

## ANSWERING OBJECTIONS ON SABBATH

In this final section we will answer some objections given against the teaching that the Sabbath day is yet to be kept by Yahweh's people, the followers of Yahshua the Messiah.

### Objection 1.

We are not under law, but under grace. Therefore, we do not need to keep the Ten Commandments.

**Answer:** For the most part I have already answered this objection. The matter is simply that, though keeping it holy was made part of the law, the Sabbath Day actually preceded the law as a day to be kept holy. Its holiness is not based on the law, but instead the commandment about it in the law is based on the fact that it was already a holy day from the beginning of creation. Therefore, unless it can be shown that the holiness was taken off the Sabbath, it is still to be kept holy.

Sad to say, the subject of law and grace is very much misunderstood in the Christian church as a whole. However, this is not the subject I am presently dealing with since it is clear that our not being "under the law, but under grace" changes nothing as relates to the Sabbath day.

### Objection 2

According the writings of the early church fathers Sunday is "the Lord's day" spoken of in Revelation 1:10 and now, as the early church did, we keep "the Lord's Day" instead of the Sabbath Day.

**Answer:** This was answered somewhat in the introduction to this writing. The Bible, not the church fathers, as they are called, is to be our guide. The apostle Paul in referring to the scriptures in II Tim. 3:15-17 was primarily referring to that portion of the Bible now called "The Old Testament", for most of the writings of the apostles were unknown when Timothy was "a child" (verse 15). It is, therefore, primarily that part of our Bible that Paul spoke of as being "able to make you wise unto salvation" and that he said "is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of Yahweh may be perfect throughly furnished unto all good works."

When we study the scriptures Paul was referring to, we find that the Sabbath is holy and is so to be kept - nothing else. There is no mention in any part of the Bible that Sunday would replace the Sabbath day. We find no indication that the Sabbath would ever be done away with, but actually just the opposite. There is no statement (or even clear evidence) in all the Bible that the early apostolic church considered Sunday to be a special day.

As regards the writings of the so-called church fathers, I again quote Isaiah 8:20: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Some of those early "church fathers" displayed strong anti-Jewish sentiments in their writings. Church history indicates that there were still believers who were keeping the Sabbath even after anti-Semitism led to the rejection of it and to the substitution of Sunday in its place by church leaders.

The fact that any so-called church father referred to Sunday as "the Lord's day" in no way gives proof that that is what John meant when he spoke of being "in the Spirit on" (or "in" - Gk. "en") "the Lord's day." We are in no way bound to accept man's interpretation of that term. John may well have been saying that in vision he was being carried forward and was "in the Spirit in the day of Yahweh", the final

day of judgment (as a good number of commentators understand him to mean - even though most of them are in churches that observe Sunday, not Sabbath). Obviously in his visions he was in (or "by") the Spirit in the day of Yahweh, i.e., the day of judgement. If, on the other hand, he was referring to being in the Spirit on some specific day of the week, there is only one day that the Bible says Yahweh calls "My holy day", and that Yahshua says He "is Lord of". That day is the ancient Sabbath day that Yahweh made for man by resting on the seventh day - the day that He blessed and made holy in the beginning.

This equating of John's phrase, "the Lord's day", with Sunday as proof that Sunday became the day honored in the early apostolic church instead of the Sabbath is an example of using a scripture of obscure meaning to overthrow the clear, plain teaching of the Bible about the sanctity of the Sabbath day. This you will find to be true of all "New Testament" scriptures used to deny the continuance of the Sabbath. They are all obscure as to their meaning or application. None of them clearly states that the Sabbath is no longer holy. None of them clearly states that the first day was kept as a regular day of worship by the apostolic New Covenant church. You should be able to see this as we continue answering objections.

### Objection 3

After rising from the dead, the Savior met with the disciples on the first day of the week, and then again eight days after. (John 20:19,26) Also the Holy Spirit fell on Pentecost Sunday. This all indicates that this was the day on which we should meet.

**Answer:** To say these things indicate that Sunday replaced the Sabbath day is nothing but pure conjecture. What a way to do away with the Sabbath which was so clearly established by Yahweh! It only shows the flimsiness of the case for Sunday replacing the Sabbath. The fact is, the first day of the week was the earliest time He could have met with them. Why should He wait until a later time? This in no wise indicates He was establishing that day as the regular day of meeting in place of the ancient Sabbath. Indeed verse 26 says He also met with them "after eight days again", but the meaning here is unclear. "After eight days" could just as easily mean the second day of the week. If it had said "after seven days" it would more likely be another Sunday. Even if it were plain that this meeting was again on a Sunday, that in itself would not be clear proof that Sunday was being made a day of worship and the Sabbath was being replaced. The obscurity lies in the fact that we do not know whether to count the same day He first met with them as one of the "after eight days", or to start counting with the next day, as normally would be the case. It could have been either way. Is this any way to build a doctrine that does away with Yahweh's clear sanction of the Sabbath day and replaces it with another day?

As far as Pentecost is concerned, the Holy Spirit had to come on that day in fulfillment of this feast, just as Yahshua died on the day the Passover was commemorated in fulfillment of that feast regardless of what day of the week Passover fell on in that year. According to the way many understand the biblical instructions concerning this Old Testament feast (called Shavuot, or "Weeks", in Hebrew), Pentecost always fell on the 1st day of the week (Lev.23:15,16). In any case, whether the particular day of the week in which the day of Pentecost came that year just happened to be Sunday, or whether Pentecost had always fallen on the 1st day of the week (as many understand

Lev. 23:15,16 to mean) this again says nothing whatsoever about doing away with the Sabbath and celebrating Sunday in its place.

#### Objection 4

**Christ arose on the first day of the week. Therefore, we should meet on that day.**

**Answer:** Who says so? Certainly not Yahshua or His apostles. I find no scripture stating that, or even clearly implying it. Furthermore, we are told in the scripture to remember His death until He comes, but no place are we told to celebrate or commemorate His resurrection on any particular day of the week, month, or year. Rather we are to live day by day in the power of His resurrection life. This is just another case of total assumption.

#### Objection 5

**In Acts 20:7 we find the church meeting with Paul and breaking bread (as in communion) on the first day of the week. This shows that this day was the day the early church met together.**

**Answer:** According to Jewish reckoning the day began at sunset. So Saturday sunset would begin the first day of the week. So this was most likely a Saturday night meeting. We see that Paul was ready to depart on the morrow and preached until midnight. It is highly unlikely that they met Sunday morning and Paul, then, continued preaching until midnight. It is much more likely that he preached beginning some time after sunset Saturday (the beginning of the first day of the week), continued until midnight, and, then, left on Sunday morning. The explanation for why they were meeting is given in the text as "to break bread". It was common for the early believers to eat together often. In the beginning they even met and ate together daily. (Acts 2:46,47; 5:42; Heb. 3:13) The fact that Paul was leaving them the following day made this their last opportunity to meet with him. So it is only natural that they would get together to eat with him, and that he would then preach to them.

In any case this was just one event in many in the narrative of the missionary journey that they were on. This hardly gives reason to suppose that this comment proves the first day of the week was the regular weekly day of meeting for the early church.

Actually, the meal they ate was described in the Greek as "the breaking of a loaf", referring to a regular meal, as verse 11 indicates, and not as "the breaking of the loaf" which term is used in Acts 2:42 as more likely referring to the communion table. More importantly, the tense of the verb used when it says, "when the disciples came together to break bread" ("break a loaf") is the perfect tense, rather than the imperfect tense. This (perfect) tense was used to indicate completed action with no indication that it was a habitual thing. The imperfect tense, not used here, is what was commonly used to indicate habitual action. In other words, if the tense is taken into account, the indication is clear that this coming together to eat on the first day of the week was just the way it happened to be on that particular occasion, not that such coming together to eat on the first day of the week was the regular established practice.

In any case, one thing is certain. This happening, and its being recorded along with many other events on this missionary journey of Paul, in no way teaches that the early church kept Sunday in

place of the Sabbath. As already stated, it was most likely a Saturday night meeting for the sake of fellowshiping over a meal and hearing Paul speak before he left the next day to continue his journey.

To use this scripture to seek to prove that the early church had special, regular meetings on the 1st day of the week is just another attempt to do away with the clear command to keep the Sabbath holy. It is an attempt to support a practice that crept in after the days of the original apostles, that of meeting on Sunday, by using a passage that in no way clearly says the early church did so. Thus it is another attempt to use an obscure passage to do away with a clear teaching of the Bible.

### Objection 6

The apostle Paul says in Romans 14:5, "One man esteems one day above another: another esteems every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

**Answer:** First of all, if this is speaking of the weekly day of meeting and resting, then, why do you try to encourage people to meet on Sunday instead of the Sabbath day (which in the Bible is definitely called "a holy convocation", i.e., a holy day of meeting together – Lev. 23:3)? Why do you esteem Sunday above other days of the week? You may claim you do not esteem Sunday above the other days, but if you meet regularly on Sundays as your primary day of meeting, "in honor of Christ's resurrection", you certainly are esteeming it above the other days of the week. You are making it to be a "holy convocation", a time of sacred gathering, which is what the Bible says the Sabbath is.

An examination of the overall teaching of Romans 14 will show that Paul is speaking about things which have no moral character in themselves, things on which people have the right to differ. This is surely not true when it comes to the matter of the Ten Commandments, which tell us to keep the Sabbath day holy. The Sabbath, as has clearly been shown, is a matter of great importance. Under the law the penalty for breaking it was death. Surely, then, we cannot say there is no moral aspect attached to the matter of the Sabbath day.

Paul was certainly not setting aside Yahweh's commandments. He was not talking about the moral commandments at all. They are not optional matters. He was most likely talking about the matter of keeping the biblical feast days given to the nation of Israel as part of the Law of Moses, which law the Gentile believers were not commanded to keep (Acts 15). However, having liberty to do so, some Gentiles apparently found it to be a blessing to celebrate those feast days as types and shadows of great salvation truths. Paul may even have been speaking of some other days that various people kept in celebration of national events, etc. But this is less likely. Whatever days he was talking about, his main point was that they should not argue about them, but let each man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

One reason I feel he was speaking of the biblical feast days found in the Law of Moses is that verse 6 in the Greek says, "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord." (The King James reading, "he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it" is not found in many Greek manuscripts, but is considered to be added in some by the copiers - as what is called an "interpola-

tion". Therefore, those words are not found in most translations.) Paul was most likely defending the right of those who, although they were Gentiles, nevertheless, had come to find blessing in keeping the biblical feast days given to the physical nation of Israel. Those feast days have great biblical, typical meaning as great object lessons of the plan of salvation. Paul was telling those who did not choose to keep those days to not judge those who did keep them, because any day such a person "regarded", he regarded it as unto Yahweh and gave Him thanks.

Once again this is another somewhat obscure passage. Although I believe I have the correct understanding of this passage, the truth is, the passage does not clearly say what it is speaking about. It is very foolish to use it to go against the clear teaching of the Bible about the Sabbath day, which is part of the moral law. Certainly Paul was not saying man's make up is so changed that he no longer needs the regular day of rest and worship such as Yahweh established for him in the beginning of time.

### Objection 7

**Paul criticized the Galatians by saying in Galatians 4:10,11 "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." This shows it is wrong to keep any day.**

**Answer:** Then why do you keep Sunday? To understand this passage you need to understand much more concerning the law of Moses and the relationship of the Gentile believers to it, as compared to the relationship of the Jewish believers to it. That, however, is an entire subject in itself.

We have no good, biblical reason to conclude that Paul was speaking about the Sabbath day in this list, for, as we have seen, the keeping of the Sabbath is included in the Ten Commandments as one of the basic moral teachings of the Bible.

Some believe Paul was referring to the Galatians lapsing back into observing pagan holidays. However, this is unlikely. It does not fit the context of the subject Paul was addressing. I personally believe the overall context indicates that Paul was referring to the Galatian believers beginning to keep the Law of Moses with its new moons, annual feast days, jubilee years, etc. However, it is not that Paul was speaking against the Gentile believers keeping these days, etc., as a matter in and of itself, any more than he was saying circumcision is wrong in and of itself when he told them not to be circumcised. Otherwise he would have been going against his own teaching in Romans 14:5,6 Although he appears to be against them getting circumcised, and against them celebrating special days, he was against neither as matters in and of themselves.

The reason he spoke out against doing these things is not that there was something wrong in these things which Yahweh Himself had given under the Law of Moses (also called the Law of Yahweh – Luke 2::23). He was against them doing these things because of the reason they were doing them. They were under the delusion that they had to become circumcised and keep the law, including, therefore, the feast days, in order to be saved. They had accepted another gospel - other than the gospel of salvation by grace through faith ("which works by love" - Gal. 5:6). They were "fallen from grace" into justification by the works of the law. No one is saved by keeping the law.

So once again the subject is not the Sabbath day, but those days which were given to the nation of

Israel as part of their national covenant. As has been shown, the Sabbath, though incorporated into the Law of Moses, nevertheless, also preceded it by over 2500 years. It was part of the Ten Commandments, and breaking the Sabbath carried the same penalty as murder, adultery, and witchcraft, because it is a moral commandment. To say from this passage that Paul was complaining about them keeping the Sabbath, and was himself setting it aside, is another example of using a passage in which the meaning is not really clear to set aside Yahweh's commandment which is very clear.

### Objection 8

In Colossians 2:16 Paul says to, "Let no man judge you in eating, or drinking, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." Thus he sets the Sabbath day aside as not having any importance.

**Answer:** Once again the question is this: was Paul speaking of the weekly Sabbath day which goes back to creation and is part of the moral code, as one of the Ten Commandments, or was he speaking of the annual Sabbaths, and those Sabbaths which occurred every 7 years, etc.? I believe he was speaking of the annual Sabbaths, such as the day of trumpets, the first and last days of unleavened bread, Shavuot (Pentecost), etc., not of the weekly Sabbath Day. Why do I say this? Because he calls them "shadows of things to come" in verse 17. It is an accepted fact that the annual feast days serve as types and shadows of great salvation truths. The body that casts that shadow is of Messiah. Although the weekly Sabbath can be used to typify our rest from our own works spiritually, it was not given for that primary reason. Its primary significance was as a memorial of creation, not as a type of a future event. It was not given as a mere "shadow of things to come", but as something needed for our well being in this life. It was given for man to meet a need in his individual life and in society as a whole. Therefore, Paul could not have been belittling the keeping of it. As a teacher of righteousness and morality he could not be lessening its importance to our well being when Yahweh Himself had given it to meet an ongoing basic need for humanity.

Furthermore, we would have to ask, what does he mean by saying let no man judge you in them? This certainly was not forbidding the keeping of them. That in itself would be judging. I believe he was saying as in Romans 14:5 regarding such days, not the weekly Sabbath, that you are free to keep them the way you understand, or even to not keep them if you so wish, for they are only shadows, and the body (which casts that shadow) is of Messiah. The handwriting of ordinances in the Law of Moses, is not to be forced upon the Gentile believers (in this case the Colossians). Nor are those ordinances to be forbidden to be kept by those who desire to keep them as they see their meaning and value, provided they do not keep them thinking to be saved by doing so.

Even if we were to grant the assumption that he was including the weekly Sabbath in his list, it would not be that he was doing away with the sacredness of the day, which sacredness goes back to the beginning of time, but that he was simply saying not to allow anyone to judge as to your manner of keeping it. The Pharisaical spirit, which judged our Savior according to their own, rigid, man made rules, still exists today. Although Paul most likely wasn't speaking of the weekly Sabbath here, we are not to let others judge us, but are to keep the Sabbath according to Yahweh's original intention as defined in the scripture and as taught by the Spirit, rather than according to man's judgment.

### Objection 9

Paul said in I Corinthians 16:2, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings

when I come." Doesn't this show that the church met, and took up collections, on the first day of the week?

**Answer:** Not at all. In fact, it shows the opposite. If they met together on that day, Paul would likely have said let each of you bring together as God hath prospered him. Instead, he told each one individually to "lay by him in store", that is by himself – at his own home – as Yahweh had prospered him the previous week. Why on the first day of the week? Because it was the most logical time to see how they had prospered the previous week, and it was the first workday after the Sabbath. It was the first business day of the week for them. The Sabbath was and is a day of rest, a "holy convocation" in honor of Yahweh's creation, not a time to go out and gather either from your fields or your business.

### Objection 10

Some say, "According to Matt. 5:17 Christ fulfilled the law for us. Therefore, we do not have to keep the Sabbath."

**Answer:** As has already been shown, the institution of the Sabbath as a holy day did not begin with the giving of the law under Moses. Therefore, our obligation to keep it holy does not depend on our relationship to the law.

In regard to this particular objection, it is important to note what our Savior was talking about as recorded in Matt. 5:17. The full statement of our Savior there is, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Then, He said, "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees" [those considered by His audience as the strictest of law keepers] "you shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."

How can you possibly read this statement of Yahshua that He came, "Not to destroy the law ... but to fulfil [it]" in light of all else He said here, and, then, conclude that by fulfil He meant He was setting it aside? That is like concluding He was using double talk by saying He came to destroy it after all by fulfilling it. Such reasoning is nothing but nonsense.

Does "fulfil" mean "to do away with"? When Yahshua responded to the reluctance of John the Baptist to baptize Him He said, "Allow it to be so now, for thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness." Does that mean He did away with all righteousness? Does it mean that, since He fulfilled "all righteousness", we no longer are required to do righteousness?

When Yahshua said He did not come to destroy the law, or the prophets, but to fulfil them He clearly meant that He came to do what they said. He did this both in the sense of living out the things spoken in them concerning Him, and in the sense of keeping the moral instructions taught in them. Indeed, the context of Matt. 5:17 speaks for itself plainly showing that His fulfilling the law did not do away with our obligation to keep its moral instructions. In fact, after making the statement, "... except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees,

you shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" He goes on to show that our requirements as His followers go even beyond the letter of the law. They include the deep spiritual meaning behind it. He said just being angry with our brother without a cause is to be a murderer, even merely looking on a woman with lustful intent is to be an adulterer, etc., etc

It is mere foolishness, in the light of all Yahshua said in this passage, to say that since Yahshua fulfilled the law we are no longer required to keep the moral teachings it gives [which, of course, are summarized in the Ten Commandments]. Nevertheless, I repeat, the responsibility to keep the Sabbath day holy does not rest upon our relationship to the law anyhow.

### Objection 11

**It is said Messiah is our rest, and, therefore, we do not have to keep any Sabbath. Resting in Him is our Sabbath keeping.**

**Answer:** This is generally based upon the statements found in Hebrews 4:9-11, especially verse 9 which in a literal translation from the Greek says, "There remains, therefore, a sabbath rest [sabbatismos] to the people of God."

This passage in Hebrews in no way states anything about the Sabbath day as respects our obligation to keep it holy. That is not the subject here at all. So why would anyone (except in grasping for a straw to support a predetermined position) think this is saying we are not to keep the Sabbath holy. Even if we were to conclude that anything is being said about the Sabbath day here, as respects resting physically on that day and using it for sacred purposes, we would have to conclude that it is telling us to seek to enter into that sabbath rest.

The real teaching of this chapter, and also most of the preceding chapter in Hebrews, is that unbelief keeps us from resting from our own works. It keeps us from entering into that spiritual rest or sabbath keeping which Yahweh has prepared for us. In verses 3 & 4 the writer speaks of the literal seventh day Sabbath merely as an example of the fact that He wants rest for His creation, and so He rested from all His own works. The writer (probably the apostle Paul) goes on to show that Yahweh's people had failed to learn to rest in His completed work, but must no longer do so.

We are to cease our own works [the works of the flesh which are categorized in Galatians 5:19-21 as "Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred . . . and such like things."] We are to labor to enter into that rest by ceasing from our "own works, as Yahweh did from His" (verses 10-11). In other words, as the context and other scriptures show, we are to enter into a faith walk with Him through the work of Calvary and His resurrection life. There is a keeping of a sabbath which is the ceasing from our own works by entering into the things of the Spirit, the things of His kingdom, this new creation in Messiah Yahshua, our heavenly High Priest. We are to enter into the good works He has already prepared for us (Eph. 2:10)

In Matt. 11:28 we read that Yahshua said "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." In verses 29-30 He shows that it is by becoming yoked together with Him and learning of Him (who was "meek and lowly of heart") that we find rest unto our souls. In this passage in Hebrews the writer is telling us that Yahweh has always wanted rest for His people. He illustrates this truth by mentioning the fact that Yahweh established the Sabbath day. How anyone could draw a conclusion from this that the writer is saying the Sabbath day is no longer holy and is, therefore, no longer to be kept holy is beyond me. It appears to be just another case of trying hard



to find something to support a theory not in itself taught anywhere in the actual words of the scripture.

To say Yahshua is our rest – He is our Sabbath - and, therefore, we do not need to keep the Sabbath day any longer is wresting these scriptures to say something they obviously do not say. Think about it. Yes, He is our rest. In that sense we could say He is (spiritually) our Sabbath. However, does that mean we no longer need physical rest? Does that mean we do not need to ever cease physical labor, or, for that matter, to even sleep? Does it mean we should never give our employees a day off? Does it mean we should no longer honor Yahweh (as respects His creative work of making the heavens and earth and all that is in them) by keeping holy what He made holy in the very beginning? Of course not. Let's use some common sense in this matter.

It is imperative that we learn to rest in Him from our own works – the unholy works of the flesh. It is essential that we also cease our own labors of trying to earn His acceptance by our own works. The Hebrews were being warned against going back to the system of the law under which people labored to be accepted by their own works of offering animal sacrifices for sin, going through various washing, etc. But in no way were they being told to break Yahweh's commandments. Under the New Covenant our sins are already paid for, and His commandments are now being written not on tables of stone where they only served to show us our sins and, thereby, condemn us to death. He now writes His law in our hearts by giving us a hunger and thirst for righteousness – a hunger that becomes filled as we learn of Him, and His word, by the Holy Spirit.

In this book to the Hebrews we are being told to enter into the finished work of the Messiah. That work was accomplished on Calvary. It is entered into by faith when we lay down our own lives and works by accepting His death in our place. We are to do this by faith as we call on His name by being immersed in His name for the remission of sins, so that we may receive His Holy Spirit who does this work of writing Yahweh's law on our hearts. [That is the original prescribed way as given in the scripture, and we can have full assurance of faith when we follow His planned way. How Yahweh will treat anyone ignorantly departs from His original, established method of accepting Calvary's work is up to Him to decide.] Be sure you have believed His word by doing what He said in the way He said to (Mark 16:15,16; Acts 2:38; Rom. 6:3-5; Gal. 3:26,27 and elsewhere.) Then, as you continue in that faith in the crucified one who is now our risen High Priest in heaven, you will be able to cease from you own works, by entering into His imputed, and imparted, righteousness wherein you will find rest – a true sabbath rest – to your soul. But as long as you seek to do it your own way – doing your own works – you will never know the true rest of the soul which the beauty and pleasure of observing the creation Sabbath Day illustrates.

Conclusion You will find, as is so of those we have already examined, that all scriptures used to teach against the Sabbath, and for keeping the first day of the week, are somewhat obscure in their meanings and/or applications. The historical origin of changing from Sabbath keeping to Sunday celebration is not at all founded in those verses so used today. The change began to come about through hatred of the Jews, and things Jewish, by church leaders after the time of the apostles, during a time that the Roman Empire was persecuting the Jews<sup>28</sup>. The so-called early church fathers did not use these verses commonly used today to argue against the Sabbath and for Sunday. They used other, often strange, allegorical, anti-Semitic reasoning. It was in more modern times (after some believers began to see what the Bible really teaches on the subject and began to return again to keeping, and teaching about, Yahweh's holy day) that these passages began to be used to try to justify what had become the long standing practice of keeping Sunday.

The Bible very clearly teaches that the seventh day of the week was blessed and made holy by

Yahweh in the beginning of human history. It very clearly teaches that Yahweh made it for man by Himself resting after the six days of creation. It very clearly tells us in the Ten Commandments to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" and gives us the reason as being, because of how it came into existence, and was blessed and made holy by Yahweh Himself in the very beginning of human history. It clearly shows us that the penalty for breaking it under the law was the same as for murder, blasphemy, idolatry, witchcraft, adultery, and other very serious infractions of the moral code. It very clearly teaches that the non-proselyte Gentile and eunuch, who had no place with Yahweh's people under the law, would be given a name and a place better than of sons and daughters if they would come to love His name, keep His Sabbaths, and take hold of His covenant, choosing those things that please Him. It very clearly promises great blessing to those who keep it, and clearly tells us Yahweh calls it, "My holy day". It clearly tells us that the love of Yahweh is to keep His commandments, and describes the last day believers in the book of Revelation as those who believe in Yahshua the Messiah and "keep the commandments of Yahweh."

Yet, even with the light of all this clear teaching in the pages of the Bible, in order to defend a practice which came about in the darkness of that period of time that came shortly after the death of the original apostles, modern day preachers and teachers turn to passages of uncertain meanings, and/or applications, to seek to support their claim that Yahweh took the holiness off His day and sanctioned another day in its place. They argue from unclear passages in attempting to support a day that Babylon<sup>29</sup>, in all its forms, ancient and modern, has always held in highest esteem in honor of the sun which has been worshipped both openly, and in cloaked form, by pagan societies everywhere.

In view of all the clear teaching of the Bible about the Sabbath day, and in view of the fact that keeping it was a sign of worshipping Yahweh, the one true creator, don't you think there would be some clear word if it were to be set aside? If indeed Yahweh changed the commandment, and changed His holy day to the day of the sun, don't you think He would have stated this clearly? There is not the least inkling in the entire Old Testament that He would set aside His day. Instead, we find just the opposite with promises of great blessing coming in our day, the day of salvation, on the son of the stranger and the eunuch who would keep it, and do the things that please Yahweh. Nor is there any hint from the lips of our Savior that the Ten Commandments, or even just the Sabbath commandment, would be annulled, but just the opposite. He said that one jot or tittle would "in no wise pass from the law" until all be fulfilled. He said that those who keep even the least of these commandments and teach men so will be called great in the kingdom of heaven. There is not one word from the early apostles saying that the Sabbath was being set aside, or that Sunday was to be kept. Instead, they give instructions to study the scriptures, the Old Testament writings, as that which is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of Yahweh may be perfect thoroughly furnished unto all good works." And it is those very scriptures which, beginning with the 2nd chapter, teach about the blessedness, and sacredness of the seventh day Sabbath.

Only in the darkness of the workings of "the mystery of iniquity" ("the mystery of lawlessness", which was already at work in the days of that great apostle Paul<sup>30</sup>) was the Sabbath of Yahweh set aside, and the day of the sun given a place of special honor by apostate leaders. It was the wolves in sheep's clothing, not the Lord of the Sabbath that changed the day. This deception is now so widespread - almost universal - in Christianity today that it is hard for people to believe the truth even when it is plainly laid out before their eyes. Even some who see it, at one time or another, find it hard to go against the huge tide of opinion of seemingly great men and women of faith. They find it

hard to embrace truth at the cost of losing friends, or positions. Others are frightened away by some who see and proclaim this precious truth, but are used of Satan to drag it into the mud by their also teaching many erroneous things, or by their bickering over certain things among themselves, or by their wrong conduct. But we are no more excused from accepting the Sabbath (or any other truth) just because such things exist among some who do accept it than the sinner is who refuses to accept the Savior, because he, or she, sees "there are hypocrites in the church."

Yahweh our Creator, and our Savior in Yahshua the Messiah, is the One who is restoring the knowledge of His Holy day. He is still calling out a remnant who want His approval more than the honor, or gifts, of men – a remnant who will "keep the commandments of Yahweh, and have the testimony of Yahshua the Messiah." If you are a true child of His, He is calling you to come out of the Babylon of the confusion of man's systems of religion – back to the clear, plain teaching of His word in the things of Zion.

In the temple in heaven there is still to be seen the ark of the covenant<sup>31</sup> – the ark that in its Old Testament type contained the Ten Commandments which were written on tables of stone by Yahweh's own finger. These commandments are foundational to true righteousness. Under the New Testament, they are now being written on the hearts of His people. One of those commandments tells us to keep holy His Sabbath Day. This Sabbath Day is a sign that He still gives to His people - those "who are Israelites indeed."

By Bro. "Robert W. Young" [trustyah@bellatlantic.net](mailto:trustyah@bellatlantic.net)  
Web site : [www.pathwayoflight.org](http://www.pathwayoflight.org).