then the role of handling the 'law and the Testimony' is handed to Him and his 'little ones' (Isaiah 8:12-22 and Hebrews 2:13). The Book of Revelation(3:7)states that that role is now with Christ alone and is given to us as we follow and

inquire of Him correctly. Only Christ may open and shut understanding to those whom He will. I Corinthians, chapters 1-4 give witness to this abundantly.

Those of the 'stick of Judah' who believe the Jew's false narrative of this history by the blindness placed on them in Ezekiel 24 and witnessed by Paul in Romans 9 through 11, do not understand the Torah, its intent, nor its true narrative. (II Cor. 3) Blindness is on their eyes to this day, as it is also on **those who foolishly look to them or their traditions to determine how to worship God in all his laws**, including the Sabbath, Holy Days, or any other thing. The only thing their narrative is good for is a historical knowledge. This, in addition to the 'oral law' which are spurious documents, written by a religious order whose authenticity is nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures, but is simply made up by them. They interpret the Torah through the false lens of their own false documents. Christ told us to have nothing to do with their doctrines. Neither the Seducers or Pharisees. The order of the Pharisees which Christ confronted in Matthew 23 is the authors of Judaism.

The Churches of God have not rightly divided the Word of Truth concerning this issue. They have erroneously begun the study of this with Romans 3:1 wherein Paul says that the Jew has an advantage over a Gentile because unto them "were" committed the oracles of God. They then incorrectly say that this means that God gave that responsibility to them and it is still with them. So, they conclude that the Jews are God's authority concerning the law as God gave it, but the oral law is what the Pharisees later added, and that part is not true. This is misguided logic. The fact is that the Rabbis (order of the Pharisees extending to this day) view the oral law documents as superior to The Word of God, and interpret all of God's laws through the lens of the oral law. In other words, any opinion they have concerning the Law is explained by the oral law. This is the traditions and doctrines of the Pharisees which Christ told us to avoid. This error in reasoning permeates many of the Church of God doctrinal decisions concerning how we should view the Holy Days and other parts of God's law.

Paul's statement in Romans 3 should be rightly seen as explaining the advantage that a Jewish Christian has over a Gentile Christian AT THAT TIME, because of their previous knowledge of God's precepts. Both Jew and Gentile must come to God through faith in Christ with a willingness to turn from his/her old ways and keep God's commandments. The Jew had an advantage because knowledge of these laws and precepts were given to them in the past. The Gentile did not have this history, and thus his road of learning would be longer after he accepted Christ. In a correct contextual reading of Romans, Paul would conclude this historical matter in chapter 11, wherein he explains that the Jews who still followed their beliefs which were decreed by God in Ezekiel 24 were then (at Paul's time) "cut off" until a future time. At no time

did he claim that Christians in his day should still look to the Pharisees for understanding. In fact, in II Corinthians 3, he makes it clear that those who do not accept Christ do not even understand the Law or writings of Moses. A veil is still over their eyes when it is read.

Anytime we integrate the Rabbinical Jewish opinion and claims concerning how we should view any matter of God's laws, we are integrating the "leaven of the Pharisees" into our worship. Christ strictly forbade this practice, and it is something we should repent of. We need to have just as fervent approach to the purge of the 'leaven of the Pharisees' as we do in purging Catholic error.

I recently had a COG minister inform me that Ezra changed the Passover, with the obvious inference that this would make what he supposedly did the truth. This is total confusion. There is no scriptural evidence that Ezra changed anything. In fact, Ezra even refused to make any decision concerning matters already written, because there was no oracle to 'inquire of'. He restored everything as it was originally written, because many things had been corrupted in the time of ancient Israel. In fact, the scriptures say that Israel had not kept all the law concerning the Feast of Tabernacles correctly since the days of Joshua. No, Ezra changed nothing. Both the New and Old Testaments texts strictly forbid anyone adding to or subtracting from only what God gave.

This Jewish myth about Ezra has been progressively concocted by Rabinnical Jewish philosophy (oral law traditions) over the past centuries. In fact, at least some of it was perpetuated by a Jewish Rabbi named Elias Levita in 1538, over 2,000 years after Ezra lived. Some of his claims, still accepted as truth today, have no written record even in Jewish texts before that time.

But it doesn't matter, if it does not agree with what God spoke and recorded by his servants, it should have no validity in determining how we worship Christ.

I have come to see that when I approach this issue, others will argue, using the Pharisee narrative to try to establish their positions. In other words, using their error to defend their error. May that cease.