

# The Enigma of "New Covenant" Advocates

***A MAJOR Premise among some Protestant Evangelicals is that WE no longer need to Keep the Law as Christ 'Fulfilled' it in our stead. Not only do we not need to keep it, but that Jesus instituted an Entirely NEW Moral Code in its Place.***

© Rich Traver, 81520-1411, 7-11-09 [ 130 ] [www.goldensheaves.org](http://www.goldensheaves.org)

There seems to be a special quality within people who profess to be especially focused on the nature of the New Covenant. That quality often surfaces as a vehement repudiation of the Old Covenant, and with an underlying concept factored into the structure of their thinking, that the Old Covenant and the Ten Commandments are one and the same. What this does is to give New Covenant advocates a **mindset against** the Law of God, where the specific terms of the New Covenant, prophesied plainly in places such as Jeremiah 31:31 and Hebrews 8:10 is to involve the implanting of those very laws into the person's core mentality, being written into their hearts and minds by God's Spirit.

In effect, a whole class of people, who think they are fully in compliance with the terms of the New Covenant, are effectively biased against its central objective: To incorporate God's Moral Standards into ones' mind and heart, those very same moral standards around which the Old Covenant was formed. Satan is clever.

Where the children of Israel failed, not so much on account of rejecting the Law, but in failing to take it to heart and comply with its intent, modern so-called New Covenant advocates are seemingly cast in a mind-set which deliberately rejects the Law as though its rejection is thoroughly the right thing to do! In effect, they make themselves self-biased against the very basis of that Covenant which they profess to so strongly embrace!

## Law? What Law?

With the rejection of the Law (10 Commandments) as a fundamental premise, it then becomes necessary to identify a whole **new set** of Laws, to satisfy the obvious question. These supposedly 'new' laws are patched together from New Testament passages, pretty much exclusively, usually ignoring any obvious correlation with Old Testament precepts that may exist. This leaves the worshipper needing

to allege (at least subliminally) that these Old Laws came from God the Father, and were later rendered passé, and that a whole **new** set of Laws originated with Jesus to form the basis of His New Covenant.

The obvious flaw of that idea being, that Jesus was the One who rested after having completed six days of Creation,<sup>1</sup> was the One who brought them out of Egyptian bondage and was the voice they heard thundering from Mount Sinai. So, typical New Covenant advocacy is also primed to mis-identify who was the God of the Old Testament, thus sidestepping another theological conundrum. Why would Jesus repudiate His own Laws, which He admittedly kept? (Isn't that the meaning of the word: 'fulfilled'?) Why would Jesus' followers, having His very mind placed within them, be of a mind to repudiate those very Laws that Jesus, by example, kept, and told us we should imitate?<sup>2</sup>

A second faulty theological premise centers around the question, what do you mean 'new'? What is 'new'? It's interesting that Jesus' forerunners' ministry is one of 'restoration'. (Mt. 17:11) Would that be **inconsistent** with that of the One he was preparing the way for? If it was the mission of the predecessor of Christ, (that early Elijah type) in both the first century and in the latter day to '**restore all things**', wouldn't it be illogical that such restoration would be rendered unnecessary as soon as Christ appeared? That, along with the fundamental idea that He was in no way intending to "do away with the Law and the Prophets" (the Old Testament) should further alert the careful disciple against any mis-conceived conclusions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jesus' statement "***I am Lord of the Sabbath***" is usually mis-applied, suggesting He was indicating His lordship over the day, (and thus was abolishing it) rather than indicating He was that Lord who **created** it and was the One they were unwittingly worshipping by their efforts to keep it. The effective point here was His identity as being the One who rested. He was that Lord! (Hebrews 4:4-10)

<sup>2</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> Peter 2:21

In order to ‘restore’ something, that thing had to have once existed. Is the ‘restoration of all things’ speaking of the same things mentioned in Ephesians 2:10 (the nearly unknown verse immediately following the ever popular and oft quoted verses 8 & 9.) “*For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God has **before ordained** that we should walk in them.*” What was ordained before? The specific point of our being ‘created in Christ’ is to reorient us into a situation of **keeping** those things that were **before ordained!** Hardly the picture of a ministry of legal abandonment or abolition!

It’s interesting to notice how the conceptualization of the word ‘fulfilled’ has been reasoned around to where it is seen as effectively meaning: “kept to such degree that **we** need not keep it any more”!, effectively canceling its applicability in ‘Christian’ life. However, pursuing that through to its logical conclusion leaves the question, what about the non-religious person? Are they also ‘exempted from having to keep the law’? (Aren’t they already?) If so, what is sin, or how is it possible to sin?

If the scripture is reliable when it says “*sin is the transgression of the law*” what law would that be? It would be strange IF the unconverted person were under obligation to keep the law, but on becoming converted, becomes released from any such obligation. Yet, when thinking it through, that seems to be the perception of many.

### How Does One Sin?

Under what covenant does one need to be in order for it to be possible to acquire the ability to sin? Was it possible to sin prior to the giving of the Law at Mount Sinai? Can the person who was never under the Old Covenant, (or never under any covenant), have the ability to commit sin? Did it become no longer possible to sin after the Old Covenant was supposedly abolished?

The faulty premise, that the Ten Commandments ARE the Old Covenant, is exposed under these considerations. Christ’s fulfillment was left as an example we should follow, (1<sup>st</sup> Pet. 2:21-22) not one we should use to excuse a disregard of the Law. The ‘way of righteousness’ is defined late in the New Testament Era as ‘the holy commandment delivered unto them!’ (2<sup>nd</sup> Pet. 2:21-22) Obviously, these refer to the Ten Commandments. This


opinion of Peter was written as late as 66AD, thirty six years into the ‘New Covenant’ era!

### The CARNAL Mind

Appropriate to this discourse is the term “a carnal mind”. It’s a state of mind, found in the ‘naturally-minded’ people. So, we would expect it to be the natural inclination of anyone who is truly UN-converted, would we not? Is there a natural desire to keep God’s Laws, but upon becoming converted, a person comes to the astounding realization that there IS NO NEED to do such a thing? A right-thinking person would see such reasoning as completely unhinged from reality.

The very scripture where we find this term used is quite clear that it is the natural inclination to NOT KEEP the Law. “*For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is **not subject to the law of God**, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*” (Rom. 8:6-8) What should be clear is that it is not normal, nor natural, for a person to regard himself as subject to the Laws of God. But when we see religious people absolving themselves of any obligation to keep the Law, and intimidating or discouraging anyone else from the idea that they NEED to keep anything (especially if found in the Old Testament), we should be able to clearly SEE the problem!

There is a line of reasoning which pours forth from the carnal (natural) mind that is consistent with and fully indistinguishable from that of an unconverted person’s thought processes. Where their counter-arguments gain credibility is when the issue of “earning ones’ salvation” is brought into the picture. Those verses which seem to leave aside any need to keep the Law are presented entirely in the context of earning what is a free Gift. Earning ones’ salvation is impossible by WORKS. Our law-keeping is the appropriate **response** to having been forgiven, it’s NOT the MEANS of it.

Other articles address the issue of why Law keeping is incumbent upon those who have been ‘justified’. Search the listings for those topics. 

---

#151 *What’s WORKS Got to Do With It?*

#165 *Grace, Works and Reward*

#94 *Oh, For the Love of God!*

#9 *We are NOT Under the Law*