

# The Torah Precedes Moses *by* Edgar Trollip

The title might be fighting words for some. I don't apologize though. It is true. I recently heard a couple of Torah observant Christians debate the validity of the book of Jubilees. Now, I am not going to go through that here. However, I am going to zone in on one peculiar argument that caught my attention. As Sean from Kingdom in Context and David Wilbur were debating the biblical 'inconsistencies' of Jubilees, Wilbur argued that in Jubilees the Torah was already active during Genesis. To Wilbur this was an incoherent message to Genesis, since in his paradigm the law was only given at Sinai. Wilbur concludes that Jubilees cannot be valid since **the Law was not yet given Genesis, while Jubilees emphasizes the law/Torah was given at creation and is eternal.**

Mind you, the term 'Torah' needs some fine tuning. Many are tossing it around more wildly than white powder in the White House. It simply means instructions (in righteous living). The way Yahusha described it, it seems the instructions were not exclusive to Moses' writings. Yahusha quotes the Psalms or Wisdom literature and also refers to it as 'Torah'. For instance:

*The Jews answered Him, "For a good work we do not stone You, but for blasphemy; and because You, being a man, make Yourself out to be Elohiym." Yahusha answered them, "Has it not been written in your Law, 'I said, you are gods'? If he called them gods, to whom the word of Elohiym came (and the Scripture cannot be broken), do you say of Him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, 'You are blaspheming,' because I said, 'I am the Son of Elohiym'?"*

**John 10:33-36 (NASB1995)**

Yahusha is of course referring to Psalm 82 and by implication including it in the law. Seeing the first five books as 'Torah' is a rabbinic construct and not the one of Messiah. Messiah's definition includes **all instructions** in Yah's way. All instructions, including those in the wisdom literature are Torah (instructions in righteousness). But for the nay-sayers I will focus on the rabbinic definition, the law given to Moses as 'Torah' in this case.

But back to David Wilbur. Is that so? Was there no law active during Genesis? I beg to differ. I have heard this argument from dispensationalists before but not from a Torah dude. He must really have his knife out for Jubilees I guess. What makes this even more ironic is that Wilbur worked at 119 Ministries. And I am in no way, shape or form dissing 119 Ministries. I have learnt alot from them. It is just ironic and I will show you why.

Most Torah observant folk will quickly point you to Psalm 119 to show proof that the Torah abides forever. That includes:

*The sum of Your word is truth, And every one of **Your righteous ordinances is everlasting.***

**Psalm 119:160 (NASB1995)**

Well, that should settle it. We can pack our bags and go home. Class dismissed. The Torah is everlasting. Not satisfied? Oh, fine. Here is one for the road:

***Elohiym's laws are pure, eternal, just.** They are more desirable than gold. They are sweeter than honey dripping from a honeycomb. For they warn us away from harm and give success to those who obey them.*

**Psalm 19:9-11 (TLB)**

How many ways do you want the Psalmist to say it? The Torah is eternal and everlasting and forever . These two passages in Psalms do sound very similar to Baruch.

*This is the book of the commandments of Elohiym, and **the law that endureth for ever:** all they that keep it shall come to life; but such as leave it shall die.*

**Baruch 4:1**

I will not cite any extra-biblical sources as proofs since that will make the exercise a piece of cake and the skeptics will question the validity thereof at any rate. But I think a write up with all the extra-biblical proof texts should make for exciting biblical exploration, but not today. This one is for those on the fence, and hopefully I can convince you to get your bum off it. You know fences were not made for sitting. .

Now, you could argue that it is forever after it was given at Sinai. That is why I am here. My aim is to illustrate that the law was alive and well in the book of Genesis. This is well before the Sinai mountain was quaking in flames and even before Moshe, the lawgiver, was born. So here goes nine reasons the Torah was active pre-Sinai and pre-Moses:

## **1. Heaven and Earth**

Are there any indicators of when and how long the Law/Torah will be in effect? Well, yes! Most of the nay-sayers are Christians but atleast value the words of the Messiah. So the following passage should be of utter importance to you:

“Do not think that I came to destroy the Torah or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to complete. “For truly, I say to you, **till the heaven and the earth pass away**, one yod or one tittle shall by no means pass from the Torah till all be done.

**Matthew 5:17-18 (TS2009)**

There you go. Heaven? Check. Earth? Check. Torah is still alive and well. Wilbur also agrees on this. Although those in Camp Torah vouch that Torah is still applicable since we still see heaven above us and step on the terra firma, earth beneath us, do they trace the Torah back to the creation of heaven and earth? Nope. The origin of the Torah goes way back to the creation account in Genesis 1. Yahusha is pointing out the two witnesses of the Torah. Could that possibly be when the Torah was made, when heaven and earth were created? When the two witnesses, heaven and earth were created the Torah manifested or was already there. *Oh, and when was that exactly?* Genesis 1:1.

*In the beginning Elohim created the heavens and the earth.*

**Genesis 1:1 (TS2009)**

Hopefully this inspires some dispensationalists to throw a hissy fit since it doesn't explicitly say the Torah was created in Genesis 1:1. You could accuse me of leading the witness here. Maybe. But according to Yahusha's words the heaven and earth are indicators of the Torah being active. You have to admit if this is true, the Genesis 1:1 origin of Torah gels well with the Psalmist's eternal Torah, wouldn't you say? Both accounts confirm the law is eternal. Seems like we are off to a good start. I can already sense some built up anger swelling up from the church pews, so before an evangelical somewhere blows a gasket, *let's move on.*

## **2. The Murder of Abel**

That evening at the dinner table had to be pretty awkward. Imagine Adam asking Cain, “So where's Abel?” Before we get to sibling rivalry we first need to define sin. John the revelator gives us the go-to definition for sin at the back of the Book. You should know this by now:

*Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for **sin is the transgression of the law.***

### 1 John 3:4 (KJV)

Easy enough to grasp, wouldn't you say? Sin is when we overstep the boundaries that Abba has laid out for us. But most Christian scholars, including the rabbinic torah crowd, would argue that the law was not at play when Cain whacked Abel. Some argue the Torah was given one book and many years later, so it does not count as murder or sin for that matter.

I know I am not the best at surprises so I might as well let this one out of the bag. The following question is for the rabbinic crowd that say the Torah was first given at Sinai: with John's definition of sin still in your rear view mirror, would you mind explaining the following verse to me:

*And Yahuah said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, **sin lieth at the door.** And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.*

### Genesis 4:6-7 (KJV)

Oh, there is that word again. S-I-N. Sin. Strangely, not too many Torah folk are connecting the dots here. Notice Cain did not fall out of his chair asking what sin is. How could Cain have known sin if it were not defined for him? Occam's razor does come in handy: the most simple explanation is usually the best. The simple reading of text implies that jealous Cain is aware of sin and thereby implicating he is aware of the law. Paul's words should be floating somewhere in your thoughts now. Didn't Paul/Shaul say that he would not have known sin, had it not been laid out in the law? Oh, fine you don't believe me, here it is:

What shall we say then? Is the Law sin? May it never be! On the contrary,

**I would not have come to know sin except through the Law;**

for I would not have known about coveting if the Law had not said, "You shall not covet."

### Romans 7:7 (NASB1995)

So to be fair, if I understand what Sha'ul is saying, Sinai was possibly the first time it was jotted down on earth, but that does not mean it did not exist. That is why we are proving this out. A careful reading of Genesis will bring you to the conclusion that the law was functioning. Remember the law includes:

*You do not murder.*

### Exodus 20:13 (TS2009)

The clear warning Cain was given, not to let sin get the best of him, was a warning not to transgress Yah's divine law, and specifically not murder his brother. The law was already at play during the sibling rivalry and eventual murder of Abel. Why would there be a divine visitation from Yahuah, warning Cain not to **sin** if sin was never defined to Cain? It does seem like Cain was aware that he was in the wrong and even his hateful thoughts were addressed. Making the law fully functional at that point.

### 3. Seed Spilling of Judah's Son

You get the idea Judah was not the best of fathers. It seems as though he was not the best example and his naughty boys just followed in daddy's footsteps. Seems like the boys were not keen on cracking open some Torah scrolls or even considered familiarizing themselves with the ways of Yah. That is probably why they couldn't care less about transgressing the Torah. Keep in mind Judah married a Canaanite wife. Abraham advised Eleazar not to take a wife for Isaac from the Canaanites. For good reasons. Those girls were into idolatry. Yahuah included the Canaanites as one of the nations that should be utterly destroyed. So off the bat, Judah's spousal choice seems to be bad one. Judah's first son, Er, ends up being struck down by Yahuah for his wickedness. His wife, Tamar, ends up being widowed. Er's brother, Onan, was to step up to the plate and help out perpetuating his brother's seedline. Now, that you are up to speed consider the following scenario:

*And Onan, **knowing that the seed should not be his -**  
it came to pass when he went in to his brother's wife,  
that **he spilled it upon the ground, so that he should not give seed to his brother's wife.**  
And his doing this appeared evil before Elohiym; and he slew him also.*

**Gen 38:9-10 (LXXE)**

Remember Er, Judah's first son and Tamar's first husband, was killed on account of his wickedness. Onan had to slot in for his brother. But, *bummer*. Who knew spilling semen can get you killed. Whoops! Onan gets struck down by Yahuah for splurging his semen on the ground. How could this be so evil deserving an immediate and direct death sentence? Not even a trial was offered. I wonder why.

This would only make sense if there was a direct instruction from the Most High that Onan was violating. Like say Deuteronomy 25:

*And if brethren should live together, and one of them should die, and should not have seed, the wife of the deceased shall not marry out of the family to a man not related: **her husband's brother shall go in to her, and shall take her to himself for a wife, and shall dwell with her.***

*And it shall come to pass that the child which she shall bear, shall be named by the name of the deceased, **and his name shall not be blotted out of Israel.** And if the man should not be willing to take his brother's wife, then shall the woman go up to the gate to the elders, and she shall say, **My husband's brother will not raise up the name of his brother in Israel,** my husband's brother has refused. And the elders of his city shall call him, and speak to him; and if he stand and say, I will not take her: then his brother's wife shall come forward before the elders, and shall loose one shoe from off his foot, and shall spit in his face, and shall answer and say, Thus shall they do to the man who will not build his brother's house in Israel. And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that has had his shoe loosed.*

#### **Deuteronomy 25:5-10 (LXXE)**

If your brother died without having children you should take the widow in. Not only were you to take care of your deceased brother's wife but you would also perpetuate offspring that would be seen as your dead brother's own. This is the heart of Yah; to take care of the widowed women.

I have to admit this law for me is a tougher one to keep and to explain to the anti-Torah people. But I do get it. Women would have it rough without men around those days. Back in the day when men were still men and women still women this made perfect sense. Abba in His divine wisdom made a way for widows to be cared for and looked after by their children. Widows and orphans are right up there on the Most High's priority list in case you haven't noticed. The commandment of preserving the seed and preserving an offspring reminded me of Ruth's story. Ruth's closest relative declined the offer to take her to wife and had to be unsandaled. You can do a self study on Ruth as homework, let's get back to Tamar.

With Tamar, Judah's daughter-in-law, being of the Melchizedek (king and priest) bloodline, Yah was having none of the Torahless behavior. Yah wants a family to continue in his ways. Should a man pass away with no offspring, the deceased's brother would continue his dead brother's bloodline through his very own seed. Onan not only neglected the commandment but it seems he couldn't care less about taking care of Tamar. Another bad move, especially if we are talking about perpetuating the Melchizedek bloodline, that would bring forth the Messiah.

#### **4. Sexual immorality of Sodom And Gomorrah**

This place probably never got a nomination for town of the year. They are best known for a BBQ from heaven, where everything ended up overcooked. I always wondered, if there was no law or standard of righteousness how could Sodom and Gomorrah be condemned and destroyed? Do the dispensationalists honestly still argue everything goes, yet Yah's wrath consumed this place to a crisp at the same time? A literal fire and brimstone judgment, but on the basis of what?

Except for their laws and customs allowing sexual immorality on a scale akin to Hollywood's perversions, their laws prohibited caring for the poor.

I know. I know. I said I won't cite any extra-biblical texts to make this a more palatable read for you. This one is interesting though. If you are curious give Jasher 19 a read. You would see that Sodom did not give the poor anything, not even a breadcrumb. Even more one Lot's daughters was given a death sentence for doing so. Deuteronomy 15 tells us clearly how Yahuah cares and how we should care for the poor.

*And if there shall be in the midst of thee a poor man of thy brethren in one of thy cities in the land, which Yahuah thy Elohiym gives thee, thou shalt not harden thine heart, neither shalt thou by any means close up thine hand from thy brother who is in want. **Thou shalt surely open thine hands to him, and shalt lend to him as much as he wants according to his need.***

**Deuteronomy 15:7-8 (LXXE)**

Beautiful, isn't it? Yah wants us to take care of the poor. The wisdom literature is dripping with scriptures that illustrate how we should show compassion to those in need. Maybe Jasher is not your thing and you don't get the selfish laws of Sodom and Gomorrah. All good.

*Now the men of Sodom were wicked exceedingly and **sinner**s against Yahuah.*

**Genesis 13:13 (NASB1995)**

There it is again. Does the word 'sinners' mean anything to you? Those doing sin, right? In other words they are those transgressing the Most High's laws. The Targum says it like this:

*And the men of Sedom were depraved in their wealth one with another, and they **sinned in their bodies**; they sinned with **open nakedness**, and the **shedding of innocent blood**, and **practiced strange worship**, and **rebelled greatly against the name of Yahuah.***

**Genesis 13:13 (Targum Jonathan)**

Lust and hatred seems to be alive and well in Sodom. You probably know the episode where the men of Sodom and Gemorrah want to sleep with the two angels visiting Lot. So even if we overlook the selfishness, corrupt laws, bloodshed, strange worship and so on we cannot overlook the sexual sins of Sodom and Gomorrah. Were these transgressions defined earlier? Why does Yah destroy a city that is not aware of their vulgar sexual misconduct? The Torah has numerous passages on this, including:

*No one is to approach anyone of his own flesh to uncover his nakedness. I am יהוה.*

**Leviticus 18:6 (TS2009)**

*And do not lie with a male as with a woman, it is an abomination.*

**Leviticus 18:22 (TS2009)**

Just to name a few. You see Sodomites and Gomorrahites, who might be seen as the nations were even judged according to Yah's standards. This is another example that can rock the dispensational boat.

The godless generation of Sodom and Gomorrah was contemporaries with Shem and Abraham. Imagine staying stone throw away from the friend of Yahuah and squandering the opportunity to familiarize yourself with Yah and his ways. They were willfully transgressing the commandments. The Torah was living and active during the time of Sodom and Gomorrah. That is the whole point of the severe judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah.

## **5. Tithes**

Ah, yes then there is tithing. The magic word the modern church utilizes to make the budgets work and get the next building project off the ground. Although churchianity abuses the phrase found in Malachi 3 where we rob Elohiym by withholding tithes, they often fail to see where it originated. Again the tithe precedes the giving of the Torah at Mount Sinai. We see it on two occasions.

Once with Jacob:

*And this stone, which I have set up for a pillar, shall be to me a house of Elohiym; and of all whatsoever thou shalt give me, **I will tithe a tenth for thee.***

**Genesis 28:22 (LXXE)**

And the second time, preceding Jacob's tithe is the tithe Abraham gave to Melchizedek:



*And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high Elohiym. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high Elohiym, possessor of heaven and earth: And blessed be the most high Elohiym, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And*

***he gave him tithes of all.***

**Genesis 14:18-20 (KJV)**

Churchianity loves pointing the finger at the congregation with tithing passages, while simultaneously reminding us we are in the new covenant and that the law has been done away with. I have no idea how that works. Maybe the guys on the church finances team and the building project committee have the best explanation.

Well, we just read Abraham, Melchizedek and Jacob knew the significance of tithing. Was this just a thumbsucked, ballpark figure that popped into their heads? Or was tithing taught from the spiritual leaders of the family, like priests in this case? These patriarchs were walking in priestly attire and teaching the commandments of Yah. We see tithing being endorsed later by Moshe here:

***'And all the tithe of the land*** – of the seed of the land or of the fruit of the tree – belongs to יהוה. It is set-apart to יהוה.

**Leviticus 27:30 (TS2009)**

*“And see, I have given the children of Lēwi **all the tithes** in Yisra’el as an inheritance in return for the service which they are serving, the service of the Tent of Appointment. “And let the children of Yisra’el no more come near the Tent of Appointment, lest they bear sin and die, because the Lēwites shall do the service of the Tent of Appointment, so they themselves bear their crookedness. A law forever, throughout your generations: that among the children of Yisra’el they are to have no inheritance, **but the tithes of the children of Yisra’el, which they present as a contribution to יהוה, I have given to the Lēwites as an inheritance.** That is why I have said to them, ‘Among the children of Yisra’el they have no inheritance.’”*

**Num 18:21-24 (TS2009)**

Even though Moshe had to pen this down for the wilderness generation, we clearly see the patriarchs practice tithing prior to Sinai.

## **6. Clean and unclean**

Here is one for bacon lovers everywhere. A simple one most churchianity overlooks so they can be free to eat the piggy. Most Christians are aware of the dietary laws that were given in Leviticus 11, post-Sinai. However, Noah was able to discern clean and unclean beasts prior to the deluge.

*Of every **clean** beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female:  
and of beasts that are **not clean** by two, the male and his female.*

**Genesis 7:2 (KJV)**

Clearly, the preacher of righteousness knew the difference between clean and unclean, a very basic requirement for a priest. It made sense that they ate clean since more of those animals made it to the ark. You see Noah never sat down to an all you can eat pork ribs night. Not only that, but offerings and sacrifices could only be made with clean animals.

## **7. Firstfruit**

This is very similar to the mentioning of the tithes, so I won't be long. If we go back to Cain and Abel we can witness the important principle of offering your first fruit.

*And Abel, he also brought of the **firstlings of his flock** and of the fat thereof. And Yahuah had respect unto Abel and to his offering: But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.*

**Genesis 4:4-5 (KJV)**

You see Cain just took an offering while Abel took the best part, the first fruit. It was a true sacrifice. Later, Moshe reminds frequently us of the principle of first fruits in the Torah:

*All that openeth the matrix is mine; and **every firstling**  
among thy cattle, whether ox or sheep, that is male.*

**Exodus 34:19 (KJV)**

Nothing new here. Cain and Abel already knew about the significance of first fruits.

## **8. Noah's nakedness**

This one should come with a PG13 warning. In biblical times the best way to usurp your brothers was to sleep with your father's wife, a.k.a your mom. Cham knew this. Cham craved his daddy's authority and rulership over his brother's so badly he would throw caution to the wind and exploit his father's drunkenness in the following passage:

*And Cham the father of **Chanaan saw the nakedness of his father**, and he went out and told his two brothers without. And Sem and Japheth having taken a garment, put it on both their backs and went backwards, and **covered the nakedness** of their father; and their face was backward, and they saw not the nakedness of their father.*

**Genesis 9:22-23 (LXXE)**

A father's nakedness means Cham slept with his mother it says so right here:

***Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's wife; it is thy father's nakedness.***

**Leviticus 18:8 (LXXE)**

Other examples include Absalom and Ruben. Absalom does the same thing later with David's concubines. He erects a tent in a public area and makes no secret of his intentions to usurp his father by sleeping with his father's concubines. Ruben had a moment of weakness when he peeped over the fence towards the ladies showering quarters and spotted a naked Bilha. When Ruben slept with Bilha, Jacob's concubine, Jacob never slept with her again. Ruben repented though, unlike Absalom and Cham.

Back to Cham. Shem and Japheth knew what happened to mommy and daddy and tried to salvage the situation as far as possible. You know love covers a multitude of sins, almost literally in this case.

The gross act of Cham was an obvious and known transgression in the eyes of the eight survivors of the deluge. They knew that Cham had stepped over the line. So much so that Naoh cursed his son, Canaan. But what was this line or moral code they were expected to adhere to but the Torah. The Torah defines 'thy father's nakedness' and prohibits incestuous relations.

## **9. Job**

Job was a Torah keeping Edomite king. I am sure that statement might have caused a Jew or two to choke on their macon. But it is true. It says so right here:

*And I will go forth **according to his commandments,**  
**for I have kept his ways; and I shall not turn aside from his commandments.***

**Job 23:11 (LXXE)**

Your gut feeling probably told you that Job kept in step with Yah's commandments. He seemed quite serious about it. This passage sounds very similar to Abraham's testimony:

*...because Abraham **obeyed My voice and guarded My Charge: My commands, My laws, and My Torot...***

**Gen 26:5 (TS2009)**

In case I left you hanging, "Torot" is plural for Torah. Which suggests Abraham not only received instructions but obeyed them.

*And Job died, an old man and full of days: and it is written that **he will rise again with those whom Yabuah raises up.** This man is described in the Syriac book as living in the land of Ausis, on the borders of Idumea and Arabia: and his name before was Jobab; and having taken an Arabian wife, he begot a son whose name was Ennon. And he himself was the son of his father Zare, one of the sons of Esau, and of his mother Bosorrba, so that he was the fifth from Abraam. And these were the kings who reigned in Edom, which country he also ruled over: first, Balac, the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba: but after Balac, **Jobab, who is called Job,** and after him Asom, who was governor out of the country of Thaeman...*

**Job 42:17 (LXXE)**

Seems as though Job did something right. There are not many people mentioned in the Word that are given the promise of the resurrection in advance. I wonder if it had something to do with his faithfulness of walking in Yah's commandments despite having haSatan coming at you full tilt. A large piece of the above segment is copied from Genesis 36, where he is mentioned in Esau's family tree.

So if my calculations are correct this makes Job a counterpart of Jacob's sons. Which makes his life time pre-Moses. I do have some researchers telling me he was a contemporary of Abraham. For this exercise it does not really matter. Both were before the Torah at Sinai.

So which laws and commandments were Abraham and Job adhering to? I propose Yah's Torah. Nothing else would make sense.

## Conclusion

You might be thinking, but when was the law given? I am suggesting during the inception of creation, it was already there. There are some good extra-biblical sources on this, however it will require a whole new article. I am sure I am only scraping the surface, but I think that we made an airtight case that the people of Genesis had to submit under Yah's law or instructions and those transgressing them had to bear the consequences thereof.

Now, I have not even given any airtime to prescriptions of sacrifices, Laban's idolatry, and Rachel's uncleanness or curses and blessings. All those elements are discussed in the Torah you know. How does all that all work when the Torah does not exist at that point? What commandments were Abraham and Job adhering to after all? How could Cain heed to a warning about sin if he does not know what sin is? How could Noah tell apart the clean animals from the unclean animals? By what standard was Sodom and Gomorrah condemned? *Bummer!* Getting wiped out of existence without even a standard to go by. These are just some of my questions if you still think there was no law pre-Moses.

Maybe you can argue that the Torah was not scribbled down on earth before it was spelled out at Sinai. Fair enough, however, extra-biblical texts suggest otherwise. What remains crystal clear is that the patriarchs knew the law. The above examples prove Torah existed before Sinai and the Hebrew families kept it. Just like the earthly tabernacle was a blueprint of a heavenly tabernacle, in like manner the law given to Moshe was a blueprint of the law of heaven.

Furthermore, the Psalmist, Baruch and Yahusha point blank told us that Yah's righteous ordinances are eternal. Dispensationalist charts and timelines across *terra firma* will have a tough time getting around the timeless Torah.