

119

MINISTRIES

“The following is a direct script of a teaching that is intended to be presented via video, incorporating relevant text, slides, media, and graphics to assist in illustration, thus facilitating the presentation of the material. In some places, this may cause the written material to not flow or sound rather awkward in some places. In addition, there may be grammatical errors that are often not acceptable in literary work. We encourage the viewing of the video teachings to complement the written teaching you see below.”

Paul Was Not an Antinomian: A Rebuttal to Rabbi Tovia Singer

Did the apostle Paul oppose the Law of Moses and teach that Christians are not required to obey it? In other words, did he advocate for antinomianism?

Popular anti-missionary, Rabbi Tovia Singer, argues that he did. Rabbi Singer claims that Paul “detested” the Law of Moses and outright *discouraged* followers of Jesus—or Yeshua, as he is called in Hebrew—from following it.

But is there any truth to these claims? We contend that there is not. Paul was not an antinomian; he was a *pronomian*. He did not oppose the Torah or discourage obedience to it; instead, he upheld the Torah and taught followers of Yeshua to abide by it.

In this teaching, we will examine one of Rabbi Singer’s videos titled “Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?” Rabbi Singer’s video tries to make the case that Paul was an antinomian. We will address each of Rabbi Singer’s claims, highlight his errors, and clarify Paul’s position on the Law of Moses according to Paul’s own writings and what his earliest interpreters say.

But before we begin, it’s important to recognize what Rabbi Singer is actually attempting to do in this video. His goal isn’t to present an accurate portrayal of Paul. His ultimate goal is to lead believers away from the Messiah. After all, he openly admits to being an anti-missionary. So, he encourages believers to throw out Paul’s letters because Paul proclaims the gospel of Yeshua, and Rabbi Singer opposes the gospel of Yeshua. Hence, he seeks to discredit Paul as much as possible, often resorting to mischaracterizing Paul’s teachings. As we will see, when Rabbi Singer portrays Paul as an antinomian, it is not the result of a careful and honest reading of Paul’s letters. Instead, he relies on the most uncharitable and unbiblical interpretations he can find—interpretations that align with his agenda.

We should also warn you ahead of time that Rabbi Singer tends to just throw out a bunch of assertions, one after another, without much careful reasoning or argument. So, if this presentation seems somewhat “all over the place,” that’s because we are simply addressing his claims one by one as he presents them.

With that said, let’s get started:

I can't help but notice in the news how Christians want the Ten Commandments displayed in courts and schools in the public arena in the United States. But as it turns out, of the Ten Commandments itself, they don't accept "guard the Sabbath." Deuteronomy chapter 5, Exodus chapter 20: "Remember the Sabbath, keep it holy." That's gone. It's not their fault, as Paul instructed them that they don't need to keep the Sabbath.

—Rabbi Tovia Singer, "Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?" *YouTube*, Aug. 19, 2024.

So, Rabbi Singer points out that Christians today largely disregard the command to keep the Sabbath, but he says that this is Paul's fault, not theirs. He claims that Paul taught Christians that keeping the Sabbath is unnecessary.

We can understand Rabbi Singer's complaint about Christians not keeping the Sabbath. It is true that most modern Christians neglect this commandment, and that is quite unfortunate. For this reason, much of our work is dedicated to teaching Christians about the importance of the Sabbath and showing that the New Testament has not abolished it. Please see our many teachings on the topic

However, here it is important to highlight Rabbi Singer's main error, and it is an error that he repeats throughout his video. Rabbi Singer's error is this: he is not criticizing Paul's actual teachings, but rather, he is criticizing a distorted caricature of Paul. This caricature is based on *antinomian readings* of Paul's letters, which don't accurately reflect Paul's theology. While this caricature of Paul is, sadly, very popular among many Christians today, a growing number of Christians are rejecting it—and for good reason, as we will see.

To put it another way, Rabbi Singer blames Paul for the problem of Christian antinomianism, but the Paul of the New Testament is not the real culprit. Nowhere did Paul teach Christians to unhitch from the Torah or commandments like the Sabbath. Instead, it was *later Christian teachers* who promoted that idea for various reasons. Many simply misunderstood Paul's writings, while others, like the second-century heretic Marcion, deliberately twisted Paul's writings to say something that they don't say. The New Testament actually warns us about this, as we will see in a moment.

But first, one might ask, "Well how can I be sure that *your* interpretation of Paul is correct?" We have many teachings that explore Paul's perspective on the Torah, so you can examine our teachings and decide for yourself whether our reading of Paul is accurate and faithful to the text. But one key advantage of our reading of Paul is that it agrees with the understanding of Paul's earliest interpreters—those who personally knew him and who were very familiar with his theology. According to these interpreters, Paul remained committed to observing and teaching the Law of Moses, including the Sabbath.

For example, let's consider Luke, the author of the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts. Luke was Paul's traveling companion (Colossians 4:14; 2 Timothy 4:11; Philemon 1:24), and he gives us valuable insights into Paul's theology and practice. What does Luke say about Paul's perspective on the Sabbath? Well, Luke repeatedly highlights how Paul prioritized worshiping in the synagogue on the Sabbath (Acts 13:14, 27, 42, 44; 18:4). According to Luke, attending synagogue services on the Sabbath was Paul's "custom" (Acts 17:2). And even when there wasn't a synagogue in the area, this still did not stop Paul from keeping the Sabbath. In Acts 16:13, Luke records how Paul observed the Sabbath by going to the river outside Philippi for a prayer service. Moreover, the "apostolic decree," which Paul endorsed (Acts 16:4), included the expectation that even Gentile followers of Yeshua would attend synagogue services

every Sabbath to hear the Law of Moses proclaimed (Acts 15:21). So, throughout Acts, Luke portrays Paul as someone who prioritized the Sabbath as a day of rest, worship, and Scripture study. This behavior is not what we would expect from someone who “detested” the Law of Moses and disregarded the Sabbath.

For more on this, see our teachings, [“The Sabbath in Luke-Acts: The Practice of the Earliest Christians,”](#) [“Moses is Proclaimed Every Sabbath in the Synagogues \(Acts 15:21\),”](#) and [“Pauline Paradox Part 2: The Paul You Never Knew.”](#)

But wait! There’s more! Luke also records how, 2000 years ago, James and Paul already *directly refuted* Rabbi Singer’s accusation against Paul. According to Acts 21:17-26, decades after the Messiah’s resurrection, Luke records how “many thousands” of Jewish Christians in Jerusalem remained zealous for the Law of Moses (Acts 21:20). However, they heard a rumor that Paul was teaching believers to forsake the Law—the same rumor that Rabbi Singer is spreading against Paul today (Acts 21:21). When confronted with this rumor during his visit to Jerusalem, Paul denied it. Paul followed James’s instructions and participated in temple rituals to demonstrate that the rumor was false and that he remained faithful to the Law (Acts 21:22-26). According to James, the purpose of Paul’s actions was to prove [“that there is nothing in what they have been told about you, but that you yourself also live in observance of the law”](#) (Acts 21:24).

Luke clearly wanted to show that Paul remained faithful to the Torah, including the Sabbath—and he was not alone. Peter—another of Paul’s earliest interpreters and someone who, again, knew Paul personally—warned that ignorant and unstable people misinterpret Paul’s letters. Peter specifically connects this mishandling of Paul’s letters to [“the error of lawless people”](#) (2 Peter 3:15-16). In other words, Peter warned that those who reject the Law twist Paul’s letters to support their false teachings. This warning demonstrates that, while Peter acknowledged that Paul’s letters could sometimes be [“hard to understand,”](#) he did *not* believe that they promoted antinomianism. According to Peter, interpreting Paul’s letters as opposing the Law of Moses was a distortion of Paul’s message.

For more on this, see our teaching, [“Confirm Your Calling Part 7: The Error of Lawless People.”](#)

At this point, someone might argue, “Luke and Peter didn’t accurately represent Paul! They portrayed him as faithful to the Torah, but that’s not really the case.” However, this objection falls apart because it relies on the assumption that Luke and Peter were firmly convinced of the Torah’s validity—a belief necessary to justify their supposed intent to falsely portray Paul as faithful to the Torah. But given that assumption, wouldn’t it make more sense for Luke and Peter to warn against Paul’s supposed antinomianism, rather than lie to defend him? If Paul’s letters truly promoted antinomianism, why would they lie about him to validate his teachings, especially since his teachings allegedly undermine their own convictions about the Torah?

Another objection is to try to discredit this evidence by suggesting that Luke and Peter did not actually know Paul and that these were pseudonymous writings. However, this objection ignores the historical evidence of authorship that we actually have. For more on the authorship of 2 Peter, see our teaching, [“Confirm Your Calling: Introduction to 2 Peter.”](#) For the historical evidence that Luke really was Paul’s traveling companion, see this article from New Testament scholar Craig Keener: “Acts: History or Fiction?” In *Jesus, Skepticism & the Problem of History* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019).

Just for the sake of argument, even if these writings were pseudonymous, they still represent the earliest Christian interpretations of Paul’s theology regarding the Law of Moses. And how do these early

interpreters understand Paul's views? They saw him as faithful to the Torah and considered the idea that Paul opposed the Torah to be a false doctrine. So regardless, this objection does not diminish the "pro-Torah" portrayal of Paul found in these early Christian writings.

Now, unfortunately it is true that many of Paul's later interpreters did not heed Peter's warning. As a result, many Christians have been misled by the error of lawless people, an error that involves twisting Paul's letters to support antinomianism. Rabbi Singer appears to have fallen into this same error. However, we should note that this misunderstanding was not universally held by later Christians. To give just one example, the Jewish Christian sect known as the Nazarenes embraced Paul's apostleship, while also fully adhering to the Law of Moses. This community continued to exist as a distinct Christian sect well into the fourth century AD. In his extensive historical study of the Nazarene sect, the scholar Ray Pritz draws the following conclusion:

There emerges from our considerations an entity, a viable entity of **Law-keeping Christians of Jewish background**. These were direct descendants of the first Jewish believers in Jesus...**they did not reject the apostleship of Paul**. They recognized his commission from God to preach to the gentiles, and they seem fully to have accepted the fruit of his labors..."

—Ray A. Pritz, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity: From the End of the New Testament Period Until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century* (Germany: Brill, 1998), 108-109.

So, while many Christians in later centuries did come to believe that Paul taught against the Torah, this belief was not universal. Nevertheless, the antinomian misinterpretation of Paul unfortunately has become quite popular, and *that misinterpretation* is what Rabbi Singer is reacting to. But as we mentioned earlier, a growing number of Christians now reject the antinomian reading of Paul in favor of a more historically and exegetically accurate reading. Many are coming to the conclusion that Paul faithfully observed and taught the Law of Moses. As we continue in this video, we will see why. Let's see what Rabbi Singer says next:

Why is it that Christians are opposed to the ritual law? Why are they fiercely antinomian? The reason for that is that Paul won and his opponents lost. One of the things that comes across very quickly when reading Paul's letters is he had enemies on all sides, and his opponents were largely fellow Christians who had a different gospel, and spread the idea that if you're going to believe in Jesus, you still had to keep the mitzvot that are outlined in the Torah. And Paul detested this.

—Rabbi Tovia Singer, "Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?" *YouTube*, Aug. 19, 2024.

When Rabbi Singer says "ritual law," he is referring to things like the Sabbath, festivals, and food laws. And it is true that many Christians today are opposed to keeping such laws. But is Paul the one who deserves credit or blame for this rejection of the Law? Not if we take the evidence we have seriously.

We have already seen how Paul's earliest Christian interpreters, Luke and Peter, did not believe that Paul was an antinomian, and they did not oppose his message. Peter calls Paul a "beloved brother" and endorses his letters (2 Peter 3:15-17). Luke Portrays Paul and the other apostles as fully in agreement concerning the Gospel, and also portrays Paul as keeping "ritual laws" like the Sabbath and festivals (Acts 13:14, 27, 42, 44; 16:13; 17:2; 18:4; 20:6; 27:9).

When we examine Paul's letters themselves, we discover that he did not, in fact, detest "ritual law." In 1

Corinthians, we see that Paul and the Corinthian community that he founded, which was made up of both Jews and Gentiles, continued to observe the biblical calendar and organized their plans around it. As David Rudolph writes:

The passing comment—“But I will stay in Ephesus until Pentecost” (1 Cor 16:8)—suggests that the Corinthians knew when Pentecost would occur. Moreover, since Pentecost is calculated by counting fifty days after “the day after the Sabbath” during Passover week (Lev 23:15-16), Paul implies that the literal day of Passover was not insignificant to the community.

—David Rudolph, “Passover in Corinth (1Cor 5:7-8),” *Verge* 2:9 (2010), 4.

Speaking of Passover, Paul explicitly commanded the Corinthian community to observe this festival:

1 Corinthians 5:8

Let us therefore celebrate the festival, not with the old leaven, the leaven of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

Why would Paul instruct his readers to celebrate Passover if he believed doing so constituted a “different gospel”? Why would he continue to prioritize the Sabbath and festivals during his missionary journeys, as we see throughout the Book of Acts, if he detested “ritual law”? The answer is he wouldn’t. Rabbi Singer’s characterization of Paul does not fit the evidence.

Now, Paul did have opponents, whom he accused of promoting a different gospel (Galatians 1:6). But as we’ve seen, these opponents could not have been the other apostles, because Paul and the other apostles agreed on the gospel. And this different gospel could not have been the notion that followers of Yeshua should keep the Torah, because Paul himself kept the Torah and urged his readers to do the same.

So, who were these opponents, and what did they teach? Well, it is beyond the scope of this teaching to do a full examination of Galatians. However, in other teachings we have argued that Paul’s opponents in Galatians were Jewish teachers who taught that the Gentile followers of Messiah must become Jews to be saved, and they taught that a Gentile became a Jew by getting circumcised (cf. Acts 15:1). That was the message that Paul opposed, and it’s a message that the rest of the apostles opposed too, as we see in Acts 15. Paul did not reject circumcision itself, as we clearly see elsewhere in his letters and in Acts (Romans 3:1; Acts 21:17-26); he rejected the misuse of circumcision as a means of inclusion for adult Gentiles. We should also note that while Paul and the other apostles did not require adult Gentiles to get circumcised to join the community—because the Law of Moses itself does not require it—they encouraged Gentile believers to learn and grow in their obedience to the Torah. For more on this, see [“Moses is Proclaimed Every Sabbath in the Synagogues \(Acts 15:21\).”](#)

In any case, we can safely rule out Rabbi Singer’s claim that Paul’s opponents were the other apostles and that the “different gospel” was the idea that Yeshua’s followers should observe the Law. The evidence contradicts that claim. Let’s continue:

In his second most important work—in his letter to the Galatians—he excoriates the churches in Asia Minor, modern day Turkey. ‘Who bewitched you, you foolish Galatians.’ What he’s telling them is they don’t need to keep the Law, they shouldn’t keep the law, and the law—while holy—has no other purpose but rather than to be a taskmaster to show you that you’re a sinner.

—Rabbi Tovia Singer, “Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?” *YouTube*, Aug. 19, 2024.

So, we've already mentioned that Paul's concern in Galatians was not with his readers keeping the Law. His concern was with his Gentile readers considering proselyte conversion—that is, getting circumcised to be considered “saved” and full members of the community. Paul rightly saw that idea as a “different gospel” because it taught that Gentiles must become Jews to be saved rather than putting their faith in the Messiah. *That* is what he is discouraging his readers from doing. We know that Paul was not opposing the Law in Galatians because, later, he explicitly commands his readers to keep the Law:

Galatians 6:2

Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.

According to New Testament scholar Todd Wilson, there is a “growing scholarly consensus” that the expression “Law of Christ” in Galatians 6:2 refers to the Law of Moses—in particular, the Law of Moses as it is taught and exemplified by Christ. As Wilson writes:

[T]o fulfill the law of Christ would be to fulfill the law of Moses in a Christlike way...

Todd A. Wilson, “Law of Christ,” *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2023), 624.

So again, it cannot be said that Paul was against his readers keeping the Law since he explicitly tells them to keep the Law.

Now, Rabbi Singer is correct that, in Galatians 3, Paul does say that the Law of Moses functions to show you that you are a sinner and that you need grace. But his mistake is in assuming that this passage represents Paul's entire theology on the Torah. As New Testament scholar Craig Keener writes:

Paul's entire theology of the law cannot be properly extrapolated from a single (polemical) passage.

—Craig Keener, *Galatians* (Cambridge University Press, 2018), 148

Contrary to Rabbi Singer, Paul did not think that the Law “has no other purpose” than to show you that you are a sinner. To fully grasp Paul's stance on the Law, we must take into account everything he says about it. When we do that, it becomes clear that he saw the Law as having a significant ongoing role in the lives of Christians. Consider these examples: Paul declares that our faith does not overthrow but rather establishes the Law (Romans 3:31). He teaches that sin is defined as breaking the Law (Romans 7:7) and admonishes believers not to continue living in sin—that is, not to continue breaking the Law (Romans 6:1-2). He calls the Torah holy, righteous, and good (Romans 7:12). He calls the Torah spiritual and says he delights in it (Romans 7:14, 22). He says the Holy Spirit empowers believers to keep the Law (Romans 8:4), while those led by the flesh refuse to submit to the Law (Romans 8:7). He appeals to the Law's authority to support his moral teachings (1 Corinthians 9:8-9). He appeals to the Law to rebuke transgressors of the Law (1 Corinthians 5:13). And as we already mentioned, in Galatians itself, he commanded his readers to fulfill the Law (Galatians 6:2). We could go on and on. When we actually consider all the evidence, it's impossible to conclude that Paul thought the Torah was only good for showing you that you were a sinner. Let's continue:

The key is, to understand Paul's thinking, is to read a very unique and very striking chapter, and that's Romans 7. Why is Romans 7...why does it stand out so much? ... So Paul is writing to Jewish people who were Christians, and he exhorts them. He encourages them not to keep the

commandments, not to keep the Torah. I'm talking about ritual commandments...he uses the widow as a metaphor. Just as a woman is released of her obligations, her marital vows once her husband dies—I mean, this is very strong language—you too are now released from your obligation to keep the law, to keep the commandments. Because after all, Christ died for your sins.

—Rabbi Tovia Singer, “Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?” *YouTube*, Aug. 19, 2024.

So, Rabbi Singer is ignoring the context here. As we saw earlier, in Romans, Paul repeatedly affirms the Law of Moses and expects his readers to be keeping it. Paul can't be encouraging believers to obey the Law in one part of Romans and discouraging them from obeying in another part.

What, then, is Paul saying in Romans 7? Well, as the context makes clear, Paul is not saying that his readers are released from their obligation to keep the Law. He is saying that they are released from a particular *function* of the Law—namely, the Law's function of condemning sinners. The Law no longer condemns them because Christ died for their sins. They are released from *the condemnation* of the Law. This is clear from the previous chapter, where several parallel passages indicate that the “law” to which Paul refers in Romans 7:6 is closely associated with sin and its consequence—death:

Romans 6:20-22

For **when you were slaves of sin**, you were free in regard to righteousness. But what fruit were you getting at that time from the things of which you are now ashamed? For the end of those things is death. **But now that you have been set free from sin** and have become slaves of God, the fruit you get leads to sanctification and its end, eternal life.

(See also Romans 6:1-2, 6-7, 11)

When it comes to Paul's analogy of the widow, Paul's point is that just as the law of marriage does not apply to a widow, the law's *condemnation of sinners* does not apply to those who have had their sins forgiven. As J. Brian Tucker writes:

Scholars who claim [Romans] 7:4, 6 as evidence that Paul thinks the law of Moses has been superseded or been made superfluous in toto have likely overstated their case. To die and be released from the law means to be free from its condemning effects, now that righteousness is facilitated through Christ. The curse, including the difficulties of our day-to-day lived existence, is overturned through the Spirit, but not in a way in which life in the Spirit makes the law unnecessary or results in a law-free existence.

—J. Brian Tucker, *Reading Romans after Supersessionism: The Continuation of Jewish Covenantal Identity* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2018), 112-113

For more on Romans 7, see our teaching “[Dead to the Law \(Romans 7:1-6\)](#).”

Let's continue:

Now this is so outrageous. These ideas are so thoroughly opposed by the Hebrew Bible because Tanakh tells us explicitly—explicitly!—that when Moshiach comes, we're going to be keeping the Torah. Not only Jews are going to be keeping the Torah. We have even passages, as an example in Zechariah 14, with the Gentiles, the non-Jews in verse 16, will be keeping the festival

of Tabernacles, which is a ritual law, even though Paul says you don't have to keep the ritual law.

—Rabbi Tovia Singer, “Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?” *YouTube*, Aug. 19, 2024.

Rabbi Singer is right that the Tanakh describes both Jews and Gentiles keeping the “ritual law” in the Messianic age. However, Paul did not oppose Jews and Gentiles keeping “ritual law.” As we’ve already seen, in 1 Corinthians 5, he explicitly commands the Jewish and Gentile believers at Corinth to celebrate Passover, as just one example. So again, when we read Paul correctly, there is no contradiction.

Let’s continue:

In Ezekiel 11, when Hashem said—it’s Messianic—that I will take the heart of stone and it’ll become a heart of flesh, to be receptive to his message and says he’ll be keeping my commandments and my statutes, openly. Openly in Tanakh. So everything Paul is saying is mendacious, is completely opposed by the Hebrew Bible.

—Rabbi Tovia Singer, “Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?” *YouTube*, Aug. 19, 2024.

Actually, Paul agrees with Ezekiel that the promised Spirit will enable believers to keep the commandments. That is what Paul says in Romans 8:

Romans 8:3-4

For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do. By sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, **in order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us**, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.

Like Ezekiel, Paul acknowledges that humans are sinful and that we need help from the Spirit to obey the commandments. And by the way, Paul and Ezekiel are just echoing Moses. In Deuteronomy, Moses urges the people to obey the commandments, but toward the end of the book he says that the people are rebellious, stubborn, and will turn aside from the commandments, and that the Law testifies against them for their sin (Deuteronomy 31:27-29). Moses, like Ezekiel, recognizes the need for God to circumcise the hearts of the people so that they will obey (Deuteronomy 30:6). This is the same thing Paul says in Romans. After Paul describes the human struggle with sin in Romans 7, in Romans 8 he appeals to Ezekiel’s prophecy to explain that Christians who have the Spirit are now empowered to fulfill the Law. Such a statement is the opposite of what we would expect from an antinomian.

Let’s continue:

And he encourages others not to keep the Law. In Colossians 2:16-17, he says it openly, let no one urge you about the holidays, the Sabbath, what you eat, what you drink, the new moons—none of the ritual law.

—Rabbi Tovia Singer, “Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?” *YouTube*, Aug. 19, 2024.

Here, once again, Rabbi Singer is ignoring the context. Colossians does not say that Paul’s readers were being judged for failing to keep commandments like the Sabbath and festivals. Rather, they were being judged for keeping them. Paul’s opponents in Colossians were strict ascetics (Colossians 2:18, 21) who

disapproved of the festive eating and drinking associated with these observances. This is why Paul urges his readers not to let those people judge them for their eating and drinking during the Sabbath, new moons, and festivals. Paul's message is, in fact, the exact opposite of what Rabbi Singer claims.

For more on this, see our teachings "[Let No One Judge You](#)" and "[A Shadow of Things to Come](#)."

Let's continue:

I'm not strawmanning Paul; I am steelmanning him.

—Rabbi Tovia Singer, "Why Did Paul Detest the Law of Moses?" *YouTube*, Aug. 19, 2024.

I think we've seen that that's just not true. Rabbi Singer has consistently misrepresented Paul's theology by cherry-picking verses without considering all the evidence and generally being uncharitable with the text. He just repeats the same tired antinomian readings of Paul, instead of giving him a fair hearing and considering what his earliest interpreters say about him. In fact, later in Rabbi Singer's video, he goes so far as to accuse Paul of being secretly gay. He just asserts that Paul struggled with his sexuality, and this struggle was what supposedly "motivated" him to oppose the Law of Moses. Singer, of course, gives no evidence for this claim. But regardless, Paul explicitly condemns homosexual behavior and other violations of the Torah in numerous places (Romans 1:26-27; 1 Corinthians 6:6-10; 1 Timothy 1:8-11). If Paul's problem with the Law of Moses was that it condemned homosexual behavior, why would Paul himself condemn it? Wouldn't we expect him to endorse it instead? Once again, the evidence does not support Rabbi Singer's claims.

Friends, we hope that you can see that these are not serious or thoughtful arguments from Rabbi Singer, and he clearly has an agenda. He is not a trustworthy source for accurately understanding Paul or the New Testament. When we consider all of the evidence—rather than selectively quoting Paul's letters out of context to construct a strawman—Paul is consistently exonerated from the charge of antinomianism. As we said at the beginning, Rabbi Singer is arguing against a distorted caricature, not the Paul of the New Testament.

If you are interested in a more historically and exegetically accurate reading of Paul, we would invite you to consider the many teaching resources we mentioned throughout this video.

We pray you have been blessed by this teaching. Remember, continue to test everything. Shalom! For more on this and other teachings, please visit us at www.testeverything.net

Shalom, and may Yahweh bless you in walking in the whole Word of God.

EMAIL: Info@119ministries.com

FACEBOOK: www.facebook.com/119Ministries

WEBSITE: www.TestEverything.net & www.ExaminatoTodo.net

TWITTER: www.twitter.com/119Ministries#