

---

# The Christian and God's Law: Two Views

---

*Jonathan Bayes and Christopher Bennett*

---

## **Are the Ten Commandments for Today? Jonathan Bayes**

Are the Ten Commandments for Christians today? This question has occupied quite a bit of attention in the course of Church history. The traditional evangelical answer has been, 'yes, indeed'.

During the Reformation period the term, 'the third use of the law' came into vogue. It refers to the use of God's moral law, summarised in the Ten Commandments, as the rule of life for the believer. Incidentally, the first two uses of the law are (1) to convict of sin and drive the repentant sinner to Christ, and (2) to put a restraint on lawlessness in society so that the world doesn't collapse into anarchy. These uses apply only to the moral component of the law, which both Jews and Christians have traditionally distinguished from the ceremonial and civil parts of the law.

At various times in Christian history the third use of the law has been challenged. Even today there are those who say that the Ten Commandments are not for Christians now. Different people say this for different reasons. We can distinguish three main groups.

At the extreme there are those who think that, because salvation is by grace, nothing we do can jeopardise our salvation, so there is simply no need to worry about all the effort involved in trying to keep commandments: if we sin, there is instant forgiveness, so who cares?<sup>1</sup>

Another group of people are (quite rightly) horrified by such talk. We ought to be living good, upright, Christlike lives, they insist. However, they don't think that keeping the Ten Commandments is the way to do it. Their argument is that we have the Holy Spirit, and he will make us holy, so we mustn't worry ourselves about external things like law: just walk in the Spirit, and all will be well.<sup>2</sup>

Yet a third group is anxious that this second approach is just a bit too glib. It forgets that sin remains inside us, fighting against the Holy Spirit. One of the things which tips the battle in the Spirit's favour is God's moral standards written down for us to think about: the Spirit, they correctly recognise, always works through the word. However, the part of God's word which we need to concern ourselves with is the New Testament. That is where we must find our Christian principles, not in the Old Testament. The Ten Commandments were given to Israel for a limited time, they were the document of the old covenant, and now that Christ has come, now that the new covenant is in force, the Ten Commandments as our law code are finished. It is the teaching of Jesus and the apostles which is our guide.<sup>3</sup>

I want now to demonstrate from Scripture that all three of these positions are wrong.

The first can be dealt with quite quickly. It is a heresy called 'practical antinomianism', which Paul came up against and mentions in his letter to the

Romans. These people's favourite text is Romans 6:14, 'you are not under law but under grace'. From here they draw the conclusion that we may freely sin: in fact, if we continue in sin, grace will abound.

Paul's answer is that grace has already abounded as much as it possibly can in the obedience of Jesus Christ to death on the cross. In that death, we died to sin, so the idea that we can go on living in sin is preposterous. A changed life is the vital evidence that we really have been born again. This is the message of Romans 5:19–6:4.

But what is it to walk in newness of life?

Our second group jumps in immediately with the answer: it is to walk according to the Spirit. Their position is often called 'doctrinal antinomianism'. They might refer to Romans 8:4–9. They insist that the sanctified life of the justified believer will conform to the righteous standards of God's moral law, but we are not to be trying to keep the law. That would be a fleshly approach. We are to rely on the Spirit, and he will produce in us a life to please God.

What this teaching overlooks is the way the New Testament consistently holds the Spirit and the word together. The work of the Spirit in our lives is mediated through the word. Otherwise God would treat us as something less than the responsible creatures he made us to be.

To be born again is to be made new. It is to have a new will to obey what our new heart delights in—namely, the law which our new mind has come to understand in its far-reaching implications. So God chooses to channel his work in our lives via his word.

The apostle refers to this in Romans 7:6. Up to this point in the epistle, when talking about the law, Paul has been mainly concerned with what theologians came to call 'the first use of the law'. It is the law in that sense from which we have been delivered. The first function of the law is to expose us as sinners, and drive us, repentant to Christ as Saviour. Once we have put our trust in Christ the law has served its purpose in that respect, so we are delivered from it in that respect.

But we are still servants of God. It is significant that the apostle contrasts 'the newness of the Spirit' with 'the oldness of the letter', not the oldness of the law. Later on in the same chapter he says that the law is spiritual (v. 14). So the newness of the Spirit cannot exclude the law. 'The letter' means the law misunderstood, the law regarded as a mere piece of writing which we struggle to obey independently of the Spirit. That is the typical attitude to the law of the unconverted moral person: 'I do my best; I don't do anyone any harm; I try to live a good life'. But the unconverted moral person fails to see that it is impossible for him or her to live a good-enough life without the power of the Spirit.

Earlier in Romans Paul has introduced the subject of the Spirit and the law. In chapter 2, where he is speaking particularly to his fellow Jews, he draws their attention to Christian Gentiles, who do not by nature have the law, as the Jews did, and yet who obey the law because it is written on their heart (vv. 14–15).

He returns to this theme a few verses later. He contrasts in verses 25 and 26 the Jew and the Gentile as circumcised and uncircumcised, and goes on to point out that sometimes a Jew, despite having the law in writing, transgresses it, whereas a Gentile

obeys it (v. 27). Obviously he is thinking about Gentiles who have been converted. He then says that to be a true Jew is not merely a matter of ethnicity. It has to do with the heart.

Paul is thinking of Moses' words to the children of Israel in Deuteronomy 10:16: 'Circumcise the foreskin of your heart'. In the context this phrase is sandwiched between two references to obedience to God's law (Deut. 10:12–13; 11:1). The circumcised heart is evidenced by the obedient life, and as Paul says in Romans 2:29, this is a work of the Spirit. Again, the Spirit is contrasted, not with law, but with the letter. The law can be wrongly used as a mere piece of writing. However, its right use in the life of the true believer, Jew or Gentile, is as the channel of the Spirit.

But this leads on to the question, where do we, as Christians today, find the law through which the Spirit works out holiness in our lives?

This is where we must consider the third group which we identified. Their answer is clear and straightforward: in the New Testament. It is the teaching of Jesus and the apostles which we are required to obey. This position is often called 'New Covenant Theology'. Those who hold this view recognise that most of the Ten Commandments are re-stated in the New Testament, and are, therefore, part of the pattern of moral life for the Christian believer. However, we obey them, not because they are the Ten Commandments, but because we find them in the New Testament. The Ten Commandments (as a document) are dead, but that does not mean that the morality of the Ten Commandments is obsolete. But to find out which of the Ten Commandments are moral principles, we have to discover them in the New Testament.

These people conclude that the Sabbath commandment is not a moral one which must be obeyed today because, they claim, it is repealed by the New Testament. That is why the early Church abolished the Sabbath and began to assemble instead on the day of Christ's resurrection.

They argue, therefore, against the doctrine of the third use of the law (the teaching that God's moral law as summarised in the Ten Commandments is the pattern for the Christian life). For one thing, the Ten Commandments are not a summary of God's moral law. For another, the law as given to Israel cannot be dissected into constituent parts, and is of no use to the Christian today as a rule of life.

These points may be answered by two considerations, the first specific, the second more general.

The specific consideration concerns the Biblical status of the Sabbath law.

The first thing to note is that the Sabbath already existed before the Ten Commandments were given. In fact it goes right back to creation. Genesis 2:3 tells us that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day—and this is given in Exodus 20:11 as a reason why his people should keep the day holy (v. 8). The day cannot be made holy by human beings. It has been holy since creation, because God sanctified it. Human responsibility is to keep that holiness and avoid profaning it. The people were reminded of this in the way that the manna was provided in Exodus 16. The Sabbath already existed then, several weeks before the giving of the law at Sinai.

The 'New Covenant Theologians' tell us that, if we believe that the Sabbath command is part of God's moral law, then we ought to be Seventh Day Adventists and hold our services on Saturdays. However, we need to note that even in Old

Testament times Sabbaths didn't always fall on Saturdays. This is obvious if we compare Leviticus 16:29–31 and 23:24 and 39. From these verses we learn that every seventh month there were Sabbaths on the 1st, 10th and 15th days. You don't need to be a mathematical genius to see that those three dates couldn't all fall on Saturdays.

It is true that the New Testament makes those festal Sabbaths a matter of indifference: they were destined for oblivion as fulfilled in Christ (Col. 2:16). However, the fact of the festal Sabbaths does emphasise the point that there is nothing intrinsic about a Saturday Sabbath.

1 Corinthians 16:2 suggests that the day of the Lord's resurrection was already the day set aside for Christian gatherings during the apostolic age. Hebrews 4 is all about rest, but it uses two different Greek words for rest. Usually it uses the word from which we get our word 'pause'. However, the word used in verse 9 is connected with the word 'Sabbath'. The point of the chapter seems to be that through faith we enter into rest: we have ceased from works. In other words, we rest in the work of Jesus, and do not rely on our own efforts for salvation. Verse 9 adds this: there remains a reminder of that fact in the weekly Sabbath which we celebrate on the Lord's Day.

The more general consideration can only be briefly touched on. It is this: the tendency of New Covenant Theology to drive a wedge between the Testaments is at odds with the teaching of the New Testament itself. Paul speaks of the Old Testament as inspired by God and therefore profitable for the Christian's training in righteousness. Moreover, Jesus stated quite plainly that he had not come to annul the law (Matt. 5:17–20). The way in which he continues makes it clear that it is the moral law summarised in the Ten Commandments which he has in mind. At a key point in his instructions on Christian ethics, Paul quotes the Ten Commandments (Rom. 13:9).

Are the Ten Commandments for Christians today? Most certainly. They sum up the life of holiness to which we are called. They are the channel for the Spirit's sanctifying power.

## References

- <sup>1</sup> This position is represented by the once fashionable idea that it is possible to separate acceptance of Jesus as Saviour from acceptance of him as Lord. It was popularized by Zane Hodges and opposed by John MacArthur in his Book *Faith Works: The Gospel According to the Apostles* (Dallas, Word, 1993).
- <sup>2</sup> This position is represented, for example, by Michael Eaton: see his *How to Live a Godly Life: The Biblical Doctrine of Sanctification* (Tonbridge, Sovereign World, 1993).
- <sup>3</sup> Probably the leading proponent of this position has been John Reisinger. See the following three of his books: *Abraham's Four Seeds: An examination of the basic principles of Covenant Theology and Dispensationalism as they each relate to the promise of God to 'Abraham and his seed'* (Venetia, Sound of Grace, 1987); *Tablets of Stone* (Southbridge, Crowne, 1989); *The Law/Grace Controversy: A Defense of the Sword and Trowel and the Council on Baptist Theology* (Sterling, Grace Abounding Ministries, 1982).

---

*Rev. Dr Jonathan Bayes is minister of Hambleton Evangelical Church, Carlton Minniot, near Thirsk.*

---

## **Not under law, but not without God's law. Christopher Bennett**

**W**hat is the role of God's law, his commands, in the Christian life; and in particular the Mosaic law including the 10 Commandments? A lot of ink has been spilled and is currently being spilled on this issue already, but I have been asked to spill a little more on the other side of the matter from Jonathan Bayes, and I am happy to do so, because of the truth not because of Jonathan.

### **A Old Testament and New Testament**

We must first understand the overall shape of the Bible: it is centred on Christ. OT is promise, NT is fulfilment; or perhaps better, OT is preparation for Christ and the kingdom, and the NT is the arrival of the Messiah-king, bringing in the kingdom. OT prophecy and typology show this to be the case, as does Jesus' use of the OT (e.g. Jonah), and then we have Matt. 12:39–41; see also Mark 1:15; Galatians 4:4–5.

Furthermore the major interpretative keys are not in the OT but in the NT: Ephesians 3:5 (and see vv. 1–13) makes it clear that there is new light from heaven in the NT, it's not all there in the OT. We need the NT to understand the OT, but we do not in the same way need the OT to understand the NT. We can start in the NT. Tyndale realised this when he said that Romans was a way in unto the whole OT; the Westminster divines acknowledged this in part in the 1640s when they let the NT determine what they did about the 4th Commandment (changing its observance to a Sunday); and Graeme Goldsworthy does this in the early chapters of *According to Plan*. There he says that it is the witness of the NT that shows us what the relationship between the OT and the gospel event actually is. If we try to understand Exodus to Deuteronomy on its own terms and work out the relationship between the Christian and the Mosaic law from Moses, we will end up with one view, and we will have a tendency to make Paul fit into that view; but if we start with the gospel event as explained in the NT and then come to Exodus to Deuteronomy, we will come to a different view of that relationship, and it is more likely to be the right one! The starting point in interpretation is crucial. Start at the centre, where all the lines meet, not in Exodus.

### **B Brief statement of the results of this perspective**

The NT shows us that Christ has brought the OT to fulfilment and this includes bringing the OT law to its intended goal in his own finished work as well as in his ethical teaching; the result is that we are not under law—any law—for justification, that is our standing before God, nor does law, even Christ's law (let alone Moses') have the same place in the Christian life that it had for God's Old Covenant people; nor is Mosaic law our primary ethical guide but rather a secondary rule, to be interpreted and applied through NT eyes and in the light of our primary, direct responsibility, to keep the law of Christ and his apostles in the NT.

In a word: Christ has fulfilled the law and we are not under it. This by no means implies that we do not have moral obligations or that we should not sorrow and repent when we sin; but it does mean we are justified by Christ's blood, motivated and empowered by the Spirit, and externally guided principally through the NT's ethics, and by OT law as seen in the light of its fulfilment in the work and teaching of Christ. One

implication of this is that neither Saturday nor Sunday is a Mosaic-type Sabbath, but that Sunday is the Lord's Day which is not quite the same.

## C Exegesis—Paul

I make no apology for basing this largely on the teaching of Paul, the most systematic and integrative writer in the whole Bible. Why shouldn't we think that he has been given the task of putting everything together on this issue, as he clearly has on so many others?

**Romans 6:14** says we are not under law but under grace. It has often been said by those who hold the 10 Commandments to be crucial for our sanctification that it is only in the matter of *justification* that we are under law. However, what is remarkable in Paul is that time and again he says we are not under law in contexts where he is talking about living the Christian life every bit as much as our justified status, if not more. So here: Romans 6:1–14 is about how we live—do we sin so that grace may abound? This shows that not being under law is a much wider and bigger thing than not being justified by law. We are in a new realm (see also Colossians 1:13) where we are under grace and the Spirit and Christ, not in the realm of law, sin, death and Satan.

Before leaving Romans 6, it is at the very least interesting to note that when Paul mentions the idea of sinning so that grace may abound, he does not say in vv. 2ff what many a Westminster Confession person has surely been inclined to: 'You *are* still under the law as a rule of life.' In other words, the Biblical answer to possible abuses of grace is not law but a right understanding of God's saving grace!

**Romans 7:4** makes a similar point: it is no longer being married to the law but to Christ instead that produces a holy life for us. This is not to say that Christ does not *use* Biblical commands in our lives, but it is our relationship to Christ that is crucial, not the operations of the law. Verse 6 is along similar lines.

**Romans 7:7–12** tells us that God's law, because of our sinful natures, increases sin in practice.

**Romans 7:14–25**: whatever this passage means—and I am increasingly inclined to think that Martyn Lloyd-Jones was on target or very near it—it certainly shows that the law is not the answer to sin and does not produce a holy life, even if we love the law and try to keep it.

**1 Corinthians 9:20–21**: Paul says he is not under law (*hypo nomon*), but then says he is outside of the law, without it (*anomos*); and to correct the false impression that the readers may get that he is lawless altogether, he adds that he is not without God's law, in fact he is subject to Christ's law (*ennomos Christou*). In other words, he has moral obligations to obey God, and for Paul these are summed up in the ethical teaching of Christ and in the moral imperatives that flow from his gospel (for this last concept, see 1 Timothy 1:10–11). Note first that Paul does not use the phrase 'under the law of Christ' (*hypo nomon Christou*) but *ennomos*, 'in a relationship of obligation to obey'. Secondly note that it is the law of Christ not of Moses. See also Galatians 6:2. Nowhere in his letters does Paul say we are under the law, (*hypo nomon*).

**2 Corinthians 3** is all about the superiority of the new covenant to the old, and describes the Mosaic covenant (and therefore law) as fading away or being destroyed in v. 11. The glory of the NT is not law but the Spirit, v. 17–18. It is beholding as in a mirror the glory of Christ that changes us as the Spirit works in us. And Christ's glory shines in the gospel (see 4:4–6).

**Galatians**—of course! Chapter 3:15–25 is about salvation-history, not (directly) personal experience. Why did God give the law of Moses? Not to give us life. It convicts of sin (v. 22) and is a child-minder (*paidagogos* is not a schoolmaster) to look after the people of God until Christ came. It had a temporary function. Verse 24 says that law was our child-minder ‘until Christ’ (*eis Christon*), better translated in the NIV margin that in its text: ‘until Christ came’ not ‘to lead us to Christ’. Hence v. 25: we are no longer under the law as our child-minder. The whole relationship of the people of God to the law has changed with the coming of Christ.

The idea that in Galatians Paul is not dealing with the Mosaic law and our relationship to it but with the law as misunderstood by legalistic people in the first century looks like a subconscious attempt to squeeze Paul into the 17th century’s theology of still being under the law in some sense, rather than something that flows out of the text. Paul purports to be telling us in Galatians 3 why the law was given (3:19)—why not accept that here is the Biblical theology of the Mosaic law and the Christian? Start here, not in Exodus to Deuteronomy.

**Galatians 5:13–25** is of a piece with ch. 3. The way to avoid moral laxity in the light of the freedom of grace is not to go back to the law and a life lived closely following it in all its regulations, but to walk in the Spirit (v. 16), to keep in step with the Spirit (v. 25). What produces holiness is the Spirit (v. 22), and therefore if we walk in harmony with him, we will be godly, which will end up fulfilling the overall intention and thrust of God’s law, which is to love others. In v. 14 Paul is not saying that the key procedural thing in true piety is to keep the law in all its details; rather he is saying that if we love and serve one another we will end up fulfilling the law’s spirit and intention.

**Ephesians 2:15** says that Christ has abolished the law.

**Colossians 2:16–17** mentions the Sabbath as a shadow fulfilled in Christ. The plural, *sabbaton*, is used, but this does not mean that translations are wrong in saying ‘Sabbath’, because the Greek for one Sabbath is normally plural in form. Even if, as is probably the case, Paul has Sabbaths other than the weekly Saturday one in mind as well as the weekly one, is there anything to suggest that the weekly Sabbath is excluded from *sabbaton* in Colossians 2:16? No, nothing; and therefore the Mosaic Sabbath is a shadow that has now gone with the coming of Christ. And *therefore it cannot have been transferred to Sunday*. Sunday as the Lord’s Day must be something different from the Mosaic Sabbath moved a little.

The fact that Romans 14:5 speaks happily of all days being equal, and that there is no record of the apostles telling the early Christians to refuse to work on Sunday even if they got into trouble for it, all serves to back up the idea that Sunday is a day when it is especially appropriate to meet with other believers and celebrate Christ’s complete work for us, but that we are not under a law of doing no work, let alone enjoying no secular (whatever that means) recreation (of course, sinful recreations and entertainments are to be avoided 7 days a week). Calvin saw the logic of this, though he didn’t quite follow it through on the rest of the Mosaic law (*Institutes* 2.28.28–34).

**1 Timothy 1:9** says that the law is for sinners not the righteous. Of course a bald antithesis like this need not mean that it has absolutely no place in the life of the righteous, but it surely does mean at least that the law is mainly for non-Christians, to convict them of sin and to restrain sin in the community. The tergiversations of Calvin,

Hendrickson and George Knight to make out that Paul has in mind the Christians Timothy is dealing with, when he talks about ‘law-breakers’, ‘the irreligious’, ‘killers of fathers,’ and ‘killers of mothers’ etc., are wondrous to behold, but not very convincing. If there ever was a knock-down argument for the primacy of the historical ‘first use of the law’ over the ‘third use’, particularly when we have Mosaic law in mind, it is here. And if ever there were obscure passages in commentaries, the three brethren have provided them!

Before I leave Paul, what about the places in Ephesians 4–6 where he uses the 10 Commandments to enforce godly living? Well, I am not saying that OT law has no relevance to the Christian life, but that it is not our primary code and needs contextualising in the light of Christ’s coming and teaching. In Ephesians 4–6 Paul contextualises Moses into the Christian era; the only Commandment he quotes is the 5th, and he changes the wording of the promise attached to it in a significant way.

## **D Exegesis—other passages**

But what about **Matthew 5:17–20**, and especially v. 18: ‘Truly I say to you, until heaven and earth disappear, not one jot or one tittle will pass from the law, until everything is accomplished.’ How can I therefore say that law of Moses has in any sense gone?

If the ‘all things’ at the end of v. 18 means the end of the world, and if no fundamental change in the believer’s relation to the Mosaic law is permitted because of our understanding of the earlier part of the verse, then all Christians must definitely offer animal sacrifices, avoid polycotton shirts, and do no work on Saturdays. If on the other hand ‘until everything is accomplished’ does not repeat the ‘until’ clause earlier in the sentence, and means ‘until all that the law looked forward to happens’ (which is what was happening in the ministry of Jesus), then the law, though not altered in itself, can change in its relation to us who are in Christ, in this era of fulfilment.

Furthermore, beware of thinking that ‘fulfil’ in Matt. 5:17 must mean something like ‘restate’ or ‘reinforce’. The NT fulfils the OT not just in terms of predictions. Matt. 1:23 has a prediction being fulfilled, but Matt. 2:14–15 is about an historical statement being ‘fulfilled’: Hosea 11:1 is about the historical fact of Israel, God’s son, being called out of Egypt. This is ‘fulfilled’ when Jesus, God’s Son, comes out of Egypt as a young child. Matt. 5:17 uses ‘fulfil’ of ‘the law and the prophets’, and in the rest of the chapter Jesus shows how the OT commands are ‘fulfilled’ in his teaching. Some of them are deepened by him (v. 21–30), some of them have Rabbinic confusion cleared from them, but some of them are also *changed*, v. 31–37. The concept of fulfilment that fits all these, in Matt. 1, 2, and 5, is that of *bringing something to its intended goal or climax*. This is what Jesus does with all the OT, the law of Moses included (this may be backed up by Rom. 10:4 as well, if ‘end’ there is understood as ‘goal’).

So by his life and saving work, and *in his teaching*, Jesus is bringing the whole OT to its intended goal. The law of Moses, including the 10 Commandments, is not a literal set of rules in its final form, expressing God’s will for Christians—we have to look at OT law through Jesus and the NT teaching, the ‘law of Christ’ (Gal. 6:2; 1 Cor. 9:21).

As for **Hebrews 4:9**—there is yet a *sabbatismos* for the people of God—the context gives no hint that this is Sunday as Sabbath, but rather it is glory, and the rest of faith now which is a foretaste of it.

## **E How do we put all this together, in terms of the role of Mosaic law today?**

The Mosaic law was an expression of God's holiness in terms of Israel, one nation long ago, and in terms of the people of God in their immature state before Christ came. It is fulfilled by Jesus, both in his life and death, and in his teaching and that of his apostles. He fulfilled some things *in our place* (the animal sacrifices, and the commands that were ceremonial), but the more moral parts of the law are telling us about how to live, but not always in a direct literal way—things have changed.

So 'don't muzzle an ox when it is treading the grain' has become 'pay Christian preachers a decent wage.'

'Don't murder' has become 'don't murder and don't even be angry, hateful, insulting.'

'Don't commit adultery' has become 'don't commit adultery and don't even lust after other women.'

'Love your neighbour' has become 'love your neighbour and love your enemy too'.

'Remove the evil man from among you' has become 'excommunicate unrepentant church members who have committed serious offences.'

The Sabbath (Saturday holy, with no work at all) has become the Lord's Day (Sunday special, with meeting other Christians to celebrate Christ's completed saving work).

Not coveting your neighbour's ox has become not coveting his Mercedes.

Having a long life in Canaan has become having a long life on the earth (see Eph. 6:2).

And so on.

## **F Practical conclusions**

1. The law of Moses, including the 10 Commandments, is not the direct set of regulations for the Christian—we are not under it any more. Instead we are obliged to obey Jesus' commands (Matt. 28:19), the 'law of Christ' (Gal. 6:2; 1 Cor. 9:21—which means we have Christ's law, rather than that we are actually 'under' it), i.e. love others by the power of the Spirit, and bear his fruit.

2. The law of Moses is relevant to the Christian because it shows us God's holiness, and its principles still apply and guide us, as long as we interpret it through Christ and the NT (see above for some examples).

3. Laws of *any* kind, in OT or NT, are not meant to be nearly as prominent or central in our Christian lives as they were in the lives of God's people between Moses and Christ. We have come from an era of law into an era of grace, John 1:17. Gal. 5:13–26 clarifies this: Ex. 16:4 and Lev. 18:4 say 'Walk according to laws', but Gal. 5:16 says 'Walk in the Spirit.' The Spirit does indeed *use* the whole Bible, including the commands in it, to educate our consciences and our inner sense of right and wrong. But in terms of daily life, making ordinary decisions, reacting to people and situations, expressing ourselves, etc., we are not meant to be continually referring to any written code of rules, but acting in line with Christ whom we are in fellowship with through the Spirit. In this way, the saying of Hebrews 8:10 is fulfilled: in the new covenant the will of God is written on our hearts, not only in terms of desire and ability to keep it but also in terms of it becoming increasingly natural, intuitive, to sense what is pleasing to God. Hence also we serve in the newness of the Spirit and not in the oldness of the written

code, Rom. 7:6. Life is meant to be like a walk with a loving and wise father, or like being married, rather than like being a low-grade official working for the council who has to follow detailed regulations for everything. The chain of causation in Gal. 5:13–26 is *not*: study and keep rules—love—please God and walk in the Spirit.

Rather it is the very reverse: walk in the Spirit (v. 16, 25)—love (v. 22)—fulfil the true intention and spirit of the law, almost accidentally (v. 14, 23).

Of course walking in the Spirit, love and obeying God all belong together; but where do we start? What is the procedure? What is the key thing? The key is not the law (see Rom. 7:14–end); it is walking in the Spirit, i.e. active fellowship with God and sensitivity to the Spirit.

4. Keep Sunday as the Lord's Day not the Sabbath.

## Bibliography

*On the Sabbath:*

D.A. Carson (ed.) *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, (Zondervan), esp. last chapter by Andrew Lincoln, which sums up the book; don't miss pp. 368–371.

J. Laansma's article on *Lord's Day* in *Dictionary of the later New Testament and its developments*, ed. by Martin and Davids, IVP.

John Calvin, *Institutes* bk 2. ch. 28. secs 28–34.

*On law and related issues more generally:*

Douglas Moo's contributions to Strickland (ed.) *The law, the gospel and the modern Christian—5 views*. (Zondervan).

Commentaries on Matthew by D.A. Carson (Zondervan, part of EBC), R.T. France (IVP, the new TNTC), and Craig Blomberg (Broadman, the New American Commentary)—what they say on 5:17–20. (France's last page on the section, pp. 116–7 in British edition, is good summary).

Commentary on Romans by D. Moo (Eerdmans, the NICNT series)—what he says on 14:5.

Commentaries on Galatians by Edgar Andrews (Evangelical Press, Welwyn series), F.F. Bruce (Paternoster, the NIGTC series), Ronald Fung (Eerdmans, the NICNT), R. Longenecker (Word, the WBC series), and Ben Witherington (T and T Clark, called *Grace in Galatia*)—especially what they say on 3:15–25 and 5:13–26.

Commentaries on Colossians by F.F. Bruce (Eerdmans, the NICNT), Peter O'Brien (Word, the WBC) and N.T. Wright (IVP, the new TNTC)—what they say on 2:16–17. On the right approach to Biblical theology (i.e. viewing the OT in the light of the NT), see the first 7 chapters of G. Goldsworthy, *According to plan* (IVP).

Tapes by Douglas Moo from the *15th Annual John Bunyan Conference*, tapes 1 and 2 (I haven't heard 3 and 4); available from *Sounds of Grace*, PO Box 185, Webster, NY 14580, USA. These are all about the relationship between OT and NT.

John Reisinger, *Abraham's four seeds—a Biblical examination of the presuppositions of Covenant Theology and Dispensationalism*.

---

*Rev. Christopher Bennett, MA, is minister elect of Wilton Community Church, Muswell Hill, North London.*

---