

**THE GOSPEL ACCOUNTS ARE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT**

2 Timothy 2:15

## INTRODUCTION

- A. There are some who teach that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are not part of the New Testament but are a part of the Old Testament Law of Moses.
- B. The main reason for this is to remove, restrict, or change the nature of the obligation in MT 19:9.
- C. If Jesus said something while He was on the earth and later it is quoted by an apostle and recorded by an inspired writer, it would show that the Lord's statement was intended to be a part of the NT.
- D. How may one prove that Matthew is New Testament doctrine?
- E. Those who are teaching that it is not say that one must find something new that Jesus taught that is, something that was not simply a restatement of or a clarification of something earlier given by Moses.
- F. Let us look at some arguments.

## DISCUSSION

- I. THAT MATTHEW 19:9 WAS NOT TEACHING WHAT DEUTERONOMY 24:1 TAUGHT.
  - A. MT 19:9 and DT 24:1. They say that Christ in MT 19:9 is simply reaffirming what Moses wrote in DT 24.
  - B. If this is so, this would mean that Jesus taught that under the Law of Moses:
    - 1. That whoever married a woman put away unlawfully (for reasons other than fornication) would be committing adultery, and...
    - 2. That whoever married a woman put away lawfully (for fornication) would not be committing adultery.
  - C. But, according to the Law of Moses:
    - 1. If a husband suspected fornication on the part of his wife, he could have the matter tested – NU 5:11-31 (the law of Jealousy).
      - a. If she were innocent, he could not divorce her according to those who are teaching that MT 19:9 is reaffirming the Law of Moses.
      - b. If she were guilty she could be divorced and would be free to remarry according to those who are teaching that MT 19:9 is reaffirming the Law of Moses.
    - 2. But, Moses taught that if she were guilty, she would be cursed among the people (5:27). She would not be a Scriptural future bride for any man.
    - 3. If there were witnesses to a married woman's fornication, she was to be put to death. LE 20:10; DT 19:15; 22:22.
    - 4. If a husband falsely charged his wife with pre-marital fornication, he could never divorce here. DT 22:19.
    - 5. The "uncleanness" of DT 24:1 cannot be past sexual uncleanness (fornication) in the case of a girl who becomes a wife for the first time, because that girl was to be killed – not divorced. DT 22:13-21.
    - 6. Therefore, this means that in MT 19:9 Jesus was not teaching what DT 24:1 taught.
  - D. Is Jesus clarifying DT 24:1? If He was, then...
    - 1. He was doing what no other prophet of God ever did when he taught on marriage – Cf. ML 2:14-16.
    - 2. He was "clarifying" what would not possibly be understood without clarification (if MT 19:9 is that clarification).

3. His "clarification" amounted to a conflict with OT marriage law.
  4. His "clarification" was made just before the law was terminated!
- E. If Jesus is clarifying DT 24:1, such means that throughout Judaism, since God suffered men to put away their wives (because of the hardness of their hearts and not because of the fornication of their wives), then God was suffering or allowing on the part of hard-hearted men the plain violation of Divine marriage/divorce law. This would have God contradicting Himself. Cf. TS 1:2; HE 6:18.
- F. Let us look at LK 16:16.
1. If this verse teaches anything at all, it is saying that some new era or period started with John.
  2. Though the Law of Moses was still in force for the Jews, CO 2:14, God through John was imposing new obligations on the Jews that were not strictly a part of the Law of Moses. Cf. ML 4:5. John called on the Jews to repent and to believe on Christ – MK 1:1-8; Acts 19:4.
  3. The Law and the prophets were in some sense "until John," next John did his work with a view toward the coming of Christ, and then Christ came.
  4. Since MT 19:9 is not a clarification of DT 24:1 – it was new material.
- G. If Jesus taught "nothing" other than the Law of Moses, then why did He make disciples?
1. Remember: John came with new obligations.
    - a. Acts 19:4 – Believe in Christ to come.
    - b. MT 3:8 – Repent of sin.
    - c. MT 3:6 – Confess sin.
    - d. MK 1:4 – Baptized for the remission of sins.
  2. If Jesus did nothing in His teaching but teach the Law of Moses, then He did less than John, who was preparing for Him!
- II. THAT IT IS FALSE TO SAY THAT ALL JESUS TAUGHT WAS THE LAW OF MOSES.
- A. If Jesus authorized the doing of one thing that was not authorized by the Law of Moses as binding on all the Jews, then it is false to say that all Jesus taught was the Law of Moses.
1. It is correct to say that Jesus lived under the law – GA 4:4.
  2. It is not correct to say that all Jesus taught was the Law of Moses. He taught the Law of Moses, but He did more than that.
- B. Jesus under the law – GA 4:4.
1. He obeyed the Law of Moses – 2 CO 5:21; 1 PE 2:22; IS 53.
  2. Taught other Jews to obey the Law of Moses – MT 23:3; 5:17-20.
  3. Called on Jews to accept Him as the Messiah of OT prophecy – MT 23:10; JN 9:5; 5:45-47; 4:25-26; MT 12:41-42.
  4. Declared rights that would become available later – MK 7:19; JN 10:10, 16; 4:21.
  5. Gave obligations that would go into effect later – MT 26:26-29; 19:9.
  6. Lived "beyond" the requirement of the Law of Moses and taught "beyond" the requirement of the Law of Moses.
    - a. MT 5:43-48 – Jesus defines the word "enemy." (Jew and non-Jew).
    - b. MT 22:37-40 – Jesus defines the word "neighbor" – Cf. LK 10:25-27. Those respecting the New Covenant would love all men.
    - c. JN 13:13; RO 5:6-10.
  7. Predicted the time when Gentiles and Jews would be united together and to God by the Gospel – MT 8:11-12; JN 10:16; 11:47-53.

8. Predicted that the Gospel would be preached throughout the world before the Fall of Jerusalem – MT 24:14; cf. CO 1:23.
- C. Did Jesus ever while on earth command anything not demanded by the Law of Moses?
1. YES!
  2. MT 26:26-29 – Apostles were under obligation to be part of the inaugural Lord’s Supper.
  3. MT 10:5-14 – Apostles were placed under obligation to preach to the Jews – limited commission.
  4. JN 14:15.
  5. JN 15:14.
- III. THAT JESUS SAID SOMETHING THAT WAS NOT A PART OF THE LAW OF MOSES.
- A. Jesus would not have imposed obligations on the Jews which would authorize their violation of Moses. MT 5:19. If Jesus authorized duties and/or options not authorized by the Law of Moses Jesus authorized them to be done after the Law of Moses was terminated.
- B. Why Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are not a part of the Law of Moses.
1. The scope of obligation imposed by them – “all men.” MT 28:18-20; MK 16:15-16; LK 24:44-49; JN 10:16; 11:51-52.
  2. Some things authorized by them could not be practiced by the Jews under the Law of Moses. MK 7:19; MT 26:26-28.
  3. These books were written by the authority of Christ which distinguishes them from the 39 books that preceded them. HE 1:1-2; JN 14:26; 16:1, 13.
    - a. Matthew was written about A.D. 50 (Acts 15:36) to the Jews.
    - b. Mark was written about A. D. 65 – for the benefit of the Romans.
    - c. Luke was written about A.D. 58 (Acts 21:15) – wrote to the Gentiles.
    - d. John was written about A.D. 66.
  4. If these books are not part of the NT doctrine, then for whom did God write these books? If they were a part of the Law of Moses they were strictly written for the Jews – Cf. PS 147:19-20; RO 9:4. But Luke wrote to a Greek! Why would God send Jewish law to a non-Jew?
  5. If these books are part of the OT canon, they were being added to it immediately before the law was terminated as a binding authority on Jews.
  6. If Jesus did not more with the law than to quote it and clarify it, then why did God want Jewish obligation clarified just before the law was removed as a binding authority?
  7. All four of them were written after the crucifixion of Christ at which point the Law of Moses was taken out of the way. CO 2:14.
  8. If they are a part of the OT Law of Moses then God had them to write additional material for the Law of Moses AFTER the Law of Moses was dead. So the material was inoperative at the very time it first came from the pen of the writers.
- C. Look at the charts on “The Inter-Testament Period.”
- D. History AFTER the cross!

#### CONCLUSION

- A. Since we have seen that Matthew is a part of the Law of Christ – the New Testament – it follows that Mark, Luke, and John are also part of the Law of Christ – the New Testament.
- B. The teachings (doctrines) of Jesus MUST be obeyed – JN 12:48.