

### RIGHTLY DIVIDING SABBATARIANISM

If the Sabbath had been instituted by and within the Mosaic Covenant, we then would have much firmer ground upon which to base an assumption that the Sabbatical solemnity might have been transferred from the seventh day to the first day of the week, seeing as the scriptures so plainly tell us that the first covenant set forth "weak and beggarly elements" and was also found faulty by him who designed it. This covenant also contained carnal commandments, "carnal ordinances" and "a worldly sanctuary" was "weak through the flesh" and "made nothing perfect".

The fact however, that the Sabbath (along with Holy Matrimony) was instituted in the creation, long before it was ever ordained into the Sinaitic Covenant, troubles the notion that (as time passed out of the Old and into the New dispensations) its sanctity was transferred to a day other than that which was originally ordained by the Creator.

As far as it concerns the restrictive ordinances which were applied to the Sabbath in the writing of the Old Covenant, they began to decay, ((see Heb. 8:13 last clause) as did all the other legalistical elements of Sinaitic bondage) under the three and one half year ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ, and they therefore find no place in the New Testament text.

We are not by this writing attempting to discourage the sanctification of Sunday (by the people of God) as the Lords day. We are discouraging the naming of Sunday as the Sabbath day, for the Scripture never calls Sunday the Sabbath day. Seeing then that the Scripture never names the first day of the week "the Sabbath day" we are out of the Scriptural order whenever we do so. There is a great straightening out day coming and we have a fore-view of this day in 1Cor. 3:13-15.

We will below make three definite assertions concerning this matter. Anybody who comes against us as touching these assertions will have to present a systematic refutation of the said assertions or their time, as far as we are concerned will be wasted. As touching the Scriptures which are commonly used to uphold the Sabbath change theory, we have been looking at them for well over twenty years. There is not one single statement in the Bible (including Heb. 4:8) which can rightly be interpreted as changing, or revealing a change of, the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week.

Assertion #1. The seventh day is called (named) the Sabbath in about sixty different NEW TESTAMENT references. At least eight of these references occur in the post resurrection (of the Lord) period covered by the writing of the book of Acts.

Assertion #2. The first day of the week is nowhere in the Scripture called the Sabbath or the Sabbath day.

The seventh day Adventist probably stress this also, but that makes no difference at all to us.

Assertion #3. The New Testament does not and absolutely would not name two different days of the week as the Sabbath day.

We now say again. The Sabbath is referenced around eight or nine times in the book of Acts which is dealing with the post resurrection (of the Lord) period. These Scripture references have been trashed by our P. F. B. doctrinaires, as well as by many other doctrinaires. One of the most conclusive of these references is Acts 15:21. In this verse of Scripture there is no controversy as to whether the reference is to the Seventh day Sabbath, which is the only "the Sabbath" there has ever been. Now answer this question. Is the Scripture witness true or not?

We do not deny that the reference to "the Lords day" in Rev. chap. one (also Heb. 4:7,8) may be indicating the first day of the week as implied by the various Scriptures which speak of the Christian gatherings which occurred on this day. We ourselves have no intention whatever of forsaking the practice of Sunday worship and rest from our dailey routine.

With the fourth commandment being deliberately left out of the New Testament text, there was therefore no need for any clarification of legalistic criterion concerning behaviour on the Sabbath day.

If the fourth commandment had been anywhere reinstated in the New Testament, the Sabbath change error would have been impossible to initiate, for the commandment specified the Seventh day of the week.

Only the omission of the fourth commandment made this misjudgment possible. If this commandment had been reinstated we would then be condemned for any attempted sanctification of the first day of the week as the Sabbath day. Only the New Testament omission of the fourth commandment allows us to consecrate the first day of the week as our Sabbath without condemnation.

We do solemnly give charge that this article be read and expounded to the saints by the pastors of the various churches, or at least by the teachers of the adult Sunday school classes. Those who refuse to do so will, we say, be accountable, not to us, but rather to him that called us and who also ordained the truth as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Dear friends, it is a mistake to think that orthodoxy cannot be wrong. Any orthodox system of doctrine, (whether it be Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian, or P. F. B.) which names the first day of the week as the Sabbath day is in error.

If these three words "Remember the Sabbath" had been anywhere recorded in the New Testament, there would never have been an occasion for the formulation of the Sabbath change theory. The Old and New Testaments are agreed in their naming of the Seventh day of the week "the Sabbath day".

Commentator Henry is a lively advocate for Sabbath change, though he wisely never (as far as we know) goes to the extreme of saying that the original Sabbath was abolished. He also appears to miss Pauls reference to "the Sabbath" in Col. 2:16. Please notice in this verse that "days" is added by the translators. Paul himself simply said "the Sabbath". What day was he referring to?

There is no use of saying to me, hear what our conservative F. B. brethren have taught in years past. We well know what these brethren taught and lived with respect to Sabbath observance. We are however looking far over their heads at the foundational teaching (and the exemplary life) of the Lord Jesus and his disciples, and we are willing to acknowledge the obvious inconsistency between the doctrine of the Lord and his Apostles, and the doctrine of these brethren of more recent years in regards to this issue... Over....



The strict condemnatory pattern of thought which some of these brethren carried as concerning Sabbath observance was based almost totally upon the Law of the Old Covenant, without any true support whatever from the Law and Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This (we say) is not necessarily a Salvation issue, but eternal rewards are surely being weighed in the balance. Those who reject our fellowship, due to these assertions, will automatically join themselves in affinity with the Pharisees and the Sadducees, who also rejected the Lord over his doctrine of "the Sabbath".

R. Corn 09

P. S. We know that this piece may very well pull the plug on our already ailing relationship with the organization, but please dear friends, be advised of this one thing. The breaking of the fragile bond of fellowship is going to have to be implemented on your end of the line rather than on mine. You might however, want to hold a serious consultation with the master before taking such measures, for once the bond of brotherly fellowship is broken it is impossible to mend other than by a sovereign act of the Lord on behalf of the estranged parties.

Luke in his follow-up treatise to the "most excellent Theophilus" identifies the seventh day eight or nine times as "the Sabbath". Eight times the book of Acts witnesses to the fact that the seventh day is "the Sabbath".

Naming the first day of the week as the Sabbath day, potentially brings confusion seeing as by it we are overriding the Scriptures implicit insistence on the divinely ordained permanence of the creation Sabbath as to the specific day of the week it was to honor. If it is true that some have held that the weekly cycle has (sometime heretofore) slipped forward by one day, making the first day of the week, now the same day as before time was the seventh day of the week, this is only another Sabbatarian fable. This piece could have been subtitled, SABBATARIAN FABLES.

The duty of a minister simply put is to bring the hearer into a state of acknowledgment of the fact that the Scripture really means what it says. This requires teaching. Acknowledgment is the whole problem, and it is the gift of God sovereignly bestowed upon whomever he will.

The Bible tells us that the inspired Scripture is (for one purpose) given "for correction". In this article we have used the following eight Scriptures "for correction". Acts 13:14, Acts 13:27, Acts 13:42, Acts 13:44, Acts 15:21, Acts 16:13, Acts 17:2, Acts 18:4.

Henry calls the seventh day "the Jewish Sabbath" as if it had been instituted in Moses or tacked on by the Pharisees and Sadducees, see his comment on Acts 13:14. Although he is a Sabbath change advocate, he yet calls the seventh day "the Sabbath day" at least four times, see comments on Acts 13:44, Acts 15:21, Acts 16:13, and Acts 17:2.

When Paul in Gal.5:13 says that we "have been called unto liberty" he is meaning liberty from the binding elements set forth in the Law of Moses, as well as liberty from the things "from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses" see Acts 13:39. Please note that he did not (in this verse) say that we are justified *in* anything. The Sinaitic Sabbath bondage is one element of this "yoke" which is also referred to in Gal.5:1. And from which we are loosed by the New Covenant, even by the words of our Lord Jesus Christ as recorded in Mk.2:27. This passage deals with the fact that the Sabbath was originally meant to be a one day per week release from the work curse, which a man (under the fourth commandment) was bound to bear for six days of the week. As far as our knowledge goes there was no allowance made by the Scriptures even in the case of sickness or other necessities. We here say also that man (even before the fall) was under a work commission as is made clear in Gen.2:15.

There are lessons, looming on the horizon (which will be beyond the concern of the average carnal Christians meditations) which (as touching divine sovereignty and its revelation (through the Church) unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places) are of far greater depth than anything we have attempted to reach for in this somewhat basic article. These prospective lessons on the non-imputative dimension of divine sovereign Grace are relevant to how that doctrinal errancy in this sphere (sabbatarianism) as well as certain other areas (such as the coming of the Lord) has no effect on the elect individuals justified standing before the All-Sovereign Justifier. Eternal rewards nevertheless, will be, in greater and lesser degrees, lost. We entreat the prayers of all concerned that we may be able to yet more fully acknowledge and set forth in writing the undeniable truths of the Law and Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

One reason for which no New Testament writer would ever have dared to name Sabbath breaking as a sin or a work "of the flesh" is because of the fact that the Scripture plainly says that Jesus "had broken the Sabbath". This Scripture reference (John 5:18) was acknowledged by Bro. Michael Brown in a piece printed in the Faith and Truth a few months ago. A restrictive first day of the week Sabbath is a commandment "of men" for the Lord never commanded it.

We now disclaim any responsibility for those who will seize upon certain selected statements contained in our writings, to the exclusion of the intended import of the integrated whole of any particular piece, and we also disclaim any responsibility for any unrealized harm incurred by such hasty and unwise persons.



The strict condemnatory pattern of thought which some of these brethren carried as concerning Sabbath observance was based almost totally upon the Law of the Old Covenant, without any true support whatever from the Law and Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This (we say) is not necessarily a Salvation issue, but eternal rewards are surely being weighed in the balance. Those who reject our fellowship, due to these assertions, will automatically join themselves in affinity with the Pharisees and the Sadducees, who also rejected the Lord over his doctrine of "the Sabbath".

R. Corn 09

P. S. We know that this piece may very well pull the plug on our already ailing relationship with the organization, but please dear friends, be advised of this one thing. The breaking of the fragile bond of fellowship is going to have to be implemented on your end of the line rather than on mine. You might however, want to hold a serious consultation with the master before taking such measures, for once the bond of brotherly fellowship is broken it is impossible to mend other than by a sovereign act of the Lord on behalf of the estranged parties.

Luke in his follow-up treatise to the "most excellent Theophilus" identifies the seventh day eight or nine times as "the Sabbath". Eight times the book of Acts witnesses to the fact that the seventh day is "the Sabbath".

Naming the first day of the week as the Sabbath day, potentially brings confusion seeing as by it we are overriding the Scriptures implicit insistence on the divinely ordained permanence of the creation Sabbath as to the specific day of the week it was to honor. If it is true that some have held that the weekly cycle has (sometime heretofore) slipped forward by one day, making the first day of the week, now the same day as before time was the seventh day of the week, this is only another Sabbatarian fable. This piece could have been subtitled, SABBATARIAN FABLES.

The duty of a minister simply put is to bring the hearer into a state of acknowledgment of the fact that the Scripture really means what it says. This requires teaching. Acknowledgment is the whole problem, and it is the gift of God sovereignly bestowed upon whomever he will.

The Bible tells us that the inspired Scripture is (for one purpose) given "for correction". In this article we have used the following eight Scriptures "for correction". Acts 13:14, Acts 13:27, Acts 13:42, Acts 13:44, Acts 15:21, Acts 16:13, Acts 17:2, Acts 18:4.

Henry calls the seventh day "the Jewish Sabbath" as if it had been instituted in Moses or tacked on by the Pharisees and Sadducees, see his comment on Acts 13:14. Although he is a Sabbath change advocate, he yet calls the seventh day "the Sabbath day" at least four times, see comments on Acts 13:44, Acts 15:21, Acts 16:13, and Acts 17:2.

When Paul in Gal. 5:13 says that we "have been called unto liberty" he is meaning liberty from the binding elements set forth in the Law of Moses, as well as liberty from the things "from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses" see Acts 13:39. Please note that he did not (in this verse) say that we are justified *in* anything. The Sinaitic Sabbath bondage is one element of this "yoke" which is also referred to in Gal. 5:1. And from which we are loosed by the New Covenant, even by the words of our Lord Jesus Christ as recorded in Mk. 2:27. This passage deals with the fact that the Sabbath was originally meant to be a one day per week release from the work curse, which a man (under the fourth commandment) was bound to bear for six days of the week. As far as our knowledge goes there was no allowance made by the Scriptures even in the case of sickness or other necessities. We here say also that man (even before the fall) was under a work commission as is made clear in Gen. 2:15.

There are lessons, looming on the horizon (which will be beyond the concern of the average carnal Christians meditations) which (as touching divine sovereignty and its revelation (through the Church) unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places) are of far greater depth than anything we have attempted to reach for in this somewhat basic article. These prospective lessons on the non-imputative dimension of divine sovereign Grace are relevant to how that doctrinal errancy in this sphere (sabbatarianism) as well as certain other areas (such as the coming of the Lord) has no effect on the elect individuals justified standing before the All-Sovereign Justifier. Eternal rewards nevertheless, will be, in greater and lesser degrees, lost. We entreat the prayers of all concerned that we may be able to yet more fully acknowledge and set forth in writing the undeniable truths of the Law and Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

One reason for which no New Testament writer would ever have dared to name Sabbath breaking as a sin or a work "of the flesh" is because of the fact that the Scripture plainly says that Jesus "had broken the Sabbath". This Scripture reference (John 5:18) was acknowledged by Bro. Michael Brown in a piece printed in the Faith and Truth a few months ago. A restrictive first day of the week Sabbath is a commandment "of men" for the Lord never commanded it.

We now disclaim any responsibility for those who will seize upon certain selected statements contained in our writings, to the exclusion of the intended import of the integrated whole of any particular piece, and we also disclaim any responsibility for any unrealized harm incurred by such hasty and unwise persons.



### RIGHTLY DIVIDING SABBATARIANISM

If the Sabbath had been instituted by and within the Mosaic Covenant, we then would have much firmer ground upon which to base an assumption that the Sabbatical solemnity might have been transferred from the seventh day to the first day of the week, seeing as the scriptures so plainly tell us that the first covenant set forth "weak and beggarly elements" and was also found faulty by him who designed it. This covenant also contained carnal commandments, "carnal ordinances" and "a worldly sanctuary" was "weak through the flesh" and "made nothing perfect".

The fact however, that the Sabbath (along with Holy Matrimony) was instituted in the creation, long before it was ever ordained into the Sinaitic Covenant, troubles the notion that (as time passed out of the Old and into the New dispensations) its sanctity was transferred to a day other than that which was originally ordained by the Creator.

As far as it concerns the restrictive ordinances which were applied to the Sabbath in the writing of the Old Covenant, they began to decay, ((see Heb. 8:13 last clause) as did all the other legalistical elements of Sinaitic bondage) under the three and one half year ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ, and they therefore find no place in the New Testament text.

We are not by this writing attempting to discourage the sanctification of Sunday (by the people of God) as the Lords day. We are discouraging the naming of Sunday as the Sabbath day, for the Scripture never calls Sunday the Sabbath day. Seeing then that the Scripture never names the first day of the week "the Sabbath day" we are out of the Scriptural order whenever we do so. There is a great straightening out day coming and we have a fore-view of this day in 1Cor. 3:13-15.

We will below make three definite assertions concerning this matter. Anybody who comes against us as touching these assertions will have to present a systematic refutation of the said assertions or their time, as far as we are concerned will be wasted. As touching the Scriptures which are commonly used to uphold the Sabbath change theory, we have been looking at them for well over twenty years. There is not one single statement in the Bible (including Heb. 4:8) which can rightly be interpreted as changing, or revealing a change of, the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week.

Assertion #1. The seventh day is called (named) the Sabbath in about sixty different NEW TESTAMENT references. At least eight of these references occur in the post resurrection (of the Lord) period covered by the writing of the book of Acts.

Assertion #2. The first day of the week is nowhere in the Scripture called the Sabbath or the Sabbath day.

The seventh day Adventist probably stress this also, but that makes no difference at all to us.

Assertion #3. The New Testament does not and absolutely would not name two different days of the week as the Sabbath day.

We now say again. The Sabbath is referenced around eight or nine times in the book of Acts which is dealing with the post resurrection (of the Lord) period. These Scripture references have been trashed by our P. F. B. doctrinaires, as well as by many other doctrinaires. One of the most conclusive of these references is Acts 15:21. In this verse of Scripture there is no controversy as to whether the reference is to the Seventh day Sabbath, which is the only "the Sabbath" there has ever been. Now answer this question. Is the Scripture witness true or not?

We do not deny that the reference to "the Lords day" in Rev. chap. one (also Heb. 4:7,8) may be indicating the first day of the week as implied by the various Scriptures which speak of the Christian gatherings which occurred on this day. We ourselves have no intention whatever of forsaking the practice of Sunday worship and rest from our dailey routine.

With the fourth commandment being deliberately left out of the New Testament text, there was therefore no need for any clarification of legalistic criterion concerning behaviour on the Sabbath day.

If the fourth commandment had been anywhere reinstated in the New Testament, the Sabbath change error would have been impossible to initiate, for the commandment specified the Seventh day of the week.

Only the omission of the fourth commandment made this misjudgment possible. If this commandment had been reinstated we would then be condemned for any attempted sanctification of the first day of the week as the Sabbath day. Only the New Testament omission of the fourth commandment allows us to consecrate the first day of the week as our Sabbath without condemnation.

We do solemnly give charge that this article be read and expounded to the saints by the pastors of the various churches, or at least by the teachers of the adult Sunday school classes. Those who refuse to do so will, we say, be accountable, not to us, but rather to him that called us and who also ordained the truth as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Dear friends, it is a mistake to think that orthodoxy cannot be wrong. Any orthodox system of doctrine, (whether it be Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian, or P. F. B.) which names the first day of the week as the Sabbath day is in error.

If these three words "Remember the Sabbath" had been anywhere recorded in the New Testament, there would never have been an occasion for the formulation of the Sabbath change theory. The Old and New Testaments are agreed in their naming of the Seventh day of the week "the Sabbath day".

Commentator Henry is a lively advocate for Sabbath change, though he wisely never (as far as we know) goes to the extreme of saying that the original Sabbath was abolished. He also appears to miss Pauls reference to "the Sabbath" in Col. 2:16. Please notice in this verse that "days" is added by the translators. Paul himself simply said "the Sabbath". What day was he referring to?

There is no use of saying to me, hear what our conservative F. B. brethren have taught in years past. We well know what these brethren taught and lived with respect to Sabbath observance. We are however looking far over their heads at the foundational teaching (and the exemplary life) of the Lord Jesus and his disciples, and we are willing to acknowledge the obvious inconsistency between the doctrine of the Lord and his Apostles, and the doctrine of these brethren of more recent years in regards to this issue... Over....