

A Response to the Challenge Proffered on the Adventist Defense League Blogsite

By William H. Hohmann

Uncomfortable questions posed to the *critics*

Notice: These questions were compiled by a friend of the ministry. Please visit this page frequently as we might continue to add more questions to this list. Contact us if you are interested in answering these questions.

An attempt was made to submit our answers, as per the apparent invitation to do so, without success, so we present our answers here. Following these questions was this statement:

It's probably obvious to the reader that these look to be rebuttal follow-up questions to the 80/85 (however many) questions of <http://www.bible.ca/> webmaster Steve Rudd. Well, that's correct to a large degree, however, it's questions like those posted on his site that are typical of questions that have been asked and answered for the last 100+ years and the critics seem to ramble along and pretend as though nothing was ever said in response to them. This kind of attitude can only be described as burying one's head to something they simply don't want to hear. The SDA church has suffered long with it's detractors for the simple reason that Jesus would have it no other way. He suffered long with his critics, prayed for them and loved them with a love that you and I can never fully understand. ***Some critics are honest and truly don't understand the message that we bring to the world but too many critics know exactly what they're doing and twisting and contorting scripture to satisfy their own preconceived notions about what they want it to say.*** The ONLY way the bible can work is if we allow it to speak to us and not try to ram ideas into it. I simply ask these questions in response to everyone, sincere or not. Many of these are long standing and haven't been addressed with biblicly sound answers. I believe it's because they cannot be refuted.

We would point out that Jesus' worst critics were those who were big on the law, with an emphasis on the sabbath. Jesus "worked" on the sabbath -- called what He did "work" and informs the reader of Scripture that even the Father in heaven works on sabbaths. John goes so far as to declare Jesus broke the sabbath, which fact the SDA denies. Jesus states it is not a sin to do good on the sabbath, as contrasted to evil, and Scripture points out that the works of the Israelites were evil "even from their youth". Jesus admonished those religious leaders, big on the law and sabbath, to judge righteous judgment, and not judge according to appearance. Yet the SDA judges all in relation to appearance when it comes to the sabbath. A Christian's works are wrought in God, and are therefore no longer perceived by God as evil. The SDA would declare your works sin, even though wrought in God, should you dare to do so on the sabbath. Woe unto them who call good, evil.

Note what has been quoted above that is bolded and italicized regarding the twisting and contorting of Scripture. Yet, these very questions demonstrate a great deal of such twisting and contorting of Scripture.

How would we define the twisting of Scripture? In the most simple terms, it is altering Scripture through addition or

deletion, and by extension, altering the application of Scripture. That stated, let's examine these "uncomfortable" questions posed to the critics of sabbatarianism and see how they fare.

1. If the Sabbath is “against us and contrary to us” as they claim [Colossians 2:14](#) states, why does the Lord himself (in [Isaiah 58:13-14](#)) say we should consider it “a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable”?

ANSWER: The Lord in Isaiah 58:13-14 is not addressing "us." "We" are not the ones being spoken to; God is speaking to the Israelites. This is a classic example of "transference theology" and as such, is also an example of twisting Scripture, altering it through the addition of people not a party to that old covenant. Regardless of how one looks at the sabbath, in the context of the whole law that was against them and contrary to those under the law, or whether it was to be a delight to those under the law, is irrelevant. Gentile Christians were never commanded to keep the law or sabbath. They were not required to become "Jews" first, and Christians second.

2. The words of Jesus in [Mark 12:29-31](#) (“thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength” and the second Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself”) have been so-called “the laws of Christ” and have supposedly usurped the Ten Commandments. However, these same words are found in [Deuteronomy 6:4, 5](#) and [Leviticus 19:18](#) so why did we need the Ten Commandments if we already had these so-called “laws of Christ” already spoken?

Answer: The questioner again twists Scripture, claiming "we" are the party that needed, or were given the Ten Commandments. Also, the questioner resorts to redefining his opposition's position on the matter. The "law of Christ" as found in Scripture is related to what Paul also calls the "law of faith" and the "law of life" and contrasts these to the old covenant law of the letter, which contains the sabbath command. The questioner acts as though it would be odd for the "usurper" of the Ten Commandments to be listed in the "old" testament writings. Yet, in the new testament writings, it comes out that love "fulfills" the law; all of it, including the Ten and sabbath:

For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. -- Romans 13:9

The questioner would have us make an exception here regarding the sabbath commandment?

This is also an example of trying to "usurp" Scripture through a rationalization couched in a question. If the Israelite, under the law, truly had a love for God and fellow man, there would be no further need to give him additional commandments regarding specific circumstances that relate to one who does not love his neighbor and God; specifically the Ten Commandments. You do not need to tell one who truly loves God not to make idols and serve and worship them, thereby having other gods. You do not need to tell one who truly loves his neighbor as himself not to murder his neighbor, covet what belongs to him, steal from him, or bear false witness against him. Contrary to the popular belief and teaching among sabbatarians, the Ten Commandments do not demonstrate love for God and fellow man. Quite the contrary, they demonstrate the people's lack of love for God and fellow man. They are not designed to "prove" people love God and fellow man — they are designed to expose the carnal human Adamic nature that is devoid of real faith and love.

The Two Great Commandments, listed in the old covenant law, serve to cement God's will and indeed requirement for even those under the old covenant, leaving them without an excuse and closing all possible "loop holes". They did not love God with their whole being. They did not love their fellow man. They were stiff-necked and rebellious.

The law served the purpose of being a witness against them in this regard:

Deuteronomy 31:26-27 Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee. For I know thy rebellion, and thy stiff neck: behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the LORD; and how much more after my death?

3. Sunday keepers always want hard facts from Sabbath keepers by asking us questions like “Why was the Sabbath not mentioned after [Genesis 2:2-3](#) until Exodus 16?” and “Why was the Sabbath command not repeated in the New Testament?” but if you ask in return for a hard fact about where is the commandment for Sunday anywhere in the bible all you get is bewildered looks.

Answer: The bewildered looks you get are a result of the Christian being amazed at your mindset regarding Christian theology and Christian Liberty (the Law of Liberty) where we, as Christians, are free to worship God at any time and at any location we so desire. It's as though you never read Romans chapter 14. You have this mindset that everything has to be spelled out for you as to what you can, and cannot do, and when you can, or cannot do it. Your question demonstrates your paradigm in that you believe there MUST be a "Christian sabbath" and that Christians MUST be under laws that are works oriented; "do this" and "don't do that". There is no room for Liberty. The sabbatarian's view of Christian liberty is Orwellian in nature.

The sabbath was never even mentioned prior to Genesis 2:2-3. This "seventh day" is not called the sabbath here. This again is an example of twisting Scripture.

Sunday is ultimately irrelevant to the sabbath question, and is used here and elsewhere as nothing more than a straw-man argument.

4. [Exodus 20:2](#) reads “I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.” The dispensationalist often refers to the Ten Commandments as “bondage”. So are they going to have me believe God brought them out of bondage just to place them under more bondage? Huh?

Answer: Again, the questioner resorts to a rationalization couched in a question. The answer though is still "yes". You are the servant of the one you serve. You are in bondage to the one you serve. Paul refers to himself as God's slave. It boils down to who or what you are ultimately under bondage to, and the nature of the bondage. Jesus said His "yoke" is light as compared to another, heavier yoke. The "question" above implies there would be a substitution of one bondage for another, ignoring the degree and nature of said bondage. This is hardly the sort of convincing argument one produces in defense of truth. You can be in bondage to sin, or in "bondage" to Christ and righteousness.

Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness. I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness. For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness. What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. - Romans 6:18-22

The bondage associated with the law, and even the Ten Commandments, is sin and death; the result of breaking any of those points. By embracing even the Ten Commandments, you get everything that accompanies them.

5. The children of Israel were commanded some 613 laws between God and Moses Doesn't the very fact that they're called the TEN Commandments tell anyone that they are a separate code of laws from the rest? Why say ten if they are "the same as the others"? See [Deuteronomy 4:13, 14](#); [2 Kings 21:8](#); [2 Chronicles 33:8](#)?

Answer: Once again, a rationalization is offered, couched in a question, instead of offering any supporting evidence for the position of the questioner. The Ten "Commandments" were originally called the Ten "Words". The Ten are the "core" of that old covenant. The questioner implies they are somehow separate and distinct from the rest of the law, based solely on they being collectively known as the "Ten". It is a simplistic view of the codification of law. The Ten gave a basic and short list of the rights of the "king", in this case God, and the rights of one's fellow man. God had the right to exclusive worship as God. One's fellow man had the right to life (do not murder) property (do not steal) and one's parents had a right to a basic level of respect and honor, despite any abuse proffered by them.

What then is the evidence of Scripture? That the balance of the laws; all 603 besides the Ten, were dictated to, and recorded by Moses, as shown in places like Exodus 24. It was the book of the law that was sprinkled with blood, as well as the people, that made up that covenant between them. Were the Ten Commandments written in the book of the law? Yes.

And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone. And the LORD commanded me at that time to teach you statutes and judgments, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it. - Deuteronomy 4:13-14.

2 Kings 21:8 Neither will I make the feet of Israel move any more out of the land which I gave their fathers; only if they will observe to do according to all that I have commanded them, and according to all the law that my servant Moses commanded them.

2 Chronicles 33:8 Neither will I any more remove the foot of Israel from out of the land which I have appointed for your fathers; so that they will take heed to do all that I have commanded them, according to the **whole law** and the statutes and the ordinances by the hand of Moses.

The accusation "the same as the other" proves to be a red-herring argument. The commandments of God for the Israelites were written down and codified by Moses, and ratified with the sprinkling of blood, i.e. the shed blood of substitute animals. The legal parties to this covenant, no matter how you try to chop it up, were God and the Israelites. Christians are not a legal party to this or any covenant God made with the Israelites. This most basic tenet of covenants is ignored by the sabbatarian.

6. Dispensationalist will tell you that the Ten Commandments were the old covenant but in the book of Hebrews (9:7) we find that the old covenant needed replacing for being faulty (the fault spoken of was found with the people and not the law vs. 8). Are dispensationalist prepared to argue that God wrote and spoke something faulty? (HINT: Don't go there.)

Answer: With boring regularity, questions are used as rationalizations, devoid of evidence. What is of interest here though is that the reference to Hebrews 9:7-8 is wrong, and not one sabbatarian in reading these "uncomfortable" questions for non-sabbath keepers apparently ever bothered to check the Scriptural citations. It shows that there is really no real interest in true scholarship or hermeneutics. It's all sloppy and shoddy. Hebrews **8:7** PLAINLY states the first covenant was flawed. Verse 8 says the problem lay with "them" which in Greek meant both the people and the covenant. How could the first covenant be flawed? Because it was made for a flawed people. For example, Matthew chapter 19 and the narrative about divorce. The law of Moses allowed for an easy divorce due to the

hardness of their hearts. But Jesus declares, "in the beginning, it was not so"! But if, as the questioner apparently insists, that this covenant was not flawed, then we are free to divorce our wives by simply handing them a bill of divorcement. If you insist Hebrews 8:7 is specifically about the Ten, then why insist your parents be afforded their due respect when it would have made more sense to command one to just love their parents? Again, because they did not truly even love their parents, they needed to be told to, at the least, give them their due respect as parents.

We should also take into account Jeremiah 31:31-4:

Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will *remember* their sin no more. - Jeremiah 31:31-34

Flawed or not, God Himself declared ahead of time that He would make a new covenant with them, that would NOT be like the previous one made with them upon leaving Egypt. Was the "Ten Commandment covenant" made with the Israelites upon leaving Egypt? Yes! But the sabbatarian dodges the obvious here by claiming "my law" in v. 33 is the same old covenant law!!! So the plain language of v. 32 is circumvented by redefining "my law" here, contrary to the context, twisting Scripture in the process. In relation to that "law", there is a *remembrance* of sin when it is transgressed.

What does God put within the believer? Scripture reveals three things that are in fact the same thing: His law, a heart of flesh to replace the stony heart one is born with, and His Holy Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit that now guides the believer, and not a written codification of law, written for flawed, carnal people that was itself also flawed as a result. The sabbatarian, by insisting the Christian be led also by the old covenant law, declares by default that it is the Holy Spirit that is flawed! It is seen as an insufficient guide in the Christian's life; that the Christian also needs to be led and guided by the Ten Commandments!

In Psalms 19:7 it is stated that "the law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul. This is what God's Spirit does. A converted person is one in receipt of the Holy Spirit. The old covenant law never converted anyone. It did however expose the carnal, human nature, and condemned men rightly and justly as a result. No wonder Paul calls it the ministration of death and condemnation. In that same context in II Corinthians chapter 3, it is that which was engraven in stone being referred to: the Ten Commandments.

7. "Christians" have ALWAYS worshipped on Sunday and NEVER on the Sabbath? Someone was taking a nap in religious history class! http://www.lltproductions.com/sabbath_history.shtml

Answer: This link does not connect to any information (what a surprise, given the above). This declaration, whether true or false, proves nothing. As stated earlier, Christians are FREE to worship whenever and wherever they so choose. So what if some choose to worship on a sabbath? The cute little dig here about sleeping in history class is itself quite revealing. Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi wrote in one of his books that the early church universally "abandoned" sabbath keeping no later than 140 AD and probably as early as 70 AD. Apparently, quite a number of sabbatarians slept through their classes in history, insisting that a pope of Rome "changed the day" over 200 years later, long after This "abandonment" back in or around 140 AD!

8. [John 17:4](#) says: "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." Could Jesus make this statement if he still had to "teach" Sunday observance by rising on that day? Is he a liar? (Again, don't go there.)

Non Sequitur. His death ended or terminated the old "covenant". With its passing went any and all commandments unique to that covenant. The new was instituted upon His spilled blood, and the new covenant makes absolutely no mention of a requirement for the observation of days as was extant under the old covenant. Christians worshiped on Sundays because they chose to. They saw a need for this, and they did it. They felt there was a significance to that day in relation to the resurrection. Seeing as the Jewish Christians continued keeping the law, and the sabbath by resting on that day, this would have made the sabbath inappropriate for that use. The Jewish Christians would have been "resting" on that day, and not "worshiping" on that day in a communal setting.

By the way, what "work" did Jesus finish, given to Him by the Father? Meeting the requirements of the law regarding a sacrifice for sin. He fulfilled the requirements of that law. Sabbatarians do not believe it. They are still trying to "keep" that law that they admit they cannot. It has been said that if you continue to do something, expecting a different outcome some day, this is an example of insanity. You cannot keep that law; not in a thousand lifetimes, and God never dumbed down the law for sabbatarians. If you want to live by the law, you will be judged by the law, and its judgment is always the same: Condemnation; wrath.

9. The gospel commission in Matthew contains this... "Teaching them all that I have commanded" and Jesus commanded the Ten Commandments ([Matthew 5:19, 19:17-19](#)). Did Jesus command Sunday?

Answer: Mt. 5:19 states "these" commandments, and not "the" old covenant commandments. "These" commandments are those Jesus proceeded to give His followers where he altered points of old covenant law way beyond "jots and tittles" that the sabbatarian claims, citing earlier in the same chapter, were not to be altered. So here is Jesus altering points of old covenant law way beyond jots and tittles, and the SDA has done likewise regarding many laws of the old covenant they claim to keep. Tithing is but one example, where they alter the law to include tithing on one's wages, contrary to the law, and giving this money to ministers, and not Levites, widows, orphans, and the poor. This also constitutes "twisting" of Scripture, yet members of the SDA have no problem believing both issues at the same time, which is logically impossible. If you cannot alter that law even down to jots and tittles, then you cannot claim you have the right to alter it way beyond jots and tittles in order to comply with the "changing times" and circumstances. Rationalizations are a method of deception.

Mt. 19:17-19 is being taken out of context. The man asked what he, personally, could do in order to be saved. Jesus answered him honestly: Keep the commandments, to which He cited some, but not all of the Ten, and one additional, not found in the Ten. The conclusion of the matter shows that neither the rich man, or anyone else, can save themselves through their own effort. ONLY GOD CAN SAVE A MAN. Read it in verse 26. But, if you think you can be saved by keeping the Ten Commandments, you go right ahead. What is important here to know is that Jesus was NOT teaching His followers to keep any of the old covenant law. He WAS literally answering the man, for if he were able to keep those commandments, he would have no need of a Saviour, for he would never have sinned.

10. The gospel writers penned their books decades (most scholars say 70 AD or later) after the cross but none of them felt compelled to tell us about a new day of worship? Strange indeed.

Answer: An argument through silence is the poorest form of evidence. I have seen sabbatarians play it both ways, claiming no one in the new testament writings wrote to quit keeping the sabbath. The question, again, reflects the

sabbatarian paradigm, believing a day of worship would have to be a *commanded* day. Regardless, the ONLY example of any gathering of Christians in the new testament writings is found in Act chapter 20, and they are not meeting together on a sabbath. They are meeting together on a Sunday. If this *did* say they were gathered together on a sabbath, these same sabbatarians would be screaming at the top of their lungs of it being an example of the church keeping the sabbath, but seeing as it is a Sunday, they all play it down as though it were some unusual event, and that it was probably a "Saturday night" when in fact there is no evidence to support this notion. It has been claimed that the narrative reflects Jewish reckoning of time, ignoring that it was Luke who wrote Acts, for a Gentile audience, and there would be no reason why he would write what he did from a Jewish perspective.

The questioner also continues to twist Scripture, claiming it's about worship and not rest.

11. Again, Luke (23:56) writes about the "...Sabbath according to the commandment" but why say this decades later if the Sabbath is no longer a commandment?

Answer: Still working from rationalizations instead of proper evidence. Luke was writing to a Gentile audience, and did not leave out important details about those events he wrote about. There is no real expectation he would attempt any revisionist history. It seems absurd that the questioner would view things in this light even considering the termination of the old covenant upon Jesus' death.

If anything, the narrative would lean towards the conclusion that many of the Gentile believers who would read Luke's narrative would not have necessarily understood the narrative if they were not keeping the sabbath, and would therefore need that clarification.

12. If the Ten Commandments are the old covenant then how do they explain away [Exodus 19:3-8](#) which is a covenant made and agreed to a full three days before they (the law) are even given by God?

Answer: The questioner overlooks or ignores that this covenant was first proposed to the people, and upon their acceptance, it was later codified and ratified as the covenant. Does the questioner think that this covenant was forced upon them, or that it was all prepared ahead of time? And here in the opening verses of Exodus 19, God is not giving them any real specifics regarding this covenant. Exodus 19 does not distinguish between any number of covenants. It appears though that the questioner is inferring that anything law-wise prior to Ex. 19:3-8 would have been the "old" covenant, and what laws were they given prior to this time? One was the sabbath command. By this reasoning, the sabbath law would be "old" covenant.

13. If there was no law before Mount Sinai, why does God say in [Genesis 26:5](#) "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws"? In the book of Genes is both moral (6th 4:8-15; 1st 35:2-4; 7th 39:7-9; 10th 25:29-34...and more) and ceremonial (4:4; 22:8-10, 31:54; 46:1) laws are mentioned.

Answer: Moses is writing, and he is writing to the Israelites who became a party to the "old" covenant. Moses refers to Abraham in this context in order to show his target audience that Abraham did all that was required of him, using terms they understood, seeing as they were given charges, commandments, statutes, laws also. It is Moses' way of saying to them, Abraham did as he was instructed in all things, and so should you. It was a way of leaving them no excuse for breaking their covenant. Also, whatever God commands or requires of someone is indeed a "law". No one is claiming there was no law before Mt. Sinai. There has always been an underlying law of faith/ belief/ trust in God. Paul writes about the Gentiles being a law unto themselves in relation to their consciences. What we see

here, again is a paradigm of law, and not faith.

14. If there is no law before Sinai, doesn't God have a lot of apologizing to do to Adam & Eve, Cain, the whole world (flood), Sodom and Gomorrah, and even SATAN HIMSELF (cast out of heaven. Why?)? Weren't they sinners? What is sin? ([1 John 3:4](#), see also [Romans 4:15](#))

Answer: If God told you to do something, or not to do something, and you did the opposite, do you think you should go unpunished because God "forgot" to inform you His Word is law? Mankind has always had a basic understanding of right and wrong, good and bad. You imply that, without being told up front by God, they would never figure it out on their own. Do you TRULY need a law to tell you murder is wrong, and you should not do it? Apparently you do, from the nature of this "question". This says a great deal about your heart. I am told, and have learned from and through God's Holy Spirit to have love even for my enemies, and to do good even to those who despise me, which is why I am answering your "questions" instead of just ignoring them, which would have been far easier. You tell the immature "not to murder" and you tell the mature to "love even your enemies". Israel, under the law, were immature spiritually.

In asking for a definition of sin, you cite 1 John 3:4, referring to the egregious translation found in the King James that is a gross mistranslation. Sin is "iniquity", properly translated. If sin is the transgression of that law, then David sinned by eating the show-bread, and no one ever sinned prior to the giving of the law.

Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression. - Romans 4:15

Seeing as that law is no more, there is no transgression for breaking or not keeping the sabbath. There is also no wrath for not keeping the sabbath. Or, do you prefer wrath? That is what you will get if you insist on keeping the sabbath, and you fail to do so, just once.

Jesus came to take away sin. Jesus paid the penalty for sin.

The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. - 1 Corinthians 15:56

Sin has been stripped of its strength. Sin has been stripped of its sting.

15. Why do Sunday advocates insist Jesus broke the Sabbath to diminish it's importance when Jesus himself states in [John 15:10](#) "...even as I have kept my Father's commandments."? Is Jesus a bald-face liar? (once again, don't go there)

Answer: You cite John 15:10 and ASSUME this is about old covenant commandments and not commandments specifically given to Jesus by the Father! Jesus said He came to REVEAL the Father. The Father was unknown previously. Scripture reveals that Jesus was the God of the old covenant Incarnate. He was the One who became Jesus who gave Israel the law. He is the God of the old covenant. His death ended the old covenant even as a marriage covenant ends upon the death of either party.

Jesus did indeed brake the sabbath as stated by John in John chapter 5. The Greek shows that this was more than just "breaking" the sabbath; He set it aside; nullified the sabbath; made it of no effect. Why do you diminish Christ in order to elevate the sabbath? Why do you twist the Scriptures?

16. In the gospels & Acts the Sabbath and the synagogue are synonymous with each other 11 times and yet the “2 proof texts” given in the new testament say nothing of a place of worship, why’s that?

Answer: What proof texts are you referring to? Said proof texts would not need to address a place of worship. Again, they worshiped when and where they wanted; often in member's homes. Again, you demonstrate a legalistic paradigm. And, if the gospel and the sabbath and synagogues were synonymous with each other, then they would be so in all instances, and not just 11. You are making a false association! You are using a logical fallacy.

In Acts 10, where Peter preaches the gospel to Cornelius and family/friends (Gentiles), there is no mention of the sabbath or synagogues. They are irrelevant. The message of the true gospel was given; they believed, and received the Holy Spirit as a result. Read the narrative. If the law and sabbath were relevant to the gospel, they would have been mentioned. It was not Luke's intent to leave out important facts or details.

Phillip, talking to the Ethiopian, relates nothing about the sabbath or synagogues. Paul, wanting to first preach the gospel to Jews, went first in every city to a synagogue if there was one. What a surprise. Yet you appear to be concluding the gospel could not be properly preached without a synagogue and that this be done on a sabbath! This is really reaching! This is twisting Scripture! When Paul was able, he taught people every day! Otherwise, he worked the other days of the week in order to support himself. I'd love to see your ministers all go out and get a job and earn their own way like Paul did. But that's not what wolves do.

17. With the practice of circumcision being very important to Jews, it is refuted over 40 times in the New Testament but not the Sabbath day meetings held all through the books of acts. We remember how rabidly the Pharisees attacked Jesus over the issue of the Sabbath. So why does Paul NOT ONCE chide them on the Sabbath issue and where is their anger over it in the New Testament writings?

Answer: Talk about loading the question! Notice Acts 15. The Jewish Christians of a Pharisaical background wanted the Gentiles to be circumcised and made to keep the law of Moses. Without the entry sign of circumcision, there could be no requirement to keep the law. The sabbath "question" was taken care of right there. No circumcision, no sabbath keeping.

The questioner also, again, twists the Scriptures regarding "Sabbath day meetings" with the implied conclusion these meetings were held by Christians, yet this is not true even in one case.

Paul's anger was directed at those of the circumcision, who were constantly coming along behind him, teaching Gentiles to keep old covenant points of law, and the sabbath was one of those points of law. Paul was not at all polite about this either. To those who insisted Gentiles be circumcised, Paul suggested they undergo a "deeper" circumcision.

For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. - Titus 1:10-11

The questioner here would have us believe the Jews would not be trying to push sabbath keeping upon the Gentiles, and that the Gentiles were already keeping the sabbath.

18. If early Christians were already worshipping on Sundays then why didn't the Jews raise a commotion about that like circumcision? Again, Paul never rebukes anyone for keeping the “old Jewish Sabbath”

Answer: There would be no need or reason for the Jewish Christians to complain about meeting together with their Gentile counterparts in Christ on a Sunday for communal worship and prayer before going off to work, or after work, which is what they did. There was no violation of law in their minds over this. Worship is not rest! They would have rested, according to the law, the day before. They would not have perceived the next day to have any sacredness preventing them from gathering with their Gentile brethren. Again, the questioner demonstrates his legalistic paradigm.

19. Why don't ANY New Testament writers denounce the Sabbath? Don't they know there's a "new day of worship"?

Answer: Why do you attempt to redefine the debate? Why do you twist the Scriptures? There was no need to specifically address the sabbath, as it was addressed in relation to the law of Moses not being required of the Gentiles, period. The sabbath was not the "old" day of worship -- it was the "old" day of rest!

Ex 31:15 (NIV) For six days, work is to be done, **but the seventh day is a Sabbath of rest**, holy to the LORD. Whoever does any work on the Sabbath day must be put to death.

Ex 34:21 (NIV) "Six days you shall labor, **but on the seventh day you shall rest**; even during the plowing season and harvest you must rest.

Jewish Christians were not required to abandon the law or sabbath. Why would they perceive communal worship and table fellowship with the Gentile members as being wrong on a Sunday, or any other day of the week? They would not.

20. If the Sabbath is Jewish, why does God (through Isaiah in the 56th chapter) encourage "the sons of the stranger", meaning gentiles, to keep it? (See also [Exodus 20:8-11](#) for the same "stranger" reference)

Answer: Context context context. Ex. 20, the stranger "within your gates"; i.e. a stranger living among the Israelites who they might attempt to have do work for them, resulting in the Jew working by proxy. Any stranger living anywhere else would not be required to rest on the sabbath. This is another example of the questioner twisting Scripture.

Isa 56. Context. A stranger who joins himself to God and Israel, undergoing circumcision and coming under the law, participating in the law, including sacrifices. This is not about Gentiles joining themselves to the new covenant and Christianity. Again, twisting Scripture.

21. If the Sabbath is Jewish only then why does Luke (the gentile doctor) refer to "nation of the Jews," "the people of the Jews," "the land of the Jews," and the "synagogue of the Jews." ([Acts 10:22](#); [12:11](#); [10:39](#); [14:1](#)) and never "sabbath of the Jews"?

Answer: Argument through silence. A logical fallacy. Not proper evidence of anything. Luke cites Paul as referring to the law as the "law of the Jews." Did the Jews consider the ten commandments their law?

This is the sort of rationalization you expect from someone trying to prove something when there is no "thus saith the Lord" on a matter. It could easily be argued that there was no need to reference the "sabbath of the Jews" as anyone who had any knowledge of Jews would know about their sabbath.

In question 11 above, the questioner asked why Luke referenced the sabbath commandment (in relation to the women resting according to the law), implying he would not do so if the sabbath were not relevant to Christianity. Now, the questioner asks a question that is in essence the exact opposite of what he asked earlier, but insists we come to the same conclusion!

22. Since God is all powerful ([Job 42:2](#)) and all knowing ([1 John 3:20](#)), why didn't God change the law and prevent sin so Christ wouldn't have to die?

Answer: 1. There was sin in the world before there was that law:

(For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. -Romans 5:13

2. The law served the purpose of bringing people under sin intentionally.

Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. - Galatians 3:19

Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. - Romans 3:19

God wants us to understand the seriousness of sin, and understand that it was through his love, demonstrated through His sacrifice, that redeems us to Him. Otherwise, you would boast in yourself, and would never understand that, without His sacrifice, you would be condemned for ever. All this was planned out by God from the beginning.

The only way God could have prevented sin in the first place would have been to either create beings with absolutely no self-will (automatons) or to have never created other beings at all. Lucifer sinned. What was his sin? He violated faith in God in favor of faith in himself. He sought to be like God was God. The questioner's question belies a simplistic view of sin and law.

23. If the Sabbath no longer exists because no one is stoned for breaking it, what about some of the other commandments that the Lord prescribed a death penalty for like the third ([Leviticus 24:16](#)), fifth ([Exodus 21:17](#)), sixth ([Numbers 35:16](#)), seventh ([Leviticus 20:10](#))? Will we throw these out, too?

Answer: Do you comply with them now? Are you perfect and sinless now? Do you stone to death those you find working on the sabbath? Do you stone members caught breaking these commandments? The sabbath no longer exists because that covenant ended, and you were never a legal party to it to begin with. The sabbath was the sign of that covenant relationship between God and the Israelites.

Whether people are being stoned or not is irrelevant to the issue. Would you prefer people be stoned for looking upon another woman with thoughts of lust? Are you without sin so as to be ready to cast the first stone? Are you worthy of death when it comes to sin? Is your heart so black that you want people punished for their transgressions, but exempt yourself? Maybe you should be first in line here. Have you ever hated someone? Hatred is the spirit of murder. Bottom line, you are condemned for being human; a son of Adam, with that Adamic nature. Whether you try to keep the sabbath or not does not undo who and what you are by nature. Keeping any of the law in the letter does not prove you righteous. Breaking the law, even in the letter, does prove you to be a sinner, and justly deserving of God's wrath; condemnation and death. There seems to be this paradigm where you and others think that, if breaking the law demonstrates sinfulness, then keeping it demonstrates righteousness. This is not true. If

you refrain from murdering someone, it does not change or alter the human nature that has the ability and capacity to harbor hatred for others. Keeping points of law, such as the sabbath, becomes nothing more than an attempt at self-righteousness. It is a form of self-denial. It is an attempt to hide ones-self from the reality of who and what we are by nature.

24. If the meaning of “fulfilled” in [Matthew 5:17](#) means do away with the law, what about [Matthew 3:15](#) that states Jesus must be baptized in order “for us to fulfil all righteousness”. The Greek word “plēroō” (play-ro’-o) is the same word in both texts translated “fulfill”. So are we “doing away with” righteousness and baptism?

Answer: Your premise is flawed. Mt. 5:17-18 refers to the law and prophets and what exists in both with the potential to be fulfilled or destroyed. Can you fulfil or destroy something in the prophets that does not exist in the prophets? No. Are there laws codified in the prophets? No. What exists in both the law and prophets with the potential to be fulfilled or destroyed? Prophecies. Did Jesus say He came to "fulfil" what was written of Him in the law and prophets? Yes:

And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. - Luke 24:44

Fulfilled here is pleroo. This ties in nicely with what Jesus stated in Mt. 5:17. It is twisting Scripture to claim Jesus was talking about the legalities of the law here when the context proves He was not. You also imply that righteousness comes through that law, thereby twisting Scripture once again. Righteousness comes about through faith, and not law.

And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: - Philippians 3:9

25. If [Luke 16:16](#) tells us the “law and the prophets” were meant to be of no more value when John the Baptist came along, why is it read from in [Acts 13:15](#), and declared as Paul’s rule of faith and practice in [Acts 24:14](#)?

Answer: The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. - Luke 16:16

John begins a new era. Now, the kingdom of God is preached (the gospel). There is a change in emphasis.

But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. - Galatians 3:23

And after the reading of the law and the prophets the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on. - Acts 13:15

Your "question" implies the Jews believed the teachings of Jesus universally. No, they rejected Jesus as the Christ in favor of the status quo of the OC law and prophets.

But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing

all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: - Acts 24:14

All things, and not some things, like most of the Jews did who rejected Christ. The law and prophets show the coming of Christ; the coming of the new covenant, and righteousness through faith instead of law as attested to in the law through the narrative of Abraham.

26. If [Psalm 118:22-24](#) is supposed to be a messianic prophecy predicting Sunday sacredness because of the resurrection of Christ then why does the New Testament never mention Sunday as a sacred day in connection with Christ's resurrection?

Answer: This premise is false. There is nothing here to indicate any particular "day" but rather a period of time; an era. This is a blatant attempt at a straw-man argument. Sunday is irrelevant. The sabbath as a day of rest for Christians stands or falls on its own merit and the evidence of Scripture. "Another day" though is written about in Hebrews chapter 4 in relation to God's rest, and entering into it through faith, while it is still called "To day".

27. It says in [1 Chronicles 17:27](#) that once the Lord blesses something it stays blessed "forever" so doesn't that mean the Sabbath remains blessed today? Where's the text showing God un-blessing the Sabbath.

Now therefore let it please thee to bless the house of thy servant, that it may be before thee for ever: for thou blessest, O LORD, and it shall be blessed for ever. - 1 Chronicles 17:27

Nothing here supports the claim that whatever God blesses stays blessed for ever. This is another example of twisting Scripture. The "it" here still refers to that house. Where is that house? Why is it not still standing if it is blessed for ever?

God blessed the seventh day of Creation week, and that day shows having no end. Psalms 95 and Hebrews 4 show that God is still in that "day" and still in that rest that He blessed AND sanctified and the believers enter into HIS REST THROUGH FAITH; something the Israelites, who had the weekly sabbath, could not do, and did not do. What they had was the weekly sabbath that was a shadow of God's rest (Col. 2:14-17). Why do you and others like you reject God's rest in favor of the weekly sabbath? God blessed AND sanctified His day of rest you reject in favor of the shadow, wherein the rest is temporary in relation to works seen by God as being futile.

28. If the Ten Commandments were abolished by Christ then why does [Isaiah 42:21](#) (a messianic prophecy) state "...he will magnify the law and make it honorable"? Shouldn't it say he'll take them out of the way?

Answer: He did magnify the law, showing the spirit of the law, and that if you were to even look upon a woman with lust in your heart, you are as guilty of adultery or fornication as though you committed the actual act. He showed that to hate someone was to have a spirit of murder, and to be guilty of murder. He showed that your very thoughts condemn you, and justly and rightly so. The law was made honorable by bringing forth the new covenant law of faith and the Spirit; a law that leads to life. Funny how you can read this and not see the implications of what was written. If he magnified the law, and made the law honorable, then it had less honor, or no honor previously. If, as you imply, this relates to the Ten Commandments, then they were less honorable and lacking in regards to this magnification.

All these "questions" are designed to do one thing: Circumvent and overthrow the hard facts of Scripture. Scripture does not say Christians have to keep the sabbath. Scripture does say Christians are not under the law; freed from the law; dead to the law; dead to sin; freed from sin. By twisting Scripture, using the methods commonly employed in deceptions, the questioner attempts to bring the believer back to the law, making him alive to the sabbath law, a servant of the sabbath law, and subject to sin for breaking the sabbath law. A false gospel results. It is no longer faith only in Christ; it is faith in Christ PLUS keeping the sabbath.

The one "uncomfortable" question I have never been able to get a sabbath keeper to answer is, "what happens to your salvation should you quit keeping the sabbath"? They do not want to admit what they teach; that your salvation is forfeit or placed at great risk should you quit keeping the sabbath. This is, indeed, a case of believing you must keep the sabbath in order to be saved, or "maintain" your salvation status before God. Your faith is subordinated to a physical, old covenant law. The SDA sabbatarian goes through all sorts of Scriptural contortions in order to justify keeping it in the letter, making all sorts of claims unsubstantiated by Scripture. When it comes to twisting Scripture, the sabbatarians wrote the book.