

PERPETUAL SABBATH CONFUSION

As concerning our two pieces on the Sabbath which we sent out awhile back, we realize that we rattled the cage and sent some disturbing sensations of doubt through the spiritual central nervous systems of those who deep down in their hearts know that the case for a restrictive first day of the week Sabbath cannot stand up to a thorough Scriptural analysis. We are not seeking compromise for the sake of compromise, but we are seeking the truth at any cost. What will it cost?

Concerning fourth commandment disannulment, the New Testament testimony of silence should be final and conclusive, that is unless one considers Heb. 4:4 to be a fourth commandment reinstatement. The New

Testament record also speaks to us on this wise, "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and the unprofitableness thereof". The Siniatic Sabbath bondage ordinances was possibly some of the most weak and unprofitable of all the Mosaical counsel. The Lord Jesus Christ disannulled all such bondage when he stated in his own "perfect law of liberty" that "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath". This saying certainly enraged the Pharisees, it may have been the most provocative of all the reproof that he ever laid on them.

Not only was the fourth commandment disannulled, bringing the ten down to nine, but also the second (graven image) commandment, bringing it on down to eight. ((As touching the second commandment rescissions were enacted, even under the Old Testament, on several occasions. One example is seen in the counter-command to Moses to *make* the brasen serpent, another in the various images of things in "earth" and "in heaven" which were made (also in accordance with divine counter-command) for the ornamentation of Solomons temple. We determine that the significance behind the image is the key factor, a long page could be filled up on this thought. Another long page could probably be filled up on the abominations of Catholic (vicarious) image worship)). Going even further, the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ only makes reference to about six of the original ten commandments, and this in a somewhat casual manner, example, the Lords discourse with the rich young ruler. Why does the New Testament somewhat deemphasize the ten commandments. The lesson here dear friends, is that under grace, as (and if) we walk in the footsteps of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ we thereby ascend up onto a highway, upon which we are out of reach of any and all commandments, you must needs be careful what you think right here lest you implicate the Lord Jesus in sin. It is for certain, that we, if we "fulfill the law of Christ" are safe from any of the commandments which were delivered to Moses.

Some may ask. What of the other three or four commandments which are unmentioned in the New Testament? Their duties we say, are intrinsic to the law and commands of the New Testament of our Lord

Jesus Christ. Who knows not that taking the Lords name in vain is wrong even though the third commandment is not quoted in the New Testament. The Siniatical Sabbath bondage however, is not necessarily intrinsic to the law and commands of the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ. Just because a man should kindle a fire on the Sabbath does not imply (under this grace dispensation) that he does not love the Lord God with all his heart, and it certainly does not imply that he does not love his neighbor as himself. What it actually boils down to is this. Those who hold for the New Testament intrinsicity of the Siniatical Sabbath bondage, have a problem with sacred (N. T.) Scripture, and their striving to make their case, constitutes a striving with the Scripture.

Bro. Jonathan Johnson (Candlelight, Nov. Dec. 2010) makes the word "perpetual" synonymous with the word "eternity". However Cruden gives as a fourth variant definition of perpetual; "During the continuance of the legal dispensation". As far as it concerns the various perpetual Mosaical ordinances, even a person who had touched the bone of a dead man had to be purified with "the water of separation". The water of separation contained the ashes of a spotless red heifer. If the word *perpetual* always equates to the word *eternity* then this ordinance also must still stand. We say that the perpetual Siniatical Sabbath bondage vanished away, see Heb. 8:13 along with the perpetual "water of separation" and the ashes of the red heifer. For those who suspect that we might have intended to apply Rom. 14:5 to assert a supposed abolition of the Sabbath day we must quote (with slight revision) from our own doctrinal statements. Quote... "We ourselves do not accept the Calvinist view that the Sabbath was abolished in Christ, but we do know by the Scriptures that the commandment was disannulled. Any who will teach that the fourth commandment is still binding, must needs observe the seventh day of the week, lest they be troubled by their own words in the judgment, for the foundational precept of the commandment is the absolute truth that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God", and the continued validity of this said foundational precept is fully intrinsic to the eight references in Acts 13:14, 13:27, 13:42, 13:44, 15:21, 16:13, 17:2, 18:4. Once again let it be remembered that the substance of the said foundational precept was there even before the imposition of the commandment."

We do here acknowledge that the disannulled commandment spoken of in Heb. 7:18 seems more specifically to be the one by which was ordained the Old Testament priesthood. However the writer of Heb. is purposefully unspecific in verse 18 leaving us to know that he intends everything which was delivered to (and by) Moses which is not grafted into the Law and gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Dear friends, if we are not careful we will unwittingly testify to the effect that we find the grace (and doctrine) of our Lord Jesus unsatisfactory.

Some may object that the ten commandments were written by the very finger of God. Very true dear friend, but they were still delivered to (and by) the hand of mediatorial Moses for the twelve tribes of the children of Israel, and as such were part of the temporal and dispensable Mosaical covenant. However we do want to make this acknowledgment. We here say thus; Everything moral, contained in the Old Testament will in some manner be found to be doctrinally intrinsic to the New Testament, including the moral duty we owe our Creator and our body (which is the true temple of our Creator) of resting one day out of seven.

On the mount of transfiguration the final verdict came. As Moses and Elijah (the law and the prophets) stood by, the eternal Father proclaimed the all-transcending preeminence of the Son. Also in Heb. 1:2 the writer gives us to know, that the word of the Son is final, disannulling everything which was spoken before, other than that which he himself reaffirmed in his own "perfect law of liberty". Over>>>

SABBATH...cont

Eight times the New Testament states as explicitly as possible to the effect that the seventh day is still "the Sabbath day". Only the fact that we are under grace makes it possible for us to stand justified before the Lord while attempting to sanctify any day other than that which was ordained from the beginning. Heb. 4:4 appears to be the closest thing to a New Testament reinstatement of the fourth commandment. If it is however a fourth commandment reinstatement then we are all transgressors of the Law. Also, those who would try to use Heb. 4:7,8 as a foundation for a doctrine of Sabbath change, must completely disallow the eight Sabbath references in Acts which name the seventh day "the Sabbath" after the Lords resurrection and the day of Pentecost. It is theologically improper to try to use the fourth commandment to enforce a first day of the week Sabbath.

One commentary says this of Christ's words as they are recorded in Mt. 24:20, Quote, "For the Sabbath he often showed a concern". We say however that the concern expressed in the words of Christ in this verse of Scripture is for his people rather than for the Sabbath, seeing as the highways (on the Sabbath) would be nearly devoid of traffic and detection of the escapees (of the A. D. 70 siege of Jerusalem) would be so much easier. Also we cannot see Acts 1:12 as a New Testament establishment of the "Sabbath days journey" ordinance, (seeing as the legal distance is not clearly stated in the Bible) as is implied by those who feel that Jesus was forbidding any who would flee persecution on the Sabbath day. Jesus never spoke any words (which are recorded for our admonition) that can rightly be interpreted as restrictive or condemnatory, concerning the Sabbath, as he did concerning adultery. Not only did he reinstate the seventh commandment, but also emphasized its deeper application to heart adultery. On the contrary, everything which he said regarding the Sabbath, gendered to liberty, unless one does consider Mt. 24:20 to be otherwise. On a slightly different note we now say this. Any work upon which we have inordinately based our hope of Salvation, or which we have inordinately regarded as the foundation of our election, will be subject to incineration whenever tested for reward-worthiness, for the blood of Christ alone is the only thing which will secure our Salvation, and the sovereign mercy of God alone is the only thing which will secure our election. Most individuals who observe a tightly restrictive Sabbath (whether first or seventh day) seem also to be strongly inclined to make such restrictive Sabbath observance essential to Salvation, which thing the Lord Jesus Christ nor any other N. T. speaker or writer did not do. We will however also say this; A tightly observed Sabbath, coupled with a proper Christian attitude concerning the matter, very well may bring a special eternal reward to those so consecrated.

Only through years of contemplation have we reached our present level of acknowledgment power as touching the undeniable theological significance of the eight Sabbath references in Acts. This somewhat shows us how overwhelming the Sunday Sabbath illusion can be. It should be easily apparent to any learned student of the Scriptures, that Luke plainly would not have continued repeatedly calling the seventh day "the Sabbath day" if there had been a divinely instituted change of the day. To say that maybe he had not yet become aware of such a change is to strongly imply that the book of Acts contains a major theological error, due to ignorance on the part of its writer. Sunday is a Sabbath only because that we (the Christian church) have made it a Sabbath (in honour of the Lords resurrection) and we have enjoyed divine sufferance in our discarding of the original creation Sabbath only by reason of fourth commandment disannulment and the perfect liberty which filled the resulting void, see Rom. 5:13 last clause and Rom. 4:15 last clause. Those who carefully read through the somewhat extensive and detailed treatment of the Sabbath contained in Kittel & Friedrich's THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, should know that Sabbath change (first day to seventh) cannot be proved. It can however be quickly disproved by the eight Sabbath references in Acts.

One popular expositor, in his comments on 11Cor. 3:13, changes the term "that which is abolished" to "what was commanded" thus eliminating this harsh word "abolished". This same commentator manages to make it through his discourse on 11Cor. 3 without alluding to this word "abolished" at all, or even commenting on its significance. In this chap. Paul undeniably makes it clear that "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones" is "that which is abolished". This expositor also implicitly gives us to know by his substituting of the word "abolished" with the word "commanded" that he really understands that the former commandment is "that which is abolished". We ourselves would definitely not take such a strong stand, concerning this matter, if we were not standing on such a solid bedrock (Scriptural) foundation. Commentator Henry comes around to an acknowledgment of the absolute sovereign authority of Christ as the incarnate word of God, with this concerning the fourth commandment, quote; "That law, as all the rest, is put into the hand of Christ, to be altered, enforced, or dispensed with, as he sees good," see comments on Mt. 12:8. He says this preparatory to an inference of Sabbath day transfer, which fable the eight references in Acts completely and thoroughly invalidates. He (commentator Henry) tries to get around this by calling the original Sabbath day "jewish" see his comments on Acts 13:14.

He (commentator Henry) continues with this concerning Christ, "He was authorized to make such an alteration of that day, as that it should become the Lords day,". Please take notice of the fact that he does not here clearly state (neither does the F. B. discipline) that the Sabbath was changed from the seventh day to the first. It seems without doubt that these things (as would be expected) reflect uncertainty. He (Henry) almost sounds as if he's saying that the seventh day itself, became the Lords day, although in other places he indicates seventh to first day transfer.

We say that God in his sovereign will has not seen fit to lay out in the New Test. a clear and/or concise prescription for Sabbath observance. This truly gives an occasion of looking back to the fourth commandment, with its accompanying ordinances, for direction, yet the problem remains that we are not sanctifying the calendar day of the week which the commandment specifies, the seventh day of the creation week. This day the Scripture continues to name "the Sabbath day" forward of the Lords resurrection and the day of Pentecost, in the same fashion that it does before time. Over>>>>

Sabbath cont.

Looking at the Scriptures which are commonly used to defend the doctrine of Sabbath change we ourselves might well be convinced if it were not for these eight references in Acts, which will not go away. Also, the fourth commandment as it is recorded in Ex.20:9-11 reads thus, "wherefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day". Deut.5:15 says, "therefore the LORD thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." These Scriptures make it very clear, that not any day following six days of work will do. It must (if it fulfills the commandment) be the seventh day of the creation week, which has been passed down to us even in these last days, by way of the current (Gregorian) calendar.

Those who gave our former pieces on the Sabbath a thorough trial by the Scriptures will know that the seventh day continues to be "the Sabbath day" on through Acts 18 and indefinitely beyond. As touching this thought we agree with Bro. Jonathan that the Sabbath is eternal or at least lasting throughout the millenium.

R. Corn 2010

P. S. Live Coals of Fire, Oct.2010 contains an article by elder J. J. Carter on the Sabbath. We say that this article is erroneous (though not necessarily destructive) although this very probably was a man of true Christian faith. We had already written and sent out two pieces of leaf-work in which we dealt with such Sabbath error and in which we had alluded to this very article, which had also been printed in the Faith and Truth a number of years ago. Bro Carter follows after the error of commentators Henry, Clarke and others in his reference to the original Sabbath day as "Jewish". Also as we stated in one of our pieces Jesus said that "the Sabbath was made for man" he did not say that the Sabbath was made for the Jews. This "jewish" Sabbath thing seems to serve as a very convenient crutch for the Sabbath change doctrinaires, seeing as they have to find some pretext for disregarding the original Sabbath and the eight Scriptural references which conclusively give it a New Testament era perpetuation.

P. S. For those who take exception to our terminology "Siniatic Sabbath bondage" we refer them again to Gal.4:22-25 which tells us very plainly that the Siniatic covenant "gendereth to bondage". It should also then be very evident that the same covenant is intended by "the yoke of bondage" mentioned in the first verse of the next chapter.

P. S. If our two former Sabbath pieces are not enough to convince Bro. Jonathan that the first day of the week is not the Sabbath, never has been the Sabbath, and never will be the Sabbath, we then pronounce plainly that he, in his mind evidently has set up a huge acknowledgmental blockade. He's not in that box by himself, he has plenty of company. The fourth commandment speaks of "the seventh day" thus, "wherefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Friend, if your going to keep the fourth commandment, you're going to have to keep the day which was hallowed by the LORD, of which day the eight (post Pentecost) references in Acts testify in such plain fashion.

P. S. The Scripture does say that the Sabbath was to be a sign between the Lord and the children of Israel "forever". The word "forever" in the Old Testament evidently means, as long as the current dispensation continues, and/or, until the Sovereign Creator brings in something which dispenses with the current. The Scriptures also say that the "earth abideth forever" yet Jesus says that "heaven and earth shall pass away". Rev. 20 goes further and says also that "there was found no place found for them". We know that the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is perfect and complete and we fully believe and know that the LORD GOD if he intended the Sabbath commandment to be of force under the grace dispensation would have said so plainly in the writing of the New Testament Scriptures.

P. S. Commentator Henry separates the Old Law by three distinctions, the moral Law, the judicial Law and the ceremonial Law. Its amazing that he could see all that and still not understand fourth commandment disanullment, see his discourse on Ex.31:12-17. The Scripture on the other hand, basically speaks of two Laws, the Law of Moses and the Law of Christ, and the first to be superseded by the second. In other words, the second contains every element essential to Salvation although much edification can be derived from the types and shadows of the first.

P. S. The Apostle Paul names five of the ten commandments, then says, "and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." We say again as we have already said. There is nothing in kindling a fire on the Sabbath which signifies that one does not love their neighbor as theirself. Yet again Paul says this. "For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

P. S. If only as much as these three words "Remember the Sabbath" were anywhere recorded in the New Testament, we would then by our failure to observe the seventh day of the week be in transgression of the commandmental Law of God.

P. S. Cruden says thus; "By the Jewish law given at Sinai the seventh day was to be a day of rest, in which no secular work was to be done, and which was to be kept holy to God. At a later period the simple Jewish law of early days, was added to by the traditions of the elders, until the Sabbath rules became burdensome, and, in some cases foolish. It was against this, and not against Gods law of the Sabbath that Jesus set himself in his teaching and healing." Here he (Cruden) seems inclined to divest our Lord Jesus Christ of any abrogative power and authority even as he would any other prophet. We ourselves are going to state plainly and without apology, that our Lord Jesus Christ (being God in the flesh) had and used a full measure of divine authority to dispense with (abrogate) everything which had been spoken and/or written in the law and the prophets, and this without destroying any of it, not "one jot or one tittle". The fact that we have it now (the Old Testament) 2000 years later to inspire our faith and deepen our wisdom confirms to us the fact that none of it has ever been destroyed, or rendered devoid of its meaning.

P. S. On one end of the definitive variability scale Webster gives this;,, fulfill, "to carry into effect." We all know that this is not what Jesus came to do, for the law was already "in effect" when he came. On the other end of the scale Webster also gives this;,, fulfill, "to finish, come to the end of." Several Scriptures, we say, would support this latter rendering especially Rom.10:14 and 11Cor.3:13. Over>>>

P. S. Mt.28:1. "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week". Here we say that it is only sound logic, that if Christ's resurrection had sanctified a new (first day of the week) Sabbath, Matthew would not have seen it a thing proper and right to place such definite emphasis upon the Sabbatical nature of the seventh day of the week which was presently closing. This same Scripture would lend itself quite well to the doctrine of Sabbath abolition, were it not for the eight infallible references in

Acts, to which we (out of such extreme necessity) allude so often. P. S. Bro. Jonathan states strongly that Rom.14:5 was not meant to be applied to the Sabbath day. He had better hope that it was, for he most likely (along with many others who make the same assertion) works on the seventh day of the week, which thing strongly suggests that he regards the original creation Sabbath, not at all. This is the day that the eight references in Acts continue to name "the Sabbath" well on after the

Lords resurrection and the day of Pentecost. Bro. Jonathan is in the same box with plenty of other co-religionists, he is not concerned with the Sabbath references in Acts which completely obliterate the Sabbath change conception. Once again the Scripture is made "of none effect" in our efforts to defend the orthodox position.

P. S. The Wycliffe Bible Commentary says this; "the Sabbath of the New Creation is most naturally to be celebrated on that day when Christ, having ceased from his finished work, rose from the dead." In spite of this Sabbath change assertion, (see comments on Ex.20:8-11), this "Protestant" commentary passes over each of the eight Sabbath references in Acts without once touching upon the theological implications of the fact that the seventh day is explicitly called "the Sabbath" or "the Sabbath day" in all eight of them. The

Wycliffe also says, "The apostolic church celebrated both the first and the seventh days, but they soon discontinued the Old Hebrew observance." This we say, may very well be true, but even if it is that changes nothing at all of what the Scripture says. The Wycliffe also quietly passes over the very significant Sabbath mention in Col.2:16, where the word "days" is inserted by the translators.

P. S. We cannot accept that Paul in Col.2:16 was binding the Colossian church with the mandatory observance of "the new moon," every Mosaical holy day, and every Mosaical ordinance concerning food and drink, we don't think there would be any commentator or theologian that would say that he was. This being so, then neither was he binding them in Sabbath observance, for he said "or of the Sabbath." The word "days" in this verse is added by the translators, evidently to cause us to think of the Mosaical high Sabbaths. All of this being so, it remains that this word, "Let no man therefore judge" is likely directed to the sinitical

judges who are dealt with in Galatians, Hebrews and other writings of Paul. It is possible that he was instructing them (the Colossian church) to sacrifice their Christian liberty, when in the presence of those who did not have "knowledge", see 1Cor.8:1. It is for sure that he was instructing them not to judge one another in the things named, one of which was "the Sabbath". We also strongly believe that the Sabbath foreshadows the millennial reign of Christ with his saints.

P. S. When we say that anything of moral significance which was spelled out in the Old Testament will in some manner be covered in the New, we by "immoral" would then mean that which gendereth to "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,". We also disclaim any responsibility for any who (by reason of our statements) endeavor to take liberties which their conscience will not bear. The best thing that you can do my friend, is to keep living just as you have been living, that is, unless you should see fit to tighten up.

Concerning the fourth commandment Adam Clarke says; exact quotation; "Because this commandment has not been particularly mentioned in the New Testament as a moral precept binding on all, therefore some have presumptuously inferred that there is no Sabbath under the Christian dispensation." see comments on Ex.20:8-11. To this we say, By using the term "no Sabbath" Mr. Clarke reveals his unwillingness to hit the fourth commandment disanullment doctrine head-on. Why? Because there is no way to hit the fourth commandment disanullment doctrine head-on. Those who have carefully studied our work on the Sabbath will know that we do not endorse the doctrine of Sabbath day abolition, although we do endorse the doctrine of fourth commandment disanullment.

We do not intend to engage in a drawn-out Sabbath debate. The Kittel & Friedrich, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament; in its thirty four pages of fairly small print on the Sabbath subject, repeatedly refers to the original Sabbath as "Jewish" as also does Henry, Clarke and no telling how many others. Based upon this faulty foundation, it (the K&F) makes a weak case for Sabbath change. In the light of the eight absolutely authoritative (and highly relevant) Sabbath references in Acts there can be nothing other than a weak case constructed in favour of this desirable inference. It would be more proper to call it (the Sabbath) Israelitish than to call it Jewish. Although Israel may have been the only people bound under the commandment (and taken into the Sabbath covenant) yet we say that the *privilege* of Sabbath rest rightly belongs to all mankind.

We also disclaim responsibility for any who (by reason of our statements) endeavor to take unto themselves liberties which their conscience will not bear. The best and safest thing that you can do my friend, is to keep living just as you heretofore have, unless you should see fit to tighten up.