

Mark 16:9, “First”, ‘prohtehi’

David Lamb:

Bob, are you saying that because Spurgeon, Moody and Pink used the word “Sabbath”, they must have been “Seventh Day”?

It may just be that I have misunderstood you, but if you did mean that, it seems you are mistaken. Spurgeon, in his commentary on the Psalms, “The Treasury of David”, says in the course of commenting on Psalm 118.24

*We observe the Lord's day as henceforth our true Sabbath, a day made and ordained of God, for the perpetual remembrance of the achievements of our Redeemer. Whenever the soft Sabbath light **of the first day of the week** breaks upon the earth, let us sing,*

*“This is the day the Lord hath made,
He calls the hours his own;
Let heaven rejoice, let earth be glad,
And praise surround the throne.”*

GE:

I see Christ's resurrection in these strophes or just nice but empty words.

David Lamb, Yes, Bob Ryan is wrong, but he is also, right. I cannot understand how these great men of God, said what they said, but could not see, the dichotomy of what they said. All I can say is that God has a time for everything He determined SHALL COME TO PASS. WHY HAD THE WORLD TO WAIT FIFTEEN HUNDRED YEARS FOR THE REFORMATION? Why did the Church of Christ ever become the mother of harlots? Because in the end IT MUST WORK OUT TO THE GREATER GLORY OF GOD!

And I believe it with all my heart with regard to the ENIGMATIC HISTORY of the “Sabbath : OF THE LORD GOD”.

God cannot be against Himself; God could change if He willed because He is omnipotent; but because God is FAITHFUL, He chose NOT to change, but rather to send Christ to PROVE HE WOULD NOT CHANGE, EVER, FOR GOD IS LOVE!

Not in the slightest would God ever change, we may NOW believe it without doubt --- BECAUSE OF CHRIST.

So never try, dear Dr Walter, tell a simple man like Gerhard Ebersöhn, God changed. I am TOO SIMPLE to ever believe you or all the hosts of learned, great, and yes, even Godly, men. God did not change; He did not change OWNERSHIP. Like God NEVER changed ownership of one single of his own, God never changed ownership of ANY of his creating and object of love. He would never exchange that which HE declared “MY HOLY DAY” for what MEN declared 'holy'. And his LORDSHIP of “the Lord's Day” God in Christ and through Christ shall most jealously GUARD with all his MIGHT --- EXACTLY WHICH GOD DID, “WHEN, RAISING CHRIST FROM THE DEAD”, “SABBATH'S”, “HE EXALTED HIM AND SET HIM AT HIS OWN RIGHT HAND IN HEAVENLY MAJESTY” --- “ABSOLUTELY ON THE SABBATH”, “THE SEVENTH DAY GOD THUS CONCERNING DID SPEAK” --- “AT SUNDRY TIMES BEFORE”. This same “GOD, WHO, in these LAST days, hath spoken unto US, BY HIS SON”.

This is my, FULL, Sabbath-doctrine, to which I shall hold, so help me God, for ever in the face of all adversity and hate toward God and his, “the Sabbath of the LORD God” : “My Holy Day”, 'The Lord's Day' by the Resurrection of Christ from the dead “In the Sabbath Day's fullness”. “And God the Seventh Day from ALL HIS WORKS, RESTED.”

Dr. Walter:

My friend, God never changed and never needed to change because nowhere in God's Word did he ever say that the Sabbath was the seventh day "OF THE WEEK." He would never say that because if He had said that then he would have changed because he applied the Sabbath to the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st, 22nd and 28th days of the month in Leviticus 23 as well as the 50th day after 7 regular sabbaths, 7th YEAR and 50th YEAR.

Hence, the principle is merely one sabbath after six non-sabbaths!

BR:

Yes that is true – but what IF God had said "just pick one day in seven – any day you wish just pick one and sanctify it as you please" -- wouldn't that be great?

GE:

Ja, saying God never said "the Sabbath was the seventh day "OF THE WEEK"" is nonsensical self-contradiction, "the Sabbath" as well as "the Seventh Day" being the self-determining essence of the concept and present reality of "THE WEEK". 'The week' comes from the creation and story of redemption of the Bible and these two-in-one things; from nowhere else. And the whole world has adopted IT, AS SUCH, and constantly continues existing in space and time according to its dictates.

DW:

Your missing the established principle. It really does not matter what day "of the week" it falls on as Leviticus 23 demonstrates. What matters is the established principle of six preceding and following a seventh regardless what day "of the week" it may fall upon.

GE:

Extinguish the Bible, the Jews, and Sabbath-believing Christians and all human history, the '*principle*' upon which '*what day "of the week"*', 'the week' is "*established*", shall stay, '*regardless*', because God and his revealed will, underlie it, unmoveable. What matters is the '*established principle*' of the six preceding days of God's creation— not man's – and the certain following day, "The Seventh Day" and "Sabbath : OF THE LORD GOD". Nothing but its Creator could be more unchangeable. Nothing established it **SURER** than its **MAKER** on the Day of Resurrection-Life from the dead "The Seventh Day God thus concerning spake ... **BY THE SON**" : "**ON THE SABBATH**". (Hebrews 1 and 4; Matthew 28:1-4)

DW:

In Leviticus that principle is applied to six "days" "month" "years" and the Sabbath falls upon the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st 22nd, 28th, 50th" in terms of days but is applied to longer periods that the term "yom " can include (Gen. 2:4) but still in six (years) followed by a seventh (year) or 50th year. It is equally true of THOUSAND year periods, six followed by a seventh thousand year followed by an eternal eighth period!

BR:

Tyndale explains how fully man-made tradition trumps the Word of God – Placing man as the Mark 2:27 "Lord of the Sabbath.

William Tyndale: "we be lords over the Sabbath; we may change it for Monday or any other day, as we see need, or have two every week, if one is not enough to teach the people."

Leviticus 23 does NOT demonstrate that you can select any day you like – sanctify it of your own authority and declare it Sabbath. Rather Lev 23 points out that GOD ALONE can

determine what day is Holy.

Notice that Lev 23 DOES NOT even remotely suggest that the 7th day memorial of Creation is “changeable”!! The lack of Bible support for your wild ideas is more than a little obvious to the Bible students reading with an ounce of critical thinking skills on this point.

The 4th commandment does NOT say “What matters is a 6th of anything you like followed by a Seventh of your choosing”.

Gen 2:3 says that God rested and GOD sanctified the day.

But the Mark 7 plan of man is to “teach for doctrine the commandments and traditions of man”.

As Tyndale suggest – making man the “Lord of the Sabbath” to sanctify and bless any day of his choosing – thus taking the seat of Christ in Mark 2:27.

GE:

Tyndale said much better when he said that Christians have much better reason to believe the Seventh Day Sabbath than the other Christians have for keeping Sundays. Or to that effect. I can look up the statement, but why? It won't make any difference with just about everyone on here.

The Sabbath is not the Sabbath because it comes after MAN'S sixth day of work, but because it came after GOD'S sixth day of work WHEN, HE, “GOD, from all HIS works, rested.” “Christentum dass nicht Eschatologie ist hat mit Christus Jesu ganz und gar und Restlos NICHTS zu tun!” KB.

DW:

The “first day of the week” is the New covenant Sabbath and it too is one Sabbath after six non-sabbaths.

Charles Spurgeon said,

“I am no preacher of the old legal Sabbath. I am a preacher of the Gospel. The Sabbath of the Jew is to him a task; the Lord's Day of the Christian, the first day of the week, is to him a joy, a day of rest, of peace, and of thanksgiving. And if you Christian men can earnestly drive away all distractions, so that you can really rest today, it will be good for your bodies, good for your souls, good mentally, good spiritually, good temporally, and good eternally.” – Charles Haddon Spurgeon, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, Vol. 7, p. 580.

Spurgeon, Moody and Pink interpreted the fourth commandment just as I do. They rejected the idea that it referred to the seventh day “of the week” and rejected the Jewish observation on the seventh day “of the week.” Instead they saw it as the seventh day after six working days irregardless of what day “of the week” it might or might not fall on.

Spurgeon: “expressly one whole day in seven, to be a holy Sabbath to himself (Le 19:30 De 5:12).”

However, they all agreed that the Old Testament predicted and the New Testament established it on the first day “of the week” for Christians under the New Covenant and rejected the Jewish observation.

GE:

You have said what you said, well! You and Spurgeon, have said what is not true, even better. You are masters of language; greater artists with the English language; while I am, quote, a “backbush rhetoric” ‘boslanster’. But no matter how fluent you

or I might be in any language, the plain, "Thus saith the LORD" is enough to dispel everything either of us might wish to say which IS NOT TRUE.

So, I am no preacher, or a preacher of the old legal and 'Jewish' Sabbath either!

I am a believer of the Gospel, simply : "the Gospel of Jesus Christ for it is the POWER OF GOD". Which power of God, God showed undaunted and unchanged "WHEN RAISING Christ from the dead" in both his flesh and in his time, which time, was the Day of God's Finishing of all his works, and day of his rest --- the day of God's once for all blessing and sanctification through Jesus Christ and in Jesus Christ, by "the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD", strictly.

DW:

You do believe in the gospel and I commend you for that. However, Jesus did not rise on the "Seventh Day Sabbath" but he arose on "THE FIRST DAY SABBATH" and that is not only the clear testimony of the gospel accounts but confirmed by the Apostles (1 Cor. 16:1-2; Acts 20:7; Rev. 1:7) and pictured in the ceremonial feasts sabbaths (Lev. 23) and predicted by David in Psalm 118:20-24 with Acts 4:10-11; 13:33).

The only writings we now possess immediately after the New Testament are the antenicene Fathers and they confirm the "first day of the week" was the universal witness in the first three centuries BEFORE Constantine that this was the "Lord's day" "the first day of the week", "the eighth day" "Sunday" all equally called the "resurrection day" of Christ!

GE:

Yes, the Sabbath of the Jew is to him a task; a greater burden and task to him is the legalist Christian's 'sabbath', whether First Day or Seventh Day of the week. But the Lord's Day of the Christ in

victory over the last enemy, death --- “the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD” --- since creation and throughout the redeeming revelation of Divinity, is to “The People of God” and “Body of Christ’s Own” a joy, a day of rest, of peace and of thanksgiving : a “FEAST OF CHRIST” and a “reward” “not to be deluded about with enticing words” of the wisdom and authorities of the world.

And if you Christian men can earnestly drive away all distractions and discern the finger of the devil that scribbled over the engraving of the Finger of God so that you can really rest IN GOD’S OWN WORDS, it will be good for your Christian practice, good for your conscience, good mentally, good spiritually, good temporally, and good eternally.

Dr. Walter:

*Spurgeon: “expressly **one whole day in seven**, to be a holy Sabbath to himself (Le 19:30 De 5:12).”*

God: “expressly **THE SEVENTH day** Sabbath OF THE LORD YOUR GOD.” “The HOLY DAY OF THE LORD” (Le 19:30 De 5:12 Is 58:13).

Dr Walter:

Yes, but not the seventh day “of the week”! but the seventh day after six working days!

However, they all agreed that the Old Testament predicted and the New Testament established it on the first day “of the week” for Christians under the New Covenant and rejected the Jewish observation.

GE:

Some Seventh Day ‘observers’ reject the “*Jewish observation*” (Sic.) of the Seventh Day Sabbath Day no less than “*they all*” —

those good men, did. They aren't many. But fewer First Day 'observers' are there who do not suffer of the same ailment.

It's all the works of fallible men; the one's above the other's cannot be expected better.

Another matter altogether is the "observation" of days" ('hehmeras paratehresthe'), that irreconcilable 'observance' with the Christian Faith OR WITH CHRIST, that Paul defines as the "foolish Galatians'",
 "return",
 "back to",
 "your former",
 heathen, pagan,
 "weak and beggarly",
 "elemental",
 "by nature",
 "no-gods",
 "UNDER WHICH YE
 DID SERVE", and
 now all over,
 "DESIRE" to be
 "IN BONDAGE",
 "AGAIN".

Sunday protagonists blame the LORD GOD Himself for this "superstition" (Calvin— one of those good men referred to) of his People, saying, this Scripture speaks of the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD, while it speaks of "the day of the lord Sun", that hermaphrodite IDOL of their IDOLATRY, the "lord Sun", and, "queen of days".

Dr. Walter

Jesus did not rise on the "Seventh Day Sabbath" but he arose on "THE FIRST DAY SABBATH" and that is not only the clear

testimony of the gospel accounts but confirmed by the Apostles (1 Cor. 16:1-2; Acts 20:7; Rev. 1:7) and pictured in the ceremonial feasts sabbaths (Lev. 23) and predicted by David in Psalm 118:20-24 with Acts 4:10-11; 13:33).

GE:

Jesus rose on the day “OF THE SABBATH” –
“SABBATH'S-TIME” Matthew 28:1, “sabbátohn”.

which was and still is and for ever shall be
BECAUSE OF WHAT HAPPENED

“IN THE SABBATH'S FULLNESS OF BEING
BROAD DAYLIGHT INCLINING ...
... TOWARDS THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK”

— every letter, every word, every phrase, every TRUTH, literally
the very GREEK'S of Matthew 28:1. and ALL : “ACCORDING TO
THE SCRIPTURES” THE PASSOVER SCRIPTURES.

Now, Dr Walter, You put in quotation marks, the words, “*he arose on “THE FIRST DAY SABBATH”, and said, “that is not only the clear testimony of the gospel accounts but (is) confirmed by the Apostles”*”. Then you give some Scriptures for reference. Your words in quotation marks though, WHERE ARE THEY? They are NOT in the Scripture you gave for reference, Dr Walter; so, WHERE ARE THEY?? They are in quotation marks, WHERE ARE THEY?

What you did by having placed those words in quotation marks, is FALSE and PREMEDITATED falsehood.

Dr Walter:

Mark 16:9 literally reads “the first sabbath in a new series” (protos = first in a new series; “sabbatou = singular and only used

*of the fourth commandment Sabbath) “proii” – 3am to 6am
Sunday Morning!*

GE:

We did discuss this before, and my challenge to you – just like here today re Matthew 28:1 – still stands: Quote Mark 16:9 that it “*literally reads*” :

One: “*he arose*” — Just that;

Two: “*THE FIRST DAY SABBATH*” — Just that.

Listen to Calvin...

Note on Mark 16:9, KJV,

“9. Now, when Jesus was risen early on the first day of the Sabbath, 2 he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils”...

“2 “Au premier jour du Sabbath, ou, de la sepmaine;” — “on the first day of the Sabbath, or, of the week.” ”

And so virtually EVERY proper English translation or version and as good as every other language on earth, and thousands upon thousands of fervent Sunday, 'First Day of the week'-Resurrection devoted scholars of mark.

You do not have an issue with me to settle, Dr Walter, but with your own people of faith. “OF THE WEEK” is the meaning of the word 'sabbatou' in the context of Mark 16:9, “Early on the First Day of the week He (Jesus), the Risen, appeared, first(of all), to Mary Magdalene...”.

Robert Young, Under “Illustrations of Bible Idioms”,

“A DEFINITE number is frequently used for an INDEFINITE, *e.g.*, — ...Mark 16:9...”; the ‘definite’ being “Early on the First Day...” (‘proh-i prohtehi (‘hehmerai’ by Ellipsis), and the ‘indefinite’ being, “of the week” (‘sabbatou’).

Dr. Walter:

The term “kuriakos” in Rev. 1:10 proves that Sunday was the “Lord's Day”! Those who insist that “kuriakos” here refers to the eschatological “day of the Lord” HAVE NOT ONE SINGLE PEICE OF EVIDENCE because “kuiakos” is NEVER ONCE used in that expression – NEVER! The phrase containing Kuriakos in Rev. 1:10 was UNIVERALLY recognized all over the Roman Empire as Sunday because it was the term that designated that day to offer incense by every Roman citizen to the Emperor as the god/man! John and Paul apply it to observing those things of the true God/man (1 Cor. 11:20; Rev. 1:10).

GE:

Dr Walter, WHO, is trying to “insist that “kuriakos” here refers to the eschatological “day of the Lord””?

DW:

There have been some on this forum who argue that “kuriakos” in Revelation 1:10 has reference to the Old Testament phrase “the day of the Lord.” However, you and I both know this term is NEVER used in that phrase but rather the common term “kurios” is ALWAYS the term used in that phrase.

The phrase containing Kuriakos in Rev. 1:10 was UNIVERALLY recognized all over the Roman Empire as Sunday because it was the term that designated that day to offer incense by every Roman citizen to the Emperor as the god/man! John and Paul apply it to observing those things of the true God/man (1 Cor. 11:20; Rev. 1:10).

GE:

Since when, Dr Walter, generally, is the Seventh Day Sabbath called “the eschatological “day of the Lord””?

DW:

Never as far as I am aware

GE:

Then why do you refer to it in THIS THREAD where NOBODY has a issue with it?!

But which day --- OF THE WEEK exactly --- did Jesus say "The Son of Man is Lord" of?

Dr Walter:

He is the Lord of "the Sabbath" – which the Lord can apply to any day He chooses as Leviticus 23 proves! He applied the Sabbath to the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st, 22nd, 28th days of the month, and 50th day! He can apply it to LONGER PERIODS OF TIME than a 24 hour "day" as Leviticus 23 and 25 prove and as the term "yom" can be used (Gen. 2:4) such as the seventh "month" seventh "year" 50th year!

Leviticus 23 is a pictorial, symbolic portrayal of shift from the Old Covenant and its Sabbath (seventh) to the New Covenant and its Sabbath (first) and between the seventh millennium to the eternal day sabbath – new creation and new earth!

Compare the words used in Mark 16:2 with Mark 16:9! "mia" is used in verse 2 but "proto" in verse 9. The plural "sabbaton" is used in verse 2 but the singular "sabbatou" is used in verse 9.

Mark 16:2 gives the normal reading for the "first day of the week" but the change in verse 9 is intentional. "Mia" is simply the regular ordinal number "first" but "prote" refers to the first in a series. Sabbaton is the regular term used for the day following the Jewish Sabbath when used with "mia" but "Sabbatou" is the normal term used for the fourth commandment Sabbath.

Hence, Jesus arose "proii" early between 3am to 6am on the

“first Sabbath of a new series” identified in verse 2 as the “first day of the week.”

This is the predicted new Sabbath observance by David in Psalm 118:20-24 and applied in reference to the resurrection of Christ in Acts 4:10-11 and confirmed as the “first Sabbath in a new series of Sabbath” by Mark and confirmed by Hebrews 4:9 as a BETTER Sabbath day observance for the people of God than the 7th day Sabbath in Creation (Heb. 4:3).

The term “prote” is used every single time it occurs in the New Testament as the first in a series or the first of something brand new.

Mark 16:9 literally reads “the first sabbath in a new series” (protos = first in a new series; “sabbatou = singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath) “proii” – 3am to 6am Sunday Morning!

GE:

Bla bla bla.

This very interpretation and this very verse a month or so ago, a Judaist Sabbatharian used to prove the Resurrection was on the Jewish Sabbath! For four hundred pages our 'discourse' went on! **Amazing! Now it's Dr Walter to prove Sunday observance! What next?!**

BobRyan:

Leviticus 23 does NOT demonstrate that you can select any day you like – sanctify it of your own authority and declare it Sabbath.

Dr Walter:

Never said you could! What I pointed out is God could and did in Leviticus 23. Proof that the Sabbath law was not restricted by God to any day “of the week” because if it were then God could not apply the Sabbath law to any other days “of the week” or of the month but He did!

BobRyan:

Rather Lev 23 points out that GOD ALONE can determine what day is Holy.

DW:

Oh no you don't! Not “holy” but “SABBATH REST” days! These days were SABBATHS not just “holy.”

BobRyan:

Notice that Lev 23 DOES NOT even remotely suggest that the 7th day memorial of Creation is “changeable”!!

DW:

They certainly do! They reflect a NEW covenant where the FIRST DAY commemorates a GREATER work -the work of redemption and the 50th day Sabbath looks forward to a GREATER CREATION as does the 50th year Sabbath in Leviticus 25. The fourth commandment takes in this change in Deuteronomy 5 where NOT A WORD IS SAID ABOUT THE FORMER CREATION but rather REDEMPTION out of Egypt is what they were to “REMEMBER” as the redemption out of Egypt by the blood of the Lamb anticipates a GREATER WORK of God that the Sabbath will commemorate with a GREATER CREATION to come!

BobRyan:

Here is a fascinating list of explicit “Sunday is the Lord's Day” style of statements that we would have “expected” to find in the actual Word of God -- IF such a doctrine were true. Instead all we find in the sola-scriptura review of this doctrine is

John the Beloved in A.D. 96 says, “I was in the spirit on the Lord’s Day.” – Rev. 1:10 --- without any mention that the Lord’s Day is other than the Mark 2:27 day “The Son of Man is LORD of the Sabbath”.

Luke in about A.D. 60 says, “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.” – Acts 20:7 -- A one time event on Saturday evening as Paul was planning an all-day-travel day starting Sunday morning.

1. The first references to Sunday as the Lord’s Day do not occur until the 2nd half of the 2nd century A.D.
2. Early claims for such a thing based on the forged/fake documents such as Ignatius’ letter to the Magnesians and the supposed Epistle of Barnabas merely demonstrate the extreme “need” to find a source for Sunday as the Lord’s Day – so great is “the need” that they willingly stoop to appeals to known fakes for getting that evidence. (Hint – a number of sources in Walter’s own list pound against the idea that the letter of Barnabas is legit yet Walter includes them both!)
3. However the language of the many Lord’s Day quotes contained in both the fake documents as well as the post 2nd century real documents well represent **the needed statements for Lord’s Day** (if one were to be introducing such a day) – so conspicuously absent from the text of scripture!

Oh well – what else did we expect.

DW:

What is fascinating in this list is that the resurrection day of Christ is defined by a variety of terms:

- (1) The Lord’s Day
- (2) The Eighth day

(3) Sunday

(4) The first day of the Week

(5) The Sabbath in contrast to the Jewish day.

BobRyan:

The first references to Sunday as the Lord's Day do not occur until the 2nd half of the 2nd century A.D.

DW:

This is not what Bob's "prophet" Ellen G. White and 99.9% of all SDA literature says! Nearly 99.9% of all SDA publications demand that Constantine and the Catholic Church were the FIRST to change the Sabbath to Sunday! They still perpetuate this lie to the unlearned. Only when history is placed right in their face will they admit that Sunday observance predated Constantine by at least 200 years and during that 200 year period it was universal according to the records they cannot get rid of!

BobRyan:

Early claims for such a thing based on the forged/fake documents such as Ignatius' letter to the Magnesians and the supposed Epistle of Barnabas merely demonstrate the extreme "need" to find a source for Sunday as the Lord's Day – so great is "the need" that they willingly stoop to appeals to known fakes for getting that evidence. (Hint – a number of sources in Walter's own list pound against the idea that the letter of Barnabas is legit yet Walter includes them both!)

DW:

Even if we surmised these two documents are forgeries they still convey what the forgers believed at that point in time.

Furthermore, Bob cannot explain away the following and all before Constantine. Note the variety of ways the resurrection day

is specified (Sunday, Lord's Day, first day of the week, not the Jewish Sabbath, eighth day)...

BobRyan:

*However the language of the many Lord's Day quotes contained in both the fake documents as well as the post 2nd century real documents well represent **the needed statements for Lord's Day** (if one were to be introducing such a day) – so conspicuously absent from the text of scripture!*

DW:

Not so! The term "kuriakos" in Rev. 1:10 proves that Sunday was the "Lord's Day"! Those who insist that "kuriakos" here refers to the eschatological "day of the Lord" HAVE NOT ONE SINGLE PEICE OF EVIDENCE because "kuiakos" is NEVER ONCE used in that expression – NEVER! The phrase containing Kuriakos in Rev. 1:10 was UNIVERALLY recognized all over the Roman Empire as Sunday because it was the term that designated that day to offer incense by every Roman citizen to the Emperor as the god/man! John and Paul apply it to observing those things of the true God/man (1 Cor. 11:20; Rev. 1:10).

Osage Bluestem:

Charles spurgeon on roman catholicism: "a vast mountain of rubbish covering the truth, sermon on Nehemiah 4:10, "Rubbish" (No. 1156)

CHARLES SPURGEON ON ROMAN CATHOLICISM: "A VAST MOUNTAIN OF RUBBISH COVERING THE TRUTH."

By Ken Silva pastor-teacher on Oct 7, 2008 in Quotes, Roman Catholicism

Soon after apostolic times there came the old Roman rubbish, which in the end proved a worse hindrance to the gospel than all the errors which had preceded it.

This Popish rubbish was found in layers; first one doctrinal error, and then another, and then another, and then another, and then another, until at this time the errors of the Church of Rome are as countless as the stars, as black as midnight, and as foul as hell.

Her abominations reek in the nostrils of all Christian men. Her idolatries are the scorn of reason and the abhorrence of faith.

The iniquities of her practice, and the atrociousness of her doctrine, almost surpass belief.

As the gospel is the masterpiece of God, "Popery" is the masterpiece of Satan!

There can scarcely be imagined anything of devilish craftiness or Satanic wickedness which could be compared with her.

She is the unparalleled queen of iniquity! Behold upon her forehead the name, Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.

The church of Rome and her teachings are a vast mountain of rubbish covering the truth.

DW:

Spurgeon had it right!

GE:

How much of this 'Rome' survived in Protestantism?!

Mainly water-baptism and Sunday sacredness.

Spurgeon himself never saw that, unfortunately.

Earth, Wind & Fire:

Amen brother Amen.....Never spoke a truer word. Wonder how many of the brethren still don't see it!

Dr. Walter:

Never spoke a more false word! Saturdayism dishonors the Glory of God, repudiates the grace of God and despises the Person and works of Jesus Christ and perverts the Word of God. Seventh dayism brings the soul back under the bondage of the Old Covenant as it is the sign of the Old Covenant:

BR:

Speaking of the New Earth – God said “From Sabbath to Sabbath” shall all mankind come before Me to worship. Is 66.

Speaking of the Sabbath Christ said “the Sabbath was made for mankind” Mark 2:27.

But of course – those who view the Word of God itself as “doctrines of demons” will not accept these texts.

Interesting what D.L. Moody said in this case –

Remember the Sabbath Day, to keep it holy. *Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor*

*thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: **for in six days the LORD made heaven and Earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath Day, and hallowed it.***

DW:

*“But as for you, speak to the sons of Israel, saying, ‘You shall surely observe My Sabbaths; for this **is a sign between Me and you** throughout your generations.” Ex. 31:13; Ezek. 20:12, 19-21. and thus belongs to the Law covenant which God has abolished (Col. 2:14-16).*

*Gal 3:10. “But now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how is it that you turn back again to the weak and worthless elemental things, to which you desire to be enslaved all over again? You observe days [Sabbath and Feast Days] and months and seasons and years. I fear for you, that perhaps I have labored over you in vain.” Gal. 4:9-11. “Therefore no one is to act as your judge in regard to food or drink or in respect to a festival or a new moon or a **Sabbath day**—Col. 2:16.*

The change of Sabbath from the seventh to the first under the New Covenant is depicted in the sabbath days in Leviticus 23 and 25 (1st, 8th, 15th, 22nd and 50th days, 50th year).

The new first day of the week Sabbath is predicted in Psalm 118:20-24 with Acts 4:10-11; 13:10 and commanded in 1 Cor. 16:1-2 and established in Acts 20:7 and designated as the “kuriakos” day in Rev. 1:10 which every person in the Roman Empire knew that term when applied to “day” was Sunday.

Spurgeon had it right again!

GE:

Dr Walter is the worst emulator of Spurgeon one could find; of

course, Dr Walter does not think so.

Spurgeon never in his life would, and I am sure never in his life did MANHANDLE THE SCRIPTURES LIKE THIS: quoting Dr Walter: "Gal 3:10. *"But now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how is it that you turn back again to the weak and worthless elemental things, to which you desire to be enslaved all over again? You observe days[Sabbath and Feast Days] and months and seasons and years. I fear for you, that perhaps I have labored over you in vain."* Gal. 4:9-11. "Therefore no one is to act as your judge in regard to food or drink or in respect to a festival or a new moon or a **Sabbath day**—Col. 2:16." --- NOT EVEN BY PUTTING THEM **SIDE BY SIDE** like Dr Walter.

DW:

Ah! When the truth hits home it hurts! Paul is talking about the same thing in both texts – Jewish legalism and particular in regard to the ceremonial laws of which the Sabbatical cycle, the sign of the Old Covenant was inseparably involved.

In Galatians the pivotal point of Jewish legalism was the ceremonial law of circumcision but not without exclusion to "days" "months" and "seasons and years" while in Colossians it is again circumcision as the pivotal point (Col. 2:11-13) but not without the exclusion to "food or drink...festival...new moon..Sabbath day."

My theology does not suffer at all by placing these texts side by side but your theology suffers greatly by denying the similarities between both these passages.

I have never questioned your personal salvation because I think you are a saved man. I wish God could open your eyes to see that you are opposing the very grace of God that you love by clinging

to the the sign of the Old covenant (seventh dayism) instead of embracing the sign of the new covenant which gives FIRST to the glory of Christ instead of LAST! Also, if He would open your eyes to see you have miserably misinterpreted baptism. If these two flies were removed from your spiritual ointment you would be on your road to a more consistent gospel of grace.

GE:

But thanks, Dr Walter, it gives CLEAR indication of your theology. You are wont to rely on **NOT “thoroughly true and reliable parallel passages”** (Young) as I pointed out to you before.

BR:

Jamieson, Fausset, Brown

Col 2:16

16. therefore--because ye are complete in Christ, and God in Him has dispensed with all subordinate means as essential to acceptance with Him.

meat . . . drink--Greek, “eating . . . drinking” (Ro 14:1-17). Pay no regard to any one who sits in judgment on you as to legal observances in respect to foods.

holyday--a feast yearly. Compare the three, 1Ch 23:31.

new moon--monthly.

the sabbath--Omit “THE,” which is not in the Greek (compare Note, see on Ga 4:10). “SABBATHS” (not “the sabbaths”) of the **day of atonement and feast of tabernacles have come to an end** with the Jewish services to which they belonged (Le 23:32, 37-39).

The weekly sabbath rests on a more permanent foundation, having been instituted in Paradise to commemorate the completion of creation in six days. [Le 23:38](#) expressly distinguished “the sabbath of the Lord” from the other sabbaths. A positive precept is right because it is commanded, and ceases to be obligatory when abrogated; a moral precept

is commanded eternally, because it is eternally right. If we could keep a perpetual sabbath, as we shall hereafter, the positive precept of the sabbath, one in each week, would not be needed. [Heb 4:9](#), “rests,” Greek, “keeping of sabbath” ([Isa 66:23](#)). But we cannot, since even Adam, in innocence, needed one amidst his earthly employments; therefore the sabbath is still needed and is therefore still linked with the other nine commandments, as obligatory in the spirit, though the letter of the law has been superseded by that higher spirit of love which is the essence of law and Gospel alike ([Ro 13:8-10](#)).

David Lamb:

Spurgeon believed in baptism in water and the sacredness of the first day of the week because that is what he believed the bible teaches. He would have differed with Roman Catholicism on both these matters, though.

Roman Catholicism holds that baptism makes one into a Christian, and admits one into the church. To quote the “Catholic Encyclopaedia”:

Holy Baptism holds the first place among the sacraments, because it is the door of the spiritual life; for by it we are made members of Christ and incorporated with the Church.

Spurgeon's beliefs on baptism were quite different. He states in his “A Puritan Catechism”:

75. Q. What is Baptism?

A. *Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, instituted by Jesus Christ (Matt. 28:19), to be to the person baptised a sign of his fellowship with him, in his death, and burial, and resurrection (Rom. 6:3; Col. 2:12), of his being ingrafted into him (Gal. 3:27), of remission of sins (Mk. 1:4; Acts 22:16), and of his giving up himself to God through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life (Rom. 6:4-5).*

76. Q. To whom is Baptism to be administered?

A. Baptism is to be administered to all those who actually profess repentance towards God (Acts 2:38; Matt. 3:6; Mk. 16:16; Acts 8:12, 36-37; Acts 10:47-48), and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and to none other.

77. Q. Are the infants of such as are professing to be baptised?

A. The infants of such as are professing believers are not to be baptised, because there is neither command nor example in the Holy Scriptures for their baptism (Exod. 23:13; Prov. 30:6).

78. Q. How is baptism rightly administered?

A. Baptism is rightly administered by immersion, or dipping the whole body of the person in water (Matt. 3:16; Jn. 3:23), in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, according to Christ's institution, and the practice of the apostles (Matt. 28:19-20), and not by sprinkling or pouring of water, or dipping some part of the body, after the tradition of men (Jn. 4:1-2; Acts 8:38-39).

Certainly, both Spurgeon and Roman Catholics use water, but it is wrong, in my view to say that Spurgeon only used water in baptism because the Roman Catholics do.

Spurgeon would have had similar disagreements in the practice of keeping the first day of the week sacred.

GE:

I have all my life until very recently said that I am prepared to keep still, and accept the status quo in God's Church as far as water-baptism is concerned. I did keep quiet, and lived and wrestled with this question, in my heart. In fact, the first book I wrote (hand), but never published, was In Defence of Baptism (Afrikaans on mostly 'sprinkling' vs. 'immersion'. I think it still lies somewhere between some strewn around manuscripts.) I never confronted the Church with the changes in my opinion. I still

think it's not worth bothering. To me it's a pity how Karl Barth's quality of workmanship suffered in the last of his publications, the 'addendum', on Baptism. I could not even finish reading the book. What a disappointment was it. But it made me realise, we are ALL but men. Things have changed a lot though, since the increase in knowledge phenomenon.... STILL I'm NOT going to be absorbed by the baptism issue. Luckily we don't experience 'baptisms', 'daily', any more (--- to me a STRONG, doctrinal point on baptism!)

Not like we thoroughly and constantly are confronted with the Sabbath 'issue', EVERY DAY AND TIME we pick up a Bible and read the manipulated New Testament; and EVERY Sabbath that goes by in the life of the Body of Christ's Own, and the Lord's Day is dedicated to sungod the day after instead... not by them who do not know, but by THEM WHO CERTAINLY DO KNOW. ...

DW:

The Bible likens the “Sun” to Jesus Christ:

*Mal. 4:2 But unto you that fear my name shall the **Sun** of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall.*

*Therefore the “Sun” day is appropriate choice for the “Lord's Day” but where in the world can one find the day of the **Saturn god** used used in connection with the Sabbath or the Lord's Day??????????*

GE:

... instead, by the Church of Christ, the Reformation Churches, about which I am passionately convinced and shall stay convinced even though I find myself SHUT OUT by this very Church of the Living God because of its SUNDAY-WORSHIP!

DW:

Have you noticed how Spurgeon referred to all his sermons preached on Sunday morning and Sunday Evening?

*“Delivered on **Sabbath** Evening, January 15th, 1860”.*

GE:

And all Christianity have the fullest right to do it, **for as long as they honestly believe** that Christ rose from the dead on the First Day of the week. For God forgave the misled and deceived.

But woe unto them that misled and deceived the sheep of the Lord our Good Shepherd. Hell waits for those of our modern era since the tsunami of corrupt 'translations'.

Rippon:

On The Other Hand ...

Taken from :C.H.Spurgeon Autobiography: Volume2. The Full Harvest.

Chapter 2: In Calvin's Pulpit

Never did I feel my Protestant feelings boiling over so tremendously as in this city of idols, for I am not an outrageous Protestant generally, and I rejoice to confess that I feel sure there are some of God's people even in the Romish Church, as I shall have to show you by-and-by; but I did feel indignant when I saw the glory and worship which belong to God alone, given to pictures, and images of wood and stone. When I saw the pulpits magnificently carved, the gems set in the shrines, the costly marbles, the rich and rare paintings upon which a man might gaze for a day, and see some new beauty in each face, I did not marvel that men were enchanted therewith; but when I saw the most flagrant violation of taste and of religion in their 'Calvarys' and cheap prints, my spirit was stirred within me, for I saw a people wholly given unto idolatry. They seem as if they could not

live without Mary the Virgin, and without continually paying reverence and adoration to her. (p.21)

GE:

This one has never been said better....!!

*".....I never could make out how the money got to the Virgin, and to Dominic, and to the rest of them; but I have a notion that, **if you were to discover how the money gets to the poor, you would find how it reaches the saints.**"*

What a jewel! And it not only applies to the RCC!

So, here's a **third relic from Roman Catholicism in Protestantism**

BR:

Spurgeon,

"Money gained on Sabbath-day is a loss, I dare to say. No blessing can come with that which comes to us, on the devil's back, by our willful disobedience of God's law. The loss of health by neglect of rest, and the loss of soul by neglect of hearing the gospel, soon turn all seeming profit into real loss."

"Salt Cellars": Salt Cellars, C.H. Spurgeon (Vol. 2 M-Z)

FROM: CHARLES SPURGEON'S CATECHISM

(WHAT IS TO BE TAUGHT TO CHILDREN):

49 Q Which is the fourth commandment?

A The fourth commandment is, Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy

manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor they cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.

50 Q What is required in the fourth commandment?

A The fourth commandment requires the keeping holy to God such set times as he has appointed in his Word, expressly one whole day in seven, to be a holy Sabbath to himself (Le 19:30 De 5:12).

51 Q How is the Sabbath to be sanctified?

A The Sabbath is to be sanctified by a holy resting all that day, even from such worldly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days (Le 23:3), and spending the whole time in the public and private exercises of God's worship (Ps 92:1,2 Isa 58:13,14), except so much as is taken up in the works of necessity and mercy (Mt 12:11,12).

“...the reason why people become Hyper-Calvinists and Antinomians, is because some, who profess to be Calvinists, often keep back part of the truth, and do not, as Paul did, “declare all the counsel of God”; they select certain parts of Scripture, where their own particular views are taught, and pass by other aspects of God's truth. Such preachers as John Newton, and in later times, your own Christmas Evans, were men who preached the whole truth of God; they kept back nothing that God has revealed; and, as the result of their preaching, Antinomianism could not find a foot-hold anywhere.” (Charles Spurgeon, Gospel of Sovereign Grace).

“It is to be feared that some zealous brethren have preached the doctrine of justification by faith not only so boldly and so plainly, but also so baldly and so out of all connection with other truth,

*that they have led men into presumptuous confidences, and have appeared to lend their countenance to a species of Antinomianism very much to be dreaded. From a dead, fruitless, inoperative faith we may earnestly pray, "Good Lord, deliver us," yet may we be unconsciously, fostering it." (Charles Spurgeon, **Faith and Regeneration**)*

A.W Pink on the subject of Sabbath

[But some may ask, "Has not the Law been fully abrogated by the coming of Christ into the world? Would you bring us under that heavy yoke of bondage which none has ever been able to bear? Does not the New Testament expressly declare that we are not under the Law, but under Grace; that Christ was made under the Law to free His people therefrom? Is not an attempt to overawe men's conscience by the authority of the Decalogue (ten commandments) a legalistic imposition, altogether at variance with that Christian liberty which the Savior has brought in by His obedience unto death?" We answer thus: So far from the Law being abolished by the coming of Christ into this world, He Himself emphatically stated, "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets (the enforcers thereof): I am come not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew 5:17, 18) . True, the Christian is not under the Law as a Covenant of Works nor as a ministration of condemnation, but he is under it as a rule of life and a means of sanctification." (A.W. Pink – The Ten Commandments)

Then of course there are the reformers on the subject of Sabbath

The Augsburg Confession by Philip Melanchthon (1530)

Moreover, it is disputed whether bishops or pastors have the right to introduce ceremonies in the Church, and to make laws concerning meats, holy-days and grades, that is, orders of

ministers, etc. They that give this right to the bishops refer to this testimony John 16, 12. 13: I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth. They also refer to the example of the Apostles, who commanded to abstain from blood and from things strangled, Acts 15, 29.

They refer to the Sabbath-day as having been changed into the Lord's Day, contrary to the Decalog, as it seems. Neither is there any example whereof they make more than concerning the changing of the Sabbath-day. Great, say they, is the power of the Church, since it has dispensed with one of the Ten Commandments!

I am saying that the force of the argument they make is explicitly centered on the continuing validity of the Ten Commandments and especially the 4th commandment – the Sabbath commandment.

How one chooses to apply the Mark 7 method of “edit that commandment according to tradition” is a different matter.

*But the arguments themselves are applicable to the commandment whether you choose to edit God's Word or not. In their case they may be choosing to edit while applying the force of their 4th commandment argument. So we then notice that they do NOT say “because we edit the 4th commandment from the way God gave it – THEN the 4th commandment is still valid and here are some arguments for keeping it.” By nicely sidestepping their own man-made-tradition for editing God's Word – they then are free to apply the full force of their argument from the language of the commandment itself – from the fact of the 4th commandment itself. (Hence when Spurgeon answers the question about which is the Sabbath Commandment – he quotes verbatim from the 4th commandment text.) An argument that I find **even more forceful and compelling if you***

do not Edit the Word of God.

In my case – I choose not to edit God's Word. The result is that the logic in the arguments they make is even more compelling when applied to an unedited Word of God!

DW:

Funny! Anyone who knows and has read the ante-nicene Fathers knows Melancton didn't know what he was talking about. It seems that Roman Catholics and followers of Ellen G. White are the only ones willfully ignorant of history.

The only thing Constantine did was make law what was already universally practiced among Christians. He made it law because the heathen within his empire worshipped the gods of the mystery religions whose names are associated with the days of the week like the “Saturn” day god and the “Sun” day God as well as the other five.

Part two

Mark 16:9, the meaning of the time-phrase, ‘proh-i prohtehi tou sabbatou’

As an example of the universally accepted interpretation, I propose “Die Wuppertaler Studienbibel”, which is said, “besitzt keine Parallele”, “Als Er aber auferstanden war, in der Frühe am ersten Tage nach dem Sabbat, erschien Er zuerst der Maria aus Magdala... Sie ging hin und verkündete...”

“While then having risen / having been raised though, in the morning on the First Day after the Sabbath, He appeared to Mary Magdalene... She went and told...”. (Quoted from F. Rienecker, ‘Das Evangelium des Markus’.)

Rienecker comments, “...der erste Mensch, dem der Auferstandene begegnet...” Note that the whole story concerns Jesus’ first APPEARANCE : “on the First Day of the week” – that naturally followed “AFTER the Sabbath”; it is NO account of Jesus’ resurrection!

The commentaries I have read don’t pay any attention to the idea that the Adverbial time-phrase ‘proh-i prohtehi tou sabbatou’ could (or should, according to Dr Walter) mean “*the “first Sabbath in a new series of Sabbaths”*”. The day Jesus appeared on undoubtedly is the ‘week-day’ “after the (weekly) Sabbath” as Wuppertaler explains it. As I have said, it has never before been questioned that ‘prohtehi tou sabbatou’ is the First Day : “OF THE WEEK”. Dr Walter’s idea is a novelty of his own invention— with the view to his private Sunday-propaganda agenda.

I have not mentioned the futility of Dr Walter’s attempts due to the most basic fact of all, that Mark 16:9 in no way whatsoever, states that Jesus ‘ROSE’ from the dead ‘proh-i prohtehi tou sabbatou’. What’s the use for Dr Walter’s Sunday-Resurrection promotion by the supposition ‘proh-i prohtehi tou sabbatou’ means “*the “first Sabbath in a new series of Sabbaths”*” IF THERE IS NO ‘RESURRECTION’ found in the text? The resurrection as

historical actuality “on the First Day” or of the First Day, is alleged in 16:9 in only bad commentaries written by bad connoisseurs. The historical event “on the First Day” and of the First Day in Mark 16:9, whether “on the first day” or of the first day “*“in a new series of Sabbaths”*” or not, was, “he APPEARED” — NOT, ‘he rose’!

Although I believe Mark’s ‘second ending’ is ‘canon’, it is impossible to deny it has been ‘added’. The fact the second ending was not ‘original’ but was added later, explains its omission in some manuscripts. It also explains the different “vocabulary, style and subject-matter of the section” (Vincent Taylor). YET, no one before Dr Walter has come up with what he has conjured.

There are more, ‘endings’ to Mark. There are variants of the ‘recognised’ second ending. They all, are later. They, all are more predisposed. They all are from the age of predominant Sunday-observance. Yet they all, do not mention that Jesus rose; or the day that He would have raised on— or that He rose ‘on the first day’ “*“in a new series of Sabbaths”*”. Why? Because it would have been most absurd. But after two millennia of ‘text criticism’, Dr Walters discovers, that is, what Mark 16:9 means, specifically in connection with the word ‘prohehi’-‘prohton’ which “is a common Markan word” (Taylor). So would ‘prohtos’ be.

‘Prohtos’, “first”, says Dr Walter, in Mark 16:9, means “*“the “first Sabbath in a new series of Sabbaths”*””. But Dr Walter ignores the morphology, “the form and structure of words in a language, especially the consistent patterns of inflection, combination, derivation and change etc. that may be observed and classified. (Collins) Dr Walter maintains regardless, Mark 16:9 declares Jesus rose from the dead on “*the “first Sabbath in a new series of Sabbaths”*”, but while “first”, ‘prohtos’ is in the Dative Case

“sabbath”, ‘sabbaton’, should also have been in the Dative Case, like this, ‘prohtehi sabbatohi’, which of course is not the case.

Even were Dr Walter right, “*the “first Sabbath in a new series of Sabbaths”*” would have meant the first “Sabbath” in a new series of Sabbaths— the first LAST day or first SEVENTH day, “*in a new series of Sabbaths*” or LAST or SEVENTH days. Or ‘the most important’ “*in a new series of Sabbaths*” or LAST or SEVENTH days; the First Day of the week never would have come in the picture; only the Sabbath or the last or Seventh Day : OF THE WEEK, would have featured.

So, Dr Walter’s idea is simply too absurd, and too fantastic for scholars to ever give thought.

Never forget, Mark doesn’t speak of the Resurrection at all, which makes Dr Walter’s interpretation that Jesus ROSE from the dead “*the “first Sabbath in a new series of Sabbaths”*”, even more ludicrous.

That brings us to the term, ‘sabbatou’, which Dr Walter maintains, “... = *singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath*” ...and thus never means ‘of the week’...?

Claimed Dr Walter,

“*Mark 16:2 gives the normal reading for the “first day of the week” but the change in verse 9 is intentional. “Mia” is simply the regular ordinal number “first” but “prote” refers to the first in a series. Sabbaton is the regular term used for the day following the Jewish Sabbath when used with “mia” but “Sabbatou” is the normal term used for the fourth commandment Sabbath. Hence, Jesus arose “proii” early between 3am to 6am on the “first Sabbath of a new series” identified in verse 2 as the “first day of the week.”*”

... “but “Sabbatou” is the normal term used for the fourth commandment Sabbath”? That’s strange, isn’t it?!

“Jesus ... on the “first Sabbath of a new series” ... arose “proii” early” which is directly Mark 16:9 supposed to be, at least according to Dr Walter— “the “first **Sabbath** of a new series” **identified** in verse 2 as the “**first day of the week**...”” but... ...

“but “Sabbatou” is the normal term used for the fourth commandment Sabbath”— the Seventh Day? The Seventh Day— ‘of the week’? If that, is not self-contradictory, I wonder what is.

“Leviticus 23...”

Quoting DW:

“Jesus did not rise on the “Seventh Day Sabbath” but he arose on “THE FIRST DAY SABBATH” and that is not only the clear testimony of the gospel accounts but confirmed by the Apostles (1 Cor. 16:1-2; Acts 20:7; Rev. 1:7) and **pictured in the ceremonial feasts sabbaths (Lev. 23)** and predicted by David in Psalm 118:20-24 with Acts 4:10-11; 13:33).”

Quoting DW:

“... **in Leviticus 23**. Proof that the Sabbath law was not restricted by God to any day “of the week” because if it were then God could not apply the Sabbath law to any other days “of the week” or of the month but He did!

... Not “holy” but “SABBATH REST” days! These days were SABBATHS not just “holy.””

Quoting DW:

*“They certainly do (change)! They reflect a NEW covenant where the FIRST DAY commemorates a GREATER work -the work of redemption and the 50th day Sabbath looks forward to a GREATER CREATION as does the 50th year Sabbath in **Leviticus 25**. The fourth commandment takes in this change in **Deuteronomy 5** where NOT A WORD IS SAID ABOUT THE FORMER CREATION but rather REDEMPTION out of Egypt is what they were to “REMEMBER” as the redemption out of Egypt by the blood of the Lamb anticipates a GREATER WORK of God that the Sabbath will commemorate with a GREATER CREATION to come!”*

Quoting DW:

“The “first day of the week” is the New covenant Sabbath and it too is one Sabbath after six non-sabbaths.”

Quoting DW:

*“It really does not matter what day “of the week” it falls on **as Leviticus 23 demonstrates**. What matters is the established principle of six preceding and following a seventh regardless what day “of the week” it may fall upon.*

***In Leviticus that principle is applied** to six “days” “month” “years” and the Sabbath falls upon the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st 22nd, 28th, 50th” in terms of days but is applied to longer periods that the term “yom “ can include (Gen. 2:4) but still in six (years) followed by a seventh (year) or 50th year. It is equally true of THOUSAND year periods, six followed by a seventh thousand year followed by an eternal eighth period!”*

Quoting DW:

*“He is the Lord of “the Sabbath” – which the Lord can **apply to any day He chooses as Leviticus 23 proves!** He applied the Sabbath to the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st, 22nd, 28th days of the month, and 50th day! He can apply it to LONGER PERIODS OF TIME than a 24 hour “day” as Leviticus 23 and 25*

prove and as the term “yom” can be used (Gen. 2:4) such as the seventh “month” seventh “year” 50th year!”

Quoting DW:

*“**Leviticus 23 is a pictorial, symbolic portrayal** of shift from the Old Covenant and its Sabbath (seventh) to the New Covenant and its Sabbath (first) and between the seventh millennium to the eternal day sabbath – new creation and new earth.”*

Quoting DW:

“Mark 16:9 literally reads “the first sabbath in a new series” (protos = first in a new series; “sabbatou = singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath) “proii” – 3am to 6am Sunday Morning!”
(Emphases GE.)

Seven times in this conversation does Dr Walter ‘quote’, “Leviticus”, as well as other Scriptures. NOT ONCE does he quote actual words, from “Leviticus” or from the other Scriptures ‘quoted’.

Seven times therefore, Dr Walter supplies “*Proof that the Sabbath law was not restricted by God to any day “of the week”*”.

Seven times says Dr Walter, “**as Leviticus 23 proves... the Lord can *apply to any day He chooses* ...**” that “*He is the Lord...*” uhm... excuse me, *the Lord can **apply to any day He chooses*** that *He is the Lord...* “of “the Sabbath”! Understand? That’s what Dr Walter says, “**as Leviticus 23 proves**”.

“**As Leviticus 23 proves**” without actually giving us one word from Leviticus, or, from other Scriptures, anywhere.

But we, because Dr Walter thinks we are ‘*saved men*’, are supposed to believe him.

Five times, “Sabbath” is “not the seventh day “of the week”!”

[“...the Sabbath law was not restricted by God to any day “of the week” because if it were then God could not apply the Sabbath law to any other days “of the week” or of the month but He did!”]

O yes, now I remember, Dr Walter said, ‘the Seventh Day’, but NEVER the Seventh Day ‘OF THE WEEK’!

“...nowhere in God's Word did he ever say that the Sabbath was the seventh day “OF THE WEEK.” He would never say that because if He had said that then he would have changed because he applied the Sabbath to the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st, 22nd and 28th days of the month in Leviticus 23 as well as the 50th day after 7 regular sabbaths, 7th YEAR and 50th YEAR. Hence, the principle is merely one sabbath after six non-sabbaths!

The “first day of the week” is the New covenant Sabbath and it too is one Sabbath after six non-sabbaths.”

“Spurgeon, Moody and Pink interpreted the fourth commandment just as I do. They rejected the idea that it referred to the seventh day “of the week” and rejected the Jewish observation on the seventh day “of the week.” Instead they saw it as the seventh day after six working days irregardless of what day “of the week” it might or might not fall on.

Spurgeon: “expressly one whole day in seven, to be a holy Sabbath to himself (Le 19:30 De 5:12).”

However, they all agreed that the Old Testament predicted and the New Testament established it on the first day “of the week” for Christians under the New Covenant and rejected the Jewish observation.”

Dr Walter's BASIC idea is, every one and all of *"the ceremonial feasts sabbaths"* of the *"laws"*, WERE, *"the Seventh Day Sabbath"* — quote: Emphasis GE: ***"Saturdayism dishonors the Glory of God, repudiates the grace of God and despises the Person and works of Jesus Christ and perverts the Word of God. Seventh dayism brings the soul back under the bondage of the Old Covenant as it is the sign of the Old Covenant:"*** But as for you, speak to the sons of Israel, saying, 'You shall surely observe ***My Sabbaths***; for ***this*** is a ***sign*** between Me and you throughout your generations." Ex. 31:13; Ezek. 20:12, 19-21. and thus belongs to ***the Law covenant*** which God has abolished (Col. 2:14-16)."

Quote: "... he arose on *"THE FIRST DAY SABBATH"* and that is ... pictured in the ceremonial feasts sabbaths (Lev. 23) and predicted by David in Psalm 118:20-24 with Acts 4:10-11; 13:33)."

Quote: *"The Sabbath of the Jew is to him a task; the Lord's Day of the Christian, the first day of the week, is to him a joy, a day of rest, of peace, and of thanksgiving. Spurgeon, Moody and Pink interpreted the fourth commandment just as I do. They rejected the idea that it referred to the seventh day "of the week" and rejected the Jewish observation on the seventh day "of the week." Instead they saw it as the seventh day after six working days irregardless (Sic.) of what day "of the week" it might or might not fall on. Spurgeon: "expressly one whole day in seven to be a holy Sabbath to himself (Le 19:30 De 5:12)." However, they all agreed that the Old Testament predicted and the New Testament established it on the first day "of the week" for Christians under the New Covenant and rejected the Jewish observation."*

More BLATANT, my eyes, have never, read.

But AT THE SAME TIME AND BY THE SAME EFFORT, the man Dr Walter tries to DENY the Sabbath is the Seventh Day— “OF THE WEEK”?!

All ‘sabbaths’ in the Old Testament Scriptures – in “*Leviticus 23*” in particular and elsewhere – according to Dr Walter, **ALWAYS OCCURRED ON** the Seventh Day Sabbath ‘of the week’ — today’s “Saturday”! Quote: “**Bob Ryan:** “*Rather Lev 23 points out that GOD ALONE can determine what day is Holy.*” **Dr Walter:** “*Oh no you don't! Not “holy” but “SABBATH REST” days! These days were SABBATHS not just “holy.”*”.

The Seventh Day Sabbath ‘of the week’ – today’s, “Saturday” – REGARDLESS DISTINCTION in the Old Testament Scriptures between it and ‘ceremonial sabbaths’, LIKE ALL ““SABBATH REST” days”, **THEN**, fell on the ‘seventh day’, a “sabbath”, whereby “the Old Testament predicted and the New Testament pictured”:— quote, “the Lord’s day sabbath ... a holy Sabbath ... established ... **on the first day “of the week”** for Christians under the New Covenant”. (Emphasis GE.) The Scriptures “Old Testament” and “New Testament”, both as one – according to Dr Walter – “rejected the idea that it (“the Lord’s day sabbath”), referred to the seventh day “of the week” and rejected the Jewish observation on the seventh day “of the week””.

Dr Walter alleges nothing distinguished any ‘sabbath-day’ so that it could be a ‘ceremonial sabbath’ because it did not regularly fall on the “seventh day sabbath” — ‘of the week’. Even though according to Dr Walter, “sabbath” without exception meant “the seventh day”, it did not mean, quote, “the seventh day “of the week”!”. It meant, quote, “not the seventh day “of the week”! but the seventh day after six working days!”;

“expressly one whole day in seven to be a holy Sabbath to himself”;

“the Sabbath law was not restricted by God to any day “of the week””;

“the seventh day after six working days irregardless of what day “of the week” it might or might not fall on”;

“God never changed and never needed to change because nowhere in God's Word did he ever say that the Sabbath was the seventh day “OF THE WEEK””!

So, according to Dr Walter – **five times** in this short discussion – “Sabbath” is *“not the seventh day “of the week”! but the seventh day after six working days!”*.

But, says the LORD,

“I will rain bread ... and the people shall gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in MY LAW, or no. It shall come to pass that on the Sixth Day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily. ... THIS SHALL BE (LAW), WHEN the LORD shall give you ... bread (8) ... the thing which the LORD commanded (16) ... And the Children of Israel did so. ... And it came to pass that on the Sixth Day (according to God’s Law), they gathered twice as much bread. ... And Moses said unto them, This is that (Law) which the LORD HATH SAID, tomorrow SHALL BE THE REST OF THE HOLY SABBATH, SABBATH UNTO THE LORD : Bake which ye will bake ... and that which remaineth over, lay up ... until tomorrow. And they laid it up till the next day. ... And Moses said, Eat that TODAY, FOR TODAY IS THE SABBATH UNTO THE LORD ... THE SEVENTH DAY WHICH IS, THE SABBATH!” Exodus 16.

God, with “**commandment**”, “**gave**”, **his**, “**Sabbath, Day**”, with one day’s – “the Sixth Day’s” – notification; which HE, in advance

and irrespective and regardless of man's activities or choice of "working days"-behind, "willed", **before!** ...

"(29) See, for the LORD hath given you the Sabbath : THEREFORE He giveth you the Sixth Day ... they shall PREPARE (5) ... Let no man go out on THE SEVENTH DAY. SO, the people rested on the Seventh Day."

God's predestinating will and providence determined "the Seventh Day Sabbath OF THE LORD GOD"; not man's retrospective overview of his own "working days".

"Six days ye SHALL (henceforth) gather bread; but on the Seventh Day which is the Sabbath ... unto the LORD ... there shall ..." BY THE LORD'S DOING "... be none". (25,26)

God, while He "gave" "the Sixth Day" and "the Seventh Day", **NAMED** "the Sixth Day" and "the Seventh Day". God at once instituted 'the week', explaining by word-symbol or idiom of the "Rest Day" – "Sabbath Day" the 'seven-days-cycle' that HE, uniquely LIMITED in Divine Revelation by the otherwise inexplicable phenomenon of "the Seventh Day Sabbath".

The great Charles Spurgeon in

"50 Q What is required in the fourth commandment? ... The fourth commandment requires the keeping holy to God such set times as he has appointed in his Word, expressly one whole day in seven, to be a holy Sabbath to himself (Le 19:30 De 5:12)" clearly means, the word "himself" is God, "himself".

Now what Dr Walter did with this teaching of Spurgeon's, read!

"Spurgeon, Moody and Pink interpreted the fourth commandment just as I do. They rejected the idea that it referred to the seventh day "of the week" and rejected the Jewish observation on the seventh day "of the week." Instead they saw it

as the seventh day after six working days irregardless of what day “of the week” it might or might not fall on.

*Spurgeon: “expressly **one whole day in seven**, to be a holy Sabbath to himself (Le 19:30 De 5:12)”“ ... “to himself” — to MAN, Dr Walter speaking of “the seventh day after six working days” OF MAN’S “working”! Dr Walter! ... “the Sabbath law was not restricted by God to any day “of the week”“ ... “God never changed and never needed to change because nowhere in God’s Word did he ever say that the Sabbath was the seventh day “OF THE WEEK”“!*

But as the Book Dr Walter seven times without a word from, refers to, “*Leviticus 23*”, expressly DIFFERENTIATES between ‘The Sabbath’ and ‘sabbaths’,

Introductory remark, verse 2:

“Speak unto the children of Israel ... the feasts of the LORD which ye shall proclaim holy CONVOCATIONS (or days of congregation), these, MY feasts” —

First of all, verse 3:

“Six days shall work be done (by you): but THE SEVENTH DAY (by name) is The-Sabbath-of-Rest” (by NAME!

“The-Sabbath-of-Rest”, God’s, “Rest”! The “work” of “six days”, is man’s work; the “Rest” of The-Seventh-Day-Sabbath-of-Rest, is God’s Rest.) “The-Sabbath-of-Rest, an holy CONVOCATION (or day of Congregation); ye shall do no work therein: it is The-Sabbath-of-the-LORD in all your houses (in all the world in all times.)”

Again, man’s ‘rest’ is a doing nothing, whereas the “Rest” is “of the LORD” — “the LORD’S”, and greatly to be praised because the “Rest” is his (Promise of Jesus’ resurrection), obtained in victory, through “the exceeding greatness of his power which God worked” to “finish all the works of God”!

Then, subsequent and subordinate, verse 4:

“**THESE**, are the feasts of the LORD,
also holy convocations,
which, YOU,
shall (by Law) proclaim
IN (or ‘according to’) THEIR, SEASONS :”
“Seasons”, to “DATE: In the fourteenth”;
“Seasons”, to “MONTH
(“you”, determined and “proclaimed”) the FIRST”,
“Seasons”, to “DAY-and-TIME-in-the-AFTER-NOON-of-day” —
THIS, the “Season” and “the Feast of the LORD”, “the Passover of Yahweh” in the Book of Moses, ‘The Book for the Levites’ ...

... proving Dr Walter an ignorant and FOR NO REASON BUT SUNDAY-WORSHIP, malicious Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD GOD antagonist.

Now I myself, on this forum Baptist Board and during CURRENT discussions, gave the words of Leviticus 23, for everyone to READ the differentiation, that THAT Scripture, so pertinently draws BETWEEN “the Sabbaths”-Seventh Day (of the week), and all other “sabbaths”-“holy convocation” and or “feast” and or “high day” — “*ceremonial sabbaths*” as they are called, and as Dr Walter himself describes them, “... not ... the “Seventh Day Sabbath” but ... the **ceremonial feasts sabbaths** (Lev. 23).”

Doctor Walter does not recognise or allow difference or distinction between “the “Seventh Day Sabbath”” and “the **ceremonial feasts sabbaths**” : Says he,
“*pictured in the ceremonial feasts sabbaths (Lev. 23)*”
“*the Sabbath law was not restricted by God to any day “of the week”*”
“*God could not apply the Sabbath law to any other days “of the week” or of the month but He did!*”

“nowhere in God's Word did he ever say that the Sabbath was the seventh day “OF THE WEEK.” He would never say that because if He had said that then he would have changed because he applied the Sabbath to the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st, 22nd and 28th days of the month in Leviticus 23 as well as the 50th day after 7 regular sabbaths, 7th YEAR and 50th YEAR. Hence, the principle is merely one sabbath after six non-sabbaths!”

“Your missing the established principle. It really does not matter what day “of the week” it falls on as Leviticus 23 demonstrates. What matters is the established principle of six preceding and following a seventh regardless what day “of the week” it may fall upon.

In Leviticus that principle is applied to six “days” “month” “years” and the Sabbath falls upon the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st 22nd, 28th, 50th” in terms of days but is applied to longer periods that the term “yom “ can include (Gen. 2:4) but still in six (years) followed by a seventh (year) or 50th year. It is equally true of THOUSAND year periods, six followed by a seventh thousand year followed by an eternal eighth period!”

“(BR: “Lev 23 points out that GOD ALONE can determine what day is Holy.”)

DW:

Oh no you don't! Not “holy” but “SABBATH REST” days! These days were SABBATHS not just “holy.”“

“the Sabbath” – which the Lord can apply to any day He chooses as Leviticus 23 proves! He applied the Sabbath to the 1st, 7th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 15th, 21st, 22nd, 28th days of the month, and 50th day! He can apply it to LONGER PERIODS OF TIME than a 24 hour “day” as Leviticus 23 and 25 prove and as the term “yom”

can be used (Gen. 2:4) such as the seventh “month” seventh “year” 50th year!”

‘Sabbaton’

States **Dr Walter**,

“...”sabbatou = singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath...”.

“Compare the words used in Mark 16:2 with Mark 16:9! “mia” is used in verse 2 but “proto” in verse 9. The plural “sabbaton” is used in verse 2 but the singular “sabbatou” is used in verse 9. Mark 16:2 gives the normal reading for the “first day of the week” but the change in verse 9 is intentional. “Mia” is simply the regular ordinal number “first” but “prote” refers to the first in a series. Sabbaton is the regular term used for the day following the Jewish Sabbath when used with “mia” but “Sabbatou” is the normal term used for the fourth commandment Sabbath. Hence, Jesus arose “proii” early between 3am to 6am on the “first Sabbath of a new series” identified in verse 2 as the “first day of the week.”

...

Mark 16:9 literally reads “the first sabbath in a new series” (protos = first in a new series; “sabbatou = singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath) “proii” – 3am to 6am Sunday Morning!”

“Mark 16:9 literally reads “the first sabbath in a new series” (protos = first in a new series; “sabbatou = singular and only used

of the fourth commandment Sabbath) “proii” – 3am to 6am Sunday Morning!”

GE:

Really bad grammar, is the only impression I, get. And worse pedagogy. Combined, a nightmare. First one must have something clear to one self, before you can teach someone else. You would have made my task to react on your ‘stuff’, much easier, Dr Walter, if you talked sense, and used at least correct Greek references. So let the learner teach the scholar.

Re: Dr Walter,

““sabbatou = singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath...”

Now, *““sabbatou = singular”* is wrong, in that it does not tell halve, or it tells twice as much of what is necessary to know before one may apply “=”. ‘Sabbátou’ is the Singular Genitive, and that makes the world’s difference, because *“singular ... Sabbath”* in Greek, normally means it is the Nominative, ‘sábbaton’, not Genitive, ‘sabbátou’ — no implications mentioned yet!

Al right then, departing from the assumption you meant ‘sábbaton’ Nominative representing any Case, *“= singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath”*, you’re again, wrong, and in more than one way, wrong. I’ll now point to the most obvious way in which it is wrong to say ‘sábbaton’, *“= singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath”*. This is how... ‘sábbaton’, *“= singular”*, can also occur, the Singular, used for a Plurality of ‘sabbaths’! E.g., in Mark 2:27, “the Sabbath was made for man” // “Sabbaths were made / are, for man’s sake.” Or in Matthew 12:12, “it is proper to do good on a Sabbath” // “it is the proper thing to do good on Sabbaths always”. In these cases the Singular, has a Plural meaning.

In another category are those cases where one Gospel uses a Plural where another uses a Singular, e.g., Matthew 12:2, “Your disciples do what is not proper to do on a Sabbath”, ‘en sabbátouhi’ // Mark 2:24, “do on the Sabbath, ‘tois sábbasin’, that which is not proper”. So does Luke in 6:1 use the Singular, – “on the Sabbath through the cornfields” – where Matthew 12:1 has a Plural, – “on the Sabbaths through the cornfields”. In these cases the Plural has a Singular, meaning.

In any instance the Dative depends on Context. One must be specific, is the moral of the story. And Dr Walter is totally negligent. One cannot rely on what he so easily states categorically.

Therefore, is it correct what Dr Walter warrants us, “*“sabbatou = singular and only used of the fourth commandment Sabbath”*”? Generally speaking, ‘sabbath’, ‘sábbaton’, yes. 58 times in the Gospels, 10 instances in Acts, and two in Paul’s Letters. But there are in fact exceptions.

Most obvious exception is where it is said the Pharisee fasted “twice a week”, ‘dis tou sabbátou’ — twice on a ‘sabbath’, Singular, making no sense.

Then there are all the passages containing references to one certain ‘day-of-the-week’. These are the stories of the visits to the tomb and first appearances.

Visits to the tomb:

The two Marys “intended to go have a look at the tomb, towards, the-First-Day-of-the-week”, ‘eis mian sabbátohn’, Matthew 28:1;

Mary Magdalene comes, sees the stone, runs back, “on-the-First-Day-of-the-week, ‘tehi miai tohn sabbátohn’, while being early darkness still”, John 20:1;

The women “come to the tomb with spices prepared deepest of early morning on-the-first-day-of-the-week, ‘tehi miai tohn sabbátohn’”, Luke 24:1;

“They very early sunrising on-the-First-Day-of-the-week, ‘tehi miai tohn sabbátohn’, re-inspect the stone”, Mark 16:2;

Jesus “early on-the-First-Day-of-the-week, ‘proh-i prohtehi sabbátou’, appeared to Mary Magdalene first”, Mark 16:9;

In the Gospels then, no reference exists stating the Resurrection occurred “on the First Day” — whether the “*first day*” or the “*first sabbath*”; or, the “*first day*” or the “*first sabbath OF THE WEEK*” or the “*first day*” or the “*first sabbath in a new series*”. There’s NO such Scripture.

Paul:

The disciples “on-the-First-Day-of-the-week, ‘en tehi miai sabbátohn’, having been assembling still”, Acts 20:7;

“On-the-First-Day-of-the-week, ‘kata mian sabbátou’, each of you put aside by himself”, 1Corinthians 16:2.

What problem can there be with interpreting the word ‘sabbath’, ‘sabbaton’ for ‘week’ in EVERY instance of these **combinations of ‘time-structures’ or ‘time-phrases’?**

Dr Walter has a problem with his ‘*ordinals*’ and ‘*numerals*’. Reckons he, “*“Mia” is simply the regular ordinal number “first” but “prote” refers to the first in a series.*” No; “*“prote”*” — ‘*protos*’ > ‘*prohtehi*’, “first”, in Mark 16:9, *is simply the regular ordinal number “first”— not, ““Mia”” > ‘miai’ > ‘heis’ in “Mark 16:2”, which “gives the normal reading for the “first day of the week”*”... “*normal*”, in Hellenistic, New Testament Greek, yes. Because here we have to do with Greek idiom.

Mentions Blass Debrunner (247.1.) “...*das Hebräische, das alle Monatstage durch Kardinalia bezeichnet. “.* ‘Cardinals’ : ‘one’, ‘two’ — ‘Day One’, ‘Day Two’ etc. in stead of ‘First Day’, ‘Second Day’ etc. If therefore Hebrew would have had the same influence in “Mark 16:2”, it also would have read as in Mark 16:9, with ‘*prohtehi*’ in stead of ‘*miai*’. BD(247.1.1.), “*“Mia” = ‘prohteh’* auch z. B. A 20:7, 1C 16:2, Mc 16:2, L 24:1; nur [Mc] 16:9 ‘*prohtehi sabbátou*’, wofür indes Eusebius ‘*tehi miai*’ zitiert.”

Mark 16:9’s Cardinal Number for name of the day the ‘First Day OF the week’, ‘*prohtehi sabbatou*’, is therefore ‘*simply*’ explained by Hebrew influence, and further proves the passage was added and did not have the same author as the primitive ending. But the meaning is just the same: “The First Day of the week.”

And yes, of course, the ordinal, ‘*prohtehi*’- ‘on the first’ — “*the first in a series*”; and surely, yes, on the first ‘**Sabbath**’=‘**week**’, “*of a new series*” **identified in verse 2 as the “first day of the week”**”, ABSOLUTELY!

So far from, “Mark 16:9 literally reads “*the first sabbath in a new series.*”” Because it does not literally or idiomatically read any of that, for Mark 16:9 literally reads “*prohtehi*” and not “*“Mia”*”, while “*prohtehi*” *simply is the regular ordinal number “first”* in

the Dative Case of Relation, and THEREFORE “*refers to the first in a series*” — the ‘series’ in English idiom, “of the week”, from the Hellenistic Greek idiom for ‘of the week’, literally, “of the sabbath”- ‘sabbatou’ ... Singular Possessive.

Earth, Wind & Fire:

I stand corrected....not saturday or sunday but everyday. Christ is the NEW sabbath so you can dispence with all OT ways. Christ is Lord of the Sabbath.

GE:

Christ is not your or any Christian's 'sabbath'; that is equally robbing both Christ and the Lord's Day Sabbath of their due respect and honour. No, it's more dishonouring to the Lord of the Sabbath than to the Sabbath because Christ is greater than and infinitely incomparable with the Sabbath even the “Holy Day of the LORD”. So your sort of worship Christ as Sabbath let me have no part in it! Thanks! And He will not approve of or take part in your worship of Him if He must share his Lordship with anything else.

Do you really think you can shrug off the Sabbath just like that?! The Sabbath's keeping is your duty as Christian; the Sabbath's Lord, is the Lord Jesus. See that you don't abuse your privileges.

Dr. Walter:

Re: Bob Ryan, “*Here is the part where Spurgeon affirms the validity of God's 4th commandment*”

Nice try bob! However, you omitted your introductory remark to Spurgeon's quote. Your introductory remark implied that Spurgeon interpreted the fourth commandment as you do – HE DID NOT. Here is your introductory remark:

I concur with Spurgeons interpretation of the fourth commandment. He did not interpret it to be the seventh day “OF THE WEEK” but only one day in seven. I further quoted Spurgeon to prove He rejected the seventh day “OF THE WEEK” interpretation by the Jews. He explicitly interprets the fourth commandment as “the first day of the week” and that would be impossible if he accepted the Jewish and SDA interpretation of the fourth commandment.

GE:

Dear Dr Walter, you also, 'interpret' men like Moody and Spurgeon, 'invalidly'. Those men did NOT, 'interpret' the Fourth Commandment as you aver, “only one day in seven”; they understood the 'Sabbath' for 'the Lord's day' which again, they 'interpreted' as having been the day of Jesus' resurrection; which again they all unanimously 'interpreted' as having been SUNDAY, “the First Day _OF THE WEEK_”. THAT, and NOT what YOU allege, the first day or 'sabbath' “IN A SERIES” : a 'series', of “working days”.

The strength of all and each of your 'arguments', Dr Walter, is your ability to say nothing at all with much use of words, or at best something so vague the border between it and nothingness becomes virtually invisible.

Re: Dr. Walter, “ *I never denied the fourth commandment can be referred to in the plural!* ”

I never said you did, Dr Walter.

Re: Dr. Walter, “ *I never denied the singular can be understood in the abstract generic sense. What I stated was that the singular “sabbatou” (genitive) or singular accusative “sabbaton” is the normal use* ”

You did not make mention of the *“the abstract generic sense”*. You did not state, *“the singular “sabbatou” (genitive) or singular accusative “sabbaton” is the normal use”*; you ONLY ‘stated’, *“the singular “sabbatou” ..., is the normal use”* — but even that, not exactly.

Nor did you or do you, take cognisance of the implications, had you made such ‘statement’.

Re: Dr. Walter, *“ What I stated was that the singular “sabbatou” (genitive) or singular accusative “sabbaton” is the normal use for the fourth commandment ”*

You could have meant it; you did not say it. In any case, the singular *“sabbatou”* (genitive) or singular accusative *“sabbaton”* just is not, *“the normal use for the fourth commandment”*.

‘Sabbaton’ is the word normally used for

‘sabbath’, meaning – either, or –,

- 1) ‘The Sabbath-Seventh Day’;
- 2) ‘a sabbath’, ‘ceremonial’;
- 3) ‘week’, the only seven days-cycle marked by its LAST day;
- 4) ‘week’, the ‘seven-days-feasts dated by their FIRST day.

Re: Dr. Walter, *“the wording of Mark 16:9 is peculiar and different from the normal expression for “the first day of the week.””*

“The wording of Mark 16:9 is ... different...” indeed. As countless students of the ‘second ending question’ have noticed— and have shown —, as an *“expression for “the first day of the week”* is not particularly *“peculiar”*, ‘prohtos’ being a Hebraism (cf. BlassDebrunner above) that rather than the cardinal ‘heis’ has (if I’m not mistaken), become *‘the normal use’* to indicate also ‘the First Day’ in Modern Greek.

Re: Dr. Walter, *“the wording of Mark 16:9 is peculiar and different from the normal expression for “the first day of the week.” It is the distinctive difference along with the normal use of the singular that indicates Mark is talking about the FIRST SABBATH in a NEW SERIES of Sabbaths, established on “the first day of the week.””*

Why do you discern some “*distinctive difference*” in “*the wording of Mark 16:9*”? Because you illegitimately PRESUME that the text states that Jesus actually ROSE from the dead on ‘the First Day of the week’, Sunday— and on no other day whatsoever. Now you would not have placed any value on this supposed “*intentional*”, “*peculiar*” and “*distinctive difference*”, were it not for your presumption of the Resurrection on Sunday.

Ironical is it, that you try show “*the wording of Mark 16:9*” through having incorporated ‘prohtos> prohtehi’ instead of ‘heis> miai’, should NOT mean ‘the First Day OF THE WEEK’!

Whether “*the change in verse 9 is intentional*”, “*peculiar*” and “*distinctive*” or not, what is the point, arguing ““*prote*” refers to the first in a series ... but “*Sabbatou*” is the normal term used for the fourth commandment Sabbath”, if by “*the first in a series*” you did not mean, the First Day “*OF THE WEEK*”?

Of course you would base this on a second assumption of yours, that “*the fourth commandment Sabbath*” meant “*the “first day of the week”*” — “*the “first day of the week”*” just like “*Mark 16:2 gives the normal reading for the “first day of the week”*” with “*the normal reading*” as you say, of ““*mia*””, “*for the “first day of the week”*”.

Therefore, no! Alleging “*Mark 16:9 literally reads “the first sabbath in a new series”*” is “*literally*” incorrect and *peculiarly and intentionally, distinctively false*. So was your bold

assertion, NEVER, ““OF THE WEEK”” – “irregardless of what day “of the week”” –, “literally” incorrect and *peculiarly* and *intentionally, distinctively* false!

Because that’s what you wrote, Dr Walter, never mind “*the singular “sabbatou” (genitive) or singular accusative “sabbaton” is the normal use for the fourth commandment*” being “*the normal use of the singular*” — it neither explains nor changes, NOR PROVES, anything you said, true or correct ... on the contrary....

22 February 2011