

MORE ON THE UNSOUND DOCTRINE OF SABBATH CHANGE

The Fire-Baptized discipline states thus, verbatim quote; "The Christian Sabbath is the Lord's Day." This statement seems to be all the discipline offers on the theology of the Sabbath as touching the identity of the day to be sanctified. This somewhat vague statement carries an uncertain sound. It carries the sound of those who are not certain (and are hesitant) of where exactly they should be standing on this issue, for the discipline never states (explicitly) the Sabbath change doctrine, nor specifies the proper day of the week its subjects presumably should observe. Chap. XLV section 10 does not name Sunday as "the Sabbath" and neither does 1Cor.16:2.

The Sabbath change doctrine stands totally upon a Scriptural implicit, (even an solid implicit does not furnish grounds for a divine law or command, even though it does furnish grounds for doctrinal formulation). The day which the Scriptures call the Sabbath in Genesis-Malachi, they continue to call the Sabbath on through Acts 18:4 which speaks of a time well beyond the Lords resurrection and the day of Pentecost. The last reference to "the Sabbath" in the Bible is found in Col.2:16. In this verse of Scripture the word "days" is added by the translators, so it remains that Paul in this verse simply said "the Sabbath". Seeing then that the Bible calls the same day of the week "the Sabbath" all the way up through Acts 18:4 there is no reason to suppose that Paul intended any other day.

It definitely appears that many folks are reprobate concerning the Sabbath. We are not saying that such individuals are "reprobate concerning the faith" or that they are going to be lost, (see our second P. S.). We are simply saying that these persons are (according to certain hidden purposes in the manifold wisdom of God) being held in a state in which they cannot change their untoward belief concerning this issue. The doctrine of human power of choice is going to have to suffer a little bit right here but we're not going to apologize for that either. Ones being, *as* reprobate, concerning the Sabbath is not at all the same as "reprobate concerning the faith".

The fact that Sabbath change advocate Mt. Henry in his comments on Acts 13:14 calls the original Sabbath day "jewish" clearly reveals that he was having a problem with the book of Acts naming of the seventh day of the week as "the Sabbath". Our Lord Jesus Christ in his own "perfect law of liberty" states plainly that "the Sabbath was made for man" he did not say that the Sabbath was made for the Jews.

The popular disregarding of the eight Sabbath references in Acts (listed in the former article) for the purpose of supposedly establishing *Sabbath change* reveals the very same principle used by the Jesus only, the Universalist, and probably most other erroneous teachings, in the supposed establishing of those doctrines, for they likewise have to override many explicit Scripture statements in doing so.

Mk.2:27. This authoritative statement of our Lord Jesus Christ seems to imply that (under grace) the keeping of the Sabbath is a matter of individual conscience, as also does some of the statements of the Apostle Paul. This perfect liberty concept seems to be fully confirmed by the manner in which the Lord many times blesses Sunday worship even when it is offered by those who have (only the day before) totally disregarded the original creation Sabbath, which day the Bible continues to call "the Sabbath" as long as it speaks of the Sabbath which is well on after the Lords resurrection and the day of Pentecost.

Let us now say. We are certainly not endorsing a "let every man choose his own Sabbath" theology, as reportedly is taught by some Holiness churches. This is likely a runaway rendering on Rom.14:5 and could have a very destructive potential to the unity of the general assembly of the Lords spiritual body, as well as to the spiritual stability of the individual who attempts to exersize such extravagant liberties. We do not want to fall into that rut where we do "every man, that which is right in his own eyes".

This piece needs to be studied in conjunction with the former Sabbath article which we sent out awhile back.

R. Corn

2-2010

P. S. A brother who was printed in the Faith and Truth, stated to the effect that any and all of the elements of Sinaitical bondage, (see Gal.4:24) which were attached to the seventh day of the week, are now (under Grace) transferred to the first day of the week. In regards to this we say, that this brother had no more rightly divided Scriptural foundation for such an assertion, than do the above named sects, and certainly not more than the various seventh day churches, which all stand upon the fourth commandment clause which states thus, "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God". The eight Scripture references in Acts can be used to prove absolutely and irrefutably, that the seventh day continues to be "the Sabbath day" on into the New Testament dispensation. As far as our knowledge reaches there has never been any person so radical as to try to assert that these eight references would be intending the first day of the week. Such extreme assertions potentially wreak havoc upon ones acknowledgmental facilities, and very well may lead into the *as reprobate* condition which we alluded to earlier in this piece.

P. S. Sabbath inconsistencies (we say) are in the nature of things which (under Grace) may be dealt with according to 1 Cor.3:15, seeing as "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" are not necessarily involved in errors which are of such a strictly legalistical nature. Peradventure "the pride of life" should be the motivator in any such matters, then the issue becomes much more serious, and also potentially subject to be dealt with, (not according to 1Cor.3:15, but rather) according to 1 Cor.3:17. If the spiritually combustible materials signified in 1 Cor.3:13 as "wood, hay, stubble:" do not represent un-imputed sin, then somebody explain to us what they do represent, seeing as we know absolutely that righteousness, (which manifests itself chiefly in works of charity) will not burn. Please see our piece titled, SOVEREIGN NON-IMPUTABILITY; JUSTIFICATION BY GRACE, ref.Rom.4:8, Rom.3:24, Tit.3:7. Over>>>

MORE ON THE UNSOUND DOCTRINE OF SABBATH CHANGE

P. S. The case for a restrictive Sunday Sabbath cannot stand the test of an intensive Scriptural analysis. Not one New Testament speaker or writer, utters the least measure of condemnation upon Sabbath breaking, (seventh day or otherwise) and in the former article we showed the major reason why they would not have dared to do so. How is it then, that we in these latter days, have assumed such pharisaical boldness in stepping out beyond the point where all the New Testament writers reined in. If we are not careful in this matter we will be found "going about to establish" our own righteousness. We are not here referring to those who conscientiously restrict themselves in Sabbath observance, but rather to those who, in a condemnatory spirit seek to restrict others, in a Sunday observance of Sabbath, which thing the implicit New Testament pattern of silence will not countenance.

P. S. Col.2:16 seems to be simply a different phraseological framework of the Apostolic emancipation which is otherwise worded in Rom.14:22. In Col.2:16, please note again that the word "days" is added by the translators, seemingly encouraging the doctrinaire to apply it to the "high" Sabbaths of the Mosaic ordinances. Paul said "the sabbath".

Am I saying that we should not keep Sabbath? No, but when the Acts 15, apostolic counsel, (inspired by the Holy Ghost) drew up the discipline for the early gentile Christians, they did not consider Sabbath keeping as a "necessary" article to be added to the list. And so it is in all of the New Testament writings. In this four-fold law of necessity, (contained in Acts 15:28,29) we believe the command against fornication covered all sexual immorality and lewdness, which thing is definitely the top priority in true Christian living, see also 1Cor.6:18.

P. S. 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 itself was disannulled. Any who will teach that the fourth commandment is still binding, might ought to buckle down and keep the seventh day, lest they be troubled by their own words in the judgment, for the foundational precept of the commandment was 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 foundational precept was there even before the commandment was imposed.

P. S. Although we are looking at the works of various commentators, as touching this subject, we are still returning to the base source of truth, the Holy Scriptures, for the impetus of the formation of our final conclusions, basically these eight Sabbath references in Acts, which continue to name the seventh day as the Sabbath, after the Lords resurrection and the day of Pentecost.

P. S. As far as it concerns this round about, double jointed theology by which means it has been concluded that the fourth commandment lawfully serves to the enforcement of a first day Sabbath, this sort of rationalizing, we say, is about as wreckless as any of those systems of doctrine which the P. F. B. discipline holds "as false and unscriptural". However, we say, that this matter is not necessarily a Salvation issue as some of these others very well may be. Such things as these will ultimately be decided by the Master himself.

As we have said before so we say again, eternal rewards will certainly be affected by the proper or the improper emphasis which we (especially the ministry) place upon such things.

P. S. One reason for the writing of this article is that they who truly love the truth, may know more of that which they truly love.

R. Com 2-2010

P. S. A brother who was pinned in the Faith and Truth, aimed to the effect that any and all of the elements of spiritual bondage (see Gal 4:24) which were attached to the seventh day of the week, are now (under Grace) transferred to the first day of the week. In regards to this we say, that this brother had no more rights divided Scriptural foundation for such an assertion, than do the above named sects, and certainly not more than the various seventh day churches, which all stand upon the fourth commandment clause which states, thus, "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God". The eight Scriptural references in Acts can be used to prove absolutely and undeniably, that the seventh day continues to be "the Sabbath day", on into the New Testament dispensation. As far as our knowledge teaches there has never been any person who radical as to assert that these eight references would be including the first day of the week. Such extreme assertions, weakly have upon ones self-knowledge, faculties, and very well may lead into the eschatological condition which we alluded to earlier in this piece.

P. S. Sabbath observance (we say) is in the nature of things which (under Grace) may be dealt with according to 1 Cor 3:15, seeing as "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" are not necessarily involved in errors which are of such a strictly legislative nature. Perseverance "the pride of life" should be the motivator in any such matter, then the issue becomes much more serious, and also potentially subject to be dealt with (not according to 1 Cor 3:15, but rather) according to 1 Cor 3:17. If the spiritually combustible materials signified in 1 Cor 3:13 as "wood, hay, stubble", do not represent an impeded air flow, somebody expects to in what they do represent, seeing as we know absolutely that righteousness (which manifest itself clearly in works of charity) will not burn. Please see our piece titled, SOVEREIGN NON-IMPUTABILITY JUSTIFICATION BY GRACE, Romans 4:8, Romans 3:24, Titus 3:5, Overlook.