

VOLUME II

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Additional Barriers To Sabbatarian Theology

A NEARLY COMPLETES GUIDE TO THE BARRIER OF CIRCUMCISION

This study takes almost everything that has been said about Circumcision's barrier to Sabbatarian theology and puts it in one place. A little repetition seems worth the trade off of duplication versus increased understanding and convenience to researchers studying the 12th Edition.

And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the LORD thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the LORD thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day. — Deuteronomy 5:15

God's interaction with his people down through time has largely been characterized by various covenants. In the Adamic Covenant, God tells Adam and Eve that He will bless them if they multiply and fill the Earth with other human beings. In the Noahide Covenant, God promises the human race that He will never destroy the world with a flood again. The Covenant required compliance with seven moral laws which were to apply to the entire human race down through time. The sign of the Noahide Covenant was the rainbow. Moving along we get to the Abrahamic Covenant, which promises Abraham a large nation of descendants if he is faithful. The sign he is given is Circumcision. Moving further along the history of God's interaction with His people, we get to the Mosaic Covenant. God will bless Israel if they are faithful to Him and remain separate from the Pagan nations around them. The sign of the Mosaic Covenant is the Jewish Sabbath. There was over 1,000 years between Abraham and Moses.

Moses is very clear that the Mosaic Covenant was not given to Israel's ancestors. At this point, then, we need to examine Deuteronomy 5:3, looking at its meaning and reviewing the efforts of Sabbatarian apologists to side-step what it means for Sabbath observance. This study touches on other related texts. This study presents a dialogue with a noted Sabbatarian, Marcos Thayer.

DEUTERONOMY 5:3

This section was recently added and is currently under revision and general editing. Thanks. Kerry Wynne.

PROBLEM OVERVIEW – by Kerry Wynne

The Lord said in Deuteronomy 5:3 that the Covenant between Israel and God had not been made with their ancestors. If the Ten Commandment Covenant had never been made with the ancestors of the Exodus Israelites, then it would mean that there was no Sabbath Commandment until the Exodus. To accomplish this twisting of Scripture, Sabbatarians claim that the Sabbath ordinance goes all the way back to Creation. Judaism 101 rejects this idea today as it has from its beginning.

Sabbath-keepers want to confine how far back the “ancestors” Moses is talking about to the 400 years of Egyptian slavery by stuffing Old Covenant statements about the Sabbath into Genesis 2. Since there is no record of anyone keeping the Sabbath prior to Exodus 16, this is a serious problem for them. There is no Sabbath expressed or implied in Genesis 2, and this is a fact of the Hebrew language in which Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20 were written. No ancient Hebrew reading Moses’ writings as translated into the Ancient Hebrew language of ancient Israel would ever think Moses indicated the presence of a Sabbath ordinance before Exodus 16. Therefore, without a Garden of Eden origin for the Sabbath, there is no evidence for it until Exodus 16.

This study on Deuteronomy 5:3 cannot be fully understood without first reading the chapters and sections of this book that deal with the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20. What our book does is to assist the reader to understand what Moses said in the original Hebrew language that proves that there was no Sabbath in Genesis. Therefore, please read these sections of our book before reviewing this short study.

There are three insurmountable barriers to the idea that this passage from Deuteronomy 5 does not mean that the Covenant that contained the Sabbath commandment was NOT given to the ancestors of the Hebrews prior to Exodus 16:

- 1. The Ordinance of Circumcision is required for any Gentile to keep the Sabbath. The Sabbath cannot be for everyone because Circumcision was required of Jews as a sign that they were set apart from the Gentiles.**
- 2. The Hebrew Bible, when read in Hebrew by a person with “native” experience with Ancient Hebrew, clearly goes out of its way, via Moses, to clarify at every step along the way that there was no Sabbath until the Exodus. For example, the Hebrews didn’t keep the Sabbath between the time they left Egypt until a week after they arrived in the Wilderness of Sin (Wilderness of the Moon in Semitic). No Sabbath-keeping for five weeks!**
- 3. Jesus instructed His followers to obey the teachings of the Pharisees. What did the Pharisees teach? They taught that the ORAL LAW was given to Moses up on the Mount and then added to by the judges of Israel’s court system thereafter under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. God promised that these judges would be guided by Him to be just and fair. The MISHNAH TORAH teaches (1) No Sabbath prior to the Exodus. (2) Sabbath for Jews only. (3) Gentiles held accountable to Israel’s Dual Court System to the Seven Laws of Noah only, but the Hebrews held accountable to the entire 613 Laws of Moses. (4) Gentiles who kept the Sabbath before they were circumcised were candidates for stoning to death = an act of treason against Israel and God.**

2 THE LORD OUR GOD MADE A COVENANT WITH US AT HOREB. 3 IT WAS NOT WITH OUR ANCESTORS [A] THAT THE LORD MADE THIS COVENANT, BUT WITH US, WITH ALL OF US WHO ARE ALIVE HERE TODAY. 4 THE LORD SPOKE TO YOU FACE TO FACE OUT OF THE FIRE ON THE MOUNTAIN.

Footnotes:

[A] Deuteronomy 5:3 Or not only with our parents

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER ARGUES:

Notice Colossians 2:16.

1) *heorte* (3 annual pilgrimage feasts - passover/unleavened bread, pentecost, tabernacles)

2) *nuenenia* (12 or 13 new moon festivals per year)

3) *sabbatwn* (trumpets, day of atonement, and first and last days of the annual seasons)

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS:

Thaler tackles what is perhaps the single most important anti-Sabbatarian text in the New Testament in order to prove that the Sabbath could not be abrogated, which is a seemingly good way to “prove” that the Sabbath had to have started at Creation in order to qualify as something that applies to everyone at all times. He seeks to demonstrate that the sabbath type in the third position of Colossians 2:14-17 is a reference to a special class of ANNUAL feast days.

Paul is not talking about three types of classifications for Jewish feast days. He is talking about the three kinds of SABBATHS. There were only three classifications of SABBATH scheduling, and those were ANNUAL, MONTHLY, AND WEEKLY. Three apples do not equal three oranges. This conceptual error means that most everything Thaler says needs to be evaluated very carefully.

In the second place, the word for SABBATH in the third place is used over 60 times in the New Testament. In almost all cases it means the WEEKLY SABBATH DAY. In the cases that it does not, the context dictates that it means “a full week of 7 days.” It is interesting that Sabbath keepers want to see it as a reference to the weekly Sabbath everywhere else but here in Colossians 2:14-17. Additionally, note that Paul chose to use the word, SABBATON, in the third position, which is the same word the Greek *Septuagint* uses in Exodus 20 for the word SABBATHS.

These word studies are available in LFG 12th Edition, Volume IV.

In the third place, there are at least three passages in the OT where the three classifications of Jewish holy days are presented as annual-monthly-weekly. In these passages of Scripture, the context fits three types of SABBATHS—not a general classification of three types of Jewish feast days. We define a day as a “sabbath” if there are any work restrictions. There are two levels of work restrictions-- all work or only the work necessary to support public worship. By this definition, all three classifications of Jewish holy days qualify to be labeled “sabbaths.”

The most important SDA Sabbath scholar in the history of Adventism, the late Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, said that the Sabbath in the third position is, indeed, a reference to the weekly Sabbath, and that it could not possibly refer to anything else (*From Sabbath to Sunday*, page 360). Thirty or so years later, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination launched a massive research campaign to defend the Sabbath against the intrusions of the anti-Sabbatarian movement that Bacchiocchi's book launched. The final project of this committee was published in the form of the book by Dr. Skip Mac Carty, entitled *In Granite or Ingrained*. It was apparently the decision of the steering committee at Andrews University that concluded that this new book would have to work with the fact that the Sabbath in the third position was a reference to the Weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue, but that Dr. Bacchiocchi's Judaizing theories—the ones that went along with this conclusion— would have to be presented in more “attractive” packaging. I personally know a member of this steering committee, as he was a member of the Adventist church that I attended at the time. Then, seeing that the second book could not remedy the disaster Dr. Bacchiocchi created, the Denomination appears to have commissioned Dr. Ronald du Preez to come to the rescue. The result was his *Animal Sacrifices Theory*, which proposed that St. Paul was criticizing Christians who were still offering animal sacrifices on these Sabbaths. Three of the greatest minds in Adventism could not successfully evade the fact that the Sabbath in the third position is a reference to the Weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue. It was du Preez' book that resulted in us looking into the animal sacrifices required for the Jewish holy days, and then into the lunar Sabbath concept, since it appeared that all the three Sabbath types were scheduled according to the new moons.

All three of these sabbaths—annual, monthly, and weekly—go together as a set, and they are always directly scheduled according to the new moon. They all require animal sacrifices to make them holy. (See also Numbers 28 for the weekly Sabbath requirements.) Other Jewish feast days were regulated by the new moon also, but some of them were only indirectly scheduled by them. I am not sure if all the Jewish holy days specified by the Law of Moses required animal sacrifices, but they probably did.

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER ARGUES:

Also [consider the Hebrew concept of] chiasm:

- 1) yearly**
- 2) monthly**
- 3) yearly**

If Paul was referring to the "weekly Sabbath", he would have failed to cover trumpets and day of atonement, leaving his audience to believe that trumpets and day of atonement were requirements, as they are never classified as "heorte" in the new testament.

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

Remember the problem with using a general literary characteristic of the Hebrew language to trump a specific, “theological” principle of Judaism. In this passage St. Paul is referring to THE Sabbath set—annual, monthly, and weekly. This is the way the Sabbaths were scheduled. The fact that the Feast of the Trumpets is not included in this list is irrelevant—totally irrelevant.

CHIASM is a characteristic of the way the Hebrews used their own language, but it is a literary, not a theological, concept. It would be used to support a pro-Sabbatarian viewpoint only as a last ditch effort, since the principle of the three kinds of Sabbaths is listed in Scripture almost always as

ANNUAL, MONTHLY, AND WEEKLY. Sometimes the order is different, but the Sabbath SET always includes these three classifications of Sabbaths that were scheduled according to the new moon and for which animal sacrifices were required. Furthermore, since the word in the third position is almost always used to indicate the Weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue, determined by context, an attempt to use the literary principle of CHIASM instead is an approach that would rank very low on the list of logical possibilities. (We concede that the Weekly Sabbath of the Decalogue became fixed probably during the Babylonian Captivity when the Babylonians imposed a fixed calendar on the Empire. You may wish to study our landmark research on the lunar Sabbath principle in our book, LYING FOR GOD, to see that what we have to say about the lunar connection between the three types of Sabbaths is valid for the original biblical Sabbath as given from Mt. Sinai until around the time of the building of the second temple.)

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER SAYS

Not to mention that these Festivals, New Moons, and Annual Sabbaths fall under the umbrella of those things which are "against us" in verse 14.

But the Sabbath was made "for" us (Mark 2:27), not "against us". Therefore, the weekly Sabbath cannot be in the equation in Col. 2:16.

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

Do not forget that Mark 2:27 specifies that the Sabbath was for the Jews only in this way. The Jews viewed the Gentiles as subhuman "dogs." If Jesus were to have specified that the Sabbath was for everyone, the Jews would have attempted to stone Him for blasphemy. Jesus would have to have said something like, "The Sabbath was made both for the Jews and the Gentile dogs" in order to teach that the Sabbath was for everyone.

Paul said that what was nailed to the Cross was a list of the sins that we have committed. However, there are compelling reasons why this passage must be read to mean that the Law of Moses was nailed to the Cross. These linguistic studies are presented in Volume IV of LFG. From a point of logic, Paul said that the event he is talking about is what made the Jewish dietary laws and the three types of sabbaths (annual-monthly-weekly) obsolete. You may argue about the sabbath type in the third position, but you cannot argue that Paul did not say that the event he mentioned first in the passage made these things obsolete, and only the nailing of the Law of Moses to the Cross could make ordinances obsolete that had been an integral part of Judaism for thousands of years.

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER STATES

In addition, Paul qualifies "which" sabbaths he's referring to in verse 17. Those "which" are a shadow of things to come. The Sabbath points backward to Creation, and also as a memorial of our deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, which today means the bondage of sin, as Egypt is a symbol of our deliverance from sin.

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS TO THAYER

The passage itself states that these three kinds of Sabbaths and the Jewish dietary laws were shadows of the REALITY of Christ. It says so right in the passage itself. The proper translation of this passage is that these Sabbaths—annual, monthly, and weekly—WERE SHADOWS OF THINGS WHICH WERE TO COME. It seems that translators are left with no other possible wording, if for no

other reason than there is nothing that the shadowy symbols could point forward to after the Cross. What could a shadowy Sabbath possibly point to after the Cross? Surely not to the Second Coming?

Theologians have long accepted the principle that the key symbols of the Old Testament can point both backwards AND forwards. This is a marvel of Scripture and an evidence of the continuity of the Revealed Record.

Shadows are cast by a REAL object. The REAL "OBJECT" that cast the "shadows" represented by the Jewish dietary laws and the three kinds of Sabbaths was Jesus Christ—the REAL sacrifice. And. Speaking of sacrifices, we must never forget that the derivation of the Hebrew word for SABBATH is from the Semitic concept of PROPITIATION. It took propitiation— with the sacrificing of animals—the make any of the Jewish Sabbaths as holy, and twice as many animal sacrifices on the weekly Sabbath. Jesus, is our Sabbath. He is our Sacrifice. He has already offered Himself as the Supreme Sacrifice. Propitiation has already happened, and the shadowy representations of that Sacrifice disappeared when Christ died.

A careful analysis of the Semitic roots of the Hebrew word for the Sabbath is an important part of the study of Colossians 2:14-17. Its underlying meaning is PROPITIATION.

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCUS THALER STATES

The Sabbath day symbol "remains" today as a symbol of our eternal rest in God. And all those who enter into God's eternal rest, will ALSO cease from doing their own works or labors on the Seventh-day, "as God did from His". (Hebrews 4:9,10).

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

Thayler is in conflict with the *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia's* entry on Hebrews 4. This official publication of the Church states that this passage cannot be used to either prove or disprove whether Christians should or should not keep the 7th day Sabbath. This entry explains exactly why this is so in both cases.

Only cognitive conditioning that results in circular thinking could tempt a well-versed student of the Bible to think that there is a reference to the 7th day in Hebrews 4. The seventh-day is clearly not stated or implied in this passage. It does not say that a person who rests in God's Grace will not do any work on the 7th day. This is adding words to Scripture that are not there. And if Man followed God's example of what He did on the 7th day, Adam and Eve would never have worked another day. God's ceasing from creating Planet Earth lasted forever.

The whole theme of the Book of Hebrews is about the rest that Christians find in the Gospel. That theme is strongly represented in Hebrews 4. The author of Hebrews—likely, St. Paul—is using a COMPARISON here between the physical resting on the Sabbath days to the rest from the worry of one's eternal destiny that comes from the Gospel. Christians can have something that the Jews never had, and that is rest from fear that the Gospel provides. Check most any Bible commentary, and you will not find any support from Greek linguistic studies that would agree that this passage is about refraining from work on the 7th day of the fixed week.

The use of Hebrews 4 to prove the continuance of the Jewish Sabbath must be considered proof-texting—a Bible study method that has been rejected by biblical scholars as a very bad way to analyze Scripture.

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER SAYS

The eternal rest mentioned in Hebrews 4, does not in any way shape or form "eclipse" or "erase" the symbol of that eternal rest—the weekly Sabbath, any more than our marriage between us (the Church) and "Christ" erases or eclipses physical marriage between man and a woman in Ephesians 5.

J. N. Andrews answers perspicaciously demonstrates this reality:

"Those who read carefully the text referred to [Hebrews 4], will observe that it does not even mention God's act of sanctifying the seventh day! Much less does it state his "primary object" in sanctifying the day. Paul asserts in verse 3, that the works of God "were finished from the foundation of the world." He proves the point in verse 4 by quoting Gen.2:2. "God did rest the seventh day from all his works." Whatever allusion this may be supposed to make to the future rest of God's people, it is certainly a mere inference to state from this text, that God's "primary object" in sanctifying the Sabbath, (before the fall of man.) was to typify the rest into which the redeemed should enter after the Second Advent!

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

No anti-Sabbatarian spokesperson we know of has claimed that the primary purpose of setting the 7th day of Creation aside as the day that God CEASED creating Planet Earth was to typify the spiritual rest that is possible only for the Christian believer. In the science of logic, this tactic is called a STRAW MAN argument. Perhaps D. M. Canright did.

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER

J. N. Andrews (continued) – "With as much propriety at least, might it be said that God's primary object in the creation of Eve, and in the institution of marriage, was to typify the union between Christ and the church. For the same Apostle in Eph.5:22-33 speaks much more in favor of such a view than he does in favor of the view of Canright in Heb.4. Particularly notice verses 30-33 where the language of Gen.2, is quoted and applied; yet no one who reads Gen.2, with care, can believe that God's primary design in the institution of marriage was to typify the union of Christ and the church. Neither should they on less evidence, in reading the same chapter, conclude that God's primary object in sanctifying the day of his rest was to "sanctify it as a type." A type of future redemption instituted when man had not yet fallen!!

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

The institution of marriage can be successfully used to represent the relationship between Christ and the church. As long as there is gender on Planet Earth, this principle applies. Since there was no Sabbath at Creation—which is what the Hebrew Bible teaches when it is read in Hebrew by a Hebrew—the Sabbath institution cannot possibly be used to represent a permanent relationship of some kind. Colossians 2:14-17 teaches that the sabbaths represent Christ. Since the derivation of the word for the Sabbath is derived from the concept of PROPITIATION, the Sabbath was an ideal symbol of the sacrifice that Christ would eventually make that would end all sacrifices. The Old

Testament states that God was going to do away with the Hebrew Sabbath because the Hebrews were so rebellious and disobedient, so it should come as no surprise that the Sabbath got abolished in the New Testament.

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER

(J. N. Andrews, continued) - How much more natural the reason assigned by the Lord Jesus for the sanctification of the Sabbath, than the reason inferred by Canright, which he declares is the only reason in the New Testament! "The Sabbath was made for man," says the Lord, "and not man for the Sabbath." Mark 2:27. The same expression that is used by Paul respecting the creation of Eve. 1Cor.11:9. "The primary objects" of both institutions are stated in these two texts, whatever they may be elsewhere used to illustrate. The language in each case carries the mind back to the beginning; and there we find the creation of Adam, of Eve, and of the Sabbath. Gen.2:1-3,7,18-24." {1853 JNA, RRCS 3.3}

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

So is this the argument that J. N. Andrews is putting forth and that Marcos Thaler is also presenting, and that is that just like God gave Eve to the man, Adam, so God gave the Sabbath to Adam, the first of all Mankind, as a permanent institution? If so, it is a comparison that does not exist and is, therefore, invalid. God created marriage in Eden. He created the Sabbath at the time of the Exodus. This is what the Hebrew Bible teaches when it is read in Hebrew. No competent Hebrew linguist alive who would be willing to make an assessment of the meaning of Genesis 2 that would differ from the plain wording of the Ancient Hebrew text.

On the other hand, the Sabbath can successfully represent Christ. With the Sabbath being fused to the concept of propitiation and sacrifice, a successful comparison can be made between the two—that is, between the Sabbath and Christ, the Supreme Sacrifice. But when the Supreme Sacrifice died on the Cross, the need for the Reality of that Propitiation vanished. There was NEVER a time when the word for Sabbath—the Hebrew word, with its Semitic derivation—was not associated with the concept of propitiation. During the days of Creation there was no sin, and no concept of the need for The Great Exchange that later became necessary for God to set up because of the Fall of Man.

SABBATARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER CLAIMS

[The Adventist pioneers] have refuted these anti-Sabbatarian arguments eons ago. Years ago. Anti-Sabbatarians might consider digging in their old materials to see just how well they took care of all the critics.

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

It is not an easy thing for a firmly-grounded Adventist like I was to study his way out of Adventism. I spent thousands of hours over a period of a few years studying, and my studies included the writings of J. N. Andrews. What I found in his writings was a definite lack of logic. Things just didn't "follow." For example, he conceded that Sabbath abandonment was universal before 200 AD, yet he promoted Ellen G. White's claim that the pope had changed the Sabbath. The first pope did not sit on his throne until after 400 AD. After studying every known theory of Sabbath abandonment, I saw that only one of those theories made any sense. That is the theory that the early church forsook Sabbath-keeping on the basis of biblical principles, concepts, and themes ALONE. In writing *Lying*

for God, the research team studied several of Andrews' books. The pioneers of Adventism took logical short-cuts at every turn to bring the Bible and history to match what Ellen White said about the Sabbath.

SABBATH APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER ARGUES

I will also add that the eternal spiritual rest in Hebrews 4 does not eclipse the literal physical Sabbath keeping, just like spiritual baptism as in dying, being buried, and resurrected to a new life in Christ Jesus mentioned in Romans 6:1-6 does not replace physical Baptism. This is why precisely the "sabbatismos" remains. The symbol, the Seventh-day Sabbath, remains today, as a perpetual reminder of that spiritual eternal rest that was even offered in the Old Testament according to Hebrews 3, but they failed to enter into it due to lack of faith.

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

Thaler's metaphor that compares Sabbath-keeping with the Ordinance of Baptism is beautifully said, but logically it does not follow. The Sabbath ordinance pointed backward to the memory of Creation and forward to Christ. The very word from which "Sabbath" came from is the concept of propitiation. When Propitiation died on the Cross, the concept of looking forward to The Great Exchange ended forever. The REALITY SACRIFICE perished on the Cross, and along with it, the shadows which the REAL OBJECT created vanished.

Hebrews Four is not about the continuation of the Sabbath ordinance. It talks about a spiritual rest that the Hebrews never had under the Old Covenant and compares and contrasts this with the rest of assurance in the Gospel that would not have been possible without the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross.

SABBARIAN APOLOGIST MARCOS THALER ARGUES

Concerning Mark 2:27, instead of re-inventing the wheel, I will provide the irrefutable research provided by Mr. [Bob] Pickle:

#190: The Sabbath is Jewish. Even if this were true, which it isn't, what would it prove? Our Savior is Jewish, and 64 of the 66 books of the Bible are too. If we must reject the Sabbath for such a reason, how can we remain Christians?

If the Sabbath is Jewish, why did Jesus say, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mark 2:27)? He didn't say that the Sabbath was made just for Jews. He said it was made for Man.

Of Jesus it is said, "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made" (John 1:3). Since He's the one who made the Sabbath for man, He ought to know what He's talking about.

Interestingly, the name Adam is also one of the Hebrew words for "man." Thus Jesus in Mark 2:27 is referring to the making of both the Sabbath and Adam in Genesis 2.

More than this, the Greek of Mark 2:27 says that the Sabbath was made for "the man", not "the man" for the Sabbath. Why did Jesus say "the man" instead of just "man"?

In the first eleven chapters of Genesis, the Hebrew word Adam occurs 52 times, always in the singular, and is translated "Adam," "man," and "men." In 43 of these 52 times, adam occurs with the definite article "the." In 7 of the remaining 9, from Genesis 4:25 to 5:5, adam is used as a proper noun, and so the definite article is omitted. Only in 1:26 and 2:5 does the word Adam appear neither as a proper noun nor with the definite article.

First the Hebrew phrase "the man" means either Adam or both Adam and Eve. Then, beginning with Genesis 6:1-7, the phrase begins to mean not just Adam but his descendants as well, or in other words, all mankind. Therefore, when Jesus said that He made the Sabbath for "the man," He meant that He made it for Adam and all his descendants, since that is precisely what "the man" means. How then can anyone declare the Sabbath to be merely "Jewish"?

Paul uses similar language when talking about the woman: "Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man" (1 Cor. 11:9). If the Sabbath that was made for the man is really Jewish, then the woman that was made for the man is really Jewish as well. Essentially, that would mean that marriage is only for the Jew, not for the Gentile.

Adam took but two things out of the garden with him: the Sabbath and marriage. Both are under attack today. Even though the Lord blesses and sanctifies but one woman per man on wedding day, there are those who declare it doesn't matter what woman you keep. And though Jesus blessed and sanctified but one day for us, there are those who will say that you can keep any day you want.

Source:

<http://www.pickle-publishing.com/.../response-to-video...>

ANTI-SABBATARIAN KERRY WYNNE RESPONDS

Thaler attempts, citing Bob Pickle's research, to use Mark 2:27 to show that Colossians 2:14-17 could not possibly mean what it says because Mark 2:27 "proves" that the Sabbath was given to everyone at Creation. This hopeful idea of Thaler's is KEY to his defense of the idea that Leviticus 5 does not teach that the Ten Commandments were not given to the ancestors of the Hebrews prior to Exodus 16. Pickle seems to think that because the phrase means, "The Sabbath was made for THE man," that this is proof that the writer's intent was to define the meaning of this phrase to mean that the Sabbath for every man who had ever lived. Jesus is quoted as saying something like, THE Sabbath was made for THE man. Is there any REAL significance in Aramaic and/or Greek with the use of the definite article before both of these words? Jesus was speaking in Aramaic. Not Hebrew.

Let's look at this claim logically. First, Jesus said it, not to teach anything about the continuance of the Sabbath ordinance, but to show the right relationship of priorities between people's needs and the requirements of the Sabbath ordinance. It is an Old Covenant statement, and of all people who would stand by the Old Covenant and its Sabbath commandment is the One Who gave it. Sabbath observance would be applicable until the Cross. Word studies do not indicate that the word Jesus used for "man" is a form of the word that MUST mean "all Mankind." It has multiple related meanings, including this one, but it has many other related but different meanings at the same time. Anti-Sabbatarians would claim otherwise if this word has indicators associated with it that dictated that it could only mean "all men."

Adventism is built on a Bible study method called proof-texting. This is according to the late Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell, who is widely acknowledged to be the greatest SDA theologian who has ever served the Adventist Church. Cottrell also noted, in the same statement, that this Bible study method is so thoroughly discredited that it is not used any longer and that it has led to some rather strange doctrines. He was probably referring to the SDA Doctrine of the Investigative Judgment.

Jeff Benner, one of the world's most respected Hebrew linguists, states that the Bible cannot be properly understood without understanding the original language and the culture of the times that produced that writing. He added that in the case of Hebrew, some of the statements in the Old Testament can probably never be accurately understood. In this case, we are talking about Aramaic and Greek. In the Jewish culture of Jesus' time, the Jews believed that the Gentiles were not even human. They referred to them as dogs. Even Jesus suggested this concept of a Gentile woman, whose child He healed when she asked for the crumbs that fall down to a dog under the master's table. If Jesus had not confined the jurisdiction of the Sabbath to the Jews, He would have opened Himself up to being stoned for blasphemy. Every Jew of Christ's day knew that Circumcision was an absolute requirement for Sabbath-keeping and that the Sabbath was the symbol of the DIFFERENCE between them and every member of every other society.

The truth of it is that before His audience, Jesus, in reality, actually indicated to his hearers that the jurisdiction of the Sabbath was CONFINED to the Jews. This passage actually teaches the opposite of what Sabbatarians wish it said. This misunderstanding of Scripture illustrates, perhaps better than any other passage in the Bible, the danger of using the proof-texting method of Bible study.

CONCLUSION: Moses indicated in Deuteronomy 5 that the Law of Moses was NOT given to ANY of Israel's ancestors, whether the ones who lived during the 400 years of Egyptian slavery or those ancestors who lived further back to the time of Abraham-- a span of around 1,000 years. The Sabbath commandment was one of the 613 rules and regulations of the Law of Moses. Typical of the way God constructs His covenants, the Sabbath got added to the Noahic Covenant, with the sign of the Rainbow, and the Abrahamic Covenant, with its sign of Circumcision.

THE SABBATH A MEMORIAL TO THE ESCAPE FROM EGYPTIAN SLAVERY AND ITS RELEVANCE OF THE QUESTION OF CIRCUMCISION AND SABBATH-KEEPING

The Abrahamic Covenant had its sign, and that sign was the Ordinance of Circumcision. In biblical systemology we find that the attributes of God's covenants tend to be additive. For example, one of the earliest covenants granted to mankind was the promise that the Earth would never be completely destroyed by another flood. The sign of this covenant was the rainbow. The sign of the Abrahamic Covenant was the Ordinance of Circumcision. Rainbows were not subtracted, and Circumcision was added. The Mosaic Covenant, established at the time of the Exodus, had a sign also, and this sign was the Sabbath Ordinance. But apparently in God's plan for Judaism, first things are first. Throughout the dispensation of Judaism until the Cross, Circumcision was given precedence over the Sabbath as illustrated by the fact that when there was a conflict between the labor necessary to perform a circumcision and the command to not work on the Sabbath, Circumcision "won." The primary, all-pervasive definition of the term for SABBATH in Ancient Hebrew was PROPITIATION. To the "Good Ship Propitiation" were added the "cargo containers" on the ship's top deck labeled MEMORIAL TO CREATION and RESECUE FROM EGYPTIAN SLAVERY.

No Christian meets both qualifications for being a Sabbath-keeper. The first requirement, of course, is that a person must be able to remember that God created the world. Everyone can do this, so it might be construed as a possible argument to use in favor of the idea that everyone is supposed to keep the Sabbath.

However, the second thing a person must be able to do is to remember that God rescued him or her of Egyptian slavery. William Hohmann asks if today's Sabbath-keepers break the Sabbath when they fail to think about how God rescued them from Egyptian slavery. No gentile Christian or his ancestors has ever been rescued from slavery in Egypt by the miraculous power of God, so Christians do not meet an important qualification for those who were commanded to keep it— the Hebrews and their progeny. Note this passage from Deuteronomy:

(NIV) - Deuteronomy 5:12-15 - "Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, as the Lord your God has commanded you. ¹³Six days you shall labor and do all your work, ¹⁴but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, nor your ox, your donkey or any of your animals, nor any foreigner residing in your towns, so that your male and female servants may rest, as you do. ¹⁵Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the Lord your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the Lord your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.

Sabbath-keeping for Christians fails the logic test. As believers we are not "allowed" to take only the parts of Scripture that suit our own personal agenda and discard those that teach what we do not like. Israel was commanded to keep it as a memorial; a reminder it was their God who made heaven and earth and who rested on that seventh day, of which the Sabbath was a shadow of where they could rest from their labors and remember also that they and their ancestors who were slaves in Egypt worked without rest. Israel collectively often "forgot" all this— having abandoned God and His commands for them, having turned time and again to idolatry. Christians are not ancient Israelites,

devoid of God's Spirit. True Christians, in possession of God's Holy Spirit, are not going to forget who their God is, and as such, do not need the memorial of a Sabbath as a reminder not to forget God. The Christian has entered into God's rest through faith, a rest that is permanent as contrasted to the weekly Sabbath rest which was temporary and merely a shadow of God's rest. (See: Psalms 95; Hebrews 4; Colossians 2:16-17.)

CIRCUMCISION A PREREQUISITE FOR SABBATH-KEEPING

We cover this subject from another perspective elsewhere. Here we will touch on what Adventists knew about the barrier of the Ordinance of Circumcision and when they knew it. We will also cover some Adventist objections, such as the less-than-stellar ones of the late SDA Sabbath scholar, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi.

A former Adventist researcher who has chosen to remain anonymous has found proof in the work of Seventh-day Adventist theologians Maxwell and Damsteegt that Seventh-day Adventists have known since no later than 1992 that the Jews have typically understood that observance of the Ordinance of Circumcision was a requirement for keeping the Sabbath. This unnamed former Adventist scholar, whose work we found posted at a website which examines the Sabbatarian views of the now defunct Worldwide Church of God, focuses on the research of these SDA biblical scholars, Mervyn Maxwell, and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday*. Berrien Springs, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992:

So, if the Christians were worshiping on Sunday, why wasn't there an outcry in the Jewish church in Jerusalem? It was a church that most likely continued to meet on Saturday at the synagogue for several decades to hear the scriptures read. The reason they did not cry out in protest is because Jews believed then, and still believe now, that the Sabbath was given only to Jews. They NEVER expected Gentiles (which made up most of the early church) to keep the Sabbath. Notice the following passages:

“The children of Noah...were given seven Laws only, the observance of the Sabbath not being among them” (Midrash Deuteronomy Rabbah 1:21 [Soncino ed., p. 23], as quoted in C. Mervyn Maxwell and P. Gerard Damsteegt, eds., *Source Book for the History of Sabbath and Sunday* [Berrien Springs, Mich.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1992], p. 75).

The Noachian laws are also listed in Midrash Genesis Rabbah 16:6 (Soncino ed., p. 131), Sanhedrin 56 a, b; and Midrash Song of Songs Rabbah 1:2(5) (Soncino ed. pp. 26-7) (ibid., p. 74). Gentiles could be considered righteous if they observed these laws, which did not include the Sabbath. Nor did they include restrictions about pork. Rabbi Judah could say that there was a time for the “sons of Jacob when unclean beasts were still permitted to them” (Hullin 7:6, as quoted in Maxwell and Damsteegt, p.74. The rabbis did not think that the Sabbath had been given to Gentiles: “Why does it say, 'The Lord hath given you' (Ex. 16:29)? To you hath he given it [the Sabbath], but not to the heathen. It is in virtue of this that the Sages stated [Sanh. 56b] that if some of the heathen observed the Sabbath, then not only do they not receive any reward [but they are even considered to be transgressing]” (Midrash Exodus Rabbah 25:11 [Soncino ed., p. 314], as quoted in

A non-Jew who observes the Sabbath whilst he is uncircumcised incurs liability for the punishment of death. Why? Because non-Jews were not commanded concerning it.... The Sabbath is a reunion between Israel and God, as it is said, 'It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel' (Ex. 31:17); therefore any non-Jew who, being uncircumcised, thrusts himself between them incurs the penalty of death.... The Gentiles have not been commanded to observe the Sabbath. (Midrash Deuteronomy Rabbah 1:21 [Soncino ed., pp. 23-4], as quoted in Maxwell and Damsteegt, p. 75).

The Jews understood that the Sabbath commandment was given only to Israel. The Jews traditionally thought in terms of two different sets of laws– the Noachian laws– which they believed were given to everyone, and the *TORAH* laws that they believed were given only to Israel at the time of the Exodus. Circumcision was not part of the Noachian Laws. It was part of Abraham’s covenant, which is shared by both Jews and Muslims, both of which regard Abraham as the “father” of their religion. As we have pointed out elsewhere, Islam curiously has never demanded to share in the special sign between Jews and God: The Sabbath.

It is important to keep in mind that the Noachian laws are listed in the Pentateuch and fully explained in the sacred oral traditions that Jesus Himself validated when He instructed His followers to do everything the Pharisees told them to do, as we have documented elsewhere. The Pharisees were the only Jewish sect that considered the sacred oral traditions to be significantly “inspired.” All seven of these laws are found in the *Pentateuch* if you look carefully. Please note that in the following quotes from the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, some are from traditional laws published by the Sanhedrin, so they originated later in the history of Jewish sacred traditional law. When Palestine came under Roman control, the dual court system of Israel as described in another chapter evolved into the Sanhedrin. By the time of Jesus, the Sanhedrin enforced Jewish laws within conquered Israel, but its ability to carry out a death penalty was subject to Roman approval.

Adventist apologists may be tempted to suggest that these interpretations were developed by the Jews at some time after the death of Christ after they had new reasons to feel animosity toward Christians. This escape route is blocked by the total history of the development of the Jewish sacred oral traditions. In another chapter, one authored by Larry Dean, examples from the *Mishnah* are presented. Keep in mind that by contrast, the *Mishnah* developed from exacting oral transmission standards over a period of nearly 5,000 years and which dated back to the time of Moses. Dean explains why the sacred oral traditions of the *Mishnah* were not written down until around 200 CE. These very ancient sacred oral laws provide every possible evidence that the Noahide laws ruled everyone in the world prior to the giving of the Torah from Mt. Sinai to the Hebrews and that these laws never included a Sabbath commandment. As Dean demonstrates so well, in the Nation of Israel, which set of laws, Noahide vs. Torah, was applied to individuals within its borders depended on whether that person was circumcised or not:

The Seven Laws

Laws which were supposed by the Rabbis to have been binding upon mankind at large even before the revelation at Sinai, and which are still binding upon non-Jews. The term ‘Noachian’ indicates the universality of these ordinances, since the whole human race

was supposed to be descended from the three sons of Noah, who alone survived the Flood. Although only those laws which are found in the earlier chapters of the Pentateuch, before the record of the revelation at Sinai, should, it would seem, be binding upon all mankind, yet the Rabbis discarded some and, by hermeneutic rules or in accordance with some tradition (see Judah ha-Levi, “Cuzari,” iii. 73), introduced others which are not found there. Basing their views on the passage in Gen. II.16, they declared that the following six commandments were enjoined upon Adam: (1) not to worship idols; (2) not to blaspheme the name of God; (3) to establish courts of justice; (4) not to kill; (5) not to commit adultery; and (6) not to rob (Gen. R. xvi. 9, xxiv. 5; Cant. R. i. 16; comp. Seder Olam Rabbah, ed. Ratner, ch. v. and notes, Wilna, 1897; Maimonides, “Yad,” Melakim, ix. 1). A seventh commandment was added after the Flood—not to eat flesh that had been cut from a living animal (Gen. ix. 4). Thus, the Talmud frequently speaks of “the seven laws of the sons of Noah,” which were regarded as obligatory upon all mankind, in contradistinction to those that were binding upon Israelites only (Tosef., Ab. Zarah, ix. 4; Sanh. 56a et seq.).

He who observed the seven Noachian laws was regarded as a domiciled alien (Ab. Zarah 64b; see Proselyte), as one of the pious of the Gentiles, and was assured of a portion in the world to come (Tosef., Sanh. xiii. 1; Sanh. 105a; comp. ib. 91b; “Yad,” l.c. viii. 11).

Here is a more extensive quote from the *Jewish Encyclopedia* which supports the concept that the Jews are very serious about their belief that the Sabbath was given to Israel alone. This passage is particularly interesting because it has a direct bearing on the Sabbath question for Christians as viewed by the Jews (*Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, “Gentile,” section “Gentiles May Not Be Taught the Torah”):

Resh Laish (d. 278) said, “A Gentile observing the Sabbath deserves death” (Sanh. 58b). This refers to a Gentile who accepted the seven laws of the Noachidæ, inasmuch as “the Sabbath is a sign between God and Israel alone,” and it was probably directed against the Christian Jews, who disregarded the Mosaic laws and yet at that time kept up the observance of the Jewish Sabbath. Rabbina, who lived about 150 years after the Christians had changed the day of rest to Sunday, could not quite understand the principle underlying Resh Laish's law, and, commenting upon it, added: “not even on Mondays [is the Gentile allowed to rest]”; intimating that the mandate given to the Noachidæ that “day and night shall not cease” (=“have no rest”) should be taken in a literal sense (Gen. viii. 22)—probably to discourage general idleness (ib. Rashi), or for the more plausible reason advanced by Maimonides, who says: “The principle is, one is not permitted to make innovations in religion or to create new commandments. He has the privilege to become a true proselyte by accepting the whole Law” (“Yad,” Melakim, x. 9). R. Emden [An unrenderable Hebrew symbol follows the word “Emden,” ed. note] In a remarkable apology for Christianity contained in his appendix to Seder Olam (pp. 32b-34b, Hamburg, 1752), gives it as his opinion that the original intention of Jesus, and especially of Paul, was to convert only the Gentiles to the seven moral laws of Noah and to let the Jews follow the Mosaic law—which explains the apparent contradictions in the New Testament regarding the laws of Moses and the Sabbath.

In his classic "A Digest of the Sabbath Question," former SDA theologian, Robert D. Brinsmead observed:

The Book of Jubilees (a Jewish pseudepigraphal work of the second century BC) says that "the Creator of all things.., did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep Sabbath thereon, but Israel alone" ("The Book of Jubilees," in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. R.H. Charles, vol. 2, Pseudepigrapha [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913], p. 15).

This same anonymous researcher also quotes biblical scholar, James Charlesworth, in support of his point that the Jews have always viewed the Sabbath as being given only to the Jews:

Further evidence of the antiquity of this rabbinic understanding comes from the second-century BCE book of Jubilees:

The Creator of all blessed it, but he did not sanctify any people or nations to keep the Sabbath thereon with the sole exception of Israel. He granted to them alone that they might eat and drink and keep the Sabbath thereon upon the earth" (Jubilees 2:31, James Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, [New York: Doubleday, 1985], vol. 2, p. 58).

As noted by Michael Morrison, who writes about the former Sabbatarian views of the Worldwide Church of God, it was the fact that the Jews understood that the Sabbath was only for the Jews that combined with the decision of the Council of Jerusalem not to require the new Gentile converts to be circumcised that prevented any controversy over the official discontinuance of the ordinances of circumcision and the Sabbath at that time.

See: <http://www.gci.org/law/Sabbath/history1>???

Summarizing the research of SDA researchers, Maxwell and Damsteegt, and biblical scholar, Charlesworth, our anonymous former SDA scholar comments on their work as follows:

Based on these quotes above, we can see from the Jewish writings, and from the Adventist documents that the Gentiles were never expected to keep the Sabbath. This was the understanding of the Jews, to whom the Sabbath was given, and whom Christ never corrected on this matter. So, this begs the question, Why do Adventists and others keep the Sabbath rather than the Lord's day, which according to the writings of early Christians, was kept during the time of the Apostles?

Note: Unfortunately the link to this quote no longer works, so source identification at the time the 7th Edition was published is impossible.

We will spend a considerable amount of time examining the Circumcision-Sabbath connection because the concept is so critically important to the Sabbath question. A proper understanding of this principle helps us understand what St. Paul was thinking when he wrote about the law, circumcision, and the Sabbath. Paul was a Jewish lawyer, and he would have thought about these things the same way as other Jewish lawyers.

Apologists for Adventism point out that the mixed multitude were commanded to keep the Sabbath

during the Exodus when the Manna was also given to the Hebrews, and that a very large number of these people were not circumcised at the time. This excuse works for about two weeks. At the time the Sabbath appears to have been merely an obedience test, like the Manna Obedience Test. However, when the LAW was given to them a short time later at Mt. Sinai, circumcision became a covenantal agreement between each individual Hebrew and God and the nation of Israel as a whole. The specifications of this treaty required circumcision in order to keep the Mosaic Law. Thereafter, Old Testament writers made note of how this concept was incorporated into universal practice in Israel.

We are much more interested in the entire concept as it developed through Jewish history because above everything else, we need to understand what St. Paul and the other apostles were thinking when they brought circumcision into discussions about the Law.

Israel viewed the Law of Moses as one integrated and inseparable body of 613 equally important “covenant” points of law. You break one of these 613 laws, and you have violated the covenant. The Decalogue was only a part of the Law of Moses, and it was strikingly incomplete. Rabbinical thought rejects outright the idea of “Ten Commandments,” instead viewing the Decalogue as “Ten Categories” of the Mosaic Law. Take the Seventh Commandment that addresses the sin of adultery. Because of the very nature of Hebrew linguistics and culture, this commandment of the Decalogue, to our surprise, does not forbid sexual relationships between a man and a woman who are not married. By the very definition of the word “adultery”, two unmarried persons cannot possibly commit the sin of adultery. Any attempt to say that adultery covers all sexual sins ignores the facts of Hebrew linguistics and culture. In English, fornication is the definition of a sexual relationship between a man and a woman who are not married. Even more striking is that the Decalogue portion of the Law of Moses does not address homosexual behavior or human sexual relations with animals. Rabbinical law draws a sharp difference between adultery and fornication, supporting this fact.

Evidence of the interpretive restrictions imposed by the existence of the separate definitions of these English words is that God chose to cover these additional areas of sexual sins— fornication, homosexuality, and bestiality— outside of the Decalogue “section” of the Law of Moses. The Jews believed that all 613 of these laws were equally important. Thus, when St. Paul says that circumcision is a token of bondage to the entire law, we are confronted with the principle that without the requirement for circumcision, there is no requirement for keeping the Sabbath because it is one of the most important components of the Law of Moses. Abraham’s covenant is explicit: Circumcision must occur on the 8th day. For Jews, that means that circumcision is the “front door” of the entire Mosaic law, since circumcision must occur on the 8th day, even if the 8th day was the Sabbath. Circumcision “trumped” the Sabbath’s stern prohibition against “working” on the Sabbath. Keep in mind that the abrogation of the Decalogue at the cross did not cause natural law and/or the Law of the Spirit to cease:

Again I declare to every man who lets himself be circumcised that he is obligated to obey the whole law. – Galatians 5:3 (NIV)

The Torah, we must remember, contains the Sabbath Commandment and is included in the 613 laws of Moses. A Gentile only needed to swear before three “learned Rabbis” that he would abide by the Noahide Commandments in order to avail himself of all benefits of both Jewish citizenship and the Jewish afterlife. Circumcision was not necessary, and neither was Sabbath-Keeping.

Before the Law of Moses was given at Mt. Sinai, God required the foreigner who wished to participate in the Passover to be circumcised:

“An alien living among you who wants to celebrate the LORD's Passover must have all the males in his household circumcised; then he may take part like one born in the land. No uncircumcised male may eat of it.” – Exodus 12:48 (NIV)

The Passover is the single most important event in Judaism, even eclipsing the Sabbath. The Sabbath can be set aside for eight day circumcision, but nothing trumps the Passover. It is odd thinking for Sabbatarians to arrive at the conclusion that circumcision would be required for a Gentile to participate in the Passover but not to keep the Sabbath. The Ordinance of Circumcision came first before there was even the first Sabbath day.

In the Old Testament we see that Gentiles were only required to keep the Sabbath if they chose to undergo circumcision and full-conversion to Judaism as we see in this passage from Isaiah 56– a text which Sabbatarians like to use to demonstrate the perpetuity of the Sabbath. This conclusion begs the logical conclusion regarding the perpetuity of sacrifices:

For this is what the LORD says: “To the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths, who choose what pleases me and hold fast to my covenant— ⁵ to them I will give within my temple and its walls a memorial and a name better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name that will not be cut off. ⁶ And foreigners who bind themselves to the LORD to serve him, to love the name of the LORD, and to worship him, all who keep the Sabbath without desecrating it and who hold fast to my covenant— ⁷ these I will bring to my holy mountain and give them joy in my house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and sacrifices will be accepted on my altar; for my house will be called a house of prayer for all nations.” – Isa 56:4 - 7 (NIV)

In our study of the problems of Sabbatarianism, our interest is as much in how the Israelites viewed the concept of the Law and its relationship to the Sabbath as we are in the actual teachings of the Scriptures regarding it. What we do know is that by the time of Jesus, the keeping of the *Torah*– the Law of Moses– was thought of to be for Jews only, and Gentiles were not welcome to participate in its ordinances unless they were circumcised and underwent full-scale conversion to Judaism.

The Council of Jerusalem made the decision not to impose circumcision on the Gentile converts, thus settling the Sabbath question forever. **The late SDA Sabbath scholar, Dr. Bacchiocchi teaches that the exemption (contrary to the law) for circumcision was for the Gentiles only and was still required for the Jewish Christians. (See Bacchiocchi's essay, “How Did Sabbath Keeping Begin,” in the section titled, ‘Attachment to the Law.’) If the issue involved here is truly a moral one, God could therefore not make a distinction between what Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians were required to do! What kind of theological nonsense is this in regard to the Gospel in which God and his Christian followers do not even differentiate between male and female, the free and the slave? We are at a total loss to see why Dr. Bacchiocchi would suggest such an idea. Dr. Bacchiocchi's willingness to split the requirement for Sabbath-keeping between the Jew and the Gentile is a desperate attempt on his part to extricate himself from the illogical web into which he has fallen.** If the Jewish Christians elected to continue to keep the Sabbath and circumcise themselves, it was only because they chose to retain their Jewish identity and cultural connection. It had nothing to do with their conversion to Christianity. In essence, the Pharisees of Antioch in Acts 15 wanted the Gentile Christians to convert to Judaism as part and parcel of their conversion to Christianity. The Apostles at the Council of Jerusalem would have none of it.

The biblical understanding of circumcision as taught in Scripture and Jewish rabbinical writings provides definitive evidence that Sabbath-keeping ended at the cross and was officially put to rest at the Council of Jerusalem.

As we mentioned elsewhere, Jewish thought regarding Gentiles and the Sabbath is based on the Jewish belief that the Sabbath was not given to Adam and Eve at Creation. Nowhere in the Book of Genesis is the Sabbath mentioned. Nobody is mentioned keeping it. No rules are set forth for keeping it in Genesis. Nowhere in Genesis does God command any Patriarch to keep it. Understanding the linguistics of their own Hebrew language, they clearly perceived that Moses worded his account of the events of the 7th day of Creation in such a way as to make certain they could not possibly read a Sabbath commandment into what he wrote. The complete absence of any mention of the Sabbath in the Book of Genesis loudly confirms the careful reading of the Creation events.

These concepts about what the Bible really teaches about the question of Sabbath-keeping for Christians from a combination of Jewish traditional theology and the Bible:

The Jews knew the Sabbath didn't begin at Creation.

The Jews believed the Sabbath was given to Israel and Israel alone.

Similarly, the gateway to keeping the *TORAH*, even for an Israelite, was circumcision. Circumcision represents the bondage of an Israelite to the *Torah*.

The Sabbath was not part of Noachian Law, which is self-evident from studying the Pentateuch, and which is evident from studying the sacred oral laws that Jesus validated when He told His followers to do everything the Pharisees told them to do.

God sent his prophets to rebuke many Gentile nations, but there is no record in the Bible that God ever rebuked them for Sabbath-breaking.

Jesus viewed both the Sabbath and circumcision to be ceremonial in nature. Logic demands that this is true. For a moment, try to imagine a situation, for example, where the law against stealing could trump the law against murder, or vice versa. Note what Jesus said:

Jesus said to them, "I did one miracle, and you are all astonished. ²² Yet, because Moses gave you circumcision (though actually it did not come from Moses, but from the patriarchs), you circumcise a child on the Sabbath. ²³ Now if a child can be circumcised on the Sabbath so that the Law of Moses may not be broken, why are you angry with me for healing the whole man on the Sabbath?" – John 7:21-23 (NIV)

As it turns out, the 8th day had tremendous significance to the Jews. It would have to be of great significance to trump the venerable institution of the Sabbath. Co-author, Larry Dean, explains:

Genesis 2:2-3 says NOTHING about God ceasing creation in order to "dwell among us." NOWHERE in Exodus 16 - when the Sabbath was given to the Children of Israel - is there a whisper that the day was the day set aside when "God would dwell among them." Similarly, Exodus 20:8-11, Deuteronomy 5:15, Exodus 31:12-16, Exodus 35:1-3.

Total deafening silence on "dwelling among us" on the Sabbath.

NOWHERE does the Bible SAY that the Sabbath was the day set aside when God would "dwell among them." It's just amazingly, absolutely silent on that. Nor does the Old Testament SAY the Sabbath was "a" or "the" "day of Worship." "Worship" takes place whenever and wherever God "dwells among us." I will now present my argument that God's "dwelling among us" is connected to PLACE, not time. God is outside of time.

But he dwells in PLACES and PERSONS.

NOT in "days." He is not restricted by time. He comes where we ARE.

The Feast of Tabernacles was an 8-day festival, commemorating God's inhabitation of the Jewish Tabernacle. (see Exodus 40:34-38, Leviticus 23:39-43) Jewish tradition held that God assumed residence in the Tabernacle on the 8th day of the Feast, which is not NECESSARILY the "day after the Sabbath." (although it can be). It was specifically denominated as an "8th-day Sabbath" in its own right, on the 8th day of the Feast of Tabernacles. (Leviticus 23:39) Hence the precise terminology and origin of an "8th-day Sabbath."

Recall the PURPOSE of the Tabernacle was for God to be able to "dwell among them." (Exodus 25:8). Jesus put on human flesh to "dwell among us." (John 1:14) Jesus's amazing prophecy in John 7:37-39 was uttered on the last day, the "8th-day Sabbath" of the Feast of Tabernacles (verse 37), wherein he prophesied the Holy Spirit would come.

Thus, "God dwelt among us" has a striking, stunning chronology:

- God entered residence in the Israelite Tabernacle, as celebrated on the "8th day-Sabbath" of the Feast of Tabernacles, to "dwell among us." This is quite obviously a typology of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

Jesus prophesied the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the "8th day-Sabbath" of the Feast of Tabernacles, on the last day of the festival. Jesus put on human flesh to "dwell among us." Consistent with that, he insisted repeatedly that he IS the "Temple." It cost him his life at his trial, since that was understood as clear-cut blasphemy. Saying you are the Temple is saying you are God. After all, the "Temple" is the place where "God dwells among us." As long as Jesus was on earth, the Holy Spirit was precluded from "dwelling among us." (John 16:7)

The Holy Spirit arrived on "the day after the Sabbath" in Acts 2, and "dwelt among us." WE are the Temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 6:19). YOU are the "Temple of the Holy Spirit" and the Holy Spirit "dwells in you." YOU are the "place" where the Holy Spirit "dwells." (1 Corinthians 3:16, 2 Corinthians 6:16, 2 Timothy 1:14; Romans 8:11; Romans 8:9; 1 John 2:27);

The Holy Spirit "dwelling in us" resulted in the abolition of the 8th-day circumcision in Acts 15. Circumcision was unlawful "work" that violated the Sabbath, but it took priority over the Sabbath when the Sabbath was the 8th day of the Baby Boy's life. (John 7:23). The Holy Spirit "circumcises our hearts" (Romans 2:29) and is the "law of the New Covenant." (John 8:1-8, 2 Corinthians 3:1-3)

- In Heaven, God will "dwell among us." (Revelation 21:3). There is no Temple in Heaven because God and the Lamb are the Temple (Revelation 21:22).

In NONE of these multiple descriptions of God "dwelling among us" is there the slightest whisper that this is limited to the Sabbath, or ever even HAPPENED on the Sabbath. This is fitting, since the only weekly-days specifically-connected with "God dwelling among us" are the "8th Day Sabbath" (Leviticus 23:39) and the "Day after the Sabbath" (Acts 2).

But since God promised never to "leave us or forsake us" (Hebrews 13:5-6), this is the "never-ending 8th day of creation."

When God dwells among us forever.

Surprisingly, the barrier of Circumcision figures into making Mark 2:27 one of the strongest anti-Sabbatarian texts in the New Testament. Note that the teaching that Jesus said that the Sabbath was made for "Man" is often the text of last resort when Sabbatarian theologians are backed into a corner. For the 12th Edition, we are including a much fuller treatment of Mark 2:27 to follow.

MARK 2:27

This section comes from our chapter, The Sabbath in the Gospels:

The story of the healing of the Syrophoenician woman's son demonstrates that Jesus was familiar with the attitude of the Jews of His day that the Gentiles were sub-human, considering them to be little better than dogs:

Matthew 15:21-28 New American Standard Bible (NASB)

The Syrophoenician Woman

Jesus went away from there, and withdrew into the district of Tyre and Sidon.²² And a Canaanite woman from that region came out and began to cry out, saying, "Have mercy on me, Lord, Son of David; my daughter is cruelly demon-possessed."²³ But He did not answer her a word. And His disciples came and implored Him, saying, "Send her away, because she keeps shouting [a]t us."²⁴ But He answered and said, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."²⁵ But she came and began [b]to bow down before Him, saying, "Lord, help me!"²⁶ And He answered and said, "It is not [c]good to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs."²⁷ But she said, "Yes, Lord; [d]but even the dogs feed on the crumbs which fall from their masters' table."²⁸ Then Jesus said to her, "O

woman, your faith is great; it shall be done for you as you wish." And her daughter was healed [e]at once.

If Mark 27 were to have recorded that Jesus was teaching that the Sabbath was made for anyone else but the Jews, He would have been speaking blasphemy in their eyes, and most likely they would have gathered up stones to throw at Him. Our co-author, Larry Dean, explains the broader picture and helps us see both how Jesus' statement in Mark 2:27 excludes Gentiles from the Sabbath and explains why the Ordinance of Circumcision HAD to trump the Sabbath when the 8th day of a baby boy's life fell on it:

On the 8th day of Christmas, we celebrate the Circumcision and naming of Christ. (Luke 2:21). Both the ACT of circumcision and the mandatory "8th day" it was performed on are significant prophecies of the New Birth.

The Talmud is a wonderful source for understanding how First Century Jews and Christians viewed circumcision. The Talmud is adamant: Man's creation was not "finished" until he was circumcised, which was the only sign of Abraham's covenant. Without circumcision, man is simply an animal. The Talmud scathingly-savages uncircumcised Gentiles as subhuman "dogs" and "beasts." When Jesus declared that the Sabbath was "made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" in Matthew 12:1-8, Mark 2:23-28 and Luke 6:1-5; it is axiomatic that he was not referring to Gentiles. Only to circumcised Jews.

The "naming" of a person is simultaneous with circumcision (Luke 2:21, Genesis 17:5). Names are only given to human beings, who have completed and participated in this prophecy of the "8th Day of creation."

Circumcision MUST be performed on the 8th day of the Baby Boy's life, even WHEN it is on the Sabbath, even when nobody disputes that the act of Circumcision frontally violates the Sabbath. Circumcision is "work" that clearly violates the Sabbath. But according to the Talmud, it is the "8th day of creation" that is performed by man, to make a man "human," and to "finish creation." Only "humans" can observe the Sabbath. Only humans can participate with God in creation. The Sabbath - the mere "cessation" of work - is set aside and abrogated for circumcision. This is why the Sabbath never applied to Gentiles. Circumcision was a ritual of man's active "participation" in "finishing" of creation, on the "8th day of creation."

This is deeply prophetic. The number "Eight" represents perfection.

The 8th day or the "day after the Sabbath" is also significant in twin ritualized "prophecies" of Leviticus 23. Both the Feast of Weeks (Leviticus 23:15-16) and the Feast of First Fruits (Leviticus 23:11) culminated on the "day after the Sabbath" and were fulfilled on the "Day after the Sabbath" as well in the New Testament. The Resurrection fulfilled the Feast of First Fruits on the "day after the Sabbath" (Luke 24, Matthew 28, John 20, 1 Corinthians 15:23). The prophecy of the Feast of Weeks

was fulfilled "on the Day after the Sabbath" on the Day of Pentecost when the Holy Spirit descended on the Upper Room (Acts 2). Finally, Jesus's amazing prophecy that the Holy Spirit would be the "Living Water" in John 7: 37-39 occurred as fulfillment of an "8th day Sabbath" "prophecy" at the tail-end of the Feast of Tabernacles.

It is significant that both Circumcision and the Descent of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2 happened on the "8th day." They are both fulfilled by the ultimate "Circumcision of the Heart" performed by the Holy Spirit (Romans 2:25-29). The Holy Spirit is the "Law of the New Covenant" (2 Corinthians 3:1-3, Romans 8:1-4), and represents the triumph of the Spirit over mere flesh. This is what the "prophecy" of circumcision predicted all along. The Holy Spirit creates in us a new heart, and "writes" the "Law of the New Covenant" on our hearts. Our "hearts of stone" are dissolved by the Holy Spirit, and a New Heart is created. (Ezekiel 11:19; Ezekiel 36:26; Jeremiah 31:33; Hebrews 8:10). Thus, circumcision under the Old Covenant became obsolete when a Gentile believer received the Spirit. (Acts 15:5-11). Circumcision was required to enter into the Old Covenant, the "Covenant of Stone Tablets."

The Epistle of Barnabas - which is not part of the Biblical Canon - summarizes all of these disparate themes as the "never-ending 8th day of creation." Jesus gave his own "sneak preview" of the resumption of creation when he abolished the Sabbath in John 5:18 and his "8th day Sabbath" prophecy in John 7. The Sabbath represented the cessation of creation. When Jesus healed on the Sabbath and abolished the Sabbath in John 5:18, he announced that creation was resuming.

On the 8th Day after Christmas, we celebrate the "never-ending 8th day of the New Creation," because the Resurrection and the "Circumcision of the Heart" by the Holy Spirit is FAR more important and dramatic than the original 6-days of Creation and the "prophecy" of circumcision. Both of these "8th day of creation events" occurred for the first time on the "Day after the Sabbath."

On the "never-ending 8th Day of Creation," the creation of man is being finished as the Holy Spirit operates on our New Hearts, supernaturally-guiding us into compliance with the "Law of the New Covenant."

THE WEEKLY SABBATH IS LISTED IN LEVITICUS 23 AS ONE OF MANY CEREMONIAL ORDINANCES.

Note that the Jews knew which ordinance superseded the other when contests between circumcision and the Sabbath arose. Jesus recognized that the Law of Moses incorporated this hierarchy between the two ordinances. At the Council of Jerusalem, the Apostle Peter, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, was able to persuade the other apostolic leaders to avoid saddling the new Gentile converts with a burden that neither they nor their Jewish fathers were able to bear. Once the decision was made not to require the Gentile converts to be circumcised, the Sabbath question was settled forever. There was no chance (without ignoring the legalities of that covenant law) for the Sabbath question to

surface again without first reviving the question over Christians undergoing circumcision. This understanding helps us to see why the requirement to keep the Jewish Sabbath was never indicated in any Scripture that post-dated this historic council.

The link between circumcision, the TORAH, and the Sabbath is clear.

And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them.⁵ But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. – Acts 15:4 – Acts 15:5 (NIV)

Both Christians and Jews understood that TORAH law was designed to keep Jews and Gentiles *separate*. The TORAH, with the Sabbath and its dietary laws, had to come to an end before the Gospel could include the Gentiles. While it may not matter what day Christians choose to worship God, choosing to retain the Sabbath as a day of rest is like rebuilding the same wall of separation that cost God so much to tear down. Here is how Paul talks about this concept in Ephesians Chapter 2:

Therefore, remember that formerly you who are Gentiles by birth and called “uncircumcised” by those who call themselves “the circumcision” (that done in the body by the hands of men)—¹² remember that at that time you were separate from Christ, excluded from citizenship in Israel and foreigners to the covenants of the promise, without hope and without God in the world.¹³ But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far away have been brought near through the blood of Christ.¹⁴ For He himself is our peace, who has made the two one and has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility,¹⁵ by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, thus making peace,¹⁶ and in this one body to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility.¹⁷ He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near.¹⁸ For through him we both have access to the Father by one Spirit.¹⁹ Consequently, you are no longer foreigners and aliens, but fellow citizens with God’s people and members of God’s household,²⁰ built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone.²¹ In Him the whole building is joined together and rises to become a holy temple in the Lord.²² And in Him you too are being built together to become a dwelling in which God lives by His Spirit. – (NIV)

Jews and Christians can now eat together and worship together. The barrier erected by the Jewish ordinances of the Sabbath, the Jewish dietary laws, and circumcision have been destroyed by what happened at the cross.

The Jews, according to the sacred oral traditions passed down under the most exacting oral transmission standards, have virtually always believed that the Sabbath was given to them at the Exodus as a sign to differentiate them from all the other peoples of the world. In fact the very words of God Himself explain why He gave the Sabbath to Israel:

“Observe the Sabbath day by keeping it holy, as the LORD your God has commanded you.¹³ Six days you shall labor and do all your work,¹⁴ but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your ox, your donkey or any of

your animals, nor the alien within your gates, so that your manservant and maidservant may rest, as you do. ¹⁵ Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the LORD your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the LORD your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.” (NIV-Deuteronomy 5:12-15)

Israel was the only nation ever brought out of Egyptian slavery by God. The Sabbath part of the 10 Commandments would differentiate the Nation of Israel from all the other peoples of the world who were required only to keep the moralistic requirements of the Noachian laws.

Furthermore, Rabbinical Judaism taught that the Gentiles would be eternally saved if they kept the basic moralistic laws given to mankind in the Book of Genesis.

The Noachian Laws and how they were enforced were not detailed in the Old Testament as we know it and which both Jews and Christians accept as the inspired Word of God. We present the concept not as true doctrine, but as a way to understand how Jews thought about the subject of The Law.

It is no surprise that the Jews would view the Sabbath as their exclusive sign from God, since they read the books of Moses in their own language. The meaning indicators in Genesis 2 that are invisible to us are perfectly clear to rabbinical scholars who have had special training in the ancient form of the Hebrew language. They have recognized, “from the beginning,” that Moses contraindicated a Sabbath commandment at the time of Creation. In his classic “A Digest of the Sabbath Question,” Robert D. Brinsmead says:

The Book of Jubilees (a Jewish pseudepigraphal work of the second century BC) says that “the Creator of all things.., did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep Sabbath thereon, but Israel alone” (“The Book of Jubilees,” in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. R.H. Charles, vol. 2, Pseudepigrapha [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913], p. 15).

Jewish tradition taught that the “Noachian Laws” were given to every person on Earth around the time of the Great Flood. The key point, however, is that the Sabbath was not a part of the Noachian laws. Therefore, the Jews believe that the Gentiles who keep the Noachian laws will be saved without having kept the Sabbath or circumcision, and there is no indication in the rabbinical records that the Jews ever officially believed otherwise. God never sent an Israelite prophet to rebuke a heathen nation or city for Sabbath-breaking, but He did so for disregarding the basic principles of REAL morality— in particular violence and sexual evils. **Thus, the Noahide Commandments were an earlier “shadow” of the Great Commission. The Great Commission commanded the Apostles to take the Gospel to ALL the Nations. In the Mishnah, the Jews were commanded to enforce and apply the simple moralistic rules of the Noahide Commandments to all “Nations.” If the Gentiles agree to abide by these simple Commandments, their lives were to be spared.**

The logic of set theory demands that one cannot use a trait that is characteristic of all the members of the set to create a sub-set. C.S. Lewis once said that nonsense is nonsense even when you are talking about God. One of the reasons God explained for giving the Sabbath to Israel was to create a sign that would differentiate them from all the other nations of the world. If all the nations, kindred, tongues, and people of the world kept the Sabbath, it would be impossible for God to use the Sabbath as a distinguishing sign. In fact God wished to keep Israel separate from the Heathen during the dispensation of the *Torah* (Exodus to the Cross) for good reasons. The Israelites were a stubborn and stiff-necked people according to God’s own assessment. He knew the Hebrews would easily be

corrupted by associating with the Heathen. The ordinances of the Sabbath, circumcision, and the Jewish dietary laws placed a high wall of social separation between Israel and the Gentiles. If people don't eat together, they are less likely to become friends. Along similar lines, the ordinance of circumcision made it a very painful process for the head of a Gentile household to make a decision to join an Israelite community and to live as a proselyte. Contrast this with God's expressed New Covenant purpose to tear down this barrier between Jews and Gentiles after the cross. St. Paul was God's specially designated ambassador of the Gospel to the Gentiles according to Scripture. We credit our reading of the works of Robert D. Brinsmead for the concepts I have mentioned in this paragraph.

It should be clear, now, that the Adventist interpretation that only the "ceremonial" laws were nailed to the cross is not possible for a number of reasons. The Sabbath was a ceremonial law designed to keep Israel and the Gentiles separate, and that barrier must come down if Jews and Gentiles are to be united in the Gospel. The Old Testament, as well as Jewish traditional theology, view the TORAH as an absolutely inseparable covenant. No Jewish Scholar recognized a distinction between the "moral" and "ceremonial" components of the Mosaic Law, nor did any of them recognize a distinction between the "Ten Commandments" and the rest of the 613 Mosaic Commandments.

At least in the years subsequent to the writing of *From Sabbath to Sunday*, Dr. Bacchiocchi was fully aware of the Jewish concept of the circumcision-Sabbath connection, although he tried his best to discount it. In a later book he acknowledges that the opinion of Jewish rabbinical thought for hundreds of years before the birth of Christ was that the Sabbath was given to Israel at the time of the giving of the manna; that it was given only to Israel; and that circumcision was a prerequisite for both Israelites and proselytes to Judaism for keeping the Sabbath. Here is proof of what he knew, quoting a section of that book. Please keep in mind that the following statement is written by a pro-Sabbatarian, Seventh-day Adventist author. The trouble is that he wrote this at a time when he had unfettered access to scholarly studies that by that time had thoroughly disproved the concept that the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance. We are referring again to the definitive work of the D.A. Carson team. Dr. Bacchiocchi offers no proof that the Sabbath was a Creation ordinance, perhaps because there is no proof to offer and all the evidence is against this point-of-view. We do not approve of the content of the following quoted passage and it does not reflect the opinion of any of us four authors. The following quote is from Bacchiocchi's book, *The Sabbath in the New Testament, Answers to Questions*, Chapter 8, "Questions About The Sabbath in the Old Testament," posted at Dr. Bacchiocchi's website, Biblical Perspectives.)

QUESTION:

Have not Rabbis and Church Fathers taught that the Sabbath is a Mosaic institution established by Moses for Israel alone? Does not this historical view negate the creation origin and universal validity of the Sabbath?

ANSWER:

Mosaic Institution. Some Palestinian Rabbis and some early Church Fathers did reduce the Sabbath from a creation ordinance for mankind to a Mosaic institution for the Jews. Their teaching, however, does not negate the validity of the Biblical view of the creation origin and universal scope of the Sabbath, because the teachings of the Scriptures are not "a matter of one's own interpretation" (2 Pet 1:20).

Jewish Identity. Furthermore, note should be taken of the factors which contributed to the adoption of the Mosaic origin of the Sabbath. It was the strong desire to preserve a

Jewish identity, at a time when Hellenistic forces were pressing for the abandonment of the Jewish religion, that apparently led Palestinian Rabbis to reduce the Sabbath from a creation ordinance established for mankind to a Mosaic ordinance given exclusively to Israel.

Such a development occurred in response to the determined efforts of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes to implement a program of radical Hellenization of the Jews through the prohibition of sacrifices and Sabbath-keeping (175 BC). The result was that many Jews fell away, "sacrificed to the gods and desecrated the Sabbath" (1 Macc. 1:43).

Pious Jews passionately resisted the Hellenization efforts of Antiochus Epiphanes, preferring to be slaughtered rather than desecrate the Sabbath (1 Macc. 2:32-38). The need to preserve a Jewish identity at that critical time inspired an exclusivistic and nationalistic view of the Sabbath.

The notion was introduced at this time by some Rabbis that the privilege of Sabbath-keeping was denied to the Gentiles and reserved exclusively for Israel. As stated in the book of Jubilees, "He [God] allowed no other people or peoples to keep the Sabbath on this day, except Israel only; to it alone he granted to eat and drink and keep the Sabbath on it" (2:31). If the patriarchs are sometimes mentioned as keeping the Sabbath, this is regarded as an exception "before it [the Sabbath] was given" to Israel.

A Secondary Development. The notion of the Sabbath as an exclusively Jewish institution, established not at creation for all mankind but by Moses for Israel alone, makes God guilty, to say the least, of favoritism and discriminatory practices.

It must be said, however, that the notion of a Mosaic origin of the Sabbath represents a late secondary development rather than an original tradition. This is borne out by the fact that in Hellenistic (Greek) Judaism the Sabbath was viewed as a creation ordinance for mankind. Moreover, even in Palestinian literature (both apocalyptic and rabbinic) frequent mention is made of God, Adam, Seth, Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph as scrupulously observing the Sabbath.

Apologetic Need. The early Fathers adopted the notion of the Mosaic origin and exclusive Jewish nature of the Sabbath, to challenge those Christians who defended the binding obligations of the Sabbath commandment in the Christian dispensation. The standard and frequent argument is that the patriarchs and righteous men before Moses did not observe the Sabbath, and thus the day must be regarded as a temporary ordinance, deriving from Moses, and enjoined exclusively on the Jews on account of their unfaithfulness.

The reduction of a creation ordinance to an infamous sign of Jewish disobedience may reflect the need for short-term apologetic arguments, but it lacks a comprehension of the permanent and lofty values placed upon the Sabbath by Scripture.

(Dr. Bacchiocchi, from *The Sabbath in the New Testament, Answers to Questions*, Chapter 8, “Questions About The Sabbath in the Old Testament,” posted at Dr. Bacchiocchi's website, Biblical Perspectives.)

Again, our purpose in providing the above reference from Dr. Bacchiocchi is simply to show that he was well aware of facts that make his Sabbatarian views difficult to sustain.

As we mentioned in another chapter, Bacchiocchi seemed to be unaware that the Greek hatred of the Sabbath, circumcision, and the Jewish Food Laws continues unabated until this day. His is an odd “Judeo-centric” view of the conflict found in the Book of Maccabees. Adventism has fewer than 1,000 members in Greece today, and Greece has the lowest rate of circumcision in the Western World (less than 2 percent). Had not the Apostles swiftly abandoned the Sabbath, Circumcision and the Jewish Food laws at the Council of Jerusalem, Christianity would have quickly shriveled into an obscure sect of Judaism localized around Jerusalem. Simply put, Adventism is a non-starter in Greece because of the Sabbath and its adoption of the Jewish Food laws. The Greeks hate those Jewish traditions just as passionately today as they did 2,000 years ago. For the Apostles to have NOT abandoned the Sabbath, circumcision and the Jewish Food laws would have been direct disobedience to the Great Commission. Christianity would have never spread among the Greeks, had the Greeks been forced to comply with the Mosaic Law.

BRENDAN KNUDSON'S OBJECTIONS TO THE CIRCUMCISION ARGUMENT

Elsewhere we have explained that Brendan Knudson is a highly resourceful defender of Sabbatarianism. We include some of his objections with our responses to follow:

KNUDSON: Just because the Jews believed that circumcision was a prerequisite to Sabbath-keeping does not make it true.

AUTHORS: Thanks for acknowledging that the Jews have believed that circumcision is a prerequisite to Sabbath observance. Additionally, it is odd for an Adventist to argue that circumcision was not a prerequisite to Sabbath Keeping, since Adventists erroneously – and without a stitch of proof in Genesis – argue that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob kept the Sabbath. Yet Genesis is clear that all of those Patriarchs were circumcised.

In order to understand a Jewish book like the Bible, you must understand Jewish language, culture, and history. We know that the Jews of Jesus' day believed that neither Gentile proselyte nor Jew could keep the Sabbath without being circumcised. Jesus Himself restricted the application of the Sabbath to Israel by excluding the Gentile “dogs” in Mark 2:27. It was a group of Jews—the Apostles—who, in apostolic times, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, decided that the Gentile converts coming into the Church did not have to be circumcised. The issue of Sabbath-keeping never arose after the Council of Jerusalem. Even if the Apostles happened to be wrong in their beliefs, this was what they believed, and it was this belief that guided their thinking about what Jewish requirements would be appropriate for the new Gentile converts. More than anything though, they had the Great Commission, and Jesus' expression of the Great Commission was inconsistent with the Mosaic Law.

What they believed about the relationship between circumcision and Sabbath observance affected how New Testament writers thought and wrote about it. The truth of the concept is found throughout the Law of Moses. The interpretation of this principle is manifest in how the Jews implemented it throughout their recorded history. Jesus even commented on the relationship between the two

ordinances when He pointed out to his Jewish audience that their practice was to circumcise a new baby boy on the Sabbath if the 8th day of his life fell on the Sabbath.

KNUDSON: The Bible demonstrates that Sabbath-keeping applied to the uncircumcised stranger who was passing through Israelite territory. The scope of the teachings of the *Pentateuch* about Sabbath-keeping seems to include both the circumcised foreigner and the uncircumcised foreigner.

AUTHORS: Gentiles working within the national boundaries of Israel on the Sabbath would make it difficult for their Jewish hosts to keep the Sabbath. Almost certainly the Law of Moses regulated the foreigner's activity on the Sabbath so the Jews could keep the Sabbath at all times, as well as to prevent a Jew from working by proxy through Gentiles. The Gentiles rested on the Sabbath only because Jewish law required them to appease their hosts while they were within their gates. When they left they were no longer bound by law to keep the Sabbath. They were no more "Sabbath keepers" than the animals within the gates of the Jews, who also rested/ceased. Imagine a Gentile merchant who wants to load the goods he purchased from an Israelite merchant on his camels after sunset on the Preparation Day. He wants his Jewish merchant to unlock the storehouse and help him load-up for the long journey back to the Kingdom of Sheba.

The Mosaic Law as interpreted in both the *Mishnah*, the *Mishneh Torah*, and the *Talmud* demonstrates yet another outrageous falsehood of Adventism, and the opposite of what Knudson alleges. Recall that Ellen White claimed that the Jews could hire Gentiles to do work on the Sabbath that Jews were prohibited from doing:

As a consequence the people were dependent upon the Gentiles for many services which their rules forbade them to do for themselves. They did not reflect that if these acts were sinful, those who employed others to perform them were as guilty as if they had done the work themselves (*The Desire of Ages*, page 204, paragraph 1, Chapter Title: Bethesda and the Sanhedrin.)

Both Knudson and White have fallen into the notorious logical morass known as the "Myth of the Shabbos Goy," which is debunked here:

"The basic rule of thumb as far as having a gentile do work for a Jew on Shabbat is that if a Jew may not do it, a non-Jew cannot do it for him. This is true whether or not the Jew specifically asks the non-Jew to do the work or if the non-Jew does it on his own, whether the non-Jew is paid for his efforts or not."

"Therefore, they decreed that when a non-Jew performs work for a Jew on Shabbat, he becomes his agent for that action and it's considered as if the Jew performed the work himself."

http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/1140867/jewish/The-Myth-of-the-Shabbos-Goy.htm

KNUDSON: In this, we see that the Sabbath was binding upon the uncircumcised as well as the circumcised, thus demonstrating that its universal nature extended beyond the covenant God had established with Israel.

AUTHORS: God made no covenant with any other nation but Israel. The Law of Moses specified what was to happen within the territorial boundaries of His nation, Israel. The concept of national jurisdiction is recognized by the popular statement, “When in Rome, do as the Romans do.” The provision Knudson cites was enacted to enable the Jews within their own domain to keep the Sabbath without interference from their Gentile visitors. The law also prevented the Jew from using the Gentiles among them as proxy workers. Knudson draws a conclusion then that goes way beyond the confines stated in Scripture regarding the Gentiles who happened to be “within the gates” or borders of Israel. This restriction to territory within the confines of Israel hardly qualifies the Sabbath as being universal in nature.

The Sabbath was definitely a “religious” thing for the Jew, but it was merely a civil provision for the visiting Gentile. The Jew could be stoned to death for picking up firewood on the Sabbath, but there was no provision in the Law of Moses for stoning their Gentile guests who collected firewood on the Sabbath (unless of course the Gentile was doing it on behalf of a Jew). As demonstrated in the previous response, the Sabbath was only “binding” on a Gentile insofar as a Jew could not hire a Gentile to perform work on the Sabbath that a Jew was prohibited from doing.

SANDERS: Any Gentile or foreigner that wished to keep the Sabbath was required to obey all the Old Covenant laws which required circumcision. In Isaiah 56, we have the mentioning of the Eunuchs who kept the Sabbath. God told them that they must keep the covenant to be accepted and that the covenant requires circumcision.

For this is what the LORD says: “To the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths, who choose what pleases me and hold fast to my covenant—⁵ to them I will give within my temple and its walls a memorial and a name better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name that will not be cut off. – Isaiah 56:4-5 (NIV)

KNUDSON: From the time that the Israelites refused to enter the Promised Land at Kadesh, the Scriptures reveal that the Hebrews were forbidden from performing circumcision (Joshua 5:7) and the entire next generation who entered the promised land were not circumcised until they had crossed the Jordan (Joshua 5:2-4). Circumcision was required to partake of the Passover (Exodus 12:43-49) and they did not eat it during all the 40 years in the wilderness until the rite of circumcision was renewed (Joshua 5:11). This fact represents a final blow to the anti-Sabbatarian argument that the Bible concept of circumcision is a barrier to Sabbatarianism.

HOHMANN: Knudson takes great liberty with Scripture, drawing conclusions not necessarily supported by the text. It does not say the Hebrews were forbidden from performing circumcision. The narrative indicates it was something neglected by them. Israel had a nasty habit of forgetting the law given to them down through time. The same can be said for the Passover. Knudson assumes; draws out a conclusion, that they had not kept the Passover for those 40 years in the wilderness. All the narrative does tell us is that it was kept by them just prior to entering into the land, along with the next generation undergoing circumcision. Knudson wants desperately to turn this into the “last nail in the coffin” regarding the “alleged” connection between circumcision and Sabbath observance, when in fact all that is demonstrated is the Hebrew's proclivity at ignoring their own law. Here is the passage from Joshua 5 to study for yourself:

² At that time the Lord said to Joshua, “Make flint knives and circumcise the Israelites again.” ³ So Joshua made flint knives and circumcised the Israelites at Gibeath Haaraloth.

⁴ Now this is why he did so: All those who came out of Egypt—all the men of military age—died in the wilderness on the way after leaving Egypt. ⁵ All the people that came out had been circumcised, but all the people born in the wilderness during the journey from Egypt had not. ⁶ The Israelites had moved about in the wilderness forty years until all the men who were of military age when they left Egypt had died, since they had not obeyed the Lord. For the Lord had sworn to them that they would not see the land he had solemnly promised their ancestors to give us, a land flowing with milk and honey. ⁷ So he raised up their sons in their place, and these were the ones Joshua circumcised. They were still uncircumcised because they had not been circumcised on the way. ⁸ And after the whole nation had been circumcised, they remained where they were in camp until they were healed.

Note that this passage does not suggest or imply that God ordered Israel to cease practicing the ordinance of circumcision during their desert wanderings. It does not tell us why circumcision ceased during those 40 years. It is more reasonable to assume that the cessation of this practice was the result of the neglect of the practice by the people. What Knudson would need to support his objection is a text that records God forbidding circumcision around the time when the forty years of wandering in the desert began.

WYNNE: The root of Knudson's objection is based on the errant premise that the Sabbath ordinance is intrinsically moral. The Sabbath started out as an obedience test. Shortly thereafter it was elevated to the status of an obedience test that would distinguish Israel from all the other nations of the world. Because both are intrinsically "ceremonial," God can do what he wants to with them. The whole world did without a Sabbath for two-thousand years before God gave it to Israel. The whole world went without the ordinance of circumcision until God called Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees. God would not be intermittent with moralistic laws. For example, He would not ever suspend the natural law against adultery. Imagine God punishing Israel by taking away the prohibition against adultery because they had been doing evil! Recall that once God did threaten to take away Israel's Sabbaths:

I will stop all her celebrations: her yearly festivals, her New Moons, her Sabbath days—all her appointed feasts. – Hosea 2:11 (NIV)

Note that once Israel crossed the Jordan and became established as a nation, the hierarchy between circumcision and the Sabbath remained unchanged until the time of Jesus, with circumcision, a "ceremonial" point of law, taking precedence over the Sabbath. Circumcision remained the gateway to the privilege of keeping the Law of Moses, the Sabbath being the most significant seal of the contract between God and Israel from Mt. Sinai to the Cross. Circumcision may have fallen into widespread neglect during the Desert Wanderings because there was no functioning court system until the Children of Israel crossed the Jordan and established one!

KNUDSON: Exodus 23:9 - "You shall not oppress a sojourner (גֵּר). You know the heart of a sojourner (גֵּר), for you were sojourners (גֵּר) in the land of Egypt."

This verse highlights how the Hebrews were in the position of *gēr* while they were in Egypt. It doesn't imply that they had adopted Egyptian religious practices, but speaks in the general sense of being foreigners. It is speaking of the vulnerable status of being a minority within another culture. Also, the command not to oppress the foreigner within the land must also embrace a universal sense inclusive of uncircumcised foreigners in the land. So we see that the Sabbath in

Exodus 23:12 is for the uncircumcised stranger as well as the circumcised Hebrew.

In the Sabbath Commandment in Deuteronomy, we see again a social aspect of the Sabbath commandment with the commentary which shows that the rest of those mentioned alongside the Israelites was to be equal to the Israelites rest as it says synecdochally, "that your male servant and your female servant may rest as well as you". The Deuteronomic account also gives the larger context for the *gēr* by reference to the experience of slavery in Egypt.

In this, we see that the Sabbath was binding upon the uncircumcised as well as the circumcised, thus demonstrating its universal nature beyond the covenant God had established with Israel.

DEAN: For much of Israel's history, oral and written histories record key court decisions and the legal precedents that those decisions established. Down through the history of Israel, judges within that legal system referred to those records to help them make decisions in difficult situations that would be in keeping with the principles of the Torah. These records were collected and incorporated into a Jewish document called the *Mishnah*. The record of these oral and written traditions shows that Israel utilized two separate court systems— one for Jews and one for the Gentiles living within the borders of the country. The Gentiles were not held accountable to the TORAH. Instead, they were held to the Noachian laws. These Noachian laws were the foundation of all law systems, including the TORAH, but they did not include the Sabbath. As noted elsewhere in this book, the Jews have traditionally believed that Gentiles who kept the Noachian laws would be granted eternal life in Paradise. Here is a *Wikipedia* definition of the *Mishnah*:

According to Rabbinical Judaism, the Oral Torah (Hebrew: תורה שבעל-פה, Torah she-be'al-peh) was given to Moses with the Torah at Mount Sinai, as an exposition to the latter. The accumulated traditions of the Oral Law, expounded by scholars in each generation from Moses onward, is considered as the necessary basis for the interpretation, and often for the reading, of the Written Law. Jews sometimes refer to this as the *Masorah* (Hebrew: מסורה), roughly translated as tradition, though that word is often used in a narrower sense to mean traditions concerning the editing and reading of the Biblical text (see Masorah). The resulting Jewish law and custom is called *Halakha* (Hebrew: הלכה).

While most discussions in the *Mishnah* concern the correct way to carry out laws recorded in the Torah, it usually presents its conclusions without explicitly linking them to any scriptural passage, although scriptural quotations do occur. For this reason it is arranged in order of topics rather than in the form of a Biblical commentary. (In a very few cases, there is no scriptural source at all and the law is described as *Halakha le-Moshe mi-Sinai*, law to Moses from Sinai.) The Midrash *Halakha*, by contrast, while presenting similar laws, does so in the form of a Biblical commentary and explicitly links its conclusions to details in the Biblical text. These *Midrashim* often predate the *Mishnah*.

The Mishnah also quotes the Torah for principles not associated with law, but just as practical advice, even at times for humor or as guidance for understanding historical debate.

In Israel's legal system Gentiles were held accountable ONLY to the Noahide laws, which did not include a Sabbath requirement. Correlating with and reinforcing this principle is that the Rabbis

believed and taught that the Gentiles would be eternally saved if they kept the Noahide laws. The Sabbath was only binding on a Gentile insofar as a Jew could not hire a Gentile to perform work that a Jew was prohibited from doing on the Sabbath. Once again, the heart of the 4th Commandment is a prohibition against “working,” and the Commandment facially includes “man-servants and maidservants” in this prohibition. That includes Gentiles and “sojourners.”

Our assertion that there can be no Sabbath-keeping without circumcision, therefore, is based on biblical evidence and is supported by Jewish written and oral tradition that Jewish authorities believe extends back as far as the period of the Judges.

THE SABBATH IS ABOUT A TREATY WITH A CEREMONIAL REQUIREMENT IN THE MIDDLE

Robert Brinsmead's intense research prior to the publication of his 1981 essay, “Sabbatarianism Re-examined,” brought to Adventists the fact that contemporary biblical scholars had discovered the fact that the 10 Commandments were modeled after the Hittite treaties of the time. (See *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, George E. Mendenhall, 1954; and “The Two Tables of the Covenant,” Meredith Kline, *Westminster Theological Journal* 22 (1960) 133-146, both available on the Web). Brinsmead says:

The ceremonial nature of the Sabbath law has been confirmed by Mendenhall's 1954 discovery that the Ten Commandments conform to the structure of treaties between Hittite kings and their vassals. Annexed to the stipulations of a Hittite treaty was a provision for a periodic ceremony to rehearse the treaty between the lord and the vassal. Meredith Kline beautifully demonstrates that the Sabbath law in the middle of the Ten Commandments is the counterpart of a Hittite treaty memorial celebration with respect to its provision for the rehearsal of God's covenant. The Sabbath law, therefore, was a law requiring a ceremony of covenantal rehearsal.

The Sabbath was a ceremonial rite given to Israel to help the Chosen People remember that God was the One responsible for bringing them out of Egypt. It would be so very much like God to communicate His plan for them in the context of their contemporary culture because the people could understand it better. Moses, in Leviticus 23, lists the weekly Sabbath as one of the many ceremonial festivals given to the Israelite nation to be observed, labeling them “appointed feasts.” The evidence in this section combines with the fact that a study of the Hebrew linguistics of the Creation Story illustrates the fact that the Sabbath could not have been a Creation ordinance. There are two fundamental reasons God listed for giving the Sabbath to Israel, and BOTH specifications have to be met for its consistent application: (1) to help Israel remember that God created the world, and (2) to help Israel remember that God rescued them from Egyptian slavery. At the time of Creation, there was no Egyptian slavery to be rescued from. The specifications for the use of the Sabbath cannot be met for anyone living before the time of the Exodus.

THE THEORY OF PROLEPSIS: A POSSIBILITY

One respectable but less-than-definitive argument against a Genesis origin for the Sabbath is the possibility that Moses used a literary device called prolepsis in Genesis 2:2-3 to show the relationship between the events of the 7th day of Creation and the giving of the Sabbath commandment at Mt. Sinai. The Bible is literature. The books of the Bible share many attributes with world literature. We mentioned earlier that failure to understand the linguistics of the original language of the Pentateuch

can lead to disaster. The same is true of a failure to understand it as a literary work.

One of our critics, Knudson, objects that the prolepsis argument is not a good one and claims that it has been thoroughly refuted. We have never claimed that it is a proven argument, and we fail to see how either Sabbatarians or anti-Sabbatarians could prove or disprove it. It is a definite possibility since Moses wrote about events that stretched from Creation through the giving of the 10 Commandments on Mt. Sinai.

The commentary on Genesis 2:3 in John Gill's Exposition of the Bible theorizes that since Moses wrote about both Creation and the Exodus, he was likely thinking about both events when he wrote Genesis and Exodus. It is entirely possible and consistent with other facts that He chose to show the relationship between the 7th day of Creation and the 4th commandment through prolepsis. *Merriam Webster's On-Line Dictionary* defines this term as "The representation of a thing as existing before it actually does or did so, as in "he was a dead man when he entered." [In regard to] literary [terminology], a figurative device in narrative, in which a future event is prefigured, such as "the destruction of the Vendôme Column and his part in it are foreshadowed in moments of haunting prolepsis."

The calculated risk we take in including this in our presentation is that our Sabbatarian brethren might think that we include it because we have nothing better to hold up as evidence against a Creation origin for the Sabbath. To the contrary, we are confident to present it because we are in the process of providing proof, not merely "evidence," that a Creation origin for the Sabbath is not possible. We demonstrate this fact, and not tentatively, from a study of the Hebrew linguistics of Genesis 2, Exodus 16, and Exodus 20. Quoting Gill:

And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.

A day in which he took delight and pleasure, having finished all his works, and resting from them, and looking over them as very good; and so he pronounced this day a good and happy day, and "sanctified" or appointed it in his mind to be a day separated from others, for holy service and worship; as it was with the Jews when they became a body of people, both civil and ecclesiastical: or this is all said by way of prolepsis or anticipation, as many things in this chapter are, many names of countries and rivers, by which being called in the times of Moses, are here given them, though they were not called by them so early, nor till many ages after: and according to Jarchi this passage respects future time, when God "blessed" this day with the manna, which descended on all the days of the week, an omer for a man, and on the sixth day double food; and he "sanctified" it with the manna which did not descend at all on that day: besides, these words may be read in a parenthesis, as containing an account of a fact that was done, not at the beginning of the world, and on the first seventh day of it; but of what had been done in the times of Moses, who wrote this, after the giving of the law of the Sabbath; and this being given through his hands to the people of Israel, he takes this opportunity here to insert it, and very pertinently, seeing the reason why God then, in the times of Moses, blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it, was, because he had rested on that day from all his works, (Exodus 20:11) and the same reason is given here, taken plainly out of that law which he had delivered to them: *because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made*; which shows, that this refers not to the same time when God blessed and hallowed the seventh day, which was done in the times of Moses, but to what had been

long before, and was then given as a reason enforcing it; for it is not here said, as in the preceding verse, "he rested", but "had rested", even from the foundation of the world, when his works were finished, as in (Hebrews 4:3) even what "he created to make" V5, as the words may be here rendered; which he created out of nothing, as he did the first matter, in order to make all things out of it, and put them in that order, and bring them to that perfection he did.

<http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/gills-exposition-of-the-bible/genesis-2-3.html>

It is possible, then, that Moses, writing about both events, comments on the blessing and the hallowing of the 7th day in Genesis 2 before it took place because in his mind he knew it had taken place in the future.

Knudson possesses a general knowledge of the Hebrew language. He does not, however, exhibit expert level knowledge of Ancient Hebrew. Nor does he speak for the Seventh-day Adventist Church in any official capacity, especially in view of his recent highly controversial activities in regard to the White Estate. He has reviewed our work, having posted refutations of it on the Internet. His challenges are well-articulated, and we will present his objections with appropriate rebuttals throughout this updated version. Here are his objections in regard to the concept of prolepsis:

KNUDSON: The author's defense [Wynne's] that you can have your cake and eat it too in regard to the possibility that Moses referred to the blessing and the hallowing of the 7th day of Creation as a literary prolepsis— is double-speak and amounts to a concession that the blessing and hallowing would have to have taken place on the 7th day of Creation. This concession backs Wynne away from an argument he initially presented as a weighty one.

DEAN: Since the practice of the Sabbath obligation itself is nowhere mentioned in Genesis; and is not introduced until Sinai in Exodus; it is not "having your cake and eating it too" to admit that the 7th Day of Creation was hallowed. The "blessing and hallowing" of the 7th Day of Creation does not imply a recurring weekly 7th Day Sabbath. Nor can the language in any way be stretched that far. The Adventist insistence that the Sabbath is a "creation ordinance" is simply dishonest.

THE TORAH WAS TO BE TEMPORARY

This argument is related to the concept of Circumcision by the fact that submitting to Circumcision is the gateway to keeping the TORAH. The reign of the TORAH ended at the Cross, but this fact is underscored by the Council of Jerusalem's announcement that the Gentiles did not have to be circumcised. By making the end of Circumcision public, the entire Law of Moses was invalidated by the principle that if you break one of its 613 laws, you have broken them all. The Council of Jerusalem specifically mentioned that the dietary laws regarding meat were terminated for the Gentiles, breaking a complete subset of laws within the TORAH.

As we demonstrated earlier, a careful analysis of Moses' account of the events of the 7th day of Creation in Hebrew shows that he went out of his way to indicate to his Hebrew readers that the recurring Sabbath rest did not start in Eden. We have also seen strong evidence that God communicated concepts to Israel in the context of their own cultural familiarity. The Ten Commandments were modeled after the treaties of their neighboring countries with a ceremonial component in the middle. The best evidence available to date is that the "Sabbath" concept was originally a Heathen idea based on the four phases of the Moon and fertility rites that God took,

cleansed of its Heathen connotations, and presented to Israel fully redeemed and cleansed, and newly identified with the seven days of Creation Week as both a remembrance of God's creative power and a reminder that He had brought them out of Egyptian slavery.

Moses stated that the Covenant, which contained the new ceremonial weekly Sabbath, was not given before Sinai: Their fathers prior to Egypt did not keep the Sabbath:

Deut. 5:2-3:

The Lord our God made a covenant with us at Horeb. The Lord did not make this covenant with our fathers, but with us, with all those of us alive here today.

God gave them the Sabbath law at Sinai. He did not remind them about it: Nehemiah 9:13-14:

You came down also on Mount Sinai, and spoke with them from heaven, and gave them just ordinances and true laws, good statutes and commandments. You made known to them Your holy Sabbath, and commanded them precepts, statutes and laws, by the hand of Moses Your servant.

It is clear that the Sabbath command did not exist before the Exodus.

In other chapters we will study more about the temporary nature of the TORAH. Colossians 2:14-17 tells us when the reign of TORAH law ended.

WHAT THE PIONEERS OF ADVENTISM KNEW ABOUT THE PROBLEM OF CIRCUMCISION

As we have mentioned before, a review of the Sabbath histories authored by the first Seventh-day Adventist historian and apologist, J. N. Andrews proves that he understood a broad spectrum of facts about early church history that posed insurmountable obstacles to the Sabbath abandonment theory that he and Ellen White had developed. Let us review some of the things he wrote about. Andrews mentioned the issue of circumcision and was familiar with virtually all of the anti-Sabbatarian comments to be found in the writings of the early church fathers. In fact in some of Andrews' books he attempted to refute and minimize the significance of specific passages. Apostate SDA leader, D. M. Canright, helps us to know what Andrews knew by examining and refuting his claims.

In Justin Martyr's essay, *Dialogue with Trypho*, he discusses circumcision and the Sabbath with his Jewish friend, approaching him in a way that respected his friend's Jewish heritage. Notice that Justin Martyr did not cite St. Paul as an authority that the Sabbath is not required of Christians. Trypho, being a Jew, would not have recognized Paul's authority. It is significant that Justin is able to prove that the Sabbath was for the Jews and the Jews only from Old Testament logic alone. Justin Martyr was born in 100 A. D. and died in 165 A. D. Here is what Justin Martyr wrote in Chapter Nineteen.

CHAPTER XIX

CIRCUMCISION UNKNOWN BEFORE ABRAHAM. THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES ON ACCOUNT OF THE HARDNESS OF THEIR HEARTS.

“It is this about which we are at a loss, and with reason, because, while you endure such things, you do not observe all the other customs which we are now discussing. This circumcision is not, however, necessary for all men, but for you alone, in order that, as I have already said, you may suffer these things which you now justly suffer.

“Nor do we receive that useless baptism of cisterns, for it has nothing to do with this baptism of life. Wherefore also God has announced that you have forsaken Him, the living fountain, and digged for your selves broken cisterns which can hold no water.

“Even you, who are the circumcised according to the flesh, have need of our circumcision; but we, having the latter, do not require the former.

“For if it were necessary, as you suppose, God would not have made Adam uncircumcised; would not have had respect to the gifts of Abel when, being uncircumcised, he offered sacrifice and would not have been pleased with the uncircumcision of Enoch, who was not found, because God had translated him. Lot, being uncircumcised, was saved from Sodom, the angels themselves and the Lord sending him out. Noah was the beginning of our race; yet, uncircumcised, along with his children he went into the ark. Melchizedek, the priest of the Most High, was uncircumcised; to whom also Abraham the first who received circumcision after the flesh, gave tithes, and he blessed him: after whose order God declared, by the mouth of David, that He would establish the everlasting priest. Therefore to you alone this circumcision was necessary, in order that the people may be no people and the nation no nation; as also Hosea, one of the twelve prophets, declares.

“Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing to God; and after them Abraham with all his descendants until Moses, under whom your nation appeared unrighteous and ungrateful to God, making a calf in the wilderness: wherefore God, accommodating Himself to that nation, enjoined them also to offer sacrifices, as if to His name, in order that you might not serve idols. Which precept, however, you have not observed; nay, you sacrificed your children to demons.

“See how God will destroy the nations to the beat of instruments of music as they also are burned.

“And you were commanded to keep Sabbaths, that you might retain the memorial of God. For His word makes this announcement, saying, ‘That ye may know that I am God who redeemed you.’ (Ezekiel xx. 12.)”