

Par. 8.5.**The Sabbath and the Law**

The Netherlands ('Belgic') Confession of Faith:

"In view thereof the whole manner in which God ought to be served and worshipped by us is circumstantially explained therein, indeed nobody, not even the Apostles, may teach us different than what we have already been taught in the Holy Scriptures...", Article 7.

Calvin:

"The law has sustained no diminution of its authority, but ought always to receive from us the same veneration and obedience." 2, 7, 15

"We must not imagine that the coming of Christ has freed us from the law: for it is the eternal rule of a devout and holy life, and must, therefore, be as unchangeable, as the justice of God which it embraced, is constant and uniform." 'Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists'

8.5.1.**Calvin and the Christian Day of Worship****8.5.1.1.****Calvin and his 'Institutions of the Church'**

"By this we see that God did not miss anything when he ordained the Sabbath day. And since it has such large a scope, what else do we need to teach us the perfect doctrine of holiness other than what the Holy Spirit has set before us? The purpose is that we should live in holy obedience to God. How are we to do this? By receiving his simple word and by fashioning our lives according to his righteousness. Now since the things of our own nature are contrary to this, we must start by renouncing ourselves. Having done that, we will have what is necessary to serve God. But this is very hard to do. Therefore, when we hear God commanding us to keep the Sabbath day, let us consider well that we cannot do it by playing at it. Instead we must be firm with ourselves. We will profit throughout our lives if we keep the Sabbath well by renouncing whatever is our own and by dedicating ourselves entirely to God."

Die Afrikaanse gedeelte begin op bladsy 6. Gebruik die 'Tools'-knoppie om die rooi onderstreping uit te skakel: Tools > Language > Set Language > Do not check spelling.

I quote from John Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book 2, Chapter 8, *Fourth Commandment*, Paragraphs 28 to 32 (Volume 1), from the *English Translation* by Henry Beveridge, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Michigan, 1970, pp 339 to 344.

Whichever book others may deem the 'Manifest of the Reformation', this is the book I esteem as such.

"Fourth Commandment."

"But as this commandment stands in peculiar circumstances apart from the others, the mode of exposition must be somewhat different."

In Book 4, Chapter 10, Par. 16, Calvin describes his method in explaining 'ceremonies': "... adapting my discourse wholly to our own age, yet nothing has been said which may not be useful to all ages."

I shall also try to *adapt my discourse wholly to our own age*, yet to say *nothing* that should not have been *useful* in Calvin's *age* or in any other age for that matter, for we haven't to do with a temporary thing in this Commandment, regardless of, or exactly for the *peculiar circumstances* in which it *stands apart* in the context of the Ten

Commandments. Commanding Israel in the flesh, God commands the Israel of God of all time, saying,

“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 do no work, &c.

Says Calvin, paragraph “28. The purport of the commandment is, that being dead to our own affections and works, we meditate on the kingdom of God, and in order to such meditation, have recourse to the means which he appointed. ...”

The *peculiar circumstances* in which *this commandment stands apart from the others*, is clear. A vast difference becomes obvious between the Commandment Calvin refers to from the Old Testament, and the same Commandment as he applies it to Christians. *This Commandment stands apart from the others* in that it applies to especially Christians! “The purport of the commandment is, that being dead to our own affections and works, we meditate on the kingdom of God”. What is a Christian? A Christian is a person whose thoughts, while he is dead to his own affections and works, are on the Kingdom of God. And what is the Kingdom of God? It is the Gospel of Jesus Christ and his Church in the world – which is the Church in congregation ... **on the Lord’s Day!** So is the “purport of the commandment” and its *peculiar* day, “the Seventh Day” and “Sabbath of the LORD your God”, and the relation between them, *exposited*.

The Commandment has been written twice with the finger of God – nay, thrice now. ‘The finger of God’ is his Holy Spirit with which He at the creation wrote his Sabbath Rest on the first page of the history of mankind, for all its generations. By the same finger God – “the wind bloweth where it listeth” – wrote His very Sabbath Day in tables of stone for a rebellious, stiff necked and restless nation with hearts of stone. But “We all like sheep have gone astray” – which is one reason the Fourth Commandments applies to all men of all times.

Because so far sunk in the slavish mentality of idolatry and forgetfulness of Him, God in his Sabbath Law provided specially for man’s enjoyment in the rest of His salvation. With the Sabbath God invites man to share in the celebration of His ultimately finished creation – finished in being saved from perdition. But giant men have despised salvation, and provoked God in “the day of their visitation” until this day. “Wherefore, as the Holy Spirit saith, Today if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years! (We have seen God’s works in Christ for two thousand years and still refuse to enter!) Wherefore I was grieved in that generation

(of men), and said, they do all err in heart; and they have not known my ways. So I swear in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest.”

This reminds the attentive reader of the day of temptation, when Adam and Eve – the first ‘fathers’ of mankind – in the day of their creation and “*ere nightfall*”, tempted God. Not only had they seen God’s works in their own creation, but also in His choosing, making, blessing, rest and sanctification of the Seventh Day – in which they must have seen (we are not told they did) the tender mercies of God. For despising God’s tokens of mercy, our fathers were driven out of the garden into “the wilderness”, and God in his wrath then, swore, “they shall not enter into my rest” (not before they shall have seen “the day of My Salvation”)! We do not expressly read (the very little suggestions they might have despite) of God’s Sabbath being rested upon by either the first or any of the early generations of mankind – not until God’s electing salvation had appeared. Not before after the exodus, would the Sabbath be re-discovered – be revived as it were from the dead. Through Jesus Christ then finally – this time from the deadness of Judaism and for Christians – is resurrected to life for Spiritual Isra-El, God’s Sabbath Day. And is it, yet again, despised and discarded for man’s own works and choice of the First Day.

Calvin refers to the Scriptures by the pen of Paul, saying, Christians keep the Sabbath being “*dead to our own affections and works*”. Referring to the Gospels, he says, to “*meditate on the kingdom of God*”.

Here indeed Calvin hits on the absolute roots of the Sabbath Day’s observance and celebration in all of Christendom of the apostolic age! The keeping of the Sabbath Day by the early Church was a matter of course and most obvious in its not being mentioned in every, or in the majority of cases, of its implication and involvement. Whenever the first believers acted corporately, in worship, in congregation, in prayer and praises, in confession, in proclamation, in preaching and teaching – in whatever meant the life of the Church – the Sabbath Day is supposed and implied and is as real, as present and as involved as the Body that is Christ’s itself: implemented and erected, put to service and inhabited – and thus “remembered”, “kept” and “honoured” the Day which God chose, “My Holy”. To the end is this, that God had *purported* – which is the revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ, Victor Triumphant in resurrection from the dead, “on the Sabbath Day”.

Some principle observations of Calvin’s therefore come not merely in passing, but they derive from the essence, relevancy and validity of the Fourth Commandment and the Seventh Day Sabbath, for what singly it ought to mean to the Christian Church.

But Calvin cannot have acted more strangely than to have intended these basic essentials of the Seventh Day of the Fourth Commandment to apply and belong to the First Day of the week.

“(A)nd in order to such meditation”, says Calvin, the Christian believer has the “recourse to the means which he (God) appointed”.

Such recourse of course is the keeping of God’s Sabbath Rest. But Calvin intends “means” and “recourse(s)” that are nothing but Jesus Christ Himself, the Author and Finisher of Christian faith and worship, and which, in the conclusive and finishing end of all the works of God, is nothing but Jesus Christ in resurrection from the dead!

Was not the Seventh Day made as such a recourse, to this end and as a means of this service? Indeed, any ‘Calvinist’ will admit and insist. But without a thought to the contrary, the best Calvinist will apply this purpose and end of the Seventh Day Sabbath, to the First Day of the week, and on no grounds than the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead! I cannot present a better example of such mis-application than the great Calvinist, Charles Spurgeon. Says he, Sermon April 9, 1882 (emphasis CGE),

“And so I come to my last head, and to the practical conclusion: the bearing of this resurrection (of Jesus Christ) upon ourselves. Paul expressly bids us “Remember” it. “Why,” says one, “we don’t forget it.” Are you sure you do not? I find myself far too forgetful of **divine truths**. We ought not to forget, for **this first day of the week is consecrated for sabbatic purposes to constrain us to think of the resurrection. On the seventh day men celebrated a finished creation, on the first day we celebrate a finished redemption. Bear it, then, in mind. Now, if you will remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David rose from the dead, what will follow?”** (Emphasis CGE)

No, on the **Seventh** Day, **God**, celebrated **His**, finished creation, which He finished by redeeming it in that Jesus Christ rose from the dead. If you be not too forgetful of this divine truth, and will remember that **God** consecrated the **Seventh** Day of the week for **sabbatic purposes to constrain us to meditate upon the Kingdom of God**, we shall celebrate a creation finished – and a salvation finished – by that redemption in Christ and by Christ, “*In the Sabbath’s fulness of day when there suddenly was a great earthquake and an angel of the Lord descended from heaven and hurled away the stone from the door*”.

We ought not to forget it (like Spurgeon does), nor the facts bearing upon the indication and consecration of the Sabbath-resurrection of our Lord. While Spurgeon confesses his human tendency to forget “divine truths”, he illustrates just such weakness in taking for granted for the day of Jesus’ resurrection, “this first day of the week”. He bases his

seeming innocent observation upon illusions such as, “See how the holy women tenderly wrap Him in fine linen with sweet spices” (*The holy women did not do it, but the men.*); “Then comes the grand truth, that as soon as ever the third sun commenced (its) shining circuit, Jesus rose again.” (*The third sun did not commence (its) circuit, but declined: ‘epiphohs-k-ousehi’*, when *Jesus rose again.*)

With such illusions and myths the case for the First Day resurrection has through the centuries been concocted. But we Protestants also forget that the whole mass of these false impressions of the events of Jesus’ death and resurrection are the fabrications of antichrist – upon which we base our Reformed conviction and even our translations of the Texts to the effect of a Sunday-resurrection.

As individual persons the Fourth Commandment intends our entering into God’s Rest in Christ through faith – the ‘rest’ of the forgiveness of our sins. But as “the People of God” – in all public life of “the Body that is Christ’s” – the New Testament purpose of the Fourth Commandment intends our “keeping of the Sabbath Day”. “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect ... who is he that condemneth?” “God is it who justifies ... Christ who died, yea rather, who is risen, who is even at the right hand of God exalted, and who makes intercession for us”. (Ro.8:34-35) Believers are here addressed as the Church! “Therefore don’t you be judged by anyone with regard to your Sabbath Days’ feasting!” (Col.2:16). The Seventh Day Sabbath is the Day of Christian Freedom it being the day upon which Christ set us free from death and grave – not the First Day of the week!

“Remember” this, says Spurgeon, quoting 2 Timothy 2:8, “Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my Gospel”. To “remember”, says Spurgeon, means to “celebrate a finished redemption”. (Says Calvin, “The purport of the commandment is ... that we meditate on the kingdom of God”). The Christian Day of Worship-Rest “is consecrated for sabbatic purposes to constrain us to think of the resurrection”. (Calvin expresses the same truth, “... that being dead to our own affections and works, we ... have recourse to the means which he appointed”).

Nowhere does the Scriptures attach such value to the First Day of the week – especially not in connection with the resurrection of Jesus. Now we translate the Gospels so as to make the First Day of the week seem to be the day of His resurrection. But it is a tragic mistake which lies at the root of all anti-Sabbath and pro-Sunday dog-fighting. Translations that are purely the perverted thoughts of men are simply accepted for Gospel, while the thoughts of the One who is Lawgiver are twisted to suit man’s reluctance to “have recourse to the means which he

appointed". Man would rather appoint his own means, and invent his own day of worship-rest, and force the Word of God to serve his schemes.

But God under his Covenant of Grace in the New Testament, introduces, reaffirms and confirms his Sabbath Day for all "spiritual" Israel in all her generations. The hope of Israel is not disappointed; the expectations of God's covenanted promises are come true and real in Christ – it is God's Day sanctified in '*practical conclusion*' in Him in resurrection from the dead – the Lord's Day, is its name. In Christ and under the Gospel God creates the Seventh Day already promised in his creation of the world – anew, that is, originally. We in Jesus Christ find the beginning of all things: "... the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God ... These things says the First and Last – which was dead, and is alive!" (Rv.2:7-8)

"(T)his first day of the week is consecrated" ... where in all of God's revelation is the First Day of the week "*consecrated*", that is, "sanctified", and "blessed" – and commanded (by precept or example)? Not from the grave on Calvary! Not in the beginning! Not at the giving of the Law! "Jesus Christ the same, yesterday, today and tomorrow." As Israel celebrated a finished Passover, and God his finished creation, "*we celebrate a finished redemption*" and "remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy"! **We celebrate a redeemed creation – the only finished creation of God's.** Only here in the resurrection of Jesus Christ all the works of God are concentrated, and consecrated and sanctified, and blessed – because finished at last and first! For in Christ God finds His Rest. Here in the resurrection of Jesus Christ *we* not only *celebrate a finished redemption*, but a creation finished in its redemption – hence God's Day of Rest. Here is the primal event of the finishing of the whole and redeemed creation of God – "and God the Seventh Day rested" – "thus God concerning the Seventh Day spake" by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead "in Sabbath's time".

The Sabbath is physical proof "remaining" with "the People of God" of Jesus' resurrection from the dead – "because" (as Hb.4 verses 8 and 10 say) "because" Christ is Author and Finisher of our redemption and Perfector of God's creation – the Hope of the Faith. As much a 'proof' as the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is the Lord's Day, because God does not forsake the works of his hands, nor does His Word return to Him empty.

Exactly for its routine and culture, the Sabbath or its observance in both Old and New Testaments is seldom if at all mentioned while being taken for granted and implied. The Apostolic Church – as the Old Testament Church in type* – NEVER assembled, but in celebration of the resurrection of Jesus from the

dead – for which reason they NEVER assembled to the purpose of "remembering", or "celebration", or 'meditation' of the great deeds of their Creator Saviour, but on the Seventh Day Sabbath "maintained" (*apoléipetai*) – on it usually, mainly, most importantly and most naturally! Any day pretending to be, or forcefully thrust in the place of the Seventh Day of the Commandment as the Christian and Congregational Day of Worship-Rest, is a stranger to and an enemy of the Gospel of Christ. God permits no enmity between Law and Grace, but in Jesus Christ has brought together and completed the last and greatest of "all His works", to make peace.

* See Ez.46:3, 44:24.

"Early Christian writers are wont to call it (the Sabbath) typical, as containing the external observance of a day which was abolished with the other types on the advent of Christ. This is indeed true; but it leaves the half of the matter untouched. Wherefore we must look deeper for our exposition, and attend to three cases in which it appears to me that the observance of this commandment consists. First, under the rest of the Seventh Day, the divine Lawgiver meant to furnish the people of Israel with a type of the spiritual rest by which believers were to cease from their own works, and to allow God to work in them. Secondly, he meant that there should be a stated day on which they should assemble to hear the Law, and perform religious rites, or which, at least, they should specially employ in meditating on his works, and be thereby trained to piety. ..."

Op hierdie tydstip skenk my goeie vriend en medegelowige, 'oom' Jan de Villiers, Calvyn se 'Institusies' aan my ... en ek besluit onmiddellik om in Afrikaans voort te gaan. Dit is 'n pragtige band in vier boeke van 'n nuwe vertaling deur prof. dr. H.W. Simpson (Dept. Latyn), prof. dr. L.F. Schulze van die Departement Dogmatiek, Teologiese Skool, en, dr. C.M.M. Brink, Navorsers, Calvynnavorsingsentrum, almal van die Potchefstroomse Universiteit vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys.

Aan die begin het ek oor die 'Institusies', opgemerk, "Whichever book others may deem the 'Manifest of the Reformation', this is the book I esteem as such." Kyk net wat sê die vertalers daarvan op die binneste voorblad, "Met uitsondering van die Apostoliese geskrifte (Die Nuwe Testament) het geen leef tyd na Christus hierdie boek se gelyke voortgebring nie."
Onteenseglik!

Daarom waag ek my kritiek op Calvyn se 'Institusies' betreffende die Vierde Gebod met die grootste respek, en met die gevolglike skerpe bewustheid van my eie ontoegerustheid, ontoereikendheid en onwaardigheid om so-iets aan te pak. Ek moet my egter laat lei deur die woorde van die Nederlandse Geloofsbelydenis, Artikel 7, "Aangesien die hele wyse waarop God deur ons gedien moet word, daarin breedvoerig beskrywe is, mag ook niemand, selfs nie die apostels nie, anders leer as wat ons reeds deur die heilige Skrif geleer word nie ...". In kort kom my hele kritiek teen Calvyn se sienings betreffende die Vierde Gebod dus daarop neer dat hy nie streng by die Skrifte hou nie.

"Omdat die gebod besondere oorweging verdien wat van dié van die ander gebooie verskil ..." (2.8.28), sal die volgende tog as riglyn vir ons doel by die oorweging daarvan geld:

"(Ons) moet daarop let dat daar altyd meer is in dit wat die wet gebied en dit wat dit verbied as wat die woorde weergee." Nooit minder nie! Die hele idee van een "aspek" van die Wet tot niet gemaak en 'n ander "aspek" 'behou', is daarom ontoelaatbaar.

"Wanneer ons sê dat dit ("gehoorsaamheid van siel, verstand en wil") die betekenis van die wet is, voer ons nie 'n eie interpretasie in nie, maar ons volg Christus, wat die beste Uitlegger van die wet is. Want toe die Fariseërs die volk se gemoed met die verwronge opvatting deursuur het dat iemand die wet volbring wat met sy uiterlike werk geen oortreding daarteen begaan nie, het Hy dit as 'n hoogs gevaarlike dwaling ontmasker. Hy verklaar dat dit hoerery is as 'n mens onkuis na 'n vrou kyk; Hy getuig dat elkeen wat sy broer haat, 'n moordenaar is. Want Hy vind die mense skuldig voor die gereg wat selfs net toorn bedink. Hy vind hulle skuldig voor die raad as hulle deur te murmureer en te sug, slegs geringste aanduiding van 'n vertoornde gemoed gee. Hy vind hulle die helse vuur skuldig as hulle met skeldwoorde en kwaadwillige gesprekke openlik in toorn uitbars. Die mense wat hierdie dinge nie kon sien nie, het van Christus 'n tweede Moses gemaak, 'n insteller van die evangeliese wet om die gebrek in die Mosaïese wet aan te vul. Hieruit het die algemene grondstelling in verband met die volmaaktheid van die evangeliese wet ontstaan wat die wet van vanouds ver te bowe sou gaan. Dit is om baie redes 'n hoogs verderflike opvatting. Want wanneer ons hierna die gebooie kortliks saamvat, sal dit juis uit Moses se boeke duidelik word hoe 'n onwaardige belasting dit op die wet van God inbrand. Dit gee in elk geval te kenne dat die heiligheid van die vaders aan geveinsdheid gegrens het, en dit lei ons weg van die enige en ewige reël van geregtigheid. Dit is egter baie maklik om die dwaling te weerlê. Hulle meen trouens dat Christus iets by die wet gevoeg het toe Hy slegs die wet in sy ongeskonde toestand herstel het, toe Hy verklaar het dat dit deur leuens van die Fariseërs verduister en deur hulle suurdeeg besoedel is en Hy dit daarvan gesuiwer het.

Ten tweede moet ons daarop let dat daar altyd meer is in dit wat die wet gebied en dit wat dit verbied as wat die woorde weergee. Tog moet ons daarmee behoorlik omgaan sodat dit nie vir ons 'n buigsame reël word, waarop ons steun om die Skrif na willekeur te verdraai en daarvan te maak wat ons ook al wil nie. Met so 'n onbeheerste vrysinnigheid om die perke te oorskry, veroorsaak sommige mense dat die gesag van die wet by ander mense goedkoop gemaak word, en by nog ander dat die hoop om dit enigins te verstaan, in duie stort. As dit enigins moontlik is, moet ons 'n weg betree wat ons met reguit en ferm treë na die wil van God kan lei. Ek beklemtoon: ons moet vra hoe ver ons vertolking van die wet die perke van die woorde daarvan moet oorskry, sodat dit duidelik kan wees dat geen aanhangsel uit die kommentaar van die mens aan die wet van God toegevoeg is nie, maar dat die suiwer en onvervalste bedoeling van die Wetgewer getrou weergegee word.

... As ons op die rede en doel van elke gebod let, kom die ware sin van elkeen ons teë. ... So moet ons in elke gebod afsonderlik ondersoek

instel oor die saak waaroor dit handel. Dan moet ons vra na die doel daarvan, totdat ons vind wat dit regtig is waarvan daar getuig word dat dit Hom as Wetgewer behaag of mishaaig. En laaste moet ons redenasie juis daaruit tot die teendeel lei, soos volg: As dit God behaag, dan mishaaig die teendeel Hom. As dit Hom mishaaig, dan behaag die teendeel Hom. As Hy dit gebied, dan verbied Hy die teendeel; as Hy dit verbied, gebied Hy die teendeel." (2.8.7, 8)

Laat ons die bogenoemde deeglik onthou ook in soverre dit die Vierde Gebod aangaan! Dit is my tweede argument teen Calvin dat wanneer dit by die Vierde Gebod kom, hy nie getrou by hierdie, sy eie verklaring-reëls, hou nie. Moontlik het hy sy eie inkonsekwentheid in hierdie opsig in gedagte, waar hy in 2.8.28 meld, "Omdat die gebod besondere oorweging verdien wat van dié van die ander verskil, vereis dit ook 'n volgorde van interpretasie wat 'n bietjie van die ander verskil." Ons sal sien dat Calvin geen effense 'verskil' bepleit nie, en dat hy ook wanneer dit by die Vierde Gebod kom, nie net 'n anderse "volgorde van interpretasie" uitstippel nie, maar ook wesenlike veranderinge aan "die enige en ewige reël van geregtigheid" aanbring, en daardeur niks minder nie as "'n aanhangsel uit die kommentaar van die mens ... aan die wet van God toevoeg".

Dit is egter baie maklik om hierdie "onbeheerste vrysinnigheid om die perke te oorskry" by Calvin uit te wys. By voorbeeld in 2.8.31 lyn 21 verder verklaar hy, "Sover dit hier (n.a.v. Jesaja 58:13-14) die seremoniële raak, bestaan daar geen twyfel dat dit deur die koms van Christus afgeskaf is nie. Want Hy is self die waarheid, en met sy teenwoordigheid verdwyn alle afbeeldings; by die aanskouing van sy liggaam word die afskaduwings agterweë gelaat", maar in 2.8.34 lyn 21 verder, "... So verdamp die beuselagtige redenasies van die valse profete wat die volk (die Christene) in vergange jare met 'n Joodse opvatting deurdrenk het, terwyl hulle aangevoer het dat slegs die seremoniële in hierdie gebod ... afgeskaf is maar dat die sedelike in die gebod nog van krag is, naamlik die onderhouding van een dag per week." Calvin verduidelik dat "hulle" (dit is, "die valse profete"), "die seremoniële in hierdie gebod", "in hulle taal" "die waardering" van die sewende dag ... noem". Ek kan nie sien hoe hy "die seremoniële ... sover dit" Jesaja 58:13-14

en die onderhouding van die Sabbat – die Sewende Dag – "raak", anders kon "waardeer" het nie. Hy en "die valse profete" opper "hier", presies dieselfde "beuselagtige redenasies". Calvin is op die oog af net meer konsekwent as "die valse profete", daarin dat hy enige "afbeeldings" en "afskaduwings" van "die seremoniële in hierdie gebod", soos nog "die onderhouding van een dag per week", ook agterweë laat en laat verdwyn. Daarmee bly slegs die onbegryplike oor, naamlik hoe die Vierde Gebod enigsins nog vir Calvin sin kan maak! Want met die totale wegdoening van die bevole dag, verdwyn ook die bevel as sodanig. En so word Calvin se vrysinnige vertolking van die wet 'n onbeheerste en eiewillige pleidooi vir die Sondag.

Is dit egter "die rede en doel" van die gebod? Kom dit ons teë as "die ware sin" daarvan? Het ons 'n weg betree wat ons met reguit en ferm treë na die wil van God kan lei? Is dit regtig waarvan daar getuig word dat dit Hom as Wetgewer behaag of mishaaig? "As dit (Sondag of enige dag van die week in plek van die Sabbat) Hom mishaaig, dan behaag die teendeel (die Sewende Dag Sabbat) Hom. As Hy dit (die Sewende Dag Sabbat) gebied, dan verbied Hy die teendeel (Sondag of enige dag van die week in plek van die Sabbat); as Hy dit (Sondag of enige dag van die week in plek van die Sabbat) verbied, gebied Hy die teendeel (die Sewende Dag Sabbat)". "Die ware sin" van die Vierde Gebod is daarom eenvoudig en duidelik, naamlik, "Gedenk die Sabbatdag dat jy dit heilig", ens. "Die rede en doel" van die gebod? dit is "die Sabbat van die HERE jou God"! Daar bestaan geen twyfel nie dat dit deur die koms van Christus **bewaarheid** was. In Hóm "kom die ware sin van die Vierde Gebod ons teë". "**Want Hy is self die waarheid, en met sy teenwoordigheid verdwyn alle afbeeldings**" en "bly daar (die werklike) onderhouding van die Sabbat oor vir die Volk van God" (Hb.4:9) (- **NIE, SOOS Calvin leer, absoluut GEEN SABBAT nie, soos ek eers baie later moes uitvind!**) Want, ... as ons op Die Rede en Doel van elke gebod let, kom Die Ware Sin van elkeen ons teë ... Die Saak waaroor dit handel. ... Totdat ons vind wat dit regtig is waarvan daar getuig word dat dit Hom as Wetgewer behaag ... By die wording van sy liggaam die

Kerk word die Sabbat die afskaduwing "van toekomstige dinge", naamlik die "opwassing (van die Liggaam die Kerk) met die groei van God" - Kol.2:19.

So sien ons dat daar nooit enige ruimte bestaan het vir 'n ander dag om "die Sewende Dag", "aangaande" waarvan "God aldus gespreek het", te vervang nie, en dat dit inderdaad die versinsel van "valse profete" is dat wat hulle "in hulle taal "die waardering" van die sewende dag ... noem", of wat Calvyn in sý taal "die seremoniële in hierdie gebod" noem, ooit "afgeskaf" was.

Want dit is duidelik *dat die sedelike in dié gebod, nog van krag is, naamlik die onderhouding* van die Sewende Dag of Sabbat, ter wille van Góð se Voltooiing - in Goddelike Persoon, Jesus Christus. Calvyn verwar "die seremoniële in hierdie gebod" gedurig met "die sedelike in dié gebod", terwyl albei, "die seremoniële in hierdie gebod" sowel as "die sedelike in dié gebod", op een en dieselfde 'Waarheid' neerkom - een en dieselfde 'Waarheid', "afskadu" - naamlik Jesus die Christus van God.

Calvyn verwar "die seremoniële in hierdie gebod" gedurig met "die sedelike in dié gebod", per definisie sowel as per abuis, soms onbewustelik en soms konsekwent inkonsekwent. Dit is alreeds uit bogenoemde waarneembaar, want wat sou die Sewende Dag "seremonieel" maak, maar enige van die ander dae van die week, nié; en wat sou enige of "een van die sewe dae" "sedelik" maak, maar nie die Séwende Dag nie? Gewoon logieserwys, absoluut niks! God se eie kieskeurigheid egter - vir die mens onpeilbaar en maar net waarneembaar in Sy self-openbarende en op die mens gerigte uitwaartse dae - is die enigste iets wat wél 'n verskil tussen die dae van die week kan maak. Daardie verskil-makende iets is in die skeppings-gebeurtenis van die Sewende Dag onmiskenbaar reeds duidelik - en word dáár al beskrywe as die Gods-daad van die Sewende aards-kosmiese skeppingsdag, die enkele GodsWoord en -Daad van voltooiing, heiliging, seëning en rus. En dit wat toe dáár die groot verskil bewerkstellig het, sou inderdaad wees presies wat in "die uitnemende

grootheid van die krag van sy Sterkte volgens die werking wat Hy ons-waarts gewerk het in Christus toe Hy Hom uit die dode opgewek het", die groot verskil bewerkstellig hét - ook die groot verskil van sy geheiligde en geseënde Dag van voltooiing en rus met enige van enige ander dae. Vanselfsprekend dus word die Sewende Dag waarvan God met Woord en Daad "aldus gespreek" het, veronderstel - veronderstel sonder onsekerheid en met die vaste betroubaarheid van die Waar-Word van God se Woord. Dit kon nooit enige ander dag as die Sewende Dag Sabbat van die HERE jou God gewees het nie - so min die Eerste Dag van die week as Donderdag, al het Calvyn laasgenoemde vir die Kerk-Dag oorweeg en al het hy instemmend van eersgenoemde gepraat as sou Christus daarop opgestaan het.

Calvyn se inkonsekwentheid kan verder uit bogenoemde aanhaling afgelei word as die verskillende vertalings daarvan vergelyk word. Simpson, Schulze en Brink gee 2.8.31 ná aanhaling van Js.58:13 en 14 aan,

"Sover dit hier die seremoniële raak, bestaan daar geen twyfel dat dit deur die koms van Christus afgeskaf is nie". Dit sê Calvyn, terwyl juis van die 'seremoniële' Sabbat as dág, onbeweegbaar afgelei word dat **Christus** die "doel" daarvan wás, en daarom steeds moet wéés. "Want Hy is self die waarheid, en met sy teenwoordigheid verdwyn alle afbeeldings (en staan die Werklikheid voor ons); by die aanskouing van sy liggaam word die afskaduwings agterweë gelaat. Nou, vir die eerste keer, en vervuld met die ware Inhoud daarvan, sien ons die Sabbat voor ons, Christus-skaduende-dag, Kerk-skaduende-dag! Ek herhaal: Hy sêlf is die ware vervulling van die Sabbat." (lyne 15-25)

Vir Calvyn beteken sy argumente gelykmaking tussen die Sabbat as sodanig en "die seremoniële" of "alle afbeeldings", terwyl dit juis die verskil teweegbring. Christus sien hy as "self die waarheid" en as "self die ware vervulling van die Sabbat". Vir Calvyn is geen onderskeid tussen "die seremoniële" en "die Sabbat" trefbaar nie - dis een en dieselfde - nes daar

vir hom geen onderskeid trefbaar is tussen "die waarheid" of "die vervulling" en "Christus" of "sy liggaam" nie. Nou is Christus "self die ware vervulling van die Sabbat". Die Engels sê "die Ware Voltooing" ("the true completion"). Dis tog eenvoudig die instelling en bekragtiging van die Sabbat as Christus-Dag en as Christelike vervullings- of voltooiingsdag - geensins die "afskaffing" daarvan nie!

Waar of hoe sal 'n mens 'n beter en sterker fundering, be-aming en bekragtiging van die Sabbatdag vind? Tog weet elke leser dat Calvyn net die teenoorgestelde bedoel, naamlik dat die Sabbatdag presies hiermee "afgeskaf" is!

Dan, in 2.8.34, lyne 21-30, lees ons net mooi - maar steeds dubbelsinnig - die teenoorgestelde: "... So verdamp die beuselagtige redenasies van die valse profete wat die volk in vergange jare met 'n Joodse opvatting deurdrenk het, terwyl hulle aangevoer het dat slegs die seremoniële in hierdie gebod ... afgeskaf is maar dat die sedelike in die gebod nog van krag is, naamlik die onderhouding van een dag per week. Maar dit is mos niks anders as om die dag tot 'n belediging van die Jode te verander en tog dieselfde heiligheid daarvoor in ons gemoed te behou nie! Want dan bly daar vir ons in die dag dieselfde betekenis van verborgenheid as wat onder die Jode plaasgevind het."

Aan die een kant lê die klem hier op die woord "slegs". Vir Calvyn is nie "slegs die seremoniële in hierdie gebod ... afgeskaf" nie, maar kan niks daarin "nog van krag" wees nie, ook nie "die sedelike in die gebod" nie - as mens konsekwent wil wees! "Die sedelike in die gebod ... naamlik" as "die onderhouding van een dag per week" self, is net so daarmee heen en afgeskaf, as die seremoniële aspek daarvan daarmee heen en afgeskaf is - volgens Calvyn. Géén dag en géén "heiligheid daarvoor" kan meer "in ons gemoed ... behou" word nie.

Dit is wat Calvyn geleer het en ook nie; en wat hy geleef het en ook nie. Want plaas nou net die klem op die "valse profete", en dit klink hier of Calvyn wil sê dat die hele gedagte dat die Sabbat afgeskaf is, vals is omdat dit die "valse profete" is wat dit "aanvoer".

So identifiseer Calvyn "die seremoniële" en "die sedelike in die gebod" en praat meteens téén én vir 'afskaffing' van die Sabbat. "Al is die sabbat afgeskaf, het dit selfs nou nog 'n plek onder ons". 2.8.32) Daarby gee hy ook elke rede hoekom vir hom, die Kerk nié die Sondag behoort te hou nie!

Waarvoor praat Calvyn dan nog enigsins - en met soveel agting - oor die Vierde Gebod? Die misterie verdiep wanneer die Engelse vertaling en Calvyn se eie Frans, in 34 beskou word.

Sê die Engels: "In this way we get quit of the trifling of the false prophets who in later times instilled Jewish ideas into the people, alleging that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the commandment (this they term in their language the taxation of the seventh day), while the moral part remains - viz. the observance of one day in seven. But this is nothing else than to insult the Jews, by changing the day, and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity; thus retaining the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews."

Watse 'verandering' is hier ter sprake? Die 'verandering' van die Sewende Dag Sabbat tot "een dag per week"? Hoe veronderstel Calvyn dan dat "die volk", dit is, die Kerk, deur "die valse profete" beïnvloed sou gewees het om voort te gaan met "dieselfde tipiese onderskeiding van dae soos wat onder die Jode geheers het", en om "die dag tot 'n belediging van die Jode te verander en tog dieselfde heiligheid daarvoor in ons gemoed te behou", as dit nie die Sondag was nie? Want Sondag is immers die enigste "dag per week" waarvoor Christene "heiligheid ... behou" het?

Dis wat die Frans konstateer: "ne discernans entre le Dimanche (Sondag) et le Sabbath autrement, sinon que le septième jour estoit abrogé qu'on gardoit pour lors, mais qu'il on faloit neantmoins garder un": - making no other distinction between the Sunday and the Sabbath, save that the seventh day, which was kept till then, was abrogated, but that it was nevertheless necessary to keep some one day." (Voetnota bls.343 Eerdmans 1970)

Natuurlik veronderstel Calvyn die Sondag in 34! Om dit te wil ontken sou oneerlik wees. En Calvyn sê Nee! daarvoor. Hy sê om "verstandelik dieselfde heiligheid aan (Sondag as aan die Sabbat) toe te skryf" kry ons maar net een ding reg: Ons beledig die Jode.

En terselfdertyd beledig ons onself omdat ons presies maar net doen wat die Jode doen!

Deur die implikasies van sy woord "verstandelik", erken Calvyn dat die Kerk arbitrêr - sonder fundering op die Goddelike Gebod - "heiligheid" aan Sondag toeskryf - "Hoe kan sulke vergaderinge gehou word as daar nie dae daarvoor vasgestel en bestem is nie?". "Eiesinnige godsdiens" sou Paulus dit genoem het.

Dit is dan grondliggend Calvyn se hele leer aangaande die Vierde Gebod - dat GEEN dag meer vir die Christen geld nie - **ook nie "Sunday" for "some one day" nie!**

Dis baie moeilik om te snap, indien nie onmoontlik nie, omdat Calvyn desnieteenstaande vir Sondag in die plek van die Sabbat pleit. Maar wat nog onbegryplicher is, is hoedat Calvyn hierdie dag-inagneming - hierdie "seremoniële" - van 'Sondag vir een dag per week' op die Vierde Gebod, wil gaan basseer? Dit boonop, terwyl hy die 'verstand', en (bietjie verder aan), "ons lewenservaring", "die noodsaaklikheid" en "die staat" gee as gesag en rede hoekom Sondag die Kerkdag moet wees?

Ek dink mens mag maar sê dat Calvyn heel verward voorkom. Dit blyk veral waar hy sy rede gee vir die feit dat die Sabbat "selfs nou nog 'n plek onder ons het", want hy moet daarvoor **na die Jode gaan** vir verwysing! "Die gebruik van die Jode lewer ... oorvloedig getuienis daarvan", sê hy. "In Deuteronomium het Moses ... met die volgende woorde aangedui: "Sodat jou dienskneg en jou diensmaagd kan rus soos jy. Dink daaraan dat dat jy self in Egipteland 'n slaaf was". ... Wie sou ontken dat ... hierdie aspekte ons net soveel as die Jode betaam? Die Woord van God beveel ons om kerklieke byeenkomste te hou, en die noodsaaklikheid daarvan is uit ons lewenservaring bekend genoeg. Hoe kan sulke vergaderinge gehou word as daar nie dae daarvoor vasgestel en bestem is nie? Volgens die uitspraak van die apostel moet alles onder ons behoorlik en ordelik gedoen word. As betaamlikheid en orde nie met 'n reëling van die staat onderhou kan word nie, skeel dit weinig of 'n baie gewisse versteuring en ook ondergang bedreig die kerk as die reëling tot niet gemaak sou word."

Hier is Calvyn se katagoriese bevestiging van die bron van die keuse van Sondag. Dit is nie die "die apostel" nie; dit is ook nie "Die Woord van God" nie; en dit is ook nie die Here van die Kerk nie, maar dit word "onderhou", "met 'n reëling van die staat"!

Dwarsdeur die wêreld vandag egter, gaan die Kerk steeds sy gang in die onderhouding van Sondag nieteenstaande die feit dat hy daarmee gladnie die toestemming of opdrag van die Staat uitvoer of benodig nie, maar alleen maar sy eie willekeurigheid. Dit is daarom ongetwyfeld dat Calvyn sy uitspraak maak aanpassend na die eise van die (politieke) opset en volgens die (godsdienstige) wêreldbeskouing van sy eie tyd.

Uiteidelik dan het Calvyn die vasgestelling en bestemming van juis die Sondag nie by die natuurlike teologie ("verstandelik") gaan soek nie. Waar moes hy dan daarvoor gaan soek het? In Calvyn se situasie en uit die "lewenservaring" en "noodsaaklikheid" van sý dag, was uitspraak en reëling ten gunste van die Sondag en ten koste van die Sabbat, histories, stéeds van nêrens anders te haal as by die ou vyand die Roomse Kerk nie! Dit is waar Calvyn faal, dat hy hierdie herkoms en tuiste van die Sondag nie raakgesien het nie, en die moontlikheid van so-iets by voorbaat met die egte godsdiens waarin hy geglo het, onversoenbaar sou gevind het. (Hy het so 'n gevolgtrekking - klaarblyklik onbewustelik - a priori uitgesluit.) Calvyn kon eenvoudig nie besef het, dat die Roomse Kerk die moeder van hierdie kind uit haar hoerery met die afgodsdiens was nie. Hy het wel duidelik besef dit kom nie van die Skrifte nie en net so van geen Goddelike en / of 'natuurlike' 'openbaring' nie. Calvyn was nogtans die eerste Hervormer wat verwickeld geraak het in die mees basiese (en eenvoudigste) vraag na die ware identiteit en voorkoms waarin hierdie dag homself aan hom voorgedoen het. Calvyn het nie die regte antwoord kon vind nie, maar het minstens die integriteit bewys wat veral by Luther - en tot dusver ten opsigte van hierdie vraagstuk by die

Christelike Geloof oor die algemeen – nie net ontbreek het nie, maar onontkenbaar onderdruk word.

Mens moet erken dat net soos daar by Luther nog spore van die natuurlike teologie te bespeur is omdat hy hom nie toegespits teen die natuurlike teologie nie, maar teen die synergisme van die Roomse Kerk verset het, by Calvyn ook nog spore van Sondag se onchristelike en onbybelse herkoms te vinde is omdat hy hom positief oor die genadeverbondsbeduidenis van die Sabbatsbeginsel as sodanig uitgespreek het, en nie soseer oor die vraag na die herkoms van Sondag nie. Dit verduidelik dan ook hoe dit moontlik was dat Calvyn nooit 'geklik' het nie dat die Opstandingsmotief al die tyd valslik aan die Sondag toegeskryf was!

Of vergis ek myself hier deeglik? Hieroor veel meer om te kom!

Dit vertel ook baie as daaraan gedink word hoe Calvyn gesukkel het om die vier Evangelies in een verhaal te 'harmoniseer'. Ons sal noodwendig ook na hierdie werk moet gaan kyk – in die oorspronklike – want ek het reeds overtures van heel ontradisionele wysies verneem.

Daardie wonderlike ding die internet en daar vind ek toe Calvyn se Harmonisering van Matteus, Markus en Lukas. Calvyn verwys ook deeglik na Johannes! En die weergawe wat ek toe afgelaai het gee notas oor sowaar die Latyn en Frans juis betreffende die punte hier bevestig. (Sien ook opmerkings.)

My vermoedens word bevestig! Geen oomblik skep Calvyn die indruk dat Jesus op Sondag / die Eerste dag van die week / 'die Dag van die Here' sou opgestaan het nie, maar wel letterlik uit die Engels van Mt.28:1 hervertaal, "Noudan in die einde van die Sabbatte, wat begin het om te breek teen die eerste van die Sabbatte ..." ("Now in the evening of the Sabbaths, which began to dawn towards the first of the Sabbaths ...").

Die voetnota 1 (van die vertalers of uitgewers?) lees: "Ou, au bout du Sabbaths, comme le jour apparissoit pour luire pour le

premier de la semaine;" – "or, at the end of the Sabbath, as the day began to dawn for the first of the week." " Die vertalers / uitgewers sou tog nie hierdie nota ingevoeg het as wat Calvyn voorhou, nie met hulle siening gebots het nie! Ons sal dan ook in sy bespreking oplet dat Calvyn bedoel het net wat hy geskryf het, en dat hy gladnie "die week" of "die Eerste Dag van die week" in gedagte gehad het nie, maar, "dagbreek teen die eerste dag van die Sabbatte".

Dit is duidelik dat Calvyn Matteus 28:1-7 (as onverdeelde een gebeurtenis en een tydstip) beskou het as die parallel van Markus 16:1-7 (ook onverdeelde een gebeurtenis en een tydstip) en van Lukas 24:1-8. Dit is 'n grondliggende fout waarop ons in die eerste boekdele reeds op ingegaan het, en wat ons nie nou wil herhaal nie. Hier moet dit net genoem word dat Calvyn Markus 16:1, "En toe die Sabbat verby was", verduidelik: "Die betekenis is dieselfde as in Matteus, "In die aand / einde ("evening"), wat begin breek het teen die eerste dag van die Sabbatte", en in Lukas, "op die eerste van die sabbatte"." Hier sê Calvyn heel duidelik: "Want terwyl ons weet dat die Jode hulle dag van die aanvang van die voorafgaande nag begin bereken het ..." – wat opsigtelik teenstrydig is met sy eie, eerste teenstrydigheid van 'n aand wat in die môre begin breek. Wat laat Calvyn so kleitrap? Maar net wat almal so laat kleitrap, want, skryf hy, "Want terwyl ons weet dat die Jode hulle dag van die aanvang van die voorafgaande nag begin bereken het, verstaan enigeen, dat toe die sabbat verby was, die vroue hulself voorgeneem het om die graf te besoek, sodat hulle voor dagbreek daar sou wees." 'n Suiwer veronderstelling – die foutiewe veronderstelling naamlik – word bloot op grond van sy algemene aanvaarding, aanvaar om die vertolking van die Skrif hier, mee te bepaal. Die kar voor die perde in te span, en dan nog agterstevoor! Dis wat tradisie met waarheid maak. Feit is naamlik dat Matteus praat van die vroue se voorneme om na die graf te gaan – nie Markus nie; en dat Matteus praat van hierdie handeling of voorgeneemde handeling van die vroue "in Sabbatstyd", terwyl Markus praat van die uitgevoerde optrede van die vroue "toe die Sabbat

klaar was" – dus op die Eerste Dag van die week alreeds.

Calvyn laat blyk sy totale verwardheid net hier, met sy poging tot verdere verduideliking van die onverduidelikbare: "Die twee Evangelies gee die naam van 'die eerste dag van die Sabbatte', aan daardie (een) wat eerste in volgorde tussen twee Sabbatte kom." . "Sommige Latynse vertalers", sê hy verder, "het dit, 'een', vertolk, en baie is in hierdie flater ingelok deur onkunde oor die Hebreuse taal; want alhoewel (dxa) partykeer 'een' beteken, en partykeer 'eerste', het die Evangelies – soos op baie ander plekke – die Hebreuse idioom gevolg, en die woord mian, 'een', gebruik. Maar dat niemand deur die dubbelsinnigheid die verkeerde indruk sou verkry nie, het ek hulle bedoeling duideliker gestel."

Punt wat ons hier wil maak, is, dat Calvyn geen enkele woord aanwend om Sondag die Eerste Dag van die week met die Opstanding te probeer motiveer nie. Hy het die drie Evangelies só verstaan as sou hulle eenvoudig Jesus se opstanding op die derde van die "drie" 'Sabbatte' aangee.

Onder Matteus 27:57-61 verklaar Calvyn: "Noudan, van die oomblik toe Jesus gesterf het tot die Sabbat begin het om waargeneem te word, was daar drie vry dae" – "vry dae" of te well "rusdae" of te wel "Sabbatte". Reg of verkeerd, wat Calvyn hier skryf, kom daarop neer dat Jesus op die Sabbat opgestaan het, en nie op die Eerste Dag van die week nie, want die Sabbat is nie die eerste dag van die week nie, maar die laaste dag van die week, en is die laaste dag van elke week as 'Rusdag', "waargeneem"! Daarenteen was die Eerste Dag van die week na Jesus se opstanding, geen 'Sabbat' in welke sin van die woord ookal nie.

Insiggewend is verder ook die feit wat Calvyn onderstreep, dat wanneer 'Sabbatte' mekaar onmiddellik opgevolg het, dit tog toelaatbaar was om op die een – vanselfsprekend seker die voorlaaste een – sekere werk te verrig. Vir uitsondering sover dit die Sewende Dag Sabbat aangegaan het, was daar egter nooit voorsiening gemaak nie. Elke kronologiese logistiek dwing dus

op die Sewende Dag Sabbat af as die dag waarop Jesus opgestaan het.

Calvyn het hierdie aanwysers nie tot hul bestemming gevolg nie.

Of het hy dalk? Want in sy Institusies skryf hy (presies of dubbelsinnig?): "... Aagesien die doel en vervulling van daardie ware rus wat die sabbat vanouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, word die Christene juis op die dag waarop die skaduwees geëindig het. (in die opstanding van die Here) vermaan om nie aan 'n afgeskadude seremonie verkog te bly nie. ... Soos die waarheid onder 'n afbeelding aan die Jode oorgelewer is, so word dit sonder skaduwees (en in Christus verwerklik) by ons aanbeveel – ten eerste dat ons ons lewe lank (dis tog 'n praktiese en gemeentelike beoefening) 'n voortdurende sabbatsrus van ons werke moet bedink (én doen), sodat die Here deur sy Gees in ons mag werk. ..." en God se doel met die Sabbat benut kan word. (34 lyne 3-13)

Die "seremonie" is nie "afgeskadu" nie – die "seremonie" hét "daardie ware rus", Jesus Christus, "afgeskadu". Dit doen dit vandag nog! Dit sluit enige nodigheid om deur 'n ander "seremonie" vervang te word, a priori, uit!

Daarom is dit sekerlik die mees inkonsekwente verklaring wat Calvyn in sy 'Konstitusies' oor die Vierde Gebod maak, waar hy paragraaf 34 inlei met die woorde, "Die mense van die ou tyd het egter nie die dag wat ons die dag van die Here noem, sonder oorleg in die plek van die sabbat gestel nie." Vir my is die Afrikaans beter as Beveridge wat sê "Die mense van die ou tyd het egter nie die dag wat ons die dag van die Here noem, sonder rede in die plek van die sabbat gestel nie." Calvyn wil eerder vertel hoe moeilik dit vir die mense van die ou tyd by **gebrek** aan rede was, en dat hulle naamlik deeglik eers "oorleg" (of redevóëring) sou moes deurvoer alvorens hulle tot die stap kon oorgegaan het. Weliswaar óf ten gevolge van oorlegpleging óf ten gevolge van gewaande 'rede', Calvyn se toegeeflikheid hier ten opsigte van die mense van die ou tyd se eiemagtige optrede, bly inkonsekwent met dit wat hy in die groter verband op toespeel, naamlik dat die mense van die ou tyd se keuse ten gunste van "die dag wat óns Dag van die Here

noem" , uit feitlik wanhopige bygelowigheid gemaak moes gewees het.

Vandag nog is dit die probleem met die meeste gewone Christene se verstaan van die Sondag, dat hulle nog geen duim verder as Calvyn se moedige alternatief vir die verklaring daarvan binne die raamwerk van die genadeverbond gevorder het nie, maar eerder sal terugval op Luther se floue en nog al die tyd Roomse verskonings vir Sondag. En my eie bevinding tot dusver vertel my ons Greformeerdes het nog nie eers begin om Calvyn oor hierdie onderwerp reg te verstaan nie.

Daar is daarom veel meer positiefs en klinkklaar as die verwardheid en die Sondag *per se* in Calvyn se behandeling van die Vierde Gebod. En ons konsentreer veel eerder daarop. Terloops sal ons dan ook nog sien watter dag van die week as Christelike aanbiddingsdag eintlik by Calvyn bevorder word. Ons kan maar nou al konstateer, dat dit nie die Sondag sal wees nie, maar die Sewende Dag Sabbat van die Here jou God.

Ongelukkig voel ek my gedwonge om net een negatiewe opmerkinkie te maak, en dit is, dat Calvyn een basiese voorveronderstellingsfout gemaak het. Hy het naamlik van dié standpunt uitgegaan, soos saamgevat in 33 lyn 26v: "As 'n mens bygeloof vrees, was daar nog meer gevaar in die Joodse feesdae as in die Sondae wat die Christene tans het."

Hierin lê belangrike implikasies verskuild.

Die eerste wat opval - en dalk die minste beteken - is die vertalers se gebruik van die woord "Sondae" in die sinsnede, "die Sondae wat die Christene tans het". Mens sal dit nie sommer agterkom nie, maar vergelyk nou Beveridge hier, met, "If superstition is dreaded, there was more danger in keeping the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's day as Christians now do." Watter woord is nou reg, "Sondae" of "the Lord's day"?

'n Tweede saak is die geïmpliseerde - eintlik genóemde - aanwesigheid van "bygeloof". Calvyn veronderstel dat die Kerk se Sondagonderhouding deur bygelowigheid bedreig word en reeds daarmee besoedel is. Nou lyk dit vir my die bygelowigheid in hierdie geval is juis die

beheptheid met en vrees vir bygeloof. Die reaksie op bygeloof is niks minder as sêlf, bygelowigheid nie.

Hierdie veronderselling is korrek as mens vra: Waar en wat, wat die Sabbat aanbetref, was die bygeloof waarvoor Calvyn so bang is betreffende die Sabbat? Hy noem al die aanleidende faktore tot bygeloof net tevore in 33. Maar hier is die vraagteken: Ieder en elk van hierdie redes of kenmerke van dié dinge wat by die Sabbat aanleiding tot bygeloof sou verskaf (kyk maar daar in 33 se eerste helfte veral), al dié dinge prys Calvyn in net die voorafgaande en daaropvolgende paragrawe aan as die hoogste "geestelike" deugde van die Sabbatdag, ja, as God-gegewe! Hy kan egter nie één van daardie sêlfde faktore deur middel van die Skrifte met "die Sondae wat die Christene tans het", in verband bring nie. Om die dood nie; behalwe uit vrees vir die bygeloof - dán verkies Calvyn die Sabbat bevat die grootste moontlikheid vir bygeloof, en is ons terug waar ons begin het: Hoekom die Sabbat méér as die Sondag? Watse bygeloof is dit?

Vir my is dit die eienaardigste dat die Dag wat deur die Here uitverkies was vir aanbiddingssabbat, groter gevaar vir bygeloof sou inhou as die dag wat suiwer op sosiale gronde en deur mense-toedoen "vasgestel" was. Dat Calvyn uit pure vrees vir bygeloof voorkeur aan die Sondae bo die 'Joodse Sabbatte' gegee het, blyk die bepalende riglyn vir hom te geword het, en nie die Skrifte of die inherente meriete van die saak of die dag self nie.

Trouens, lees gedeelte 32, daar staan beskrywe die eenvoudigheid waarmee die Here die Sabbat aan sy Volk gegee het. 'n Samevattende reël in dié gedeelte is in lyn 23v te vinde: "Maar as dieselfde noodsaaklikheid op ons rus , ter onderskraging waarvan die Here die Sabbat vir die Jode ingestel het, mag niemand voorgee dat dit niks met ons te doen het nie." Watter "noodsaaklikheid" rus ook op ons? "Die noodsaaklikheid om kerklike byeenkomste te hou" volgens wat "die Woord van God beveel", lyne 15-16. Daarom sluit Calvyn hierdie

gedeelte af met die pleit, "Waarom sou ons dan nie die metode gehoorsaam waarvan ons sien dat dit deur die wil van God ons opgelê is nie?" Beveridge gee hier vir "metode", "rule", d.w.s., 'wet', 'riglyn' of 'opdrag'. En dit behoort die betekenis te wees, want Calvyn sê "ons sien dat dit deur die wil van God ons opgelê is", m.a.w., die 'ons in die Skrifte deur die wil van God bevole riglyn'. Waar vind ons dit in verband met, of vir, Sondag in die Skrifte? Calvyn vertel ons nie. Hy vertel ons egter, herhaaldelik en nadruklik, waar ons in beide die Ou en Nuwe-Testament, "sien dat die Sewende Dag Sabbat deur die wil van God ons opgelê is". Hy waarsku dat "niemand mag voorgee dat dit niks met ons" - Nuwe-Testament Christen-gelowiges - "te doen het nie".

Ek wens ek kon hoor hoe Calvyn met sy vriende oor die vraagstuk van die Christelike aanbiddingsdag sou gesels het - sy 'tafelgesprekke' en so aan. Want 'n 'vraagstuk' en 'aktualiteit' was dit altemit - 'Christelike' 'saak van die dag' - nes vandag. Waar Calvyn nie so versigtig hoef te gepraat of geskryf het nie, stel ek my vry voor hoedat hy kon gesê het: 'Kyk mense, die Skrifte - en God deur die Skrifte - ken net die Sabbat vir sy aanbidding deur sy Volk. Net die Sabbat kan afgelei word uit die aanbiddingslewe van die Nuwe Testamentiese Gemeente, en net die Sabbat word herken dáár in die Opstandingsverhaal, soos ook net die Sabbat daar verwag sou kon word. So ek sou sê sover dit myself aanbetref, is die Sabbat vry vir die Christenmens om te vier. Maar nou sit ons met die sak patats dat die Kerk eintlik Sondag waarneem. Terwille van vrede en die behoud van orde, laat ons dit dan maar so aanvaar.'

Dis maar so omtrent wat Calvyn met grootste omsigtigheid en versigtigheid, ja, met grootse deernis en geduld, in sy 'Institusies' probeer verduidelik.

Ek glo nie daar is nog 'n hervormer soos Calvyn of nog 'n onderwerp van die Hervorming soos die Sabbat waaroor daar al meer gelieg was nie. Die Sabbat is verreweg nie die onderwerp

waaroor daar die meeste geskryf was nie, want dit is juis die ongemaklikste punt van hervorming wat daar is. Wanneer dit by die Sabbat kom is die liegery dus buite verhouding groot.

En dit bring ons terug na Calvyn se byna wanhopige vrees vir bygelowigheid. Wanneer hy oor die meriete van die Sabbat en die Sondag moet kies, maak hy seker die een wat volgens hom - na gevoelentheid - die minste kans bied dat 'n bygelowigheds-kettingreaksie aan die gang gesit gaan word. So kies hy maar vir Sondag. Tog glo ek diep in sy hart was Calvyn oortuig dat die Sewende Dag die Sabbat van die Here die God van Jakob en Israel was - die Here van die Christenvolk.

Nooit sal ek Calvyn daarvoor verkwalik nie, want ek, nes ons almal, het eerstehandse ondervinding van die probleem. Dit is vandag net so knaend en net so akuut as ooit tevore. Die gelowige word deur die Sabbatsvraagstuk in die Kerk onmiddellik voor die grote euwel van verdeling en afskeiding - eintlik van uitsluiting - gestel. En ai, dis g'n mens se plesier of plig nie!

Nooit sal ons ook kan agterkom wat Calvyn rêrig alles oor die Sabbat en die Sondag sou gesê en geskryf het nie. Dit is vir myself, by voorbeeld, nie eers moontlik om net sy 'Institusies' in die grondtale Latyn en Frans in die hande te kry nie, wat nog van die sekerlik vele manuskrip-pogings, om daarmee 'n vollediger indruk van die ontwikkeling van hierdie enkele werk van hom, te kan vorm nie. Wat het in geskrewe vorm beland, en wat daarvan, het behoue gebly - veral van geskrewe stukke oor hierdie saak die Sabbat en Sondag? Al wat ek weet en wat onmoontlik is om uit te roei, is dat Calvyn in die Institusies mens toelaat om tussen die lyne van 'n versugting van hom te lees, dat mens die gevoel kry Calvyn sou dalk graag meer spesifiek en uitsluitlik, meer beslissend, uitspraak wou gee, en wel duidelik ten gunste van die Sewende Dag Sabbat en ten nadele van die Sondag. Maar hy het die Gemeente te lief gehad, en onvergisbaar

het die Kerk van sy dag met brandender kwessies te doene gehad wat die aandag meer vereis het as die Sabbat / Sondag vraagstuk. In daardie opsig het Calvin sy plig met onselfsugtige oorgawe nie versuim nie, daaroor bestaan daar geen twyfel nie.

Dit het my die vrymoedigheid verskaf om oor Calvin te getuig – vir wat dit voor God en mens werd mag wees – “I am a Sabbatharian (Seventh Day) Calvinist, and find comfort in being one, Calvin so strongly supporting me in my conviction of the Seventh Day Sabbath the Lord's Day of Christian worship” .

Opvallend vind die leser reg in Calvin se eerste woorde oor die Vierde Gebod – die Sabbatsgebod – ‘n gebruikmaking van die Gereformeerde regverdigingsleer. Calvin beskryf naamlik die onlosmaaklike verhouding wat die reverdiging met die veelbewoë Sabbat het, wat so onregverdiglik, roekeloos en veragterend met werkegodsdienste, eiegeregtigheid en skynheiligheid vereenselwig word. Skryf Calvin,

“Die doel van die (Sabbats-)gebod is dat ons ons eie strewe en werke moet afsterwe, moet nadink oor die koninkryk van God, en die middels wat Hy self ingestel het sodat ons daaroor kan nadink, daarvoor moet inspan.” Met ander woorde, ons moet die Sabbat vir ons laat werk om waarlik die rus van God te ervaar. (Calvin veronderstel gelowiges wat “strewe” ens. – geen voorwaardelike verdienstelike godsdiens nie.) Ons vind herhaaldelik by Calvin dat die Sabbat, getroue diensknege en nederige werktuig van die Here, in diens van sy knegte die Kerk staan, en tot die diens van Sy Aanbidding onder die mensdom (wat Hom en sy Rusdag so gou en so maklik vergeet (en verag).)

“Die middels wat Hy self ingestel het sodat ons daaroor (oor die Koninkryk van God) kan nadink” ... watter middel is meer uitnemend geskik vir presies hierdie doel as juis die Sabbat self? Wat, meer of beter as “die koninkryk van God” self, beteken die Goddelike rus sowel as ons rus daarin? Die Koninkryk van God en die Sabbat van die Here jou God kan nie geskei word nie. Hulle is nie identies nie, maar een, soos

man en vrou toe God hulle geskape het. Het *God self* die Sabbat *ingestel*? Hy het! Het God dit ingestel as ‘n *middel* tot diens van Sy Aanbidding onder die mense? Vir geen ander rede nie! *Sodat ons oor die koninkryk van God kan nadink*? Watter sin is daar in aanbidding behalwe dit? Moet ons God se Sabbatdag juis “daarvoor inspan”? Sêlf haal Calvin uit Jesaja aan: “As jy jou voet van die Sabbat terughou, om nie jou wil op My heilige dag te doen nie, en jy die Sabbat (in plaas daarvan) ‘n verlustiging (in die Here) noem, en die heilige dag van die Here(!) hoog hou; en as jy dit eer deur nie jou eie (gekose en gewone) gang te gaan nie en nie geleentheid vir jou eie sake (en vernuf) uit te werk nie, en nie jou eie taal (van eie vermagting, selfvoldaanheid en eiegeregtigheid) te verkondig nie (maar die genadige Woord van God en sy *Koninkryk te bepeins* en te spreek) ... dan (alleen) sal jy in die HERE, (en in Hom alleen) jou verlustig (rus en verfrissing, herskepping) vind!” (In hakies, CGE)

(Ons praat van alles as ‘alleen’ dit, ‘alleen’ dat, behalwe “die Sabbat”? Net die “die Sabbat” is nie ‘net’ die Sabbatdag nie, maar enige dag, selfs net maar enige idee, dag of nie dag nie? Is ons ‘godsdienste’ sō inkonsekwent terwyl die Gebod sowel as Jesaja hul argument op juis konsekwentheid as eerste vooropstelling, basseer?)

Calvin sê met hierdie eerste woorde van hom (“dat ons ons eie strewe en werke moet afsterwe, moet nadink oor die koninkryk van God”) maar net wat Jesaja gesê het! Jesaja én hy, praat tog van die Sabbat van die Vierde Gebod – hoe kan Calvin nou die Sondag of enige dag van die mens se eie besluit en eie vermagting, in die Sabbat – die Here se dag en dag van Sý vermagting – se plek wil indink? Wat dink hy sou Jesaja van Sondag gedink en onomwonde gesê het? En wat dink óns, sou Calvin se reaksie op Jesaja se antwoord gewees het? Want Jesaja sou met presies dieselfde woorde wat Calvin hier aangehaal het, geantwoord het, en sal vandag weereens net so antwoord, én oor ‘n honderd jaar.

En elke keer sou Jesaja met "die Sabbat", "die Sewende Dag" van God se eie making in en deur Jesus Christus, bedoel het. Sou Calvyn steeds wou aandring op die kerkdag van sy eie tyd, Sondag? Nie as hy die man was wat ek glo, hy was nie!

Ek glo Calvyn het by die Sondag bly staan nie omdat hy oningelig was of omdat hy nie insig gehad nie, maar net omdat dit nog nie in God se program, die tyd vir Sabbats-hervorming was nie. Terselfdertyd glo ek die tyd in die geskiedenis vir hervorming ook ten opsigte van die Christelike aanbiddingsdag het nou aangebreek. Mag die Sabbat uiteindelik die Christus-dag wat dit is, bewys word! En weg met die reukoffer van afgodsaltare wat ons Sondag vir Sondag in die neus van die Almagtige laat opgaan! **Weg met pouslike bygelowigheid en seremonie! Bring terug die Bybelse geloof en seremonie! En laat ons die Een Ware God daarmee dien volgens sý, ewige verordeninge! Want die Sabbat alleen is Christus-Dag; die Sewende Dag alleen, "Dag van die Here"! "Want God het aldus van die Sewende Dag só gespreek: En God het op die Sewende Dag van al sy werke gerus (dit is, KLAARGEMAAK)!" ("Die derde dag ("volgens die (Pasga-)Skrifte") maak Ek (die werke van God) klaar!")**

Komaan, dominee, waarom wil u die waarheid van u gemeente - en van uself - weghou? Gaan u aan hulle hierdie dinge vertel en laat vertel, of gaan u die Woord van God dood versmoor onder die snoesige kombers van gerief en vrede? Waar is die lyding vir Christus volgens 'die derde engel se boodskap'? Ek sal u sê, as die lyding van en vir Christus nie in 'die derde engel se boodskap' is nie, soek u tevergeefs na die Sabbat daarin! Wil u die Sabbat verkondig? Daar is géén Sabbat te verkondig nie! Jesus Christus en Hy die Opgestane Gekruisigde sal verkondig word of die Sabbat sal nooit, verkondig word nie! U sal die een Opstandings-Sabbat verkondig, of u sal die valse Sabbat, die Sabbat van eiegeregtigheid en eie werke, verkondig. Ek daag u uit om my 'n alternatief te wys. As Jesus se opstanding op die eerste dag was, alleen dan, sou u 'n alternatief

gehad het. Daarom het Hy nié "op die eerste dag van die week" opgestaan nie, maar "In Sabbatstyd"! En sal u nêrens in die Skrif hierdie valse idee, "op die eerste dag van die week" op Jesus se opstanding van toepassing vind nie, maar slegs die presiese woorde, "(lank) vóór die Eerste Dag van die week" - eis mían sábbaton. En sal u nêrens in die Skrif hierdie valse idee, "(Lank) ná die Sabbat" (OAV), op Jesus se opstanding van toepassing vind nie, maar slegs die presiese woorde, "In Sabbatstyd" - sabbátohn de.

Reeds in Calvyn se eerste paragraaf vind ons die dubbele eienskap inherent aan die Vierde Gebod, naamlik die inwendigheid en die uitwendigheid daarvan. Eintlik moet ek sê, die dubbele eienskap inherent aan die Sabbat, want God maak sy "Heilige Dag" bekend sal ons sê in drie vorme, naamlik as "die Sabbat van die Here jou God", die Sabbat as hierdie Dag in die vorm van Gebod, en laastens die Sabbat as menslike antwoord of gehoorsaamheid, of 'onderhouding' van die Wet.

Die Sabbat verskyn dan in Calvyn se eerste paragraaf alreeds na hierdie eienaardigheid, die inwendigheid en die uitwendigheid daarvan.

Al die ander Gebooe se onderhouding 'verdwyn' as't ware in onsigbaarheid, omdat almal (behalwe die Vyfde Gebod) Verbiedinge eerder as Gebiedinge is. Daarom het Christus die diepere oortredinge van die Wet aan die lig gebring, sodat Hy alle skyn-gehoorsaamheid aan die kaak gestel het. As jy nie moord gepleeg het nie is jy nogtans die oortreder van die wet want jy haat nog jou broer, ensovoorts (soos Calvyn ook breedvoerig aangedui het). Wat vir die mens sigbaar of onsigbaar is, is altyd vir God duidelik. As die onderhouding sigbaar is, is die ongehoorsaamheid nogtans vir God sigbaar.

Net die Vierde Gebod egter, "sluit (in) die uitwendige onderhouding van die dag" as wesenlike van die ware en inwendige aard daarvan - soos immers van

die Sabbat as sodanig. Net die Vierde Gebod is volgens sigbare en uitwendige én onsigbare en inwendige, p^ositief van aard. Dít is "wat die gebod besondere oorweging (laat) verdien" en waar dit "'n bietjie van die ander verskil".

Dit oor hierdie besondere karakter van die Vierde Gebod en Sabbat waaroor die geskille woed. Is die Sabbat 'n dag, of is dit nie 'n dag nie; en is die onderhouding van die Sabbat 'n saak van 'n dag onderhou of nié 'n dag onderhou nie; en dan in ieder geval nie sommer enige dag of willekeurig "een van die sewe dae" (2.8.30) nie, maar juis hierdie, "die Sewende Dag (van die week)" en "Sabbat van die HERE jou God"?

Niemand sal ontken die Sabbat en die onderhouding van die Vierde Gebod bestaan nie slegs uit "die uitwendige onderhouding van die dag" nie. Ook niemand nie - nie eens Calvyn nie - sal ontken dat dit "die uitwendige onderhouding van die dag" nié "insluit" nie. Die waarheid en die enigste waarheid omtrent die hele geskil kom eenvoudig en uiteindelik by, nie eens die opvatting van "die onderhouding van een van die sewe dae" nie, maar, eenvoudig en uiteindelik, by die Sabbat (Sewende Dag), óf, Sondag (Eerste Dag van die week) uit! Laat al die gehuigel net hier stop! Hieroor en net hieroor gaan al die "getwis en gekibbel oor die Wet", soos Paulus dit sou gestel het. Ongelukkig is ons gedwing om teen sy raad in, ons juis hiermee besig te hou! Want dit gaan nie net oor die Wet en die Sabbat nie, maar oor die waaragtigheid, betroubaarheid en eer van die Woord en getrouheid van God self. Dit gaan oor "eiesinnige godsdiens" en die veragting van die beloftes van God. Dit gaan oor afgodery, of "aanneemlike godsdiens". Leuens en afgodery is nie vir God "aanvaarbare toewyding" nie. Soos van ouds is dit vandag nog 'n stank in sy neus. Sondag toeweyding en onderhouding is om ons eieregtigheid vir 'n soenoffer aan God op te dring. Hy sal dit nié aanneem nie, maar sal ons, daarvoor straf!

Calvyn het sy bes gedoen om aan die oordele van God te ontkom, maar het dit nie reggekry nie. Ek glo die Here het hom te meer daarvoor liefgekry en in genade bejeën. Ons sal egter nie ontkom aan die vuur van sy toorn nie, nie solank ons voortgaan om sy Woord só te minag dat ons nie skroom om dit te buig na die eise van ons afgodiese oorleweringe en insettinge nie.

Die oplossing vir die probleem lê daarin dat die Woord weer só terugvertaal sal word dat "Ou-" en "Nuwe-" Testament tot volle versoening sal kom. Dan sal God se finaliseringsdaad of opperste voltooiingsdaad van sy ganse skepping en van al sy werke, sy opstandingsdaad in en deur Jesus Christus uit die dood, op sy "heilige" en daarvoor "bestemde" Dag, tot sy bestemde en toegekende reg en eer kom. Dan sal Matteus 28:1 reg vertaal, die waarheid spreek. "Dit kom van die HERE" - van geen mens of mag nie. "Laat óns (daarom) daaroor bly wees", en "Laat óns, ons (daarom) daarin verlustig"! "Die Here het opgestaan!" Dit is ons ganse Geloof.

"... Christ's rising from the dead was the seal to all His claims. It was true, then, that He was sent of God, for God raised Him from the dead in confirmation of His mission. He had said himself, "Destroy this body, and in three days I will raise it up." Lo, there He is: the temple of His body is rebuilt! He had even given this as a sign, that as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, and should then come forth to life again. Behold His own appointed sign fulfilled! Before men's eye the seal is manifest! Suppose Christ had never risen. You and I might have believed in the truth of a certain mission which God had given Him; but we could never have believed in the truth of such a commission as He claimed to have received—a commission to be our Redeemer from death and hell. How could He be our ransom from the grave if He had himself remained under the dominion of death?" (Spurgeon)

"... In Sabbatstyd ..."! "Onthou die Sabbatdag dat jy dit heilig, want ... op die Sewende Dag het God ... gerus". "Onthou altyd dat Jesus Christus, 'n mens gebore uit die geslag van Dawid, uit die dood opgewek is - dit is die Evangelie ...". (2Tm.2:8)

"... En so kom ek uit", sê Spurgeon, "by die praktiese gevolgtrekking (mens kan net sowel sê, by die Wet): die betrekking wat hierdie Opstanding op onself het. Paulus gebied ons uitdruklik om dit "te onthou". ... Ons mag nie vergeet nie, want ... (en hier raak Spurgeon die pad soos ons almal maar, byster): hierdie eerste dag van die week word geheilig vir sabbatsdoeleindes, om ons te beweeg om te dink oor die Opstanding. Op die sewende dag het hulle 'n voltooië skepping gedenk, en op die eerste dag gedenk ons 'n voltooië Verlossing. Oordink dit daarom gedurig. ..."

Spurgeon moes hier die Sewende Dag van die week geskryf het want dit was "die Sewende Dag aangaande waarvan God aldus gespreek het: En God het op die Sewende Dag van al sy werke gerus", ook sy werk van "'n voltooië Verlossing". (Hb.4:4-5) En Spurgeon moes hier die Sewende Dag van die week geskryf het omdat daar van "'n voltooië skepping" geen sprake kan wees alvorens dit 'n van die dood, verlore, skepping is nie. "Oordink dit daarom gedurig", "want die Sewende Dag is die Sabbat van die HERE jou God".

Spurgeon se woorde, "sabbatsdoelenides, om ons te beweeg om te dink oor die Opstanding", verskil geensins met Calvyn se verduideliking, "Die doel van die (Sabbats-)gebod is dat ons ... moet nadink oor die koninkryk van God". Want dit is wat God se rusdaad van die Sewende Dag "in die begin" reeds beteken het en welke betekenis sy rusdaad van die begin af ingehou het en deur die eeue voortgedra het om dit in die Dag van Voltooiingsvervulling in Christus Jesus na volle maat uit te stort in die Godsrusdaad en Godsrusdag van Sy Opstanding uit die dode. En dit was nié in die Eerste Dag van die week uitgestort gewees nie, maar "in die Sabbat" - die eerste Sabbat van die Nuwe Skepping - God se Skeppings-Sabbat soos van die begin af, híér, waar en wyl in opstanding uit die dode, in Hóm "die Begin van die skepping van God", die skepping, hêrskape en léwend, teenwóordig staan. (Op.3:14)

Niemand wat sy dinkwerk oor die Sabbatdag gedoen het, sal wil beweer dat "die uitwendige onderhouding van die dag" alles is wat in die Sabbatsgebod vervat word nie, maar sal wel deeglik besef dat Christus se voltooiing van al

God se werke die essensie daarvan is, en dít is, waarsonder die Dag nie kan bestaan nie, maar ook dat dit die Dág is waarsonder die Essensie hom nie laat verwerklik of verwaarheid nie. (As God in ruimte optree, tree Hy ook in tyd op, en dan is dit vir Hóm om deur sy optrede, daaraan betekenis toe te voeg of nie.) Net so min as wat God se voltooiing sigself toelaat sónder die betrokkenheid van "die Sewende Dag", net so min laat God se voltooiing sigself op enige of "een van die (ander) sewe dae" toe. Net soveel as wat dit vir die Godsdaad was dat die Here die Sabbatsgebod ingegee het, net soveel was dit vir die feit dat die Sewende Dag, die dag van sy daad was. Die Gebods-Sabbat ís hierdie Dag, die Sewende van God se skeppings-begin en van Sy eind-voltooiing, sonder meer. Waar kom die Eerste Dag dan vandaan om hierdie dag te wil uitdruk en verplaas? Van die mens! En daarom kom dit soos 'n dief en 'n rower, net, dis nie die dag nie, maar die mens wat die dief en rower is wat, soos hy die Dag steel, God beroof.

Dis waar dit mens bring as jy "verstandelik" oor die Sondag "nadink" - daar is nie weinig sin in nie; daar is géén sin in nie. Want dit kón en sóú nooit opstandingsdag van God se Gesalfde (Christus) gewees het nie omdat dit dit nooit móés gewees het nie. Die Eerste Dag of Sondag het nooit die salwing dáárvóór ontvang nie. Maar as mens "al die werke van ons verstand" (29 lyne 28-29) daarlaat en dan agterkom hoe "die hemelse Wetgewer onder die rus van die sewende dag ... die geestelike rus uitbeeld waarop die gelowiges van hulle eie werk moet rus om God in hulle te laat werk" (28 lyn 15) (deur sy vrymagtige en genadige Openbaring aan álmal aan wie Hy so wil, en nie net aan "Israel" na die vlees - soos Calvyn beweer nie), dan volg dit dat die Sewende Dag met geestelike olie salwing ontvang het, dit wil sê, dat God dit "geheilig" het, óm dag van Sy Gesalfde te wees. Daarom móés die Sewende Dag Sabbat, dié dag van God se Gesalfde gewees het, want dáárvóór het Hy dit "geheilig en geseën". Het Hy dit "geseën en geheilig" met dié heiliging

en met dié seëning en met dié salwing wat vir geen oomblik in die waardigheid van die dag self gesetel het of bevind kon word nie, maar enkel daarin dat dit die "die geestelike rus" wat Jesus die Gesalfde van God Self is, *voorafgeskadu* of *uitgebeeld* het. Geen ander dag nie! Alléén daarom, kón, alléén die Sewende Dag, dag van God se skeppingsbegin én voltooiing, gewees het, want dit móés die dag van die opstanding van Jesus Christus uit die dode en die dood geword het en gewees het - dit is wat God se skepping, en salwing met heiliging en seëning vir uitsluitlik die Sewende Dag, beteken het.

En noudat hierdie vervulling plaasgevind hét, nou moet die dag wegval? Nooit! nóú word die dag eers bekragtig: "Sewende Dag die Sabbat van die HERE jou God"! Nou moet die Sondag die plek daarvan inneem? Nooit! nóú eers vind die Sabbat sy Ware Voltooiing, in Hóm wat eerstens die Voltooiing, ja "die Amen, van die begin van die skepping van God" is - in Hóm wat krag gehad het om Sy lewe Self neer te lê en Self weer op te neem, die Begin en die Einde, die Eerste en die Laaste, "die Beginner, en die Voltooier van die geloof". ("The Author and Finisher ...").

Let op hoe hierdie titels van Christus soos prospektief, ook retrospektief van krag is. Want sý dood is die begin, en sý lewe, die einde - sy begin ... die éinde. Sý lediging is die vervulling, en sý vervulling, die ontdaning van selfvoldaanheid, sodat alleen in die opstanding van Jesus Christus uit die dood - alleen in sy begin, daar lewe en sin - 'n éinddoel - vir alles tot stand kom, 'n opstanding uit die dood van wat voorheen net 'n skaduwee was. Dit geld ook van die Sabbat. Streng gesproke was daar nog geen Sabbat voordat Christus gesterf en opgestaan het nie. Inderwaarheid wag die hele skepping dáár, met reikhalsende verlange op die openbaarmaking van Hóm in opstanding uit die dood in Wie ook al die kinders van God bevind word, ja, wag die hele skepping dáár met reikhalsende verlange om dan ook in en deur Hóm, Sý voltooiing en rus in te

gaan. So gebeur die wording van die Sabbat in en deur Jesus Christus, in en deur sy opstanding uit die dood. Dit is regtigwaar hierso - in verband met en in konteks van die Sabbat - die laaste woord oor die dood, want van nou af heers die Lewe, die Ek IS, die Magtige. "Want Jesus hét aan hulle rus verskaf", self "hét Hy die rus van sy eie werke as God, ingegaan". (Hb.4:8, 10) "Daarom bly vir die Volk van God hulle onderhouding van die Sabbatdag van krag." (vers 9)

Waar Calvyn (28 lyn 9-10) dus verklaar dat "hulle" ("die skrywers van die ou tyd") "inderwaarheid ook die waarheid praat", as hulle sê dat "die uitwendige onderhouding van die dag ... deur die koms van Christus ... tot niet gemaak is", "praat" hy, soos "hulle", **nié** "die waarheid" nie, en "raak" hy, soos "hulle", "die saak" nie eers "halfpad aan" nie, maar mis die kol met myle! Want die ware en inwendige betekenis van die Sabbat en van die onderhouding van die Sabbatsbeginsel is veel meer as uitwendige waarneming van die dag, maar ook niks daarsonder nie. Terwyl watse onderhouding van Sondag ookal vir God 'n gruwel en sonde is wat Hy slegs weens die onkunde en goeie bedoelinge van sy kinders ontwil, as dit Hom sou behaag, mag oorsien. In hoeverre God die herders van die volk egter nié oor dieselfde kam as die skape sal skeer nie, is vir niemand om te sê nie, maar vir God om oor te besluit. Want drie maal vra Jesus vir Petrus, "Het jy my lief?", net om seker te maak Petrus, dat jy jou verantwoordelikheid as herder van "my skape", verstaan!

"Daarom moet ons dieper na 'n verduideliking hiervan (van die tot niet making van die uiterlike onderhouding van die dag) soek. Na my mening moet ons drie redes onderskei waarom hulle ("Israel") die gebod onderhou het. (By welke 'onderhouding' Calvyn ook die "die uitwendige onderhouding van die dag" inbegryp.

As die Gebod tot niet gemaak was, bly niks oor nie - ook geen dag nie. As die dag tot niet gemaak was, kon daar ook nooit 'n gebod oor gegee

gewees het nie, en sou die gebod skoon sinneloos gewees het.

God vra ons in die Vierde Gebod niks anders nie, as om in ons as sy Volk voor Hom, só liefgehê te word en só aanbid te word as wat Sý liefde jeens óns, en sy eie rus en werke, na hul eie aard en waarde, bepaal en beveel. Hierin word God se vryheid geeerbiedig dat ons in hierdie vryheid voor Hom mag lewe. Vandaar "die Sewende Dag, Sabbat van die HERE jou God". (Dis tog geen menslike Woord dié nie!) Geen menslike of Goddelike willekeur kan of durf in die vasstelling van die Sabbat op die Sewende Dag (van die week) gelees word nie, alleen maar die ewige raadsbesluit en genadebetoning van God. Daarom verwerp ons met alle mag die gedagte van die *tot niet making* van *die uiterlike van die dag*, nie slegs as totaal sinnelose idee nie, maar as totaal verdorwe voorwendsel. En betreur ons dit dat hierdie groot man, Johannes Calvyn, daardeur verlei was.)

Dit was die wil van die hemelse Wetgewer om onder die rus van die sewende dag vir Israel die geestelike rus uit te beeld waarop die gelowiges van hulle eie werk moet rus om God in hulle te laat werk. Ten tweede was dit sy wil dat daar 'n vasgestelde dag moes wees waarop hulle bymekaar kon kom om na die wet te luister en die seremonies te verrig, of in elk geval 'n dag wat hulle in besonder daaraan sou bestee om oor hulle werke na te dink om deur die herinnering daaraan in godsvrug geoefen te word. In die derde plek het Hy dit goedgevind dat 'n rusdag aan knegte en aan die wat onder ander se gesag gestaan het, toegestaan moet word sodat hulle 'n ruskans van hulle arbeid kon hê.

Alles goed en wel, maar nog steeds is die saak nog nie eers kwartpad aangeraak nie.

Van waar af kom hierdie "*wil van die hemelse Wetgewer om onder die rus van die sewende dag vir Israel die geestelike rus uit te beeld waarop die gelowiges van hulle eie werk moet rus*"? Kom dit nie vanuit die ewige Raadsbesluit van God in Christus Jesus nie? Ek dink Calvyn sou die laaste mens gewees het om dit te ontken. Nou dui dit dan nie reguit op Jesus Christus as die Lam van God en Prins van ons verlossing nie? Dit is "*die wil van die hemelse Wetgewer om onder die rus van die sewende*

dag vir Israel die geestelike rus in Jesus Christus uit te beeld", "*waarop die gelowiges van hulle eie werk moet rus om God in hulle te laat werk*". Geen mens by sy volle verstand en met die bereidwilligheid van gehoorsaamheid sal ooit wil ontken dat hierdie beginsel soos in die Gebod op die Sabbat toegespits - van die *uitbeelding* van "*die geestelike rus*" van God wat alleen maar in Christus Jesus gevind word - nie ook vir die hele lewe in breër opset geld nie. Die Sabbat is immers juis teken daarvan naamlik "dat Ek julle God is, en julle my Volk"! Maak dit nou die Sabbat ongeldig, "*tot niet*"? "Inteendeel", soos Paulus van die genade sê, dit "bevestig die wet"! Die wet lééf vanuit en van die genade - wat "eerste gekom het", nes die gelowige uit die genade sal lewe, deur die geloof alleen!

En het ons nou met al hierdie pogings om "*dieper na 'n verduideliking*" van die Vierde Gebod te *soek*, vir onself die instelling van die Eerste Dag van die week, Sondag, aangetoon of bevestig? Hoe belaglik daarom om Sondag te gaan vereenselwig met die kulminatiewe gebeurtenis waarin en waarmee en waardeur God Sy Sabbatdag van die Sewende Dag aangetoon, ingestel en bevestig het, naamlik die opstanding van Jesus Christus uit die dood? Hoe verstandig dan, om juis die Sewende Dag Sabbat van die HERE jou God, in hierdie kulminatiewe gebeurtenis te ontdek! Verrassend is dit ja! Want God se daad is altyd verruklik nuut; nogtans nie onverwags nie, maar presies sóos verwag, want "God het gespreek, en dit was"! Die toekoms - soos God se eie toekoms - het klaar in Homself bestaan, en in Sy eie verlede. Daarom is die Sabbat van die HERE jou God vir alle geslagte, tot aan die einde van die eeue - en daarna - want dit leef "úit Hom, déur Hom en tót Hom". Aan God kom toe die eer en die heerlikheid en die dank, tot in ewigheid. Vir solank as God die ware God aanbid sal word, sal sy Volk in aanbidding van en tot Hom in en deur Christus Jesus en om sy ontwil, vergader; en vir solank as wat sy Volk voor sy aangesig sal aanbid, sal hulle "op die dag van die Here" aanbid, "die

Sewende Dag die Sabbat van die HERE jou God".

Sy Volk aanbid nie twee Here nie - voor Jesus die een, en na Jesus, die ander nie. Hierdie Enige Here het net één dag wat Hy, met sy Een en ewige Woord, Sý dag, en Sy héilige dag, noem - en van ons, Christene, opeis, ja!

(Wie's nou 'behep met die dag' - hy wat hierop staan en hiermee volstaan, of hy wat die vreemde en valse eiewillig vasklou en daarvoor alle eenvoud en skoonheid van die waarheid met trane en selfs bloed opoffer?)

Par. 8.5.1.2.
Calvyn Versus Prof. FJM Potgieter
(Drie Lesings)

Calvyn in "*Times New Roman skuins geonderstreep*"

Potgieter in "*Courier New skuins geonderstreep*"

Nadruk CGE in bg. '**bold**'

Woorde geleen, *skuins / skuins*

CGE in Arial

'n Woord agterna, vooraf:

In **kern** kom alles wat Calvyn rakende die Sabbat, die rus en afskaduïng, die vervulling en afskaffing daarvan, geskrywe het, daarop neer dat hy in die **afskaduïng** van die Sabbatdag, die rus wat **in Christus verwerklik** was, verstaan het. Dan het hy verstaan dat hierdie **vervulling** in verwerkliking van die Sabbatsbelofte, hoop, vrede en rus in Jesus Christus, die Sabbat se **beëindiging**, of afskaffing, beteken het. Maar die belangrikste is, dat vir Calvyn – anders as vir al die Sondagaanspraakmakers op Calvyn – die vervulling van die Sabbat en van al die betekenis daarvan, setel in, en gebeur het in, **nié** die lyding, sterwe en dood van Jesus Christus nie, maar, setel in, en gebeur het in, sy **opstanding** uit die dode!

Dan, volgens Calvyn, het hierdie afskaffende vervulling van die Sabbatdag deur en in die opstanding van Jesus Christus, **plaasgevind op die Sewende Dag Sabbat**. Dit, vermeld of nie vermeld nie, is vir Calvyn die bepalende voorveronderstelling vir en by elke uitspraak van hom soos, "*Die skrywers van die ou tyd noem die gebod gewoonlik 'n afskaduwing, omdat dit volgens hulle die uitwendige onderhouding van die dag insluit wat deur die koms van Christus tesame met al die afbeeldinge daarvan tot niet gemaak is*".

Omdat "*deur die koms van Christus*" sy **opstanding** die **finaliteit** is – is daar vir Calvyn **géén** Sabbat wat in 'n dag bestaan, meer oor nie, maar slegs die **geestelike** onderhouding van die Sabbatsrus van die Vierde Gebod. Vir Calvyn, kom die geestelike onderhouding van die Sabbatsrus van die Vierde Gebod meer as enigiets anders, neer op die **doding van die ou mens**.

Daarom sal daar vir Calvyn nooit weer vir die Kerk 'n Sabbat-**dag** te onderhou wees nie, en sal die Sabbat van van ouds, in ewigheid nooit oorgedra of vervang word, of kán word, deur enige ander dag nie. Want dit sou bygelowigheid wees, wat beteken dat die geloof nie in die gedane en volmaakte werk en vermagting van Jesus Christus in sy opstanding vasgryp nie, maar iets anders

of beters, verwag en op hoop. By Calvyn daarom, is die Sabbatdag afgeskaf, klaar en verby!

Hierdie paragraaf verteenwoordig my agterna-bevindinge van wat ek uit Calvyn geleer het. Dit was nooit my idees voordat ek hom begin bestudeer het nie. Om die waarheid te sê, ek het aanvanklik nie geweet wat om van Calvyn te maak nie, en het hom uiters verwarrend en self verward, gevind. Wat ek uiteindelik toe moes agterkom, kon ek ook nooit by enigiemand anders vind nie. Calvyn moes homself verduidelik. Daarom los ek alles wat ek vóór hierdie skrywe van my oor Calvyn geskrywe het, net so. Dit sal aantoon hoe my ondekkingsreis deur sy geskryfte gestalte verleen het aan hierdie my uiteindelijke bevindinge.

Ek sluit egter hierdie paragraaf ook aan die begin in, sodat dit deur as rigtingaanwyser te dien, die leser sal help om Calvyn reg te verstaan.

1.

'Een Uit Sewe', OF, "Die Sewende Dag Sabbat"?

Johannes Calvyn word op groot skaal misbruik as die alfa en omega om Sondag-aanbidding te verdedig.

'n Goeie voorbeeld van sulke misbruik is Prof. FJM Potgieter in sy *'vlugskrif', 'Sondag - hoe ons dit onderhou?'* N G Kerk-Uitgewers, 1982

Let op die titel, *'Sondag - hoe ons dit onderhou?'* Nie: *'Sondag - moet ons dit onderhou?'* nie! En, let wel, "Hierdie is 'n uittreksel uit 'n wetenskaplik verantwoorde en gedokumenteerde brosjure. Dit is op versoek van die uitgewer gemaak. ..."

Geteken FJM Potgieter Stellenbosch, Mei 1982.

Skryf Potgieter,

"In sy kommentaar op Genesis het hy (Calvyn) dit - soos ons reeds weet - oor die skeppingsordinansie, en daar sê hy duidelik dat alle mense tot aan die einde van die wêreld een uit sewe dae moet rus. ..."

Hier is Calvyn se kommentaar,

"Tog het ek geen twyfel nie dat Moses, deurdat hy die woord "geheilig" byvoeg, dit wat hy gesê het onverwylid wou verduidelik, en so is alle dubbelsinnigheid uit die weg geruim, want die tweede woord (geheilig) is verklarend van die eerste (geseën). Want hulle woord kadesj het vir die Hebreërs die betekenis, om van die gewone aantal te skei. God seën daarom die Sewende Dag as Hy dit deurlugtige dag verklaar, sodat dit deur besondere wetmatigheid van die res onderskei mag wees."

Dit is wat Potgieter "een uit sewe dae" noem, bedoelende enige ander dag 'van die gewone aantal', nié 'van die gewone aantal' ge-skei of ge-onderskei nie, maar met 'die gewone aantal' gelykgestel . . . asseblief tog net nie die Sewende nie, en, sonder keuse, die Eerste! Een uit sewe dae . . . hoe ver kan mens gaan voor sy gewete hom inhaal?

Calvyn gaan egter verder,

"Ek het hierbo gesê dat ses dae met die skepping van die wêreld in beslag geneem was; nie dat God – vir wie een oomblik soos duisend jaar is – hierdie tydsopvolging nodig gehad het nie, maar dat Hy óns in die inagneming van sy werke mag betrek het. Hy het daarmee dieselfde doel in die oog gehad as met die bepaling van sy eie rus, want Hy het één dag uit die origes uitgekies vir hierdie enige nuttigheid. Daarom, is daardie seëning niks anders as die plegtige wyding waarmee God die oorpeinsing en beoefening van die mens op die Sewende Dag vir Homself toeëien / opeis nie."

Dit is wat Potgieter sê, hoe "alle mense tot aan die einde van die wêreld een uit sewe dae moet rus". ("... gaan dit oor die bevel om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus", bls. 6.)

Calvyn het nóg meer te sê,

"Hierdie is inderdaad die geskikte bedrywigheid van ons hele lewe, waarin die mens homself daaglik behoort te verdiep, om die oneindige goedheid, geregtigheid, krag en wysheid van God te oorpeins."

Hiermee sê of bedoel Calvyn geensins "die oorpeinsing en beoefening van die mens ("mense") op die Sewende Dag", moet deur sy "daaglikse" beoefening uitgeskakel, of daarmee vervang, word nie. Hy sê maar net die Sabbatsbeginsel van die Vierde Gebod en Skeppingsabbat is diepgrondige geloofsbeginsel, en daarom die Christen-gelowige se plig, nie net om op die Sabbatdag skielik uit vergetelheid opgediep te word nie, maar om dwarsdeur sy lewe voorop gestel te bly.

Mens is sekerlik daarom vergun om by wat Calvyn sê, te voeg, dat dit ook op God self slaan,

"God het daarom nie met sy werk van die skepping van die wêreld opgehou alvorens Hy dit in elke onderdeel voltooi het nie, sodat niks sou ontbreek tot die geskikte oorvloedigheid daarvan nie."

Vir my beteken dit dat God hierdie skeppingswerk van Hom – alhoewel reeds in die skepping van die wêreld – éérs en oorspronklik in die vleeswording, lyding, dood en opstanding van Jesus Christus, voltooi het, maar veral – én alhoewel uiteindelik, éérstens en oorspronklik – in sy opstanding.

"En God het op die Sewende Dag gerus."

'n Entjie verder,

"Daarom is Christus se uitspraak waaragtig, dat die Vader en ook Hyself, van die begin af gewerk het en steeds werk, want, as God sy hand net effentjies sou onttrek, sou alles dadelik verderf en tot niet gaan, soos in Psalm 104:9 duidelik gestel word: "n Grens het U gestel waaroor hulle nie mag gaan nie". Gewis word God na regte erken as die Skepper van hemel en aarde alleenlik terwyl hulle voortdurende bewaring en behoud aan Hom toegeskryf word. ... Maar om die betekenis duideliker te maak, verstaan dat die laaste aanraking van God gemaak was sodat niks sou ontbreek tot die vervolmaking van die wêreld nie. Dit is dan ook die betekenis van Moses se woorde, "van al sy werk wat Hy gemaak het", want hy dui die werklike toestand van sy werk aan soos God dit wou gehad het, asof Hy sou gesê het, Toe was alles voltooi wat God tot (of) in Homself voorgeneem het."

Die kern van wat Calvyn skryf is uiteraard en vanselfsprekend waar en moontlik, alleenlik in en deur Jesus Christus, en dan uiteindelik in en deur die opstanding van Hom uit die dode waar en moontlik, sodat die Sewende Dag van God se skeppingswerk alreeds in die Skeppingsverhaal in Hom alleen, en in sy Opstanding uit die dood alleen, betekenis verkry. "Toe was alles voltooi wat God tot Homself voorgeneem het." Hierdie betekenis is voltooiingbetekenis, heiligingbetekenis, die ware-rus-van-God-betekenis. Uit alle seën van God vervat in Jesus Christus, het die Sewende Dag ontvang omdat uit die wil van God, na sy ewige voorneme en verbondsraad en besluit. Dit "geld", net, "vir die Volk van God", vir die Volk, net van GóD, en net, "die Sabbat".

"Een uit sewe dae moet rus" ... is alles behalwe "die plegtige wyding waarmee God die oorpeinsing en beoefening van die mens op die Sewende Dag vir Homself opeis". (Daar is geen plek vir die hedonisme in die Christelike toewyding nie.) "Een uit sewe dae moet rus" is bandelose en perkelose behaging van die mens, en bandelose en perkelose verdraaiing van Calvyn. Want,

"In geheel word hierdie taal van Moses toegepas slegs om uit te druk die vervolmaking van die wêreld se samestelling en werking; en daarom darf ons nie aflei dat God só opgehou het met sy werke as om hulle te laat vaar nie."

Hoe anders, ja, hoe anders vir GóD, as deur Jesus Christus, as deur sy opstanding uit die dood?

"... En God het op die Sewende Dag van al sy werke gerus ..."

"3. . . sy (God se) seëning beteken somtyds die guns wat Hy op sy Volk uitgiet, soos wat die Hebreërs daardie mens die geseënde van God noem wat deur 'n sekere uitsonderlike guns, voor God met mag beklee word, sien Genesis 24:31, "Gaan u in, geseënde van God". So

mag ons vry wees om die dag deur Hom in liefde omhels as geseënd te beskrywe, opdat die uitnemendheid en waardigheid van sy werke daarin / daarop eerbiedig / gevier mag word".

(Ek het nog nooit 'n Sabbatarier só oor die Sabbat hoor praat nie.)

Ja, ons lees Calvyn, en onmiskienbaar hoe hy die Genesis Skrifuur met die Efesiërs 1:19 Skrifuur, verklarend vereenselwig. Dit is Calvyn se kommentaar op Genesis 2, en pertinent op die woord "geheilig", soos pertinent toegepas op die Sewende Dag van die week, wat Moses in Exodus, pertinent, "die Sabbat van die HERE jou God", noem.

Ek staan op my kop Potgieter het nooit Calvyn se kommentaar self gelees nie. Had ek geld, sou ek sedes opsyskuif en dit daarop verwed, allerdings het Prof. Potgieter, sedes opsygeskuif, besluit om nie sy reputasie, op die spel te plaas nie.

"Op stuk van sake koester ek geen twyfel nie, dat Moses, deur die woord "geheilig" te gebruik, onverwyl wou verduidelik wat hy gesê het, en so word enige dubbelsinnigheid uit die weg geruim, want die tweede woord "geheilig" is eksegeties / verduidelikend van die eerste woord "geseën ..." en verder soos hierbo, "Want hulle woord kadesj het vir die Hebreërs die betekenis, om van die gewone aantal te skei. God seën daarom die Sewende Dag as Hy dit deurlugtige dag verklaar, sodat dit deur besondere wetmatigheid van die res onderskei mag wees."

Ek moet nou eers verskoning vra dat ek Prof. Potgieter aan die begin verkeerd aangehaal het. Ek het hom oorgeskrif as sou hy geskryf het,

"In sy kommentaar op Genesis het hy (Calvyn) dit - soos ons reeds weet - oor die skeppingsordinansie, en daar sê hy duidelik dat alle mense tot aan die einde van die wêreld een uit sewe dae moet rus. ..."

Ek het "duidelik", geskryf, in plaas van "uitdruklik". Nou's daar groot verskil tussen "duidelik", en "uitdruklik". "Duidelik", kan beteken dat iets nie "uitdruklik" so geskryf hoef te staan nie, maar dat die iets nogtans, "duidelik" verstaan word uit wat nie "uitdruklik" geskryf staan nie. Dit maak wat Prof. Potgieter beweer "uitdruklik" deur Calvyn "daar (ge)sê" word, net soveel erger. Wat Prof. Potgieter aanvoer Calvyn "daar sê", is nóg "duidelik" afleibaar uit, nóg "uitdruklik" geskrywe "in", Calvyn se "kommentaar op Genesis".

Nou ploeter Prof. Potgieter maar aan om Calvyn so gruwelik falslik by te haal vir sy eie beweringe. Skryf hy voorts,

"Nou word daar beweer dat hy (Calvyn) in sy Institusie 'n bedenklige standpunt inneem, maar dat hy in genoemde kommentaar terugtrek wat hy daar (in sy Institusie) sê. Dit kom egter aan op juiste onderskeiding. In sy verklaring van Gen. 2:3 gaan dit oor die bevel om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus, kragtens die geskiedenis van die mens na die beeld van God. In die Institusie handel hy oor heeltemal 'n ander saak, t.w. die Christelike rusdag - 'n dag wat in die plek van die Joodse Sabbat gekom het."

(Oor die beweerde "heeltemal 'n ander saak", later, veel meer!)

By totale gebrek, nou, aan 'uitdruklikheid' en nóg groter gebrek aan 'duidelikheid' in enige van Potgieter se bewerings van "wat hy (Calvyn) daar" in sy 'Institusie' en "verklaring van Gen. 2:3", "sê", kan óns maar net die volgende opmerk,

Dit is wel só dat Calvyn se Kommentaar oor Genesis 2 se Skeppingsabbatverhaal, ook oor die wetgewing van die Sabbat uit later tye, sou handel. En dit is ook so dat dit vir Calvyn "oor die bevel ... kragtens die geskiedenis van die mens na die beeld van God", sou "gaan" – heel natuurlik! Oor die vele vrae wat ontstaan na aanleiding van Calvyn se 'Institusies' wil ek nie nou praat nie.

Nou gaan dit vir ons egter nie oor Calvyn of dié se 'uitdruklike' uitlatings en duidelike insinuasies "in genoemde kommentaar" nie, maar oor Potgieter, of ons wel by Calvyn vind wat hy, Potgieter, beweer, "uitdruklik", "in genoemde kommentaar", gevind word – ja, of nee, of net 'duidelik' of effens duidelik, "die bevel om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus"? Om die ware toedrag aan die lig te bring kom daarop neer dat ons dit wat ons reeds bespreek het, net so, sou kon herhaal, waarvoor daar geen nodigheid is nie. Want nóg Genesis 2, nóg die Tien Gebooe (op twee plekke) – nóg Calvyn – "sê daar" by wyse van uitdruklikheid of by wyse van duidelikheid, "die bevel" was "om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus". Want dit kom gladnie op die dryfpunt van die Gebooe neer nie.

Veel belangriker en van veel dieper betekenis is die misplasing van die middelpunt van swaartekrag van die Sabbat en van die bevel daarvan in die Sabbatsskeppingsverhaal, én Tien Gebooe, ván, "kragtens die geskiedenis van die mens na die beeld van God", ná, 'kragtens die mens.

In "die bevel om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus", is die mens se arbeid die bepalende faktor. "Om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus", is "die gebooe van mense". Vergete is die grondrede vir "die Sabbat", naamlik dat dit "die Sabbat van Gód" is, die Sabbat "na die beeld van God" dus, dat dit die "Rus'-Sjabbat-van-die-HERE-jou-God" is! As die Woord van God is die Sabbat van die Sewende Dag, God se "bevel" in en deur Jesus Christus! Want Hy is die Beeld van God, "God uit God", soos ons bely.

Maar in "die bevel", "om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus", is die werklike "Gebooe" – die Gebooe van Gód, naamlik, "Op die Sewende Dag moet jy rus" – vergete, heeltemal op die agtergrond geskuiwe, geminag asof dit gladnie bestaan nie, asof nooit in en deur Jesus Christus se vervulling daarvan eens vir altyd bevestig nie; word dit nie in ag geneem nie, maar versmaai. 'Ná ses dae van (jou) arbeid moet jy rus', is die **gebooe** van mense, die **dag** van die **mens** se rus, van die **mens** se **werke**, wat niks maar niks het om daarop aanspraak te kan maak dat dit die Gebooe van God, van God se arbeid, van God se rus, en van God se beeltenis, is nie. "Op die Sewende Dag moet jy rus", nié, 'Ná ses dae van (jou) arbeid moet jy rus' nie. "Die bevel om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus", maak die arbeid van God, tot niks, maak sy bereiking, voltooiing en rus in Christus Jesus, tot niks!

"Die bevel", "Op die Sewende Dag moet jy rus", maak egter die arbeid van Gód, en "ál die werke van God", die bepalende faktor, "kragtens die geskiedenis" daarvan deur God naamlik, en deur God naamlik om Christus Jesus ontwil. "Kragtens die geskiedenis" van die mens deur die God van die Sabbat dan! Alles daaromtrent en daarbinne is bepaal, bepaald en bepalend: "Die Sewende Dag", g'n "Ná ses dae van (jou) arbeid moet jy rus" nie. Alles daaromtrent en daarbinne is bepaal, bepaald, en bepalend: "Die Sewende Dag", KRAGTENS, die opstanding van die Here Jesus uit die dood ter wille van die mens – dit is wat "kragtens die geskiedenis" beteken!

Die KRAG van dit alles, is Jesus Christus die Woord van God **in sy opstanding** uit die dood.

"Die Sabbat is gemaak" deur drie dinge:

Dit is die Sewende Dag van God se skepping, maar van Sy skeppingsmag, skeppingsdaad en skeppingsrus; En dit is die dag 'gemaak' deur Wetgewing van God: "Op die Sewende Dag móét, jy rus, moet jy rus, moet jy rus; óp, die Sewende Dag, op dié, Sewende Dag, op die Sewende Dag, op die Sewende Dag". Dis wat wetgewing met die onderwerp van wetgewing maak: dit spesifiseer en vermenigvuldig nakoming- en / of oortredingsmoontlikhede!

'Geestelikheid' vervaag nie die Gebod nie, maar verskerp dit en skerp dit in.

Dan en vernaamlik, "is die Sabbat gemaak" volgens die wóórd en dáádswoord, van die Woord self, *kragtens*, naamlik, die opstanding van Hom uit die dood, waardeur '*geskopenheid*', nie ten gronde gaan nie, maar van vernietiging gered word. Dan nie óók, "óp, die Séwende, Dag", nie? Waarvan praat ons dan, waarvan praat God dan, as nie óók, "óp, die Séwende, Dag", nie?

Die Sabbat en die Sabbatswet van God, reik na beide kante – na die kant van God, en, na die kant van die mens; dit is dus Christosentries. Daarteenoor is "die bevel om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus", antroposentries en egosentries – 'humanisties' – want dit begin én eindig by die mens, by die arbeidsvermoë van die mens, en by die rus-vermagting van die mens – én, by sy aanmatiging.

Hoe kragteloos, leeg en ydel dan die mensebevel "om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus" – dis net so kragteloos, leeg, ydel en verwerplik as die mens se arbeid en vervulling as offer van geregtigheid aan God opgedring. Die 'bevel' "om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus" weerspréék die groot saak waaraan Calvyn homself getrou bewys het, naamlik die vrye, soewereine, uitverkiesende genade van God. (Dit was hierdie wedersyds uitsluitende teenstrydigheid tussen uitverkiesing en Sondagheiliging wat my tot ander insigte gedwing het, tot die besef van die wedersydse aanvullendheid tussen die uitverkiesing van God en sy uitverkore Sabbatdag.)

Hier moet darem onthou word: dit gaan oor Calvyn volgens Potgieter! As Calvyn sou gepraat het van "om ná ses dae van arbeid te rus" – of nader aan wat hy wél gesê het, "een uit sewe (dae) rus" – kan hy nie verskoon word nie. Dit moet egter nie vergeet word nie, dat dit nie ál was wat Calvyn sou gesê het nie, soos ons reeds gesien het en gedurigdeur wéér sal sien. Wat dit wel in hierdie bespreking aantoon, is dat Potgieter in essensie, ernstig van Calvyn verskil en hom ernstig, skade berokken!

Uiteindelik gaan dit hier oor God se heilige Sabbatdag. Is dit, met inagneming gevra, "Die Sewende Dag die Sabbat van die HERE jou God", of is dit, "Ná ses dae van arbeid" jou eie dag van aanbidding, *viz.*, Sondag, eerbiedig, eer, en vereer?

Het Calvyn geleer wat Potgieter beweer hy geleer het? Die antwoord is, nee, nie in sy kommentaar op Genesis 2:1-3 nie, en ook nie in sy *Institusies van die Christelike Godsdiens* nie. Trouens, nêrens nie.

2.

"Die Opstandingsdag"

Voer Potgieter aan – eintlik konkludeer hy sy paragraaf (óór bladsye 11 en 12), met:

"En daarmee bedoel hy dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word."

Potgieter se woord "daarmee" interesseer ons eers.

"En daarmee bedoel hy..." "Hy" is natuurlik Calvyn, en "daarmee", speel toe op wat Calvyn, volgens Potgieter, in hierdie paragraaf van Potgieter, sou gesê het. Dit is noodsaaklik om van hierdie dinge seker te maak, want Potgieter plaas net hiér, sy ganse betoog vir die Sondag en téén die Sabbat – veronderstel na aanleiding van Calvyn – op die waarheid al dan nie, van sy verklaring, "En daarmee bedoel hy dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word."

Wáarna dan, verwys Potgieter as hy "En daarmee", skryf? Hoe kry hy dit reg om die afleiding te maak dat Calvyn, "daarmee", "bedoel", "... dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word"?

Ons kan hierdie baie belangrike vraag nie na regte beantwoord alvorens ons agter die kap van die byl van Potgieter se vraag gekom het nie, of sy vraag sal in 'n lugleegte moet hang, en Calvyn se rede, sal uit dieselfde leegheid, gegryp moet word.

'Waarnee' dan, het Calvyn "bedoel dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word"?

Potgieter verskaf 'n langerige aanloop tot hierdie sy gevolgtrekkende "daarmee",

"Waarom verklaar Calvyn dan dat hy dit die kerke nie ten kwade sal dui wat nie aan een uit sewe hou nie? Hy spel dit vir ons uit in die Institusie. Hy (Calvyn) sê, om mee te begin, die Here is nie tevrede met net een dag nie: Hy eis ons hele lewe elke dag op. Begryplikerwys vra hy dan waarom ons dan nie daagliks as gelowiges saamkom nie. En dan roep hy uit: "Was ons maar so bevoorreg!" Maar weens die swakheid van so baie mense sal hulle daarmee nie kan volhou nie. Bowendien wil hy (dis nou Calvyn, nie "die Here" nie) ook

niks meer eis (nadruk Potgieter) as wat die liefdevolle God en Vader van ons vra nie. En daarmee bedoel hy (Calvyn) dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word. Soos ons reeds weet, het die vroeë Christelike kerk dié dag onder die beloofde leiding van die Heilige Gees in die plek van die Joodse Sabbat gestel."

In mees direkte konteks, kom Potgieter se gevolgtrekkende "En daarmee ..." heel onverwags, "... Bowendien wil hy ook niks meer eis as wat die liefdevolle God en Vader van ons vra nie. En daarmee bedoel hy dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word." Dit is gans onmoontlik om verband uit te maak of om aanleiding uit te wys tussen, "Bowendien wil hy ook niks meer eis as wat die liefdevolle God en Vader van ons vra nie...", en, "...En daarmee bedoel hy dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word." Mens sal daarom verder terug moet gaan soek na die ding waarop Potgieter toespeel waar hy skryf, "En daarmee bedoel hy dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word."

Potgieter gee Calvyn aan as sou hy "dit vir ons in die Institusie" "uitspel", "waarom ... hy dit die kerke nie ten kwade sal dui wat nie aan een uit sewe hou nie". Hy sou naamlik "sê, om mee te begin, die Here is nie tevrede met net een dag nie: Hy eis ons hele lewe elke dag op. ...".

Let op Potgieter se aanduidings met "om mee te begin" ... "vra hy dan" ... "En dan roep hy" ... "Bowendien wil hy" ... om uiteidelik uit te kom by, "En daarmee bedoel hy". 'n Reeks van redes – die laaste uit die vorige vloeiende en die vorige tot die volgende aanleidend – waarmee Potgieter wil aantoon wat Calvyn, "daarmee bedoel". Maar Potgieter maak daarop staat (en maak aanspraak op 'n mens se vertroue) dat sy orde dié van Calvyn is.

Laat ons nou eers gaan kyk of dit so is.

Dat "hy dit die kerke nie ten kwade sal dui wat nie aan een uit sewe hou nie", kom ('moontlik') uit 2, 8, 34, lyne 8-10, of ('moontlik') uit lyne 6-7. Potgieter maak Calvyn deurmekaar. Calvyn sê, "Ek sou nie graag die kerke wil veroordeel wat ander plegtige dae vir hulle samekomste het nie" – dis

nou in lyne 8-9. Net vóór dit, skryf hy in lyne 6-7, "Tog lê ek nie soveel klem op die getal ("number", 'nommer') sewe dat ek die kerk sou verplig om dit te onderhou nie."

"Dit te onderhou ...". 'Die getal' of 'nommer' word nie "onderhou" nie. "Dit" is die verwysende voornaamwoord vir die dag aangedui met "die getal sewe" of 'nommer' "sewe" – die 'Joodse' Sewende Dag Sabbat. Waarvan anders kan Calvyn tog praat as van die Gemeentes wat die Sewende Dag Sabbat waargeneem het, in kontras met "die kerk" oor die algemeen "wat ander plegtige dae vir hulle samekomste het", ongetwyfeld Sondae? (Beveridge se vertaling bevat die presiese implikasies.) So ek weet nie waar Potgieter aan sy inligting gekom het nie. Al wat enigiemand, wél hier tussen die lyne kan uitmaak, is dat dit wil voorkom asof Calvyn hom nogal by die Sewende Dag onderhoudende Gemeentes geskaar het!

Hoe dit ookal sy, wat duidelik is, ja 'uitdruklik' 'uitgespel' daar geskrywe staan, is die ómgekeerde volg- én logiese orde van wat Potgieter voorhou.

Potgieter se volgende stilhoupunt: Calvyn sou glo "sê, om mee te begin, die Here is nie tevrede met net een dag nie: Hy eis ons hele lewe elke dag op. ...". Dit vind die leser in 34, lyne 13-14 waar Calvyn skrywe, "Samevattend dus: Soos die waarheid onder 'n afbeelding aan die Jode oorgelewer is, so word dit sonder skaduwees by ons aanbeveel – ten eerste dat ons ons hele lewe lank 'n voortdurende sabbatsrus van ons werke moet bedink." Ook in 31, verder terug, lyne 32-34, skryf Calvyn, "Hierdie waarheid (die volle wese van die waarheid in Christus) is nie by 'n dag inbegrepe nie, maar in die verloop van ons hele lewe ...".

Calvyn se orde is dus nie 'n logiese, konsekwente volgorde nie. Met die eerste sinsnede hier verwys hy terug na die geheel van sy betoog tot dusver, en natuurlik sal wat hy in 31 lyne 32-34 geskrywe het, voorop in sy gedagtes wees waar hy feitlik dieselfde gedagte en woorde in 34 lyne 13-14 herhaal.

Nou die volgende gedagte van Calvyn, wat – volgens Potgieter – "begryplikerwys" voortvloei uit wat hy vooraf gestel het,

"Begryplikerwys vra hy dan waarom ons dan nie daaglik as gelowiges saamkom nie." Dit vind ons in 32, lyne 27-28,

"Jy sal miskien sê: "Waarom kom ons dan nie liever elke dag bymekaar om sodoende die onderskeid tussen die dae uit die weg te ruim nie?" Was dit ons tog maar gegun! ("roep Calvyn uit")".

"Begryplikerwys vra hy dan ..."

Dit veronderstel en vereis direkte, logiese aanleiding – 'n onmiddellike gevolgtrekking gebaseer op die begryp van die verband tussen minstens twee sake. Potgieter beweer Calvyn vra hierdie vraag – van 32, lyne 27-28 – na aanleiding van wat hy in 31 lyne 32-34 / 34 lyne 13-14 verklaar het. (Die feit dat Calvyn iemand anders veronderstel as vraer, maak nie juis saak nie.) Maar tussen elke twee teksplase, lê daar minstens een hele paragraaf, wat die begripsgang onderbreek, en direkte aanleiding en verband, omtrent onmoontlik maak. Dit kom neer op die ou en beproefde truuk om uit onsamehangende en onverwante feite en waarhede, 'n leuen saam te flans. Dit word 'verdraaiing' genoem.

Moet nou nie vergeet wat Potgieter se oogmerk met sy gedagterangskikking is nie. Hy wil uitkom by wat Calvyn "in die Institusie" "vir ons" gaan "uitspel" hy "daarmee bedoel", naamlik: "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word". (Wat Potgieter "daarmee", en terselfdertyd, klaar besluit het, Sondag bewys is.) Hou dit in gedagte!

Gaan Potgieter voort, "En dan roep hy uit: "Was ons maar so bevoorreg!" Maar weens die swakheid van so baie mense sal hulle daarmee nie kan volhou nie. Bowendien wil hy ook niks meer eis" (nadruk Potgieter) as wat die liefdevolle God en Vader van ons vra nie. En daarmee bedoel hy dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word."

Die leser sal die volgende in 32 lyne 29-35 vind:

"Was dit ons tog maar gegun! Ons geestelike wysheid verdien in elk geval dat 'n deeltjie van elke dag daarvoor afgeknypt word. As ons dit as gevolg van die swakheid van baie mense nie (eers) kan regkry dat ons elke dag saamkom nie, en die liefdesreël ook nie toelaat dat ons meer van hulle eis nie, waarom sou ons dan nie ..." en die res wil ek vir net hierna hou.

Die verskille tussen Calvyn en Potgieter is hierso almal versoenbaar. Ek kan ook graag Potgieter se gevolgtrekking aanvaar én onderskryf, dat Calvyn (soos inderdaad "die liefdevolle God en Vader" self) "bedoel", "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word." Maar **NIE** op grond daarvan dat Calvyn "daarmee", dit wil sê, met behulp van dié dinge deur Potgieter aangevoer deur Calvyn sou gesê of duidelik gemaak sou gewees het nie! Natuurlik is dit ook onmoontlik om op sterkte van hierdie, Potgieter se beweerde redes van Calvyn, te aanvaar dat Sondag daardie uitverkore dag van die opstanding van die Here sou gewees het.

Nou maar "Waarom verklaar Calvyn dan dat hy dit die kerke nie ten kwade sal dui wat nie aan een uit sewe hou nie? Hy spel dit vir ons uit in die Institusie", skryf Potgieter. "Hy (Calvyn) sê, om mee te begin, die Here is nie tevrede met net een dag nie ..." ensovoorts.

Dis een saak om die kerke nie ten kwade te dui nie; dis 'n ander saak om hulle in hulle ongehoorsaamheid te verskoon deur die blaam voor die deur van God te gaan lê, en te sê, hulle "hou nie aan een uit sewe nie", want "om mee te begin, die Here is nie tevrede met net een dag nie: Hy eis ons hele lewe elke dag op".

"Begrypenderwys" se voet! Calvyn simpatiseer nie met ongehoorsaamheid onder die naam van "swakheid van so baie mense" nie. Maar wag, ek dink Potgieter het tog reg hier, want dit is eintlik wat Calvyn doen. Maar dan is hulle altwee, Potgieter én Calvyn, ewe verkeerd, want menslike swakheid was nog nooit die rede waarom "die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word", of dit nou Sondag of Saterdag kon wees, of nie.

Met "daarmee", verwys Potgieter dus **terug** na hierdie vraag van hom, "Waarom verklaar Calvyn ...?" En ons sien, heel vrugtelos!

Waarna dan – na wat van enige waarde argumentshalwe – verwys Potgieter as hy die gevolgtrekking maak: "En daarmee bedoel hy ...?" Die enigste moontlikheid is, na die Vierde Gebooe, die Sabbatsgebod, en wat "die Here", daarin "eis", want dit is tog hierdie Wet wat Calvyn op hierdie plek, in sy Institusie, bespreek. Eerstens.

Dan ook, wanneer die liefdevolle God en Vader van ons "vra", is dit tog dieselfde as wanneer Hy van ons "eis". Calvyn sê dus dieselfde, ook Calvyn, "vra", en "eis". Dit – vra, eis, beveel (die "bevel" waarvan ons netnou net gepraat het) – beteken klinkklaar dat dit die Here se Gebooe is, en dit, onweerspreklik, impliseer die Vierde Gebod Sabbatdag as van ons gevra, geëis, ons beveel, as die enigste ding "waarmee" Potgieter se gevolgtrekking sin uitmaak.

"Daarmee" dan – **met die Wet** – "bedoel hy (Calvyn, die Here, en, les bes, Potgieter) dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word".

Niks anders nie.

Hierdie ontleding maak ál Potgieter se opmerkings vóór sy konkluderende woorde, "En daarmee", irrelevant. Nie één van sy redenasies vóór hierdie woorde van hom in hierdie paragraaf van hom, het iets te make met waarmee Calvyn (of die Here) dit sou wou aantoon "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word" nie. Met ander woorde, "ook niks meer" van wat Potgieter "bowendien" aandui, verduidelik waarmee Calvyn sou wou "bedoel ... dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word" nie, "ook niks meer" as dit "waarmee die liefdevolle God en Vader van ons vra", of "eis" nie, niks meer – of minder – as die Wet van God nie.

Dit wil sê, ons hoef nie nou te gaan probeer vasstel waarom Calvyn verklaar dat hy dit die kerke nie ten kwade sal dui wat nie aan een uit sewe hou nie, omdat dit nie dit is waarmee hy bedoel "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word" nie.

Ons hoef nie te probeer vasstel waarom hy dit vir ons in die Institusie sou uitspel nie, omdat dit nie dit is waarmee hy bedoel "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word" nie.

Ons hoef nie te probeer vasstel hoekom Calvyn sou sê, die Here is nie tevrede met net een dag nie, want dit sê nie waarmee hy sou bedoel het "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word" nie.

Ons hoef ook nie nou uit te vind hoekom Calvyn gesê het die Here eis ons hele lewe elke dag op nie, want dit verduidelik nie "waarmee hy bedoel dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word" nie.

Of hoekom Calvyn "begryplikerwys" vra waarom ons dan nie daagliks saamkom nie, want dit verduidelik ook nie waarmee hy bedoel het "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word" nie,

Ook wanneer Calvyn uitroep: "Was ons maar so bevoorreg!" hoef ons nie te probeer om te bepaal wat dit te doen het met waarmee hy bedoel, "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag"

gevier moet word" nie, want dit gee geen inligting in verband met, of rigting aan, die vraag, Wat bedoel Potgieter met die woord "Daarmee?" nie.

"Was ons maar so bevoorreg" om daagliks as gelowiges saam te kom! Maar nou is ons nie, en moet ons "as gelowiges" maar eenmaal tevrede wees met net "een uit sewe dae" "ons hele lewe" lank, "elke dag". En God moet daarvoor geblameer word dat Hy ons die onwaardiger Gebod gegee het. Calvyn se verskoning namens God van "die swakheid van so baie mense", dat hulle "daarmee nie (sal) kan volhou nie", is flou en inkriminerend. Natuurlik veronderstel ek dat Calvyn self nie bewus was van die implikasies van sy beter idee en swakste van verskonings nie. Want gaan lees mens elders in sy *Institusies*, val dit voor lank op dat Calvyn so nimmer as te nooit die mens se swakheid as verskoning of versagting sou aanvaar om die Gebooie te ongehoorsaam. Die veronderstelling dat God die mens nie met 'n beter Gebod tegemoet gekom het nie, bly egter 'n refleksie op die regverdigheid van God. As Calvyn "daarmee" dat "so baie mense weens swakheid nie met daaglikse samekomste sal kan volhou" nie, "bedoel het" dat "daardeur die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word", sou dit sekerlik een van die swakste argumente gewees het, en niemand sal op grond daarvan, die geheel van sy werk wil beoordeel nie. Daarom moet ons Potgieter se verwysing na Calvyn in hierdie verband, verwerp, geheel en al, en as van géén nut of betekenis nie.

Uit Potgieter se hele paragraaf tot hier, was ons instaat om net één iets positiefs uit te wys waarmee Calvyn KON bedoel het, "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word", en dit was die Vierde Gebod, die Sabbatsgebod, wat verklaar, "DIE SEWENDE DAG, is die Sabbat van die HERE jou God, DAN, mag jy geen werk doen nie ... WANT, op Die Sewende Dag het God VOLTTOOI, AL die werke wat HY tot stand gebring het, en op die Sewende Dag, het HY, van AL, SY werke wat HY vermag het om te doen, GERUS"! Dit alleen, was ons in staat, om in Calvyn volgens Potgieter, te gevind het, dit, waarmee, Calvyn bedoel HET, "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word".

Vriende en broers en susters in ons Ouer Broer, ons Here Jesus Christus, let op!

Nou wil ek, hier 'n verklaring maak, dat ek, vir sover Potgieter op die Wet toespeel met sy woord "daarmee", dat ek

volkome met hom saamstem, dat die Here self inderdaad, en nie maar net Calvyn nie, maar die Here self, uit, in, en met sy Sabbatsgebod en Sabbatdag, dit vir die gelowige, duidelik maak dat Hy "daarmee", "bedoel", "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word". (U kry hierdie benadering by geen hoofgang Sabbatariërs nie.) Maar hierdie waarheid – Die Waarheid, die Evangelie – spreek uit elke woord van die Vierde Gebod self, sonder dubbelsinnigheid of onduidelikheid vir die geloofsoog, want dit – die aanduiding reeds van die opstanding van ons Here – word vir die geloofsoog óópgemaak om in die Wet gesien en daarin, geglo te word, wanneer dit tog maar net met 'n biddende hart gelees sal word, gedagtig aan Jesus Christus wat, omrede ons oortredinge van ook en juis hierdie Gebod, sy lewe vir ons en in ons plek gegee het, om dit vir ons en in ons plek weer op te neem tot die volmaking en rus van al Góð se werke, in besonder God se uitnemendste werk na die krag van sy sterkte wat Hy gewerk het in Christus toe Hy Hom uit die dode opgewek het en verhoog het tot aan die regterhand van God in hemelse sfere, om bekend te maak die grootheid van sy genade en geregtigheid "jeens ons"! Soos Calvyn tereg opmerk, "as God sy hand net effentjies sou onttrek, sou alles dadelik verderf en tot niet gaan"; "hulle voortdurende bewaring en behoud word alleen aan Hom as die Skepper van hemel en aarde toegeskryf"; "die laaste aanraking van God was gemaak sodat niks sou ontbreek tot die vervolmaking van die wêreld nie"; "want hy dui die werklike toestand van sy werk aan soos God dit wou gehad het, asof Hy sou gesê het, Toe was alles voltooi wat God tot (of) in Homself voorgeneem het" – wat die wêreld, verlós, sou wees, en wat daarop neerkom dat, sou Jesus nie uit die dood uit opgestaan het nie, die skepping self nooit die voltooiing daarvan – op die Sewende Dag – sou ontvang het nie, maar in die niet sou verdwyn het.

Potgieter gryp dus nie hier uit die lug nie, maar bou op die fundamente van die Evangelie, as hy verklaar, "En daarmee bedoel hy" Calvyn – maar tereg ook juis God – "dat die opstandingsdag van die Here as Christelike rusdag gevier moet word".

Ek stem daarom hieroor met Potgieter saam, en om dié rede en om geen ander rede nie as juis die opstanding uit die dode van Jesus Christus.

Ek maak egter ten sterkste beswaar dat die Gebod so verkrag, so vertrap en so verag word, as sou dit tot niet gemaak moes word, verander moes word, in onheilige onding in stryd téén Christus en God moes veraard word, téén Sy ewige doel en *bedoeling* daarmee in Christus Jesus in, asof 'n stank en lank nie meer 'n welriekende geur nie, in die neus van die Almagtige. Dat hierdie Wet, die Vierde Gebod en die Sabbat van die Gebod,

waarvan die substansie – waarvan die *bedoeling* "daarmee" – die opstandingsdag aanwys, dat hierdie Wet en Sabbatdag wat die opstandingsdag van Christus aanraak, aanspreek, as't ware in die hart bêre, dat dit, van alle betekenis en skoonheid en deug beroof word met misdadige hand, dat op die opstandingsvervulling wat daarin op die Sewende Dag gewag het, op beslag gelê word en God se laasgebore dag wederregtelik van sy eersgeboortereg – want die laaste sal eerste wees – ontvreem word, dat die uitverkiesingsvoorreg van dié Sabbatdagsgebod en Sabbatdag, aan 'n ménsereg onderhewig en diensbaar gemaak word – dáárteen, híérteen, verset ek my, in my swak en sondig menswees, verset ek my, so wat ek kan. So help my God.

Want al die tyd, "soos ons reeds weet", is die donker *bedoeling* van Potgieter, die Sondag, en dat "dié dag, onder die leiding van die Heilige Gees in die plek van die Joodse Sabbat gestel" sou wees, en gladnie die *beloofde* dag – die Sabbat van die Verbondsbelofte – wat "die vroeë Christelike kerk", die Apostoliese Kerk (ook volgens Calvyn), ontvang, behou, gevier, geëerbiedig en bewaar het nie, naamlik, nie die Sewende Dag van die Sabbatsgebod nie, maar Sondag, die dag van Christelike verwording en -waan! Vreeslose waan, want vir hierdie dogma word die Heilige Gees van God op die getuiebank gebring, in kettings, en agteraf afgedreig, om valslik te getuig téén die ware Sabbat en Dag van die Here, en vir die onskuldige, maar deur mensehande vervalsde, besoodelde en bedorwe Eerste Dag van die reine skepping van God. Nie net een nie, maar twee dae *kragtens die skeppingsorde* van God, word oenteer! En uiteindelik word van God die Almagtige 'n voorwerp in die hande die mens gemaak, soos van klei, om aan die mens in onderdanigheid en diensbaarheid onderwerp te word in ondergrondse skemas. Dit is waarop verdediging vir klaer, Sondagsheliging, voor die regterstoel van mense, op neerkom. En die regbank sal bly konkel en nooit rus nie, totdat "Joodse" verweerder lewenslank in hoogste sekuriteit gekry het, of nog beter, in strafkampeonde veras is.

Aldus, as Potgieter se woorde, "En daarmee bedoel hy", vórentoe in sy paragraaf (bladsy 11/12) slaan, as sy woord "daarmee", slaan op, "... Soos ons reeds weet, het die vroeë Christelike kerk dié dag (Sondag) onder die beloofde leiding van die Heilige Gees in die plek van die Joodse Sabbat gestel."

"... het die vroeë Christelike kerk dié dag (Sondag) onder die beloofde leiding van die Heilige Gees in die plek van die Joodse Sabbat gestel."

Potgieter doen vyf dinge meteens oneer aan: die vroeë Christelike Kerk, die Beloftes van God, die Heilige Gees, die Joodse volk, en, die Sabbat van die HERE jou God. Daarmee doen hy dan sommer ook die Here van die Sabbat, wat Christus Jesus is, oneer aan – alles met een enkel leuen. Of hy dit so bedoel het? Maar natuurlik nie! Verskuldig ek myself dan daaraan dat ek die man oordeel en veroordeel – valslik? Nee, as ek sê, 'Potgieter' bedoel ek hierdie boekie en hier waar ek hier blaai en lees in hom; dit is 'Potgieter'. Oor Potgieter die skrywer van 'Potgieter' se saak met God, sal God oordeel. Maar wat hierso geskryf staan, is 'n teologiese boereverneukery wat nie vanself in die letters, woorde en sinne ingeklim het nie en sigself weer en weer onder die oog plaas oor bladsye heen nie. So gaan dit altyd met Sondag en sy alibis, nie net met Potgieter nie. Sondag is die lewendige en verantwoordelike leuen wat soos 'n suurdeeg geen afdeling van die Christelike Kerkliggaam ongeïnfilteerd laat nie. Die rede is eenvoudig: Daar bestaan nie so-iets as die Kerk sonder die aanbiddingsdag nie. Kap jy die kop af, kap jy die liggaam af. Kerk-wees en aanbiddingsdag-wees is een en dieselfde. Die aanbiddingsdag kan nie wees nie of die Kerk laat hom wees; die Kerk kan nie wees nie of hy doen presies dieselfde – hy laat die aanbiddingsdag wees. Waar die hoof lei, daar volg die liggaam. Die vraag is net, Lei die hoof ons, die Kerk, in die waarheid – in "alle waarheid", dit wil sê, in net die waarheid, wanneer hy ons in Sondagsheiliging lei? Watter hoof is dit dan wat ons so in die leuen lei, en die Waarheid laat versmaai?

Ek kan nie oor die Bybelonderwerp en ekklesiologiese aktualiteit, aanbiddingsdag, en aanbiddingsdagviering, skryf nie, of ek is voor die Here van die Sabbat onder verpligting om jou voor die bepaalde uitnodiging, smeking, uitdaging en waarskuwing te stel: "Kies vandag wie julle wil dien!" óf die Hoof van die Kerk wat aanspraak maak: "Ek is die waarheid, die lig en die lewe, wat julle in die waarheid en in die hele waarheid lei", óf "Ek is die plaasvervanger van God op aarde wat mag bekom het om tye en wet te verander".

Dit gaan hier oor wat Calvin, (volgens Potgieter) betreffende die aanbiddingsdag leer. Ek haal Potgieter dan verder aan, sonder om eers nog in te gaan op sy laasvermelde aanspraak.

"Die Christelike Kerk kan dus op enige dag hulle byeenkomste hou of selfs op meer dae per week vergader – as die lidmate daarvoor kans sien. ..."

Ja, dit is wat Calvin leer – net nie so eenvoudig en uitgemaak nie. Vir Calvin is die kwessie oor die aanbiddingsdag altyd ongemaklik en asof dit selfs seermaak – altyd behoorlik 'n kwessie. Hy glo in sy Kerk en het hom baie lief, en word daardeur as't ware verplig om sy Kerk se aanbiddingsdag te probeer regverdig. Calvin se ongemaklikheid is te verstane soos wanneer mens die onmoontlike moontlik wil maak. As voorbeeld van die ongemak waarmee Calvin Sondag wil goedpraat, hierdie opmerking van hom:

"Die mense van die ou tyd het egter nie die dag wat ons die dag van die Here noem, sonder oorleg in die plek van die Sabbat gestel nie." Darem nie "sonder oorleg" nie! Nou "noem ons" maar die dag wat "in die plek van die Sabbat gestel" was, maar "die dag van die Here", want dit is wat die ou Sabbat tog wesenlik was!

Vir Potgieter is dit egter asof Calvin dit feitlik katagories stel dat die Sondag die Christelike Sabbat geword het!

Mens sien dit baie, hoe leners roekeloos met andersmansgoed te kere gaan. Hulle maak net so met 'die Kerkvaders' van 'die vroeë Kerk'. En dis 'n oor en weer gelenery van mekaar sonder einde met elke keer 'n stukkie waarheid weg en 'n 'pirate'-onderdeel in sy plek! Dis nou wanneer dit by Sondagheiliging kom, veral.

"... Maar uit die aard van die saak is dit beter as die hele Christendom dieselfde dag vier. ..."

So maklik! Mens kan met Potgieter saamstem daarvoor dat Calvin leer dat dit ... uit die aard van die saak beter sou wees as die hele Christendom dieselfde dag sou aanwend vir die redes en doeleindes deur Calvin genoem. Maar nou word dit sommer dat "die hele Christendom dieselfde dag vier"! Was ek blind dat ek nie eenkeer gelees het dat Calvin "vier" geskrywe het nie? Om te "vier" is darem heel iets anders as die stroewe werklikheid waarvoor Calvin die Sondag nodig ag!

En was ek blind dat ek nie eenkeer gelees het dat Paulus in Kol.2:16-17, "Joodse", geskrywe het nie? Om die "Joodse Sabbat" te "vier" is darem heel iets anders as die **Christelike viering** – "betreffende die ete en drinke van fees(vieringe) van die Sabbat" – waarvoor Paulus in Kol.2:16 in die bresse tree!

"... (O)mdat sekere onrustige geeste vandag oor die dag van die Here oproer veroorsaak. ... (is) my antwoord dat ons die dae sonder die Jodedom onderhou omdat ons in hierdie opsig ver van die Jode verskil. Ons huldig die dag immers nie met nougesette eerbiedsbetoon as 'n seremonie (nie) ... maar ons neem dit aan ('aanvaar dit' – presies soos

wat Calvyn dit maar moes aanvaar) as 'n noodsaaklike middel om die orde in die kerk te behou. Maar Paulus ... vrees ... dat hy tevergeefs onder die Galasiërs gearbei het, omdat hulle tot nog toe dae onderhou het. ..."

Wat 'n kontras met die situasie in Kolossensiërs! Daar is geen ooreenkoms tussen die twee Skrifure nie, want "die apostel skrywe" in Kolossensiërs (31 lyne 28-29) "dat die sabbat 'n skaduwee van die toekomstige dinge was en dat die liggaam in Christus is". "Die liggaam" is die Gemeente wat, 'al Sabbatvierende' 'deur niemand veroordeel darf word nie' want dit is 'wat dit aanbetref', "in Christus"! Daarom "leer Paulus ons dan dat niemand die Christene moet veroordeel omdat hulle die sabbat onderhou nie, want dit is net 'n skaduwee van die toekomstige dinge", 33 lyne 10-12. Calvyn sê dit net nadat hy geskrywe het, "Ons huldig die dag immers nie met nougesette eerbiedsbetoon as 'n seremonie, asof ons sou reken dat daardeur 'n geestelike geheimenis afgebeeld word nie, maar ons neem dit (die Sabbat) aan as 'n noodsaaklike middel om die orde in die kerk te behou". Sodat niemand hom kan vergis nie, gaan Calvyn, nádat hy, **met beaming**, na Kolossensiërs verwys het, nou, in teenstelling daarmee, aan, en verklaar na aanleiding van sowel die Romeine en Galasiërs – maar veral, volgens hom, die Galasiërs – en vra, "Maar wie kan, met uitsondering van daardie waansinniges, nie sien watter onderhouding die apostel (in Kolossensiërs) bedoel nie? (naamlik hulle onderhouding van die Sabbatdag – lyne 10-11) ... Aangesien hulle (almal, die Galasiërs, die Romeine, sowel as die Kolossensiërs) egter die (Sabbat)dae as skaduwees van die geestelike dinge behou het, het hulle in elk geval (of 'noggans', Beveridge, "in so far") die heerlikheid van Christus en die lig van die evangelie, verduister."

Calvyn betwis geen oomblik die feit dat die Sewende Dag Sabbat onder **alle** Christene "behou" was nie. Hy kontrasteer egter twee **maniere** van 'onderhouding' daarvan, die een, volgens Calvyn aanvaarbaar – en volgens ons mening, onaanvaarbaar – en die ander, volgens Calvyn onaanvaarbaar – maar volgens ons mening, die enigste een aanvaarbaar. Hier is die twee maniere van Sabbatsonderhouding – van die Sewende Dag – soos Calvyn hulle teenoor mekaar stel:

"Ons huldig die dag immers nie met nougesette eerbiedsbetoon as 'n seremonie, asof ons sou reken dat daardeur 'n geestelike geheimenis afgebeeld word nie, maar ons neem dit aan as 'n noodsaaklike middel om die orde in die Kerk te behou", 33 lyne 7-10. Paulus "verklaar in sy brief aan die Romeine dat dit bygelowig is as iemand die een dag bo die ander ag", of, as – volgens Calvyn altans – "die dae as skaduwees van die geestelike dinge behou" sou word. In teenstelling hiermee moet, volgens Calvyn, "die staatsregtelike

doelstelling en die kerklike orde in aanmerking geneem" word as die Sabbat waarlik of dan korrek 'onderhou' sou wees.

Maak nie saak hoe nie – volgens Calvyn reg, of, volgens Calvyn, verkeerd, nie – dit was die Sewende Dag Sabbat wat – **volgens Calvyn** – in Paulus se leeftyd deur "die Christene", "onderhou was", en op geen wyse hoé ookal, die Eerste Dag van die week "wat ons (vandag) die dag van die Here noem" nie.

33 lyne 15 tot 18, "... En hy verklaar in sy brief aan die Romeine dat dit bygelowig is as iemand die een dag bo die ander ag. Maar wie kan, met uitsondering van daardie waansinniges, nie sien watter onderhouding die apostel bedoel nie? Want hulle het nie die staatsregtelike doelstelling en die kerklike orde in aanmerking geneem nie. (Soos Calvyn 'n paar lyne vroeër daarna verwys het, "maar ons neem dit aan as 'n noodsaaklike middel om die orde in die kerk te behou".) Aangesien hulle egter die dae as skaduwees van die geestelike dinge behou het (Calvyn se enigste klag teen die Kolossensiërs se onderhouding van die Sabbat), het hulle in elk geval die heerlikheid van Christus en die lig van die evangelie verduister. (Vir watter rede, kan ek gladnie sien nie!) Hulle het nie van hulle handewerk gerus omdat dit 'n afbeelding van hulle heilige oefeninge en oordenkinge sou wees nie, maar as gevolg van 'n sekere gewetenswroeging omdat hulle hulle verbeel het dat hulle deur te rus die geheimenisse wat in die vroeë tye aanbeveel is, in ere herstel. (Wat natuurlik heeltemal Calvyn se eie opinie is, en gladnie uit Paulus se skrywe afleibaar nie!) Ek herhaal: die apostel vererg hom oor hierdie voorbarige onderskeid tussen dae en nie oor die regmatige keuse van 'n dag om die vrede van die Christengemeenskap te dien nie. Want juis vir hierdie doel is die sabbat in die kerke wat deur hom ingestel is, behou. Hy bepaal trouens daardie dag vir die Korintiërs om bydraes te versamel ter verligting van hulle broeders in Jerusalem. As 'n mens bygeloof vrees, was daar nog meer gevaar in die Joodse feesdae as in die Sondae wat die Christene tans het. Want die godsdienstige dag wat die Jode onderhou het, is afgeskaf omdat dit (die 'afskaffing') gedien het om die bygeloof te vernietig; maar omdat dit (nodig was dat) die welvoeglikheid, die orde en die vrede in die kerk ... behou moes word, is 'n ander dag vir die doel bestem" (uit volkome eiewilligheid van die Kerk).

34. Die mense van die ou tyd het egter nie die dag wat ons die dag van die Here noem, sonder oorleg in die plek van die Sabbat gestel nie. Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie ware rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, word die Christene juis op die dag waarop die skaduwees geëindig het (die sabbat van ouds), vermaan om nie aan 'n afgeskadude seremonie

verknog te bly nie. Tog lê ek nie soveel klem op die getal sewe dat ek die kerk sou verplig om dit (die dag van "die getal sewe") te onderhou nie. Want ek sou nie graag die kerke wil veroordeel wat ander plegtige dae (as die dag van "die getal sewe") vir hulle samekomste het nie, so lank as wat hulle hulle van bygeloof onthou. Dit sal wel gebeur as die dae ("Sondae") slegs aangewend word om die tug en goeie orde te behou.

Samevattend dus: ... dat ons almal saam die regmatige orde van die kerk moet onderhou wat ingestel is om na die Woord te luister, die sakramente te bedien, en almal saam te bid

Terwyl die valse profete aangevoer het dat slegs die seremoniële in hierdie gebod (... "die waardering" van die sewende dag) afgeskaf is, maar dat die sedelike in die gebod nog van krag is, naamlik die onderhouding van een dag per week. ... Want dan bly daar vir ons in die dag dieselfde betekenis van verborgenheid as wat onder die Jode plaasgevind het. ... Die mense wat nog aan hulle instellings bly kleef, oortref die Jode drie maal in hulle growwe vleeslike bygelowigheid in verband met die rusdag. ... Ons moet ... aan die algemene leer vashou, naamlik dat ons ons heilige byeenkomste naarstiglik moet onderhou en dat ons aan die uitwendige hulpmiddele wat bydra om die diens van God te bevorder (soos die uitwendige onderhouding van die "Sondae"), aandag moet gee om te verhoed dat die godsdienste onder ons in duie stort of verslap."

Dit is dan na aanleiding waarvan Potgieter sy weg oop sien om te kan verklaar dat Calvyn sou geleer het dat dit uit die aard van die saak beter is as die hele Christendom dieselfde dag – Sondag – vier. Ek bedoel met die klem op "vier". Dit sal veel beter verduidelik wat dit beteken om die Christelike aanbiddingsdag te "vier", as mens Calvyn in Paragraaf 2,8 gaan lees waar hy van die Sabbat Sewende Dag, skryf! Dit is egter presies Calvyn se bedoeling met sy betoog in geheel in hierdie paragraaf 2, 8, dat hy wil wys hoedat die Sondae **nié** deur die Christelike Geloof 'onderhou' of 'gevier' word of moet word vir "geestelike" redes nie, of vir "n geestelike geheimenis", of vir 'n "betekenis van verborgenheid" daarin nie – wat dit wél vir Calvyn in die geval met die Sabbat van die Vierde Gebod was, en ook in die geval van die apostoliese Gemeentes! (Volgens Calvyn dan foutiewelik, die geval was.)

Van die vele enigmas in Calvyn se sieninge betreffende die Vierde Gebod Sabbat, is dit die grootste dat, volgens hom, die "geestelike" en "ewige" voordele en voortreflikhede, oogmerke en funksies van die Sewende Dag Sabbat, ná die koms van Christus (weereens vir hom), "bygeloof" geword het, veral as die Kerk dit op die 'Sondag' / 'dag van die Here', wil gaan toepas. Vergelyk 2, 8, 32

en 33 om hierdie teenstrydigheid duidelik waar te neem. Ek het dit reeds elders, asook hierbo, in nader besonderheid aangetoon.

Uiteindelik, volgens Calvyn, "vier" die Christen géén dag nie; "ons neem dit" slegs "aan" en 'gebruik' dit "as 'n noodsaaklike middel om die orde in die kerk te behou". 'Die sabbat', is "afgeskaf", of dit nou – volgens Calvyn – die Sabbat-Sewende Dag is, óf, 'die sabbat'-Sondag. Sondag word of is deur die Kerk "aangeneem" as "staatsregtelike" maatreël vir doeleindes alles behalwe sulke doelstellings as wat vir die 'ou' Sabbat gegeld het.

Calviniste se doelbewuste gebruik van die benaming "Sabbat" vir Sondag, juis as sou hulle dit op sterkte van hul Calvinistiese oortuigings doen, is geheel en al kunsmatig en vals. Dit sou in Calvyn se oë 'n onding gewees het – wat dit, trouens, is!

Vir my is dit asof ons die Here in die gesig uitdaag deur die enigste 'Dag van die Here', die Sewende Dag Sabbat, te versmaai, terwyl ons hierdie eerbare naam – eerbaar daarin dat die Dag van hierdie Naam, die Naam van sy Here dra – aan 'n dag toedig waaraan die Here dit nooit en op geen manier, belooft of oorgedra het nie. Want al sou ons nog Calvyn gehad het om ons daarin te sterk, gaan hierdie valse gebruik direk in téén die Woord van God. Maar nou het ons géénsins eers die goedkeuring of opdrag of voorbeeld van ons geliefde hervormer om Sondag die "Sabbat" te noem nie. (Andere gaan weer tot die ander uiterste en vermy die benaming "Sabbat" geheel en al, en praat van 'die rus' as sou dit niks met enige dag te doen gehad het nie. Sien James R. Hughes se weergawe van die Vierde Gebod waar hy Calvyn se Preek oor Deuteronomium 5 vertaal het. Ook Potgieter hier, waar hy van "die rus" skrywe in plaas van 'die Sabbat'.)

8.5.1.2.3.

“Die doel en vervulling van daardie rus wat **die sabbat** van ouds afgeskadu het”

Bls. 9b: “Daar moet op gelet word dat volgens Calvyn die vierde gebod nie net seremonieel is nie. Daar is ook blywende elemente: eerstens, die handhawing van ’n ordelike kerklike lewe.”

Potgieter kon nie hier na 28 verwys nie, want daar is “die handhawing van ’n ordelike kerklike lewe” nie “eerstens” nie, maar, tweedens. In 32 egter, pas Calvyn die volgorde toe soos wat Potgieter dit hier aangee. Hier verklaar Calvyn, Die twee aspekte van die Sabbatsgebod wat “nie onder die skaduwees van ouds gereken moet word nie ... pas alle tye trouens ewe veel. Al is die sabbat afgeskaf, het dit selfs nou nog ’n plek onder ons. Die doel daarvan is dat ons op vasgestelde dae bymekaar moet kom om na die Woord te luister, nagmaal te gebruik en in die openbaar te bid. Verder dien dit ook om aan ons bediendes en werkers rus van hulle arbeid te verleen. Daar kan geen twyfel daaroor bestaan dat die Here by die gebod van die sabbat in albei aspekte ’n belang gehad het nie. Die eerste aspek alleen lewer reeds in die gebruik van die Jode oorvloedige getuienis daarvan. In Deuteronomium het Moses die tweede met die volgende woorde aangedui: “Sodat jou dienskeneg en jou diensmaagd kan rus soos jy. Dink daaraan dat jy self in Egipteland ’n slaaf was” ... Wie sou ontken dat albei hierdie aspekte ons net soveel as die Jode betaam?”

Ons sien bogenoemde direkte self-weerspreking, “Al is die sabbat afgeskaf, het dit selfs nou nog ’n plek onder ons” oor en wil eers die verband en konteks soos in Calvyn, mooi uitmaak. Ons sien Potgieter se verwysing na die “blywende elemente: eerstens, die handhawing van ’n ordelike kerklike lewe”, het hy uit 28 gaan haal. Dit volg dan dat Potgieter se woorde, “Vir ons as Christene is dit van net soveel belang as vir Israel vanouds dat daar vaste tye vir eredienste moet wees”, sal ooreenstem met Calvyn se woorde: “... Wie sou ontken dat albei hierdie aspekte ons net soveel as die Jode betaam?”, en ook met: “Daar kan geen twyfel daaroor bestaan dat die Here by die gebod van die sabbat in albei aspekte ’n belang gehad het nie.” Van watter dag praat die Here deurgaans? Van die Sondag? Nee. Hy praat van die Sewende dag Sabbat. Praat die Here hier van die Opstandingsdag? By implikasie, ja! Watter dag behoort daarom ver wag te word sal die Christelike Vierdag wees? Natuurlik die Sabbat Sewende Dag!

“... Vir ons as Christene is dit van net soveel belang as vir Israel vanouds dat daar vaste tye vir eredienste moet wees. (Paulus beklemtoon dat alles gepas en ordelik moet geskied (1Kor.14:40).) Calvyn skryf in dié verband in die Institusie, boek 2, dat indien daar nie so ’n ordereëling is nie, “’n onmiddellike verwarring en verwoesting die kerk sou bedreig”.”

Potgieter gaan haal die gedagte “dat indien daar nie so ’n ordereëling is nie, “’n onmiddellike verwarring en verwoesting die kerk sou bedreig””, net verder in 32. Calvyn vervolg in hierdie paragraaf: “Wie sou kon ontken dat **albei** hierdie aspekte ons net soveel as die Jode betaam? Die Woord van God beveel ons om kerklike byeenkomste te hou, en die noodsaaklikheid daarvan is uit ons lewenservaring bekend genoeg. Hoe kan sulke vergaderings gehou word as daar nie dae daarvoor vasgestel en bestem is nie?...” Ons sien Calvyn kom tot feitlik dieselfde gevolgtrekking as wat ons nou net gemaak het; watter dag behoort daarom ver wag te word sal die Christelike Vierdag wees?

“... Tweedens moet daar ’n rusdag vir werksmense wees. Hulle het daar immers net soveel reg op en behoefte aan as van ouds. Só word die skeppingsordonansie nagekom. Die verband tussen die skeppingsgebeure en die vierde gebod blyk duidelik uit die bewoording van die gebod in Ex.20:8-11: “Gedenk die sabbatdag dat jy dit heilig. Ses dae moet jy arbei en al jou werk doen; maar die sewende dag is die sabbat van die HERE jou God; dan mag jy geen werk doen nie ... Want in ses dae het die HERE die hemel en die aarde gemaak, die see en alles wat daarin is, en op die sewende dag het Hy gerus. Daarom het die HERE die sabbatdag geseën en dit geheilig.” Dit was daarom ook die aangewese weg om die Christelike rusdag by die skeppingsordonansie te laat aansluit. ...”

Dit is wat Potgieter gevolgtrekking maak. Weereens die vraag na aanleiding van presies en elke ding waaruit hy hier gevolgtrekking uit maak: Van watter dag praat die Here deurgaans? Van die Sondag? Nee. Hy praat van die Sewende Dag Sabbat. Praat die Here hier van die Opstandingsdag? By implikasie, ja! Watter dag behoort daarom ver wag te word sal die Christelike Vierdag wees? Natuurlik die Sabbat Sewende Dag! “Dit was daarom ook die

aangewese weg om die Christelike rusdag by die skeppings-ordonansie te laat aansluit. ..." Moenie my verkwalik nie! Gaan kyk ook na C. Bouwman se kritiek teen Calvyn se siening van die Vierde Gebod (ek haal hom aan onder Calvyn se Preke oor Deuteronomium 5).

So ver het Potgieter by Calvyn se volgorde gehou – en ons ook – en so sou albei van ons tot die gevolgtrekking moes gekom het dat die dag wat daarom verwag behoort te word om die Christelike Vierdag te wees, natuurlikerwys die Sewende Dag Sabbat sal wees!

"... In sy klassieke werk, die Institusie, stel Calvyn sy standpunt in verband met die Christelike rusdag. Hy sê o.m.: "Dit was nie sonder rede dat die vroeë Christene wat ons die dag van die Here noem, in die plek van die Sabbat gestel het nie..."

Nou spring Potgieter sommer óór die belangrike res van 32 en regoor 33, na 34, want hy het gesien hy praat homself al hoe vaster uit 32! Verklaar hy:

"Dit was nie sonder rede dat die vroeë Christene wat ons die dag van die Here noem, in die plek van die Sabbat gestel het nie."

Die Calvynnavorsingsentrum van Potchefstroom se drie vertalers gee hierdie sin aan met: "Die mense van die ou tyd het egter nie die dag wat ons die dag van die Here noem, sonder oorleg in die plek van die sabbat gestel nie." Beveridge se Engelse vertaling lees: "It was not, however, without a reason that the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath." Ek verkies eersgenoemde vertaling, want dit lyk vir my meer na die ware Calvyn. "Die mense van die ou tyd" is ondubbelsinnig Christene van ná die totstandkoming van die Nuwe Testament; met ander woorde, "Die mense van die ou tyd" was nie die Apostoliese Kerk nie, was nie "die vroeë Christene" nie, maar was meesal afgedwaaldes van seker eers hier in die vierde eeu!

Hulle "rede" kon daarom enigiets behalwe die Skrifte of die lewe en leer van Jesus Christus of die Apostels gewees het. "Rede", is ook iets heel anders as "oorleg", en "oorleg" – sinodes en keiserlike en pouslike edikte en sulke dinge – was juis die modus operandi waarmee die Sabbat met Sondag vervang was. So, hulle mag dit met "oorleg" vermag het, maar vir mense wat Bybel vir "rede" vra, was hulle "instel" van "wat ons die dag van die Here noem" "in die plek van die Sabbat", betekenisloos en verwaand, om die minste te sê.

"... Want die opstanding van die Here was die eindpunt en vervulling van die ware rus, waarvan die ou Sabbat die afskaduwing was. Daarom word Christene deur dié dag gewaarsku om nie aan die skaduagtige seremonies te bly vashou nie."

Hiermee stem die Potchefstroom vertaling een honderd persent ooreen, "Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, word die Christene juis op die dag waarop die skaduwees geëindig het, vermaan om nie aan 'n afgeskadude seremonie verknog te bly nie. Tog lê ek nie soveel klem op die getal sewe dat ek die kerk sou verplig om dit te onderhou nie..."

Weereens praat Calvyn van en na aanleiding van maar één dag, en dié, die enigste daar deur hom vermeld asook geimpliseer, naamlik die Sewende Dag Sabbat – waarvan hy deurgaans praat en wat hy deurgaans veronderstel.

"... Hy lê hierop groot nadruk en beroep hom daarvoor op Kol.2:16 en 17:"

Onthou waarop "hierop" slaan: dit wat nounet uitgewys is, dat: "die doel en vervulling van daardie rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is". Calvyn "... lê hierop groot nadruk en beroep hom daarvoor op Kol.2:16 en 17:"

Onthou: Ons het Calvyn gevolg waar hy in 34 geskrywe het wat ons hier in Potgieter, te lees vind – altans, te lees vind tot by ... "Daarom word Christene deur dié dag gewaarsku om nie aan die skaduagtige seremonies te bly vashou nie".

Net hier misgis Potgieter hom deeglik met Calvyn – soos met die Skriftuur Kolossensiërs 2:16. Want Calvyn verwys gladnie op hierdie plek na hierdie Skriftuur nie. U moet na Kolossensiërs 2:16 gaan soek in 33 en indirek in 31. In 31 skrywe Calvyn: "Want Hy is self die waarheid, en met sy teenwoordigheid verdwyn alle afbeeldinge; by die aanskouing van sy liggaam word die afskaduwings agterweë gelaat. Ek herhaal: Hy self is die ware vervulling van die sabbat. Toe ons deur die doop met Hom begrawe is, is ons in die gemeenskap met sy dood ingelyf, sodat ons as deelgenote in sy opstanding in 'n nuwe lewe kan wandel. Daarom skrywe die apostel elders dat die sabbat 'n afskaduwing van die toekomstige dinge was en dat die liggaam in Christus is. Dit beteken dat die volle wese van die waarheid wat hy daar goed verduidelik het, in Christus is. Hierdie waarheid is nie in 'n dag inbegrepe nie maar in die hele verloop van ons lewe totdat ons onself volkome afgesterwe het en met die lewe van God"

vervul word. 'n Bygelowige onderhouding van sekere dae hoort dus nie by Christene nie."

Of mens met Calvyn saamstem of nie, wat hy skrywe, kom in ewigheid nie neer op wat Potgieter aanvoer hy wat Calvyn is, leer nie. Veël eerder – as mens dit stryd met Calvyn 'n dag moet uitsonder wat aan sy kriteria hierso sou beantwoord het – sou jy die Sabbat moes uitsonder, want dis al dag waarvan hy hier praat en al dag wat hy hier in gedagte het en al dag wat hy hier bedoel!

Trouens, 'n groter versameling van drogredes sal mens beswaarlik teëkom as Potgieter op hierdie bladsy 10 van hom. Ek wil nie nou ingaan op die gruwelike en onbeskaamde versmading van Gods Woord vir sover dit Kol.2:16-17 aangaan nie – sien Boek 4/2, 'Paul'. Ek wil graag dat ons gaan kyk met hoeveel respek of veragting Potgieter met **Calvyn** omgaan.

Potgieter haal Kolossensiërs 2:16-17 heeltemal buite die verband en buite die konteks waarin Calvyn dit aanwend, aan. Dit is vergryp nommer een, want dit skep valse indrukke en verwagtinge.

Vergryp nommer twee is die 'vertaling' van hierdie Skriftuur as sodanig waarin elke valse indruk en elke valse verwagting wat by die leser geskep wil word, reeds ingebou is: "Daarom moet julle nie dat iemand vir julle voorskrywe ... dat julle die jaarlikse feeste of die nuwemaansfees of die sabbatdag moet vier nie. Dit is alles maar net die skaduwee van wat sou kom; die werklikheid is Christus."

Daar wag 'n oordeel.

Maar Potgieter se derde en fataalste vergryp is eerder sy onvermoë om Calvyn se sienswyse van hierdie Skriftuur te snap. Dit sal duidelik blyk uit Calvyn se tweede toepassing daarvan in 33: "... Ons huldig die dag immers nie met nougesette eerbiedsbetoon as 'n seremonie, asof ons sou reken dat daardeur 'n geestelike geheimenis afgebeeld word nie, (met ander woorde, ons huldig die dag nie asof dit die Sabbat is nie) maar ons neem dit aan as 'n noodsaaklike middel om die orde in die kerk te behou. Maar Paulus leer ons dan dat niemand die Christene moet veroordeel omdat hulle die sabbat onderhou nie, want dit is net 'n skaduwee van die toekomstige dinge. ..." Beveridge vertaal: "Paul informs us that Christians are not to be judged in respect of (the Sabbath's) observance". Simpson se vertaling is daarom reg, "niemand (moet) die Christene veroordeel omdat hulle die sabbat onderhou nie".

Iemand wat nie die verskille tussen Potgieter se passasie en Calvyn s'n kan sien nie, wil dit nie sien of insien nie. Potgieter gaan van die **vooruitspraak** uit dis buite die kwessie dat Christene

hulle aan die Sabbat of die onderhouding daarvan, sou steur – niemand moet hulle "voorskryf om die sabbat te vier nie". Calvyn egter, gaan van die **gevolgtrekking** uit dat Christene van die Apostoliese tydvak die Sabbat onderhou het, en dat niemand hulle hierin durf oordeel of veroordeel nie – "Want juis vir hierdie doel is die sabbat in die kerke wat deur hom (Paulus) ingestel is, behou" ("Hierdie doel" was "om die vrede van die Christengemeenskap te dien")., 34, lyne 27-29.

Net om te bevestig, hier is hoe Calvyn verder aangaan in dieselfde paragraaf 33 (Ek gee weer beide vertalings om enige twyfel uit die weg te ruim):

"It was, I say, against this preposterous observance of days that the Apostle inveighs, and not against that legitimate selection which is subservient to the peace of Christian society. For in the churches established by him, this was the use for which the Sabbath was retained. He tells the Corinthians to set the first Sabbath (nie "first day" nie; "daardie dag" in Simpson, dit is, die "Sabbat" wat "behou" was.) apart for collecting contributions for the relief of their brethren at Jerusalem (1Cor.16:2)."

"Ek herhaal, die apostel vererg hom oor hierdie voorbarige onderskeid tussen dae en nie oor die regmatige keuse van 'n dag om die vrede van die Christengemeenskap te dien nie. Want juis vir hierdie doel is die sabbat in die kerke wat deur hom ingestel is, behou. Hy bepaal trouens daardie dag vir die Korintiërs om bydraes te versamel ter verligting van hulle broeders in Jerusalem."

Dit dien hier net op 'n paar teenstellings in die twee vertalings te wys.

Beveridge: "preposterous observance of days";

Simpson: "voorbarige onderskeid tussen dae".

Simpson is hier verkeerd, en Beveridge is reg, omdat die eerste gedeelte van 33 baie goed verduidelik wát – volgens Calvyn – die "voorbarige onderhouding van dae" behels het: "onderskeid tussen dae", het geensins deel van die "onderhouding" soos hy dit daar beskrywe, uitgemaak nie. Wat (in 33 se laaste helfte) ná Christus vir Calvyn "voorbarige waarneming van dae" is, is (in die eerste helfte van 33 en in 32) vóór Christus, vir hom "eerbiedsbetoon", is vir hom die "gehoorsaam" van die "geestelike" "aspekte" van die Vierde Gebod "wat die wil van God ons ople".

Ook is "onderskeid tussen dae" nie in 32 die onderwerp nie, maar wel die manier en betekenis van "waarneming", en dan van die "waarneming van" die Sabbatdag.

Die onderwerp in 33a is **hoe** die Christelike "onderhouding", "van die Jode verskil" – nié hoe "dae" van mekaar, "onderskei" sou gewees het nie.

Nog 'n verskil:

Beveridge: "set the first day apart";

Simpson: "bepaal daardie dag" – duidelik verwysend na die so pas vermelde Sabbatdag. Beveridge is hier dus verkeerd, en Simpson weer reg.

Simpson se "bepaal daardie dag" klop ook met Calvyn se konsekwente en konstante interpretasie van die Griekse woord sábbaton / sabbátohn vir die Sewende Dag Sabbat – nooit vir 'week' nie – en dus nooit vir 'die Eerste Dag van die week' nie'. Calvyn verstaan "die eerste Sabbat" in Kolossensiers 2:16-17, in Handeling 20:7, en ook in tekse soos Johannes 20:19, Markus 16:1, Lukas 24:1, Matteus 28:1, Johannes 20:1. Calvyn kan op géén manier met die gewone manier asof hierdie verse van die Eerste Dag van die week praat, versoen word nie. Sien veral sy 'Harmonie' n.a.v. Mt.28:1.

Ek sê nie Calvyn is reg nie – ek sê hy is verkeerd hierin; nogtans kan hy nie gebruik word – of misbruik word – om Sondagwaarneming kammig uit sulke Skrifte te regverdig nie. Calvyn is 'n verleentheid vir Sondag-argumentasies; of liever, Sondagargumenteerders is 'n verleentheid vir Calvyn – hy sou sy kop in skaamte vir hulle laat sak het.

Eers sê Potgieter, "Dit was daarom ook die aangewese weg om die Christelike rusdag by die skeppingsordonansie te laat aansluit."

Hoe op aarde die Skrifte oor die Sabbat as "skeppingsordonansie" by Sondag kan uitkom, sal net Potgieter verstaan. Dan gaan hy nog aan om Paulus aan te haal waar dié – volgens Potgieter se gebruik van die 'vertaling' ('NAB') wat – Christene "voorskryf" om nie "die sabbatdag te vier" nie. Potgieter sê nogal Paulus "lê groot klem daarop"! Maar net vóór dit, haal hy Calvyn (kwansuis) aan: "Want die opstanding van die Here was die eindpunt en vervulling van die ware rus, waarvan die ou sabbat die afskaduwing was". (34 lyne 4-6) Sedert wanneer was die Eerste Dag "die afskaduwing ... van die ware rus"? Goed, Potgieter sê dit nie; waarvoor plaas hy dan hierdie aanhaling reg tussen Calvyn se twee opmerkings oor die Sabbatdag? Volgens plasing – konteks – hoort hierdie betekenis tog sekerlik tot die Sabbatdag en nie tot die Eerste Dag nie? Hoe wil Potgieter die Eerste Dag dan met Calvyn se verklarings bevoordeel of motiveer? Omdat die Opstanding daar "in" sou lê en hy die Opstanding vir die Eerste Dag wil opeis!

Maar laat ons bietjie Potgieter se 'aanhaling' hier op bls 10, lyne 14-19, van naderby beskou. Die Potchefstroom-vertaling gee

hierdie lyne uit 34, lyne 3 verder, aan: "Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie ware rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, word die Christene juis op die dag waarop die skaduwees geëindig het, vermaan om nie aan 'n afgeskadude seremonie verkog te bly nie." In lyne 32-34 van 33, verklaar Calvyn: "Want die godsdienstige dag wat die Jode onderhou het, is afgekaf omdat dit (die 'afskaffing' van die Sabbat dus) gedien het om die bygeloof te vernietig". Dit is nie die Eerste Dag nie, maar die Sabbatdag wat hierdie 'vermaning' inhou, al doen die Sabbatdag dit deur sy 'afskaffing'. Dit is nie die funksie of die betekenis of 'vermaning' van die Kerk se Eerste Dag-'dag van die Here' nie!

"Die afskaduwing" behoort tot "die ou sabbat": "waarvan die ou sabbat die afskaduwing was". Dit is natuurlik waar. Maar kyk nou hoe word die Sabbat – deur Potgieter – beroof van die betekenis wat Calvyn daaraan gegee het: "Die sabbat", skryf Calvyn naamlik, het "die doel en vervulling van daardie ware rus" "afgeskadu". Maar Potgieter skryf, "die eindpunt en vervulling van die ware rus", "was", "die opstanding van die Here"! Die Sabbat geniet geensins by Potgieter die betekenisvolle diens wat Calvyn daarvoor voorbehou het nie – wat hy juis in die 'afskaffing' daarvan, daarvoor voorbehou het nie! Potgieter moes Calvyn doelbewus só verdraai het, want om te sê, "Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie ware rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is", is om die Sabbat en die Opstanding direk en onafskeibaar met mekaar te verbind – juis wat Potgieter om die dood vermy.

Wat Calvyn skryf is so goed as om te sê 'die Opstanding was in die Sabbat – eenvoudig net wat hy deurgaans in ander gedeeltes van hom van mening was die geval was. Met Calvyn se interpretasie van die woord 'sabbat' in die Nuwe Testament, dui dit altyd 'n Sabbat aan, en veral in die sogenaamde "Eerste Dag" tekse, die Sewende Dag Sabbat. Potgieter se woorde verrekening gladnie hierdie – by Calvyn konsekwente – feit nie, maar gee op enige onjuiste en onware manier voor die opstanding van die Here is in die Eerste Dag.

Samevattend: Potgieter – nié Calvyn nie – bedoel:

Want die opstanding van die Here op die Eerste Dag was die eindpunt en vervulling van die ware rus, waarvan die ou Sabbat net maar die verbygaande afskaduwing was. Daarom word die Christene deur dié dag – die Eerste Dag – gewaarsku om nie aan die skaduagtige seremonies – die ou Sabbat – te bly vashou nie.

Daarenteen bedoel, én sê, Calvyn:

"Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie rus wat **die sabbat** van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, word die Christene juis op **dié dag waaróp die skaduwees geëindig het** (die Sabbat, die dag wat sowel "**die opstanding van die Here afgeskadu het**", en waar-"in" "**die opstanding van die Here is**") **vermaan om nie aan'n afgeskadude seremonie verknog te bly nie.**"

Die implikasie sal natuurlik ook geld dat wanneer 'die Christene' 'verknog bly aan' die Eerste Dag-'dag van die Here' as "'n afgeskadude seremonie" – **asof dit** die dag sou wees wat "die opstanding van die Here afgeskadu het", en **asof dit** die dag sou wees waar-"in" "die opstanding van die Here is" – dat hulle presies **teén** Calvyn se bedoeling en 'vermaning' in, sou optree en tot vandag toe inderdaad bly optree!

(Sien ook, 'Calvin, Deuteronomy', 'Calvyn Sabbat Sondag', 'Calvin Bouwman', 'Calvin James Chrystie'.)

Twee dinge is onweerspreeklike feit:

Een: dat Calvyn geensins daarop aanspraak maak dat die Opstanding op die Eerste Dag gebeur het nie;

Twee: dat die Opstanding nooit vir hom heiligende betekenis vir die Eerste Dag inhou nie.

Dit is presies net die teenoorgestelde van wat Potgieter voorgee.

Vir Calvyn om "'n dag vas te stel" en dan wel die Eerste Dag-'dag van die Here' "te bepaal", beteken dit is die besluit van die Kerk, en dan vir die redes en doeleindes soos herhaaldelik deur Calvyn uitgelê, te wete, om die Woord te verneem, vir "die orde" ens.. Ek kan daarom katagories verklaar, Calvyn in weerwil van die 'geestelike' al dan 'godsdienstige' aard van die benaming 'dag van die Here', baseer nóóit die Kerk se "bepaling" daarvan op 'geestelike' al dan 'godsdienstige' gronde nie. Dit is vir my ook onseker in watter gevalle in al die edisies en **veral vertalings**, die gebruik van die benaming 'dag van die Here', wel eg is, of bloot die vertalers se weergawe. In elke geval – in elk geval – is Calvyn se bedoeling met 'geestelik' of 'godsdienstig', die 'ordelike', 'praktiese', 'siviele', 'staatsregtelike', "rede" – **alles behalwe** 'geestelik' of 'godsdienstig' as sou dit 'Skriftuurlik' of selfs net 'teologies' wees dat die Eerste Dag daardeur 'geheilig' sou wees!

Wie hierdie voorbehoude by die verstaan van Calvyn nie insien of wil aanvaar nie, wil eenvoudig om eie bedekte agenda, dit nie insien of aanvaar nie. Wie Calvyn nie in sy gekompliseerdheid wil begryp nie, en hom immer wil óórvereenvoudig, is óf te lui, óf te oneerlik en bang, om hom met moeite reg te probeer verstaan. Ek praat vanselfsprekend spesifiek vir sover dit die Sabbatsvraagstuk by Calvyn aangaan, want hy verskaf die Kerk geen gerusstelling vir sover dit sy Sondag aangaan nie. As Potgieter of wie ookal agter die

deur staan, moet hy nie protesteer as hy daar betrap word nie. G'n mens moet daarop aanspraak waag dat sy bevindinge aangaande Calvyn "wetenskaplik verantwoord" en "gedokumenteerd" is terwyl gewoon onjuis, slordig en nalatig nie. Hy sal hom verseker vasloop. Dit geld sekerlik ook vir myself. Op skool was dit gereeld strafpunte teen my dat my werk slordig en nalatig was. Dalk is dit nog so. Miskien vind iemand dit eendag ten spyte die moeite werd om my werk na te gaan, aantekeninge te maak en punte toe te ken of af te trek. Tot dan, staan ek by wat ek hier konstateer.

Volgens Potgieter dan, "lê" Calvyn "hierop", veronderstel die Opstanding veronderstel op die Eerste Dag, "groot nadruk en beroep hy hom daarvoor op Kol.2:16 en 17".

"Hierop", en "daarom", sê Potgieter, word die Christene gewaarsku om nie aan die skaduagtige seremonies – veronderstel die Sabbatdag 'van ouds' – te bly vashou nie.

Dit beweer Potgieter, terwyl Calvyn, verklaar (klem CGE):

"Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie rus wat **die sabbat** van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, word die Christene juis op **dié dag waaróp die skaduwees geëindig het, vermaan om nie aan'n afgeskadude seremonie verknog te bly nie**". Met "afgeskadude seremonie" bedoel Calvyn duidelik juis die Christene van sy eie tyd

se Sondagonderhouding op "verwaande" gronde van godsdienstigheid. **Hy kla dus die Christene van sy eie tyd aan** van godsdienstige gedweep met die **Eerste** Dag-'dag van die Here'. Ek wonder hoe hy vandag daarteen te velde sou getrek het! Ja, ek glo met die swaard van die Woord en skoene van ywer vir die Evangelie van vrede.

Ons het so ver, twee gedeeltetjies uit Potgieter na aanleiding van Calvyn, nagegaan, en nogal baie daarvoor moes sê, ongelukkig omtrent alles negatief. Omdat ek haastig is – baie haastig – want ek weet nie hoeveel tyd die Here my nog op hierdie aarde gaan vergun nie – onderbreek ek eers hierdie skrywe, en wil ek dit, net so, aan Lux Verbi vir publikasie voorlê. Of hulle dit gaan aanvaar is natuurlik hoogs te betwyfel – dit vertel mos nie wat Sondaghouders graag wil hoor nie. Nogtans waag ek dit hier en nou met die bede dat die Here my daarin sal bystaan.

Die Here seën u uit hemelhowe waar ons Here uit opstanding uit die dode aan die regterhand van die Almagtige verhewe "vir ons intree" "terwyl die belofte om sy rus in te gaan nog standhou", "want ons het deelgenote van Christus geword". "Daarom bly daar 'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag oor vir die Volk van God."

Sien my bestudering van 'Preek 34' in afsonderlike brosjure.

8.5.1.2.4.

“Die Uitnemendheid Wat die Rus Versinnebeeld”

In Calvyn se ‘*Harmonie*’ van die Sinoptici verklaar hy – en dwarsdeur sy lewe en dwarsdeur al sy geskifte bly hy daarby –, (Ek haal die Engels aan sodat niemand kan sê ek het met my eie vertaling geïnterpreteer nie.)

“Now in the evening of the Sabbaths, which began to dawn towards the first of the Sabbaths, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulcher. (Voetnota: “Ou, au bout du Sabbaths, comme le jour apparoissoit pour luire pour le premier de la semaine;”--“or, at the end of the Sabbath, as the day began to dawn for the first of the week.”)

And on the first day of the Sabbaths, very early in the morning, they came to the tomb, carrying the spices which they had prepared, and some women with them. And very early in the morning of the first day of the Sabbaths, they come to the tomb at the rising of the sun. (Voetnota: “Le soleil estant ja levé; ou, commençant à se lever, ou, n’estant encore levé;”--“the sun having already risen; or beginning to rise, or not having yet risen.”)

We now come to the closing scene of our redemption. For the lively assurance of our reconciliation with God arises from Christ having come from hell as the conqueror of death, in order to show that he had the power of a new life at his disposal. Justly, therefore, does Paul say that there will be no gospel, and that the hope of salvation will be vain and fruitless, unless we believe that Christ is risen from the dead. (Voetnota: 1Corinthians 15:4. “Quand il avoit predit qu’il ressusciteroit le troisieme jour.”) For then did Christ obtain righteousness for us, and open up our entrance into heaven; and, in short, then was our adoption ratified, when Christ, by rising from the dead, exerted the power of his Spirit, and proved himself to be the Son of God. Now though he manifested his resurrection in a different manner from what the sense of our flesh would have desired, still the method of which he approved ought to be regarded by us also as the best. He went out of the grave without a witness, that the emptiness of the place might be the earliest indication; next, he chose to have it announced to the women by the angels that he was alive; and shortly afterwards he appeared to the women, and, finally, to the apostles, and on various occasions.

Mark 16:1. And when the Sabbath was past. The meaning is the same as in Matthew, in the evening, which began to dawn towards the first day of the Sabbaths, and in Luke, on the first day of the Sabbaths. For while we know that the Jews began to reckon their day from the commencement of the preceding night, everybody understands, that when the Sabbath was past (which is what Mark says), the women resolved among themselves to visit the sepulchre (which is what Matthew says), so as to come there before the dawn of day. The two Evangelists give the name of the first day of the Sabbaths, to that which came first in order between two Sabbaths. Some of the Latin translators have rendered it one, and many have been led into this blunder through ignorance of the Hebrew language; for though (dxa) sometimes means one, and sometimes first, the Evangelists, as in many other passages, have followed the Hebrew idiom, and used the word mi>an, one. (Voetnota: “Et ont ici mis le mot Grec qui signifie Un;”--“and have put here the Greek word which means One.”) But that no one may be led astray by the ambiguity, I have stated their meaning more clearly. As to the purchase of the spices, Luke’s narrative differs, in some respects, from the words of Mark; for Luke says that they returned into the city, and procured spices, and then rested one day, according to the commandment of the law (obviously of the Paschal law, according to Calvin) before pursuing their journey. But Mark, in introducing into the same part of the narrative two different events, attends less accurately than Luke to the distinction of dates; for he blends with their setting out on the journey what had been previously done. In the substance of the fact they perfectly agree, that the women, after having observed the holy rest, left home during the darkness of the night, that they might reach the sepulcher about the break of day.”

[Ek plaas die volgende opmerkings in hakies omdat hierdie lesing nie oor die tyd en dag spesifiek van Jesus se opstanding handel nie.

“In the evening, which began to dawn towards”, Matteus, beteken opsigtelik vir Calvyn die “aandskemer” (van die namiddag), of die einde van dag se “lumier”, of, eenvoudig, die “skyning tot”, en nié die vertalers se “dawn”, of te wel “hanekraai”, die oggendlumier, nie! “Ons weet”, is Calvyn se uitgangspunt, “dat die Jode met die berekening van hulle dag van die aanvang van die voorafgaande nag begin”. Dit is duidelik veral n.a.v. die Franse Voetnota tot Mt.28:1. Dit maak nie saak watter tyd van die oggend Calvyn vir die ánder Skrifte vir sy ‘*Harmonie*’ verstaan het nie, want nie een van hulle gaan oor die Opstandingsgebeurtenis as sodanig nie. Nogtans, Calvyn probeer om al hierdie Skrifte se tye te laat **saamval**, maar met fatale resultate omdat so ‘n poging uit

die staanspoor uit, fatale metodes vereis, die belangrikste waarvan, oorsig van wesenlike feite en verskille, is.

Jesus het "op die derde dag" van die Pasga (Calvyn verwys na 1Cor.15:4) opgestaan, maar óók "In die einde (*"evening"*) van die Sabbat" (Calvyn verwys na Mt.28:1). "Die derde dag" van die Pasga was nie "die Sabbat" van die Pasga nie, maar "die dag ná die Sabbat" van die Pasga (Lv.23:11). Omdat Jesus dan nie op die Pásgasabbat opgestaan het nie, moes Hy, op die wéeklikse Sabbat opgestaan het. In die Voetnota tot Mt.28:1 verklaar die Frans dan ook "*soos die dag geskyn het téén (of "vir") die eerste (dag) van die week*", wat niks anders as "in", en "op", die Sabbatdag kan wees nie. Calvyn laat geen onduidelikheid oor hierdie implikasie en feit nie.

Calvyn vermeld twee verskillende **reise** – die eerste n.a.v. Mt.28:1: 'n "*voorgenome besoek aan die graf*" (*"the women resolved among themselves to visit the epulcher"*); die tweede n.a.v. Mk.16:2-3: die twee Marias én Salome, "*sit hulle reis voort*", "*pursuing their journey*". Daarom plaas hy een dag tussenin – wat natuurlik die Opstandingsabbat was – tussen, **nádat** die Marias die speserye gaan voorberei het (Lk23:54-56), en "**vóór** die voortsetting van hulle reis ... *toe die Sabbat verby was*". Calvyn **fouteer** egter deur te veronderstel dat, "*He (Mark) (less accurately than Luke) blends with their setting out on the journey what had been previously done*", want aldrie die Evangelies is honderd persent akkuraat, en ook Markus, wat nie deur twee stories te verwar van hulle dieselfde storie maak nie, maar juis die volle verhaal van die meer as een verhale, vertel. Ons is self onakkuraat as ons nie tussen die verskillende reise na en besoeke aan die graf onderskei nie, maar uit almal een storie wil saamstel.]]

Ek brei elders uit op Calvyn sy sieninge alhier, en wil nie met hierdie geleentheid verder daarop ingaan nie. Vir ons doeleindes nou wil ek egter net verduidelik dat 'n paar eenvoudige maar belangrike dinge uit Calvyn se '**Harmonie**', duidelik word.

Eerstens, Calvyn sê op geen manier dat Jesus **op die Eerste Dag** van die week opgestaan het nie. Hy assosieer nie eens vër weg, Jesus se opstanding met die Eerste Dag van die week nie.

Tweedens, Calvyn heg geen **waarde** aan die Eerste Dag van die week **weens** Jesus se opstanding nie; nie direk nie, en ook nie eens indirek nie.

Derdens, Volgens die een Franse Voetnota plaas Calvyn die Opstanding op die **weeklikse** Sabbat, die Sewende Dag, vóór "*die*

Eerste Dag van die week". Maar volgens sy eie verduideliking, is Calvyn se bedoeling dat die Opstanding plaasvind op die (eerste) **Pasga**-'Sabbat', "*volgens die Gebod van die Wet*" van die Pasga, die eerste '**Sabbat**' "*in volgorde van twee*" Sabbatte – wat slegs die Pasga se Sabbatte kan veronderstel. Die vroue besoek dan die leë graf op die tweede, van hierdie twee Pasgasabbatte, wat terselfdertyd, "*die eerste van die Sabbatte*" van onvermydelik die Fees van Ongesuurde Brode sou moes gewees het – volgens Calvyn. Calvyn kon skynbaar self nie so mooi uitmaak tussen al die 'Sabbatte' nie – en ons gevolglik ook nie sy onderskeidings nie. Maar dit maak nie saak nie, want dit is wel deeglik duidelik dat Calvyn juis die Eerste Dag van die week, **gladnie** in gedagte het nie, maar spesifiek 'seremoniële Sabbatte' of 'Fees-Sabbatte'.

Vierdens, In sy *Institusies*, 2, 28, 34, lyne 3-6, maak Calvyn dan hierdie sonderlinge opmerking: "*Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie ware rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, word die Christene juis op dié dag waarop die skaduwees geëindig het, vermaan om nie aan 'n afgeskadude seremonie verknog te bly nie.*"

Hieruit moet mens aflei – nee, hierin lees mens in soveel woorde – dat die vervulling op die Sabbatdag van dit wat daardeur voorafgeskadu was, met ander woorde, die vervulling op die Sabbatdag van "*die opstanding van die Here*" – vir Calvyn die **afstelling** van die Sabbatdag beteken het, en dat hierdie feit vir hom tot *vermaning* dien "*om nie aan 'n afgeskadude seremonie verknog te bly nie*". Oteenseglik veronderstel Calvyn Jesus se opstanding juis op die (Sewende Dag) Sabbat ("*die godsdienstige dag wat die Jode onderhou het*", 33 lyn 33) – 'n feit wat mens aflei uit die afstelling deur vervulling van die 'skadu' – maar net so oteenseglik aflei met hierdie negatiewe konnotasie volgens Calvyn. Dit sou dus – veronderstellend – onmoontlik vir Calvyn gewees het om enige positiewe, **instellende**, betekenis wat die Opstanding vir die dág van die opstanding sou hê, aan enige ánder dag oor te gedra het. Óns erken wel die (positiewe) instellende waarde van die vervulling vir die dág van die Vervulling; Calvyn het dinge egter net andersom verstaan, naamlik, dat "*vervulling*" op die dag van die skaduwee, dié dag, as 'n "*afgeskadude seremonie*", "*beëindig*" het!

Sonder uitsondering maak apologete van hulleself dus gekke wanneer hulle Calvyn byhaal vir outoriteit dat omdat Jesus kammig op die Eerste Dag van die week sou opgestaan het, die Eerste Dag van die week die *godsdienstige dag is wat die Christene onderhou*. Daardeur bewys hulleself hulself leundienaars.

Vervolgens verskaf ek 'n voorbeeld uit Potgieter van sy subtieler manier om Calvyn die Sondag te laat voorstaan. Lees

mens die gedeelte objektief, sonder vooropgestelde idees, lees jy 'n gedeelte wat die Sabbat (van "van ouds") darem pragtig uitwys na aanleiding van Jesus se opstanding. Lees mens dit egter gedagtig aan Potgieter se verbloemde oogmerk, dat Calvyn só, die Sondag motiveer, dan ontaard dieselfde gedeelte reg voor jou oë. Bladsy 9 dan, die boonste paragraaf en die eerste helfte (omtrent),

"Calvyn noem die rus van die vierde gebod wel 'n skaduwee van die werklikheid wat in en deur Christus sou kom. Maar dan benadruk hy dit dat dit nie beteken dat die Israëliete nie groot erns daarmee moes maak nie. Inteendeel, God het geen ander gebod so dikwels ingeskerp en strengte gehoorsaamheid daarvoor geëis nie. Die rede is hiervoor volgens hom geleë in die uitnemendheid wat die rus versinnebeeld. Anders sou dit - so betoog hy - 'n afgryslieke onreg gewees het om te beveel dat iemand moes sterf net omdat hy op die Sabbatdag hout bymekaar gemaak het (Num. 15:32 vv.). Waarin bestaan die afgebeelde verborgenheid, d.w.s. die geestelike rus dan? Dit is niks minder nie as die doding van die ou mens, sodat die opstanding van Christus vir ons nuwe lewe kan beteken. Dit was 'n daad van onvergeeflike minagting om wat God as sodanig bedoel het, opsetlik te misken. ..."

Waarin is "die uitnemendheid wat die rus versinnebeeld", "geleë"? Suiwerder kan die implikasie nie ontgin word nie, dat die Sabbatdag en die onderhouding daarvan gespreek het van **Jesus se opstanding** - en van die **Dag** van die opstanding van Christus. "In die uitnemendheid wat die rus versinnebeeld", in die "die afgebeelde verborgenheid", lê "die werklikheid wat in en deur Christus sou kom", "sodat die opstanding van Christus vir ons nuwe lewe kan beteken". Dit, het die Sabbatsgebod so ernstig gemaak "dat iemand moes sterf" vir die oortreding daarvan! Daarom dan ook is "die doding van die ou mens" noodsaaklike, en ware, onderhouding van die Sabbatsgebod.

Hier kry ons die verduideliking vir Calvyn se gedurige en feitlik eensydige beklemtoning van die doding van die ou mens as belangrikste aspek van die onderhouding van die Vierde Gebod! "Die rede is hiervoor volgens hom geleë in die uitnemendheid wat die rus versinnebeeld", naamlik: "Dit is niks minder nie as die doding van die ou mens, sodat die opstanding

van Christus vir ons nuwe lewe kan beteken."

Pragtig, Professor Potgieter! Onthou net, ons het al die tyd met die Sabbatdag van die Vierde gebod te doen - nie met Sondag nie.

Dit is Jesus se opstanding wat geag of geminag word; daarom is die oortreding van die Sabbatsgebod so ernstig. Dit verduidelik Potgieter teen wil en dank; hy wys self hoe Jesus se opstanding die diepste betekenis aan die Sabbatsrus verskaf.

"Die doding van die ou mens" was vir Calvyn van die grootste belang by die onderhouding van die Sabbatsgebod. Hy wy verreweg die grootste gedeeltes van sy preke en redenasies oor die Sabbatsgebod aan hierdie onderwerp, amper asof hy die Vierde Gebod vir die leer oor die verdorwenheid van die mens misgis het. Nou verstaan mens beter, hoekom dit vir Calvyn so was!

Maar lees mens hierdie paragraaf van Potgieter nog 'n keer, dan moet jy agterkom hy het gladnie die Sabbatdag - of die Sabbatsgebod - in die oog nie, maar die Sondag wat met nóg die Sabbatdag, nóg die Sabbatsgebod, **nóg die opstanding van Jesus**, iets te make het!

In kern kom alles wat Calvyn rakende die Sabbat, die rus en afskaduing, die vervulling en 'afskaffing' daarvan, geskrywe het, daarop neer dat hy in die **afskaduing** van die Sabbatdag, die rus wat **in Christus verwerklik** was, verstaan het. Dan het hy verstaan dat hierdie **vervulling** in verwerkliking van die Sabbatsbelofte, hoop, vrede en rus in Jesus Christus, die Sabbat se **beëindiging**, of afskaffing, beteken het. Maar die belangrikste is, dat vir Calvyn - anders as vir al die Sondagaanspraakmakers op Calvyn - die vervulling van die Sabbat en van al die betekenis daarvan, setel in, en gebeur het in, **nié** die lyding, sterwe en dood ('aan die kruis') van Jesus Christus nie, maar, setel in, en gebeur het in, sy **opstanding** uit die dode!

Dan, volgens Calvyn, het hierdie afskaffende vervulling van die Sabbatdag deur en in die opstanding van Jesus Christus, **plaasgevind op die Sewende Dag Sabbat**. Dit, vermeld of nie vermeld nie, is vir Calvyn die bepalende voorveronderstelling vir en by elke uitspraak van hom, soos by voorbeeld, "Die skrywers van die ou tyd noem die gebod gewoonlik 'n afskaduing, omdat dit volgens hulle die uitwendige onderhouding van die dag insluit wat deur die koms van Christus tesame met al die afbeeldinge daarvan tot niet gemaak is".

Omdat "deur die koms van Christus" sy **opstanding** die **finaliteit** is - is daar vir Calvyn **geén** Sabbat wat in 'n dag bestaan, meer oor nie, maar slegs die **geestelike** onderhouding van die Sabbatsrus van die Vierde Gebod. Vir Calvyn, kom die geestelike onderhouding van die Sabbatrus van die Vierde Gebod meer as enigiets anders, neer op die **doding van die ou mens**.

Daarom sal daar vir Calvyn nooit weer vir die Kerk 'n Sabbat-**dag** te onderhou wees nie, en sal die Sabbat van van ouds, in ewigheid nooit oorgedra of vervang word, of kán word, deur enige ander dag nie. Want dit sou bygelowigheid wees, wat beteken dat die geloof nie in die gedane en volmaakte werk en vermagting van Jesus Christus in sy opstanding, vasgryp nie, maar iets anders of beters, verwag en op hoop. By Calvyn daarom, is die Sabbatdag afgeskaf, klaar en verby!

Hierdie paragraaf verteenwoordig my agterna-bevindinge van wat ek uit Calvyn geleer het. Dit was nooit my idees voordat ek hom begin bestudeer het nie. Om die waarheid te sê, ek het aanvanklik nie geweet wat om van Calvyn te maak nie, en het hom uiters verwarrend en self verward, gevind. Wat ek uiteindelik toe moes agterkom, kon ek ook nooit by enigiemand anders vind nie. Calvyn moes homself verduidelik. Daarom los ek alles wat ek vóór hierdie skrywe van my oor Calvyn geskrywe het, net so. Dit sal aantoon hoe my ontdekkingsreis deur sy geskryfte gestalte verleen het aan hierdie my uiteindelijke bevindinge.

Maar ek gaan egter hierdie paragraaf ook aan die begin van hierdie stuk insluit, sodat dit deur as rigtingaanwyser te dien, die leser sal help om Calvyn reg te verstaan.

Niemand mag Calvyn ooit laat verklaar dat die Eerste-Dag-van-die-week-'*dag-van-die-Here*' die Christelike sabbat of rusdag of aanbiddingsdag geword het, of is, nie! Dit sal 'n drie dubbele leuen wees, 'n leuen uit die mond van die aanspraakmaker, 'n leuen wat Calvyn laat lieg waar hy nooit gelieg het nie, en 'n leuen wat die Woord van God verdraai en misbruik. Dit is dié leuen wat ewiglik die lieg-kettingreaksie so kenmerkend van Sondagsapologie, aan die gang sit.

Hierdie lieg-'avalanche' is opvallend ook in Potgieter, en daarom moet mens ook nog kennis neem van sy meer blatante misbruik van Calvyn. Want deurentyd beweer Potgieter Calvyn "*beklemtoon so*", "*Calvyn wys daarop*", soos hy wat Potgieter is, in die bladsye vóór bls. 9, van Skrifuur tot Skrifuur hop om "Sondag" te bewys.

By voorbeeld sleep Potgieter oudergewoonte Hand. 20:7 en 1Kor.16:1-2 by, en praat van "*Sondag*", as sou Calvyn "*Sondag*" gesê en bedoel het, terwyl Calvyn nóg "*Sondag*" gesê het, nóg "*Sondag*" bedoel het, maar in beide gevalle, "*die eerste (dag) van die sabbatte*" – '*seremoniële 'sabbatte*' – veronderstel, geskrywe, én, bedoel het. Calvyn sê **nooit**, waar hy uit die Skrif aanhaal, '*op die Eerste Dag van die week*' ('Sondag') soos altoos aanspraak gemaak word nie. Hy skrywe **altyd**, "*op die eerste (dag) van die Sabbatte*", of net, "*op die eerste Sabbat*", of net, "*op die Sabbat*" of dan "*In die einde van die Sabbat*" in Matteus 28:1 se eerste frase naamlik, waar Jesus se opstanding se dag en tyd aangegee word.

Dit maak verdere bespreking van die sogenaamde 'Eerste Dag'-tekse oorbodig. Calvyn gebruik nie één van hulle óóit om die Eerste Dag (Sondag) as Christelike Sabbatdag te 'bewys' of net maar aan te toon nie. Vir Calvyn bestaan daar nie so-iets as 'n Christelike Sabbatdag nie, rede nommer een, en, vir Calvyn, is dit die "*eerste Sabbat*" en nie die Eerste Dag nie, rede nommer twee!

Vir al Potgieter se eie argumentjies wat hy op hierdie teksplase bou, sien Boek 4, '*Paul*'. Hulle is almal maar die gewones. Vir nie één van hulle kan Potgieter hom op Calvyn beroep nie, konsekwent nie, want Calvyn, is deurgaans konsekwent. **Hy maak géén uitsondering oor die sake waaroor hy homself meermale katagories uitspreek nie.** Soos ons hierdie uitsprake in Calvyn se *Institusies* te siene kry, sal ons hulle – net so – in sy ander geskryfte vind.

Laat ons egter afsluit met Potgieter se woorde, "*Dae en werk as sodanig het dus vir Calvyn inherent nie godsdienstige waarde nie*". (Sien die aanhaling uit Calvyn n.a.v. 1 Korintiërs 16:1, hieronder (bls.88), aan die einde, die laaste sin daarvan!) Ons sal egter Potgieter se woorde aanwend om daarop te wys dat ons nie met alles wat Calvyn oor die Vierde Gebod en die Sabbatdag en die onderhouding daarvan sê, saamstem nie – trouens ons stem met omtrent niks met Calvyn saam nie behalwe oor die feit en die betekenisvolheid van die feit dat Jesus op die Sabbatdag opgestaan het. (Sien weereens die hele aanhaling aan die einde van hierdie lesing.) Oor die betekenis self van die feit stem ons ook hoegenaamd nie met Calvyn saam nie, maar kom tot teenoorgestelde slotsom as wat hy kom. Want vir óns, beteken die feit van Jesus se opstanding op die Sabbatdag 'volgens die Gebod' en "volgens die Skrifte" die Sewende Dag van die week, die Sabbat se finale en oorspronklike instelling en bevestiging, met ander woorde, God se heiliging daarvan, en sy seëning, voltooiing en rus daarop. Jesus se opstanding op die Sabbatdag maak dit vir óns, Gód se Rusdag en Aanbiddingsdag en gevolglik die Christelike Rusdag en Aanbiddingsdag.

Daarin verskil ons deeglik met Calvyn wat van mening was dat "*ons Here se opstanding 'n einde aan die skaduwees van die wet gebring het*", en dus 'n einde aan die Sabbatdag. Sien nogmaals die aanhaling hierna. In hierdie verskil met Calvyn wil en sal ons volhard, God smekende vir hulp en onderskraging daarin, want ons glo "Daar bly vir die Volk van God hul onderhouding van (God se) Sabbatdag oor OMDAT HY AAN HULLE RUS VERSKAF HET".

8.5.1.3.
Calvin, "The First Sabbath"
Calvin on 1 Corinthians 16:1-2
 (Emphasis and Parentheses CGE)

"On one of the Sabbaths, The end is this -- that they may have their alms ready in time. He therefore exhorts them not to wait till he came, as anything that is done suddenly, and in a bustle, is not done well, but to contribute on the Sabbath what might seem good, and according as every one's ability might enable -- that is, on the day on which they held their sacred assemblies. The clause rendered, on one of the Sabbaths, (katá mian sabbátohn,) Chrysostom explains to mean -- the first Sabbath. In this I do not agree with him; for Paul means rather that they should contribute, one on one Sabbath and another on another; or even each of them every Sabbath, if they chose. For he has an eye, first of all, to convenience, and farther, that the sacred assembly, in which the communion of saints is celebrated, might be an additional spur to them. Nor am I more inclined to admit the view taken by Chrysostom -- that the term Sabbath is employed here to mean the Lord's day, (Revelation 1:10,) (Calvin meaning, Sunday) for the probability is, that the Apostles, at the beginning, retained the day that was already in use, (the Sabbath) but that afterwards, constrained by the superstition of the Jews, they (not Paul, but "the early Christians" of after the Apostolic Age, Inst. 34a) set aside that day, and substituted another. Now the Lord's day was made choice of, chiefly because our Lord's resurrection put an end to the shadows of the law. (Calvin means, our Lord's resurrection put an end to the Sabbath Day. See Inst. 34, lines 3-4. "The Sabbath was abolished" because and by our Lord being raised on it. Therefore, "another day was made choice of", the day "what we call the Lord's Day", 34, line 2. The nomenclature, 'the Lord's day', has NO religious meaning for Calvin!) Hence the day itself puts us in mind of our Christian liberty. (The Sabbath's annulment teaches us we are 'free', "Christians therefore, should have nothing to do with a superstitious observance of days", Inst. 31c. All 'observance of days', for Calvin, is superstitious.) We may, however, very readily infer from this passage, that believers have always had a certain day of rest from labour -- not as if the worship of God consisted in idleness, but because it is of importance for the common harmony, that a certain day should be appointed for holding sacred assemblies, as they cannot be held every day. For as to Paul's forbidding elsewhere (Galatians 4:10) that any distinction (says Calvin) should be made between one day and another, that must be understood to be with a view to religion, and not with a view to polity or external order."

Calvin's distinction between "*religion*" and "*polity or external order*", is artificial and totally arbitrary, just as his distinction between the "*spiritual*" and the "*ceremonial*" of the Fourth Commandment is artificial and completely arbitrary.

Does Calvin Teach Jesus was Crucified on 'Friday'?

Calvin is very much confused as to the dates, the days and the times of the Lord's Supper, and of His last suffering, crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection.

What makes things worse, is the irresponsible and sometimes downright dishonest interpretation of Calvin's **translators** who clearly are far more confused and confusing than he was.

I shall illustrate my point with an example which I have been unable to check against the original, but which I am prepared to bargain on. In Calvin's '*Harmony of the Gospels*', he comments on Matthew 26:17,

"I have no doubt, therefore, that Christ observed the day appointed by the Law, and that the Jews followed a custom which had been long in use. First, it is beyond a doubt that Christ was put to death on the day before the Sabbath; for he was hastily buried before sunset in a sepulchre that was at hand, (John 19:42,) because it was necessary to abstain from work after the commencement of the evening. :Now it is universally admitted that, by an ancient custom, when the passover and other festivals happened on Friday, they were delayed till the following day, because the people would have reckoned it hard to abstain from work on two successive days. The Jews maintain that this law was laid down immediately after the return of the people from the Babylonish captivity, and that it was done by a revelation from heaven, that they may not be thought to have made any change, of their own accord, in the commandments of God."

Calvin, I bargain, never used the name, "*Friday*" like his translators do. Why should he have used it if he is satisfied to call it, "*the day before the Sabbath*", "*the day appointed by the Law*"? Why would he not have used the same description again, as he often does? Or why would he not have used another Scriptural description or name, like "*the Preparation (of the Passover)*" – which he also elsewhere calls the day of the

crucifixion? Calvin harboured no preferences for Sunday worship? I think he simply said, "the Preparation", but his 'translators' used "Friday" in order to get things their own way – to further the cause of Sunday observance.

Why would Calvin use the name, 'Friday'? Would he have used the name, 'Friday' to explain that Jesus was crucified on a Friday? That would make him contradict himself within a few sentences! For he has just written, "it is beyond a doubt that Christ was put to death on the day before the Sabbath" while it is beyond a doubt that Calvin meant the Passover's Sabbath. It is beyond a doubt since Calvin argues "two successive days" the Jews would rather "abstain from work on" – for which two days he presupposes two consecutive Sabbaths, the first, the one which he maintains it is beyond a doubt Jesus was not crucified on, the day of Jesus' crucifixion being the day "before" it! Jesus was not put to death on the day of this "sabbath" – "the sabbath of the Passover", the first of Calvin's "two successive sabbaths"; "it is beyond a doubt that Christ was put to death on the day before the Sabbath". He was put to death on "the day appointed by the Law" for the killing of the Passover Lamb of God, the very day indeed described by the Gospel, "17. Now on the first day of unleavening ... the disciples came to Jesus." It is only to rectify what the translators have messed up. Calvin describes this "Preparation", "the first day of unleavening": "How did Christ observe that ceremony (the Lord's Supper) on the day before the whole nation celebrated the public Passover (Sabbath)?" "On the day before" the Passover Sabbath is "the Preparation of the Passover", a fact Calvin admits and insists on!

Says Calvin (emphasis, throughout, mine),

"For John plainly affirms that the day on which Christ was crucified was, among the Jews, the preparation, NOT of the Sabbath, but of the Passover, (John 19:14;)". So if "the preparation, NOT of the Sabbath" Seventh Day, it was NOT "Friday" "the Preparation" of the weekly Sabbath, but it was the day before

"Friday" – before the day that was the "Sabbath of the Passover".

Calvin's question, "why does the day which preceded the sacrificing of the lamb receive the name of the day of unleavened bread" is perfectly legitimate. But his own explanation, "for the phrase refers to the following day", is incorrect and illegitimate. Why would the phrase refer to the "following" day? It describes the "appointed" events for, and of, the "appointed" day, which mentions nothing of "unleavened bread", but only of *ádzumos* – 'de-leaven'!

Also Calvin's further explanation that "the Law did not forbid the use of leaven till the lamb was eaten", is incomplete, since the Law – "Exodus 12:18" – demanded that leaven should be "removed" on the very day the lamb was also slaughtered. "... as is sufficiently evident from Mark and Luke" and as is sufficiently evident from Exodus 12! "Mark and Luke" state, "And on the first day of taking away leaven – when they sacrificed the Passover ...; And the day (when they removed) leaven came, when the passover must be sacrificed". Any person who did not observe the removing of leaven on the day allocated or "appointed by the Law", had to die for transgressing the institution of its 'ceremony'.

Calvin most clearly makes the bigger mistake, assuming the "killing and eating" of the Passover on one and the same day. "They killed the Passover" and "(removed the) leaven" on Nisan 14, called "the Preparation of the Passover" (Jn.19:14). But they ate the lamb and unleavened bread together on Nisan 15 – on the Passover 'Sabbath' – during its first or night-part! They killed the lamb and removed the leaven on Nisan 14 during daytime, that is, "between the pair of nights" of Nisan 14 and Nisan 15. And they ate the lamb and unleavened bread together, on, or, during, "that night" of Nisan 15 – the "night, solemnly to be observed". These were both the days "appointed by the Law ... that Christ observed ... without a doubt".

Christ did not 'observe' the night of Nisan 15 – humanly speaking – simply because He was dead that night. (And since, the night of Nisan 15 should no longer be observed by Christians). Jesus' 'observance' of the Passover Sabbath should rather be seen in the actions that Joseph took. Jesus – being dead – passively received the prescribed 'ceremonies' that belonged to and with the Day of Nisan 15, the Passover-Sabbath. Remember in this regard how Calvin estimates Jesus' burial an 'improvement' over his suffering and dying. See *eg. 'Harmony* Matthew 26:12 (emphasis

entirely mine), "... his grave would yield a sweet odour, as it breathed life and salvation through the whole world."; Matthew 27:57, "The burial of Christ is now added, as an intermediate transition from the ignominy of the cross to the glory of the resurrection. True, indeed, God determined, for another reason, (that "reason" being "according to the Scriptures", being "appointed by the Law",) that Christ should be buried, that it might be more fully attested that he suffered real death on our account. But yet it ought to be regarded as the principal design, that in this manner the cursing, which he had endured for a short time, began to be removed; for his body was not thrown into a ditch in the ordinary way, but honourably laid in a hewn sepulchre. Although at that time the weakness of the flesh was still visible, and the divine power of the Spirit was not clearly seen before his resurrection; yet God determined by this, as a sort of preparation, to shadow out what he was shortly afterwards to do, that he might exalt gloriously above the heavens his Son, the conqueror of death."

The Passover Sabbath therefore was "as a sort of preparation, to shadow out what he (God) was shortly afterwards to do" on the Seventh Day Sabbath! It ought to be regarded as God's principal design, that in this manner the cursing which the killing of the Passover lamb signified, was endured for a short time and began to be removed the very same day "appointed" for its eating as well as "honourable" return to the earth (or 'interment'). "For the remains of it was not thrown into a ditch in the ordinary way (and "would not see corruption"), but honourably by the holy ritual of burying, "be laid" in the earth, signifying how "God determined by this, as a sort of preparation, to shadow out what he was shortly afterwards to do, that he might exalt gloriously above the heavens his Son, the conqueror of death" – "in the slow hours of the Sabbath" – Mt.28:1. ("Slow hours" are the words of Dionysius for *opsé de sabbátohn*.)

Even though "now it is universally admitted that, by an ancient custom, when the passover and other festivals happened on Friday, they were delayed till the following day, because the people would have reckoned it hard to abstain from work on two successive days", and even though "the Jews maintain that this law was laid down immediately after the return of the people from the Babylonish captivity, and that it was done by a revelation from heaven", they, "the Jews" – it must be "admitted" and remembered – "have made change". It must be "admitted" and remembered they made the change "of their own accord" and, they "made change" "in the commandments of God". It was, nor is, or ever will be, as "appointed by the Law" "of God"! And these changes were made only in about the fourth century after Christ. That these 'laws' were introduced, as Calvin believes the "rabbins" claim – "shortly after the Babylonish captivity" – is of course pure myth! Every word and every argument is weightless and unattached to sure foundation. They simply aren't the Word of God or laws from God. (See end of this article.)

Disappointing is it, to say the least, Calvin so often and so strongly emphasises the fact Jesus suffered "according to the Law", yet so effortlessly accepts what the Jews decided for 'Law' – ironically just as effortlessly as God's Sabbath of God's Law is accepted for "Jewish" and for "Jewish law". The Jews are least flattered by the Christians' assumptions, for they have always believed they keep God's Sabbath Day – not a Sabbath of their own fancy. I say the only reason the Jews don't keep God's Sabbath, but their own, is because they don't keep the Sabbath of the Commandment by reason of Jesus Christ, but as their own work and own fulfilment of the Law. (Christians who keep the Sabbath for the only reason of the Commandment and not by reason of Jesus Christ, keep it as their own work and own fulfilment of the Law – the Sabbath has become a righteousness of works for them – their situation is worse than that of the Jews.)

Disappointing then that Calvin accepts the fact Jesus suffered 'according to the Law', yet takes for granted the Jews' decision of what the Law of God is – in this case, the 'Law' "by an ancient custom" and "done by a revelation from heaven", that two Sabbaths in succession are both observed on the last only.

Yet Calvin with so many words places one day in between the two 'Sabbaths' of the specific Passover week, and so makes the

immediate succession of two Sabbaths an unnecessary and irrelevant issue. Says he,

"Now from the time that Christ died until the Sabbath began to be observed, there were three free days."

The possibility of two Sabbaths following one another directly existed in the Passover Season since its institution. Surely God would have provided for it if He wanted only one observed and not both. In any case only ordinary work was forbidden on the Passover Sabbath, while specific observances were commanded for and as its very observance! Most important of these was exactly the interment – by way of burning to ashes – of the remains of the Passover offering. From the very first Passover it was like that! And at the very first Passover it had been the case that the Passover Sabbath and the weekly Sabbath followed in immediate succession – with no day in between them! In neither case of the *'two successive Sabbaths'* was the People commanded not to do work, but on the contrary, they were commanded to "wait and see" what God would do for them, and to act with all their might "out of Egypt" and "into" the Promised Peace! These were the two days – the Passover Sabbath and the weekly Sabbath – of the Israel of God's utmost effort and striving, precisely in and of their accepting of and entering into the Rest of God. We named it 'religious exercise', and strenuous it was to the point of fainting and looking death in the eye, only for God to bring salvation and rest. That was the story then, and that is the story today in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. That is what Calvin over many pages makes of the Seventh Day Sabbath of the Old Testament – but what he unfortunately sacrifices and 'abolishes' "through the coming of Christ" – which should have been for him the original, sovereign, Kingly institution of the Sabbath Day! This – the original, sovereign, Kingly institution of the Sabbath Day – is what the Sabbath Day became, and was, in the Fourth Commandment in fact! But Calvin leaves the Church bereaved of **this** Sabbath Day of God, the Passover Resurrection Sabbath DAY. Every Christian who argues the Sabbath Day but not by reason of and for the sake of Jesus Christ the Lord of the Day of the Lord, Day of the service and worship of Him our Sovereign and Saviour, does the same – he prohibits the People of God their Christian Sabbath.

Now this "coming of Christ" whereby, for Calvin, Christ "abolished the Sabbath", that "coming" – for him, Calvin – is nothing less and nothing but Jesus Christ in His resurrection from the dead! Just hear this,

"... to confirm them (the fathers) in the faith of the resurrection ... God represented to

the Jews the image of life in death, to lead them to expect that out of putrefaction and dust they would one day acquire new vigour. Now **as the resurrection of Christ, by its quickening vigour,** penetrated every sepulcher, so as to breathe life into the dead, **so it abolished those outward ceremonies ...**" of which the Sabbath – according to Calvin – was one.

The Sabbath was a ceremony, and still is a ceremony. By admitting this we don't minimize the Sabbath in any way (or abolish it for that matter), because it was and still is a ceremony that was received from God, and still belongs to the worship of Him. This fact maximises the Sabbath Day if anything could, since "out of putrefaction and dust" as out of death and grave, Christ "acquired" and "confirmed" the Sabbath's "new" and Christian "image of life" by the "quickenig vigour" of His "resurrection". Calvin's mistake is not that he considers the Sabbath Day a ceremony; his mistake is he thinks it had been abolished by Jesus' resurrection, in stead of that it was instituted, established, perpetuated eternally, by Jesus' resurrection, for the People. If for the Sabbath Jesus' resurrection meant its abolishment, what would it mean for us then? Not also our, 'abolishment'? But since Jesus' resurrection for us, meant our adoption, as Calvin puts it, "unless we believe that **Christ is risen from the dead, ... For then did Christ obtain righteousness for us, and opened up our entrance into heaven; and, in short, then was our adoption ratified, when Christ, by rising from the dead, exerted the power of his Spirit, and proved himself to be the Son of God (Mt.28:1)**", it also for the Sabbath meant its ratification and its adoption as Christian Day of Worship-Rest.

Christ therefore "should be buried that it might be more fully attested that he suffered real death on our account", "For the Law did not forbid the use of leaven till the lamb was eaten", in as much as it indeed forbade the lamb be returned to ashes and earth until the daytime of the Passover's Sabbath. "For it must not be supposed that, in this ceremony, he (Christ) took any liberty which was at variance with the prescriptions of the Law." (On Mt.26:17.)

"I have no doubt, therefore, that Christ observed the day appointed by the Law", even in His

suffering of death. For His interment indeed *the Jews* in the person of Joseph of Arimathea, followed a **Passover** custom which had been long in use. For "it is beyond a doubt that Christ was put to death on the day before the Sabbath" – of the Passover; and, that he was NOT "hastily buried before sunset". Because it was necessary to abstain from work ordinary, after the commencement of the evening, in order to observe the **work especially assigned to "that day very day"**, Deuteronomy 21:22-23, namely the interment of Jesus Christ. (Deuteronomy 21:22-23 not as mangled by translators!) Jesus was buried – "returned to the earth" – of which 'ceremony' or "*custom*", the burning to ashes of the "*remains*" of the Passover lamb was a symbol just as much as its killing was a symbol of the sacrifice of Jesus.

Calvin never thought about this aspect of the Law – obviously – but was blinded by the age-old corruption of the Papists, that the Scriptures say no work should be done on the Sabbath of the Passover, and, that the body of a man if killed should not remain hanged upon the tree but should be removed before sunset.

Other difficulties, or, easy to understand issues:

"Consider whether it may not be taken to mean separation, for those that make a distinction of days, separate, as it were, one from another. Such a mode of partition was suitable for the Jews, that they might celebrate religiously the days that were appointed, by separating them from others. Among Christians, however, such a division has ceased. But some one will say, "We still keep up some observance of days." I answer, that we do **not by any means** observe days, as though there were **any sacredness** in holidays, or as though it were not lawful to labour upon them, but that **respect is paid to government and order -- not to days.**"

"Paul's **forbidding** elsewhere (Galatians 4:10) that any distinction should be made between one day and another, **that** (Emphasis Calvin) **must be understood to be with a view to religion and not with a view to polity or external order.**"

In other words, the distinction in fact made by the Church, according to Calvin, was "with a view to polity or external order" – not "with a view to religion". "Because it is of importance for the common harmony."

"Our Lord's **resurrection** put an end to the shadows of the law."

Note that not '*the cross*' or Jesus' death, but his resurrection, according to Calvin, "put an end to the shadows of the law". Those "shadows of the law" of course here specifically are meant to be the Seventh Day Sabbath. It would defeat Calvin's own argument if he supposed the resurrection on another day than the Sabbath. The Sabbath's 'abolishment' by Jesus' resurrection, necessarily implies His resurrection was on the Sabbath Day. It indirectly also implies the resurrection could not have been on another day, and therefore also not on the First Day of the week – which never had been a 'shadow' of Jesus resurrection. Calvin's lawman's logic so requires.

"The two Evangelists give the name of **the first of the sabbaths** to that which came first in order between **two Sabbaths**", says Calvin speaking of Jesus' **resurrection**, in his comment on

"**Mark 16:1.** "And when the sabbath was past." The meaning is the same **as in Matthew**, "In the end of the sabbath, which shon (**Footnote:** "apparoissoit": "Ou, au bout du Sabbaths, comme le jour apparoissoit pour luire pour le premier de la semaine;"—or, "at the end of the Sabbath, as the day began to dawn for the first of the week.") towards the first day of the Sabbaths", and in Luke, "on the first day of the Sabbaths", For while we know that the Jews began to reckon their day from the commencement of the preceding night, everybody understands, that when the Sabbath was past, the women resolved among themselves to visit the sepulcher, so as to come there before the dawn of day."

The "*day*" here, "*the dawn of*" which Calvin supposes, is called by him "*the first of the sabbaths*", a 'sabbath' therefore, of the Passover Season. He did not have "the First Day" **of the week**, in mind. Otherwise he would have said so.

It is **the** cardinal fact of the matter, that Calvin not in any way connects the '*ceremonial*', Passover-'*Sabbaths*' of "*the date*" of Jesus' resurrection, to the Sabbath of the Seventh Day, nor, to the First Day **of the week**. For him, relation between the **two kinds** of '*sabbaths*' is totally irrelevant in the case of Jesus' death, burial and resurrection. Jesus rose on 'a' "*sabbath*", and that, for Calvin, meant the end of **all** and **any** '*sabbaths*', including the Seventh Day Sabbath – which also used to be '*shadow*' and '*ceremony*' that '*typified*' Christ. For Calvin "*the sabbath*", or 'a' sabbath, was a "*ceremony*" and "*shadow*", and therefore, was "*abolished*" by the resurrection of Christ. Again, the First Day of the week had never been a '*ceremony*' or a '*shadow*' or a '*type*' of Christ. The "*day*" that '*dawned*', therefore, after the "*Sabbath was past*", no longer was the Sabbath, no longer was the day of Jesus' resurrection, no longer the '*abolished*', '*sabbath*'.

"Christ, who celebrated the passover on the day before the Sabbath, observed the day prescribed by the Law; for we know how careful he was not to depart from a single iota of the Law. Having determined to be subject to the Law, that he might deliver us from its yoke, he did not forget this subjection at his latest hour; and therefore he would rather have chosen to omit an outward ceremony, than to transgress the ordinance which God had appointed, and thus lay himself open to the slanders of wicked men. Even the Jews themselves unquestionably will not deny that, whenever the Sabbath immediately followed the passover, it was on one day, instead of both, that they abstained from work, and that this was enjoined by the Rabbins. Hence it follows that Christ, in departing from the ordinary custom, attempted nothing contrary to the Law."

Calvin is not ambivalent in this paragraph.

He contrasts Jesus' obedience and loyalty to God's Law, with the Jews' licence, who arbitrarily "*abstained from work*" as "*was enjoined by the Rabbins*", "*on one day, instead of both*", "*whenever the Sabbath immediately followed the passover(-Sabbath)*", Nisan 15. Jesus, says Calvin, "*in departing from the ordinary custom*" of the Jews, "*attempted nothing contrary to the Law*" of God!

"(F)or we know how careful he was not to depart from a single iota of the Law. Having determined to be subject to the Law, that he might deliver us from its yoke, he did not forget this subjection at his latest hour; and therefore he would rather have chosen to omit an outward ceremony (that "was enjoined by the Rabbins"), than to transgress the ordinance which God had appointed". Otherwise how awfully would Calvin have contradicted himself, and slighted the obedience of Christ as well as the Law of God, that He obeyed '*the Rabbins*', rather than God!

"61. And Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, were there. Matthew and Mark relate only that the women looked at what was done, and marked the place where the body was laid. But Luke states, at the same time, their resolution, which was, that they returned to the city, and prepared spices and ointments, that **two days afterwards** they might render due honour to the burial. Hence we learn that their minds were filled with a better odour, which the Lord breathed into his death, that he might bring them to his grave, and exalt them higher.

Luke says that they returned into the city, and procured spices, and **then rested one day**, according to the commandment of the law before pursuing their journey. But Mark, in introducing into the same part of the narrative two different events, attends less accurately than Luke to the **distinction of dates**; for he blends with their setting out on the journey what had been previously done. In the substance of the fact they perfectly agree, that the women, after having observed the holy rest, left home during the darkness of the night, that they might reach the sepulcher about the break of day."

Deuteronomy :

"(T)he day was **changed** because the resurrection of Jesus Christ set us free from the bondage to the Law and cancelled the obligation to it. That is why the day was **changed**. Yet, we must observe the same regulation of having a specified day of the week. Whether it be one day or two is left to the free choice of Christians."

The day involved – the alleged 'changed day', is the day involved with Jesus' resurrection. The Sabbath was "the day changed", "changed", "because", "the resurrection of Jesus Christ", "changed" it – according to John Calvin!

It is this paragraph, I say, that has been corrupted. And it is this word, "changed", that I have set out to prove is not Calvin's, but the translator's. And I won't need save face, because, if I'm wrong, it will mean Calvin himself is wrong, and himself is responsible for being wrong, and for telling and teaching a lie.

From the section itself it already is obvious that we are here confronted by gross dishonesty.

First, Calvin **never** says the Sabbath was "changed".

Second, The section contains the **repetition**, which is completely unnecessary and over-emphasising.

Third, It is a stupid **contradiction** to say that "the resurrection of Jesus Christ set us free from the bondage to the Law and cancelled the obligation to it", only to have "the day **changed**", so as to again bring us under bondage by another day.

Fourth, Why argue a 'change' from the Book of **Deuteronomy**, where the institution and Divine origin of the Sabbath is recorded and explained, centuries before the alleged 'change' of it?

Fifth, That "Yet, we must observe the same regulation of having a specified day of the week" – which claim is made so contradictory in itself it blows all sense – is directly against Calvin's **own** and regular standpoint elsewhere.

Sixth, It is simply irreconcilable to say "Whether it be one day or two is left to the free choice of Christians", "**Yet, we must observe the same regulation of having a specified – single – day of the week**". Sorry to say, if this is not a corruption by some person other than Calvin, then it is a corruption that must be acknowledged is Calvin's own, and therefore may be the more deplorable and lamentable.

The ONLY way out of the predicament is to admit Calvin here means the meaning of the Sabbath was changed, or the day in its meaning was changed – "changed" in itself, and not to or into another day or exchanged for another day, the First Day of the week. If that is the case, then Calvin here argues for, and not against the Sabbath Day; and if that is the case, then Calvin here argues the Christian and resurrection-meaning and significance of the Seventh Day of the week Sabbath – which is exactly what I believe the meaning of the Sabbath Christian "according to the Scriptures" is – the Resurrection Day of the Christian Faith!

Then, should one then even more be shockingly surprised that Calvin, throughout, applies the principles of the Seventh Day Sabbath to the First Day of the week-"Lord's day", and himself, speaks of "Friday", "Monday", "Saturday" – using names of the days of the week he never elsewhere would have used?

"There is another thing we need to note. We are being very narrow if we have only a rest for our hands and feet and go not further than that. What should we do then? We must apply this rest to a higher purpose. We must refrain from our business which hinders us from meditating on the works of God. We must call upon his name and exercise ourselves in his word. If we spend the Lord's Day in partying, games and sports is this honouring God? No! Is it not mocking him and misusing his name? Yes! When the stores are closed on the Lord's Day and men do not travel about as they do on other days, is this so that we can have more leisure and liberty to attend to the things that God commands? Is it so that we can be taught by his word, meet together for the confession of our faith, call upon his name, and exercise ourselves in the proper use of the sacraments? This is how the **Sabbath** regulation should serve us.

. . . It is true that we are not limited to the seventh day, nor do we, in fact, keep the same day that was appointed for the Jews, since that was **Saturday**. But, to show the liberty of Christians, the day was changed because the resurrection of Jesus Christ set us free from the bondage to the Law and cancelled the obligation to it. That is why the day was changed. Yet, we must observe the same regulation of having a

specified day of the week. Whether it be one day or two is left to the free choice of Christians."

In which case then, Calvin is to be rejected as speaking falsely in the name of the Sabbath of the Lord your God, of the day of popish supremacy and authority and pietistic, hypocritical scruples "set free of", yet "changed". The very reason he uses, still has no positive meaning for the day the Christians assumed for their 'Lord's day'. Still – according to Calvin himself – the causative event and event of Jesus' resurrection, was the event of, and on, the day that caused that day, not, to be "changed", but, for us, to "be set free of". Here, somebody has called that day, "Saturday", who wants us to believe Calvin called it "Saturday". According to Calvin himself, Jesus' resurrection was the event of, and on, the day "from the bondage" of which, we allegedly were "set free". According to Calvin himself "obligation" to the day was "cancelled" by the very event on, and belonging to, that day, the event namely of "the resurrection of Jesus Christ". The First Day of the week is not advanced "because the resurrection of Jesus Christ" happened not on it. **Calvin** does **not** teach advancement of Sunday through the resurrection of Jesus – never ever.

But in truth, the resurrection of Jesus Christ *limited* and *appointed* the Seventh Day Sabbath the Christian Day of Worship-Rest once for all – directly in opposition to Calvin and the whole world of 'religion'. To us it does not matter what they say or have made honourable custom of. Is it the Word of God? Yes, or, no – is all that matters.

I conclude Calvin failed in this respect – in regard to the Christian Sabbath – as everyone should who denies the Fourth Commandment's Day of Worship-Rest; as everyone should who fails to see the meaning Jesus' resurrection obtained for the Day of its occurrence, and what it all meant for us: Hebrews 4:9!

It only shows, the believer should not put his trust in man, or in princes, even though that man or prince be the greatest of the Reformers, even John Calvin. The believer should put his trust in God, and believe his Holy Word of Scripture. (That would have been Calvin's own ideal for believers.) So he shall enter in into the Rest of God, and observe His holy Sabbath Day, "the Seventh Day concerning which God thus spoke, and God the Seventh Day rested from all His works" – in and through and by and for the sake of Jesus Christ in rising from the dead, "in the fullness of the Sabbath Day".

8.5.1.4.

Calvin's Explaining of Sunday-keeping in the Church

Calvin mentions the "Lord's day" meaning Sunday the first time in 33 in answer against "some restless spirits (who) are now making an outcry about the observance of the Lord's day". In 34a he attentively – almost parsimoniously – formulates his statement, "... the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath". "We call" it this nowadays; it wasn't called "the Lord's day" in the time of "the early Christians". "What we call the Lord's day" is Sunday; and "we", "call" it "the Lord's day", or, "the Lord's day for the Sabbath" – not the Apostles.

Calvin's statement of explanation for Sunday-keeping in the Church, reads, "My reply is, (... some observance of days is retained ...) ... those days are observed by us without Judaism" – he means without the Law, not because the Commandment demands it of us.

How does Calvin go about to tell us this?

He has created a certain background to which he first refers back,

"I am obliged to dwell a little longer on this ..." ...

"this ..." ... what is it? And,

"I am obliged ..." ... why?

With these words Calvin says, I tell you the following, on the grounds of what I have just now said ... in 32 and more specifically in the end to 32.

In 32 Calvin had given his reasons for his assumption, "The Sabbath being abrogated, there is still room among us ... to assemble on stated days ...". Then he quoted some Old Testament Sabbath-Scriptures to show "It cannot be doubted that the Lord provided for" "this", "in the commandment of the Sabbath". After his quoting, he proceeds, asking, "Who can deny that" "this" is "equally applicable to us as to the Jews?" He actually says, "Who can deny that both are equally applicable to us as to the Jews?" With "both", he refers to two things that "there is still room" for "among us". Those two things we have already seen were "first, to assemble on stated days ...", and, "secondly", "to give ... servants ... relaxation". So Calvin repeats what he has just said – but only the "first" of "both" those things. Now he brings to the attention only the "first" of "both", that "Religious meetings are enjoined us". He goes on explaining further, "Religious meetings are enjoined us by the word of God; their necessity, experience itself, sufficiently demonstrates. But unless these meetings are stated, and have fixed days allotted to them, how can they be held? We must, as the Apostle expresses it, do all things decently and in order (1Cor.

15:40). So impossible, however, would it be to preserve decency and order without this **politic arrangement**, that the dissolution of it would instantly lead to the disturbance and ruin of the Church."

"Religious meetings are enjoined us by the word of God" yet by 'Word' of 'Sabbath' Scriptures! Calvin not so much as once quotes Scripture for authorisation of the Church's "fixed days". They are "observed by us" by "politic arrangement" – the "necessity" of which "experience itself sufficiently demonstrates".

"So impossible ... would it be to preserve decency and order without this politic arrangement", says Calvin, "that the dissolution of it would instantly lead to the disturbance and ruin of the Church". Calvin immediately goes on to say: "But if the reason for which the Lord appointed a Sabbath to the Jews is equally applicable to us, no man can assert it is a matter with which we, have nothing to do."

Here is seen Calvin's strategy most clearly. He first creates an imaginary distinction or division in the Commandment, then accepts the "reason" for the Sabbath, but rejects the "Sabbath" – which IS the reason. Then the "reason", "is equally applicable to us", but the "Sabbath", is (inconsistently) "appointed to the Jews". He throws out the baby with the bath water.

So the "it" in Calvin's conclusion, "no man can assert it is a matter with which we have nothing to do", reduces the "matter ... with which we have to do", to "the reason" only. Yet of the Sabbath Day itself "remains" nothing; it has been "abolished". All that "remains", is one "stated day", the First Day-'Lord's day' by "politic arrangement" – its "necessity" being "sufficiently demonstrated by experience itself".

How can Calvin appeal to the Commandment which *states* and *appoints* the *day* exactly by *reason* there given – full, ample and exclusive '*reason*', that all has to do with God's faithfulness, power and command – yet can accept only what is convenient and reject what is inconvenient!

I cannot dictate to any person of intelligence what logic and consistency should mean or be; they are active principles that speak for themselves – they intrinsically urge their own force upon the mind. Then perhaps I should have sorted honesty with this group of concepts. What these basic forces of understanding open up upon the mind in the Fourth Commandment is both reason and day undivided. I cannot follow my heroic leader in this design.

"Our most provident and indulgent Parent has been pleased to provide for our wants not less than for the wants of the Jews" ... the Jews, our older brother. For we are the Household of God, and our most provident and indulgent Parent has been pleased to provide for both of us in and through and for the sake of our Eldest Brother, Jesus, Anointed of the Father and Firstborn of the Elect.

Our Father provided us with the Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace. In this pact we knew the Seventh Day of His creating all along. *Who can deny that it is equally applicable to us as to the Jews?*

Calvin sensed that he has talked himself into trouble, and that the more he would talk, the deeper he would get into trouble. He desperately objects,

"Why, it may be asked, do we not hold daily meetings, and thus avoid the distinction of days?" "Why, it may be asked" – the while presuming "the Sabbath being abrogated", and "thus avoid the distinction of days", yet "there is still room among us to assemble on stated days"? The solution is not to "hold daily meetings", but to accept "there is still room among us to assemble on stated days". Then to accept how and by whom the "stated days" are "appointed" and "enjoined upon us" – that it is by God in his Commandment, and by His Word Jesus Christ – even "that his own example might operate as a stronger stimulus" that He created this room and freedom among us.

The basic presumption for Calvin is, "the Sabbath being abrogated". Now we sit in the hopeless situation we have NO "distinction of days", NO "stated days", NO "appointed day" left. So the second presumption is drawn: "there is still room among us to assemble on stated days".

Calvin departs from these two totally arbitrary but categorical theses – theses mutually excluding and destructive – First, "the Sabbath is abolished"; Two, "there is still room among us to assemble on stated days". He makes no effort to justify – but carefully avoids to justify – the First Day – referring to it as "the Lord's day" – with the Scriptures or the Gospel. Calvin has thus created for himself an immense, insurmountable, predicament. He cannot refer to the Old Testament because there he will only find the Seventh Day Sabbath the Lord's Day of Worship Rest. He cannot refer to the New Testament because there he will only find the Church of the New Testament keeps the same day. He therefore has to resort to "this politic arrangement", "the dissolution of" which "would instantly lead to the disturbance and ruin of the Church". He has to resort to "this politic arrangement" because its "necessity, experience itself, sufficiently demonstrates".

Particularly noteworthy is the stark fact Calvin does not call on the big motive for the First Day-'Lord's day' observance, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead.

One conclusion without any ors or buts may be made from Calvin's *Institutions* thus far, that he argues AGAINST the '*Lord's day*'-First Day of the week as replacement for the Seventh Day Sabbath.

A second conclusion without any ors or buts may be made from Calvin thus far, that he argues for the Seventh Day Sabbath

(and not for the First Day-'*Lord's day*') from both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures.

Therefore, "Why... do we not hold daily meetings, and thus avoid the distinction of days?"

Here is the reason why – the reason which Calvin – not I – ultimately gives: "Why should we not adopt the rule which the will of God has obviously imposed upon us?"

Yes, Why should we not?

"The will of God" for Calvin is NO "politic arrangement", but is "expressed" and "enjoined us by the word of God". And "the will of God" for Calvin is "the rule" or the "commandment" – the "commandment the observance of which the Almighty enforces ... more strictly" than any. In this expression of "the will of God" he "has obviously imposed upon us" the Seventh Day Sabbath in that Commandment – it is there for his People to see with their own eyes, "obvious", and to believe without question. Because God has furnished, meant and enjoined and "imposed upon us a stated day" – "the use for which the Sabbath" – Seventh Day – "was retained" (by Paul).

But now, according to Calvin, "there is still room among us to assemble on stated days" any day but the Seventh Day, and it hasn't got a thing to do with the revelation of God's will for us in his Commandment or in Christ. It strictly is "this politic arrangement", that is, "Christian society(s)" decision for "the observance of ... what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath".

It is to "this" Calvin refers, saying, "I am obliged to dwell a little longer on this, because some restless spirits are now making an outcry about the observance of the Lord's day." Calvin replies to the complete denial and refusal of these "restless spirits" who say the Church indeed does celebrate Sunday because of the Law or Revelation – "mystery" – and who maintained NO day should be "retained", "enjoined" or "observed", "There is still room among us to assemble on stated days". But it is by "politic and ecclesiastical arrangement / policy and order in the Church", the "necessity" of which "experience itself sufficiently demonstrated".

The "restless spirits" said, no, Christianity does not have "stated days" – Christianity does not need "the observance of the Lord's day" either. Calvin is not engaged in an argument with Sabbath-believers, but with anti-'*Lord's day*' campaigners - antinomians! To observe any "stated days", these "restless spirits" said – 'the Lord's day' for that matter, it makes no difference – would mean the Church 'Judaised'. Calvin unknowingly has joined forces with the antinomians!

It must be because of Calvin's trying for the whole of 30 to show why it is "the seventh day" commanded in the Fourth Commandment, that Chrystie omits that section. In 31a Calvin does no more than to rephrase his "remarks on the number (seven)"

found in 30 – which he in 31 decided were "somewhat far-fetched". It must be for still the same reason that Chrystie also omits halve of section 31. He omits this section especially because it contains Calvin's conclusion,

"I have no objection to their (obviously Sabbath-keepers) taking it (the probable reason for the number) more simply: that the Lord appointed a certain day on which his people might be trained, under the tutelage of the Law, to meditate constantly on the spiritual rest, and fixed upon the seventh, either because he foresaw it would be sufficient, or in order that his own example might operate as a stronger stimulus; or, at least, to remind men that the Sabbath was appointed for no other purpose than to render them conformable to their Creator."

Calvin states he has no objection to the observance of the Seventh Day on condition it complies with the spiritual benefits he here stipulates. He confirms this concession where he in 34 says, "I do not cling to the number seven as to bring the Church under bondage to it, nor do I condemn churches for holding their meetings on other solemn days, provided they guard against superstition". Churches at that point in time held their meetings on NO "other solemn days" than Sundays and Sabbaths. Calvin for that reason does not "condemn churches for holding their meetings on" the Seventh Day.

He makes this allowance in line with the very benefits he from the beginning – since sections 28 to 30 – argued for the Sabbath Day of the Fourth Commandment. These attributes says he, belong with and to "a certain day" "that the Lord appointed", and which He "fixed upon the seventh"!

Finds Calvin here in 31, that "his people might be trained, under the tutelage of the Law, to meditate constantly on the spiritual rest" (that "spiritual rest" again, which Calvin certainly meant can only be found in Jesus Christ). So much easier – and honest must it be to find and accept this Day "fixed upon the seventh, either because he (God) foresaw it would be sufficient, or in order that his own example might operate as a stronger stimulus; or, at least, to remind men that the Sabbath was appointed for no other purpose than to render them conformable to their Creator."

What is confirmation of the Seventh Day Sabbath if this isn't? Should not it "be sufficient" that "the Sabbath" is the Christian Sabbath – 'The Lord's Day'? Who, when 'studying' this, can deny Calvin maintains the Sabbath and "the Sabbath of the LORD your God" of "the Fourth Commandment", the Seventh Day of the creation order and of contemporary Christian worship?

Who can blame the person who 'studies Calvin' and finds he still maintained the Seventh Day-Lord's Day – even against his own intentions? Calvin must himself have found the

reasons for Seventh Day Sabbath-worship "sufficient" and "more simple" than his own complicated and impossible apologetics for observance of the First Day of the week.

It may categorically be concluded then that Calvin consistently rejects Sunday / First Day / 'Lord's day'-observance by reason of the Fourth Commandment or by whatever reason other than 'Christian social order'. It must equally categorically be concluded that Calvin, in contrast, with much duplicity argues in favour of Seventh Day Sabbath-observance by reason of the Fourth Commandment, and, by reason and by virtue, of every "spiritual" advancement of that day, as he in that Commandment discovers and in his Institutions, circumscribes.

Never does Calvin concede to the First Day of the week as much as he does to the Seventh Day! He makes his concessions for Sabbath-keeping in these various places in accordance and in agreement with his earlier findings in paragraphs, 28, 29, 30 and 31a, where he confirmed the Seventh Day's sabbatical privileges, benefits and duties, and where the First Day of the week is not so much as mentioned or implied.

"Sabbaths", Or, "Sundays"?

How strange then to find Calvin also declares, "Early Christian writers are wont to call it (the Fourth Commandment) typical, as containing the external observance of a day (the Sabbath the seventh day of the week) which was abolished with the other types on the advent of Christ."

Where in 33, Calvin denounces the "preposterous observance of days", he with reference to 1 Corinthians 16:2 makes this unambiguous statement which every Sunday-advocate shuns like the plague:

"It was, I say, against this preposterous observance of days that the apostle (in Romans 14) inveighs, and not against that legitimate selection which is subservient to the peace of Christian society. For in the churches established by him (Paul), this was the use for which the Sabbath was retained. He tells the Corinthians to set the first day apart for collecting contributions for the relief of their brethren at Jerusalem."

The division of the paragraph is unfortunate and should be made as follows, following Calvin's intention, logic and actual exposition of his subject matter:

1. "...because they (Christians in Rome) dreamt that by their cessation from labour they were cultivating the mysteries which had of old been committed to them (the Jews). It was, I say, against this preposterous observance of days that the apostle (in Romans

14) inveighs, and not against that legitimate selection which is subservient to the peace of Christian society. For in the churches established by him, this was the use for which the Sabbath was retained. End of paragraph.

New subject:

2. He tells the Corinthians to set the first day apart for collecting contributions for the relief of their brethren at Jerusalem.

The first passage means, "Subserving to the peace of Christian society" was "the use for which the Sabbath was retained"! "The Sabbath" was the "legitimate selection", says Calvin – it was conditional for, or, "subservient to the peace of Christian society"! The Sabbath was retained because it was "sufficient".

In his Commentary on this Scripture, Calvin explains the meaning of *katá mían sabbátou*, "every first Sabbath". It is his meaning in his *Institutions* as well: Paul tells the Corinthians to set the first Sabbath apart for collecting contributions for the relief of their brethren at Jerusalem.

In the context of the whole of this Paragraph and Chapter, Calvin as a rule uses the one word, "Sunday", rendered "the Lord's day" for the First Day of the week – not the words "the first day" as in this exceptional case. In just the next lines, for example – which contain Calvin's conclusion to Paragraph 33 – he uses "the Lord's day", "as Christians now do", with the meaning of the First Day of the week.

(I do not know the Latin or the French here, but find Calvin a consistent and consequential thinker, and therefore won't easily accept he in his Commentary is at variance with himself in his Institutions. In "the first day" it may be a case of the manipulation of Calvin's actual words.)

I returned to this question after several days. I still did not have the originals available, but could compare the excellent Afrikaans translation from the Latin by H.W. Simpson of the Potchefstroom University for Christian National Education, SA, 1986.

I was not surprised my suspicion of the English Translation by Henry Beveridge was justified.

The Afrikaans reads much like the English for most part. I present it here, and will indicate visibly where and how the English differs with the Afrikaans:

"... It was, I say, against this preposterous observance of days that the Apostle inveighs, and not against that legitimate selection which is subservient to the peace of Christian society. For in the churches established by him (Paul), this was the use for which the Sabbath was retained. He tells the Corinthians to set the first day apart for collecting contributions ..."

The translator's idea with "*the Sabbath*" is, "*the first day*" "*was retained*" "*the Sabbath*". Calvin's idea is just the opposite, "*the Sabbath* (Seventh Day) *was retained*" "*subservient to the peace of Christian society*", and according to the same rule, was "*set apart for collecting contributions*". Therefore Calvin would have interpreted 1 Cor.16:2, "*he (Paul) tells the Corinthians to set the first SABBATH day apart for collecting contributions*". In his commentary on First Corinthians 16, Calvin eventually decides on "*every Sabbath*".

The Afrikaans confirms the latter reading, "*Ek herhaal, die apostel vererg hom oor hierdie voorbarige onderskeid tussen dae en nie oor die regmatige keuse van 'n dag om die vrede van die Christengemeenskap te dien nie. Want juis vir hierdie doel is die sabbat in die kerke wat deur hom ingestel is, behou. Hy bepaal trouens DAARDIE DAG vir die Korintiërs om bydraes te versamel ...*" (Emphasis CGE)

"*THAT DAY*" ("*DAARDIE DAG*"), refers to the "*sabbath*" just mentioned, not, to "*the first day*". According to Calvin's interpretation of the Greek of 1 Cor.16:2, "*that day*", was the "first Sabbath (Saturday)" – *mian sabbátou*, not, "*the first day* (Sunday)".

Calvin, consistently, with 'Sabbath', means the 'Jewish' Seventh Day Sabbath, or, some Jewish 'ceremonial' Sabbath, never another day whatsoever. He detested the very idea '*the Lord's day*'-Sunday regarded a, or, the, Sabbath, and it is to express his aversion of the idea, that he writes of "*what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath*". *We call the Lord's day for the Sabbath* without provocation, without reason, and, without foundation! We simply call the '*arranged*' day that.

Calvin also consistently does not connect '*the Lord's day*' with the First Day (Sunday) for 'religious' reason. For him '*the Lord's day*' plainly, was the "*legitimate*", "*selected*" or "*stated day*" "*which is subservient to the peace of Christian society*" and its "*order and discipline / decency*". Its "*legitim(acy)*", is not based on or gotten from the Fourth Commandment, or from any 'moral principle' of Scriptural or 'Sabbath'-Law, but simply, is "*that politic and ecclesiastical arrangement*" which the practicing Christian should "*regard*" with respect – with the '*legitimate*' respect for it, it having been the Church that decided on and "*appointed*" the day "*adopt(ed) a necessary remedy for preserving order in the Church*". And, says Calvin, "*we adopt*" it, which means that "*we*" appointed and instituted it – not the Scriptures nor God.

With the meaning of "*the first Sabbath*" accepted, it also becomes unnecessary to divide the passage as I proposed above. The paragraph or passage as found in the published editions undivided therefore, explains and confirms the reading "*the first*

Sabbath" for genuine, and the reading "*the first day*", for fraudulent.

This is not the end yet – I must still consult the Latin and French originals.

Nevertheless, Calvin confirmed what he taught with his writing with what he practiced in daily life. No one must accuse Calvin with double standards – what is more than can be said of about all other Sunday-proponents.

Par. 8.5.1.5.**John Calvin James Chrystie Lord's Day**

(Discussion format: James Chrystie in Courier New; when quoted in comments "Courier New Cursive Underlined"; comments CGE in Verdana; Calvin in "Times New Roman Italics Underlined"; Emphasis CGE **bold underlined**)

8.5.1.5.1. Diverse Opinion**Gerhard Ebersöhn:**

"I am a Sabbatarian (Seventh Day) Calvinist, and find comfort in being one, Calvin so strongly supporting me in my conviction of the Seventh Day Sabbath the Lord's Day of Christian worship."

James Chrystie – a Calvinist:

"... it becomes necessary to vindicate the good name of Calvin, the greatest of the Reformers, from the aspersion—for we regard it as such—that he maintained "the abrogation of the fourth commandment as a ceremonial institution, and contended for a Sabbath or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary human arrangement." That this eminent Reformer did use some expressions which give colour to these assertions, we do not deny, but this is all: he still maintained the Divine authority of the Lord's day. In speaking of this institution, among other words, he thus defines its end. ...

For the intelligent and candid reader this will suffice. Calvin needs to be studied. That the infidel should misunderstand him, we do not wonder;—we are surprised that any one taught in truth and capable of discrimination should do so."

The Rev C Bouwman – a Calvinist:**"Conclusion**

The reader will understand that I do not intend these critical comments to erode appreciation for Calvin. He was and remained a

man of God, greatly used by God as a blessing for His catholic church. But Calvin, like anybody else, was a child of his times, and reacted to the apostasy of his day. His teachings on the Sabbath were a vast improvement over the works-righteousness teachings of the Roman Catholic Church of his time, but did not do full justice to the Word of God."

8.5.1.5.2. Ostensibly Pro Calvin

"... (Calvin) asserts that the change (from the Sabbath to the First Day of the week-'Lord's day') was made not by "human arrangement", but by apostolic, and, of course, Divine authority (Inst., Bk.2; Chap.8; Sec.33)", says Chrystie.

"Offences must come, that they which are approved may be made manifest." One end to be accomplished by the permission of error, is the trial of man's faith, and the establishment of that of the truly and intelligently faithful. In this way, controversy more than compensates for any labour and anxiety to which it subjects the friends of truth. Among the topics of discussion at the present time, the claims of the Christian Sabbath occupy a justly pre-eminent place.

We confine ourselves, at present, to that view of it which from circumstances painfully familiar to our readers, possesses a peculiar interest to us, at this time, viz.: Is the first day of the week now, the appointed day of rest, and of special religious observances? is it the Christian Sabbath?

Before we enter on the direct examination of this question in the light of the Scriptures, by whose authority alone it can be determined, it becomes necessary to vindicate the good name of Calvin, the greatest of the Reformers, from the aspersion—for we regard it as such—that he maintained "the abrogation of the fourth commandment as a ceremonial institution, and contended for a Sabbath or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary

human arrangement." That this eminent Reformer did use some expressions which give colour to these assertions, we do not deny, but this is all: he still maintained the Divine authority of the Lord's day. In speaking of this institution, among other words, he thus defines its end (Inst., Bk.II.; Chap.8; Sec.28):

"First, under the rest of the seventh day, the divine Lawgiver meant to furnish the people of Israel with a type of the spiritual rest by which believers were to cease from their own works, and allow God to work in them. Secondly, he meant that there should be a stated day on which they should assemble to hear the law and perform religious rites, or which, at least, they should specially employ in meditating on his works, and be thereby trained to piety. Thirdly, he meant that servants, and those who lived under the authority of others, should be indulged with a day of rest, and thus have some intermission from labour."

"Having established this statement ..."

What has Calvin – "in speaking of this institution" – "established" in "this statement"?

Using the expression "Under the rest of the seventh day", this eminent Reformer gives colour to his assertion,

"the divine Lawgiver meant",

"First,"

"to furnish the people of Israel with a type of the spiritual rest by which believers were to cease from their own works, and allow God to work in them."

"Secondly,"

speaking of this institution, Calvin, the greatest of the Reformers, has established,

"the divine Lawgiver under the rest of the seventh day meant",

"that there should be a stated day on which they should assemble to hear the law and perform religious rites, or which, at least, they should specially employ in meditating on his works, and be thereby trained to piety."

"Thirdly,"

"under the rest of the seventh day",

Calvin defines its end, that "the divine Lawgiver meant", "that servants, and those who lived under the authority of others, should

be indulged with a day of rest, and thus have some intermission from labour."

Here 28 ends. Chrystie skips 29, 30 and halve of 31.

Nevertheless he claims, "this eminent Reformer ... still maintained the Divine authority of the Lord's day" (Chrystie meaning Sunday with "the Lord's day").

Calvin – against Chrystie – in the above quotation (or part thereof as quoted by Chrystie) – still maintained the Divine authority of the Sabbath, to which he appeals under the name of "the seventh day", and which he also describes as "the rest of the seventh day". If therefore the 'Lord's Day' should be identified for what it already had been, and still would have had to become by virtue of that 'Rest' which coming, since the beginning had been its true meaning and content, it is impossible it could have been anything but "the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God". And it would have been impossible by virtue of Christ and the 'Rest' He is to 'all the Children of Israel in all their generations', the one and only Church of Jesus Christ. God "the divine Lawgiver" in Christ and through Christ "under the rest of the seventh day ... meant ... to furnish the people (believers) ... with a type of the spiritual rest". He thus instilled the Seventh Day Sabbath with "the Divine authority of the Lord's day".

This despite, Chrystie *still maintains* Calvin meant Sunday; *still maintains* Sunday the First Day of the week, is the Lord's day. Can he blame the reader who 'studies Calvin' and *still*, finds Calvin actually – willy-nilly – *maintains the Seventh day and the rest of the Seventh Day*? Can Chrystie blame the reader who 'studies Calvin' and *still* discovers in his 'Institutions' he actually – willy-nilly – *maintained "under the rest of the seventh day ... a type of the spiritual rest"* – which stands in relation to the true Lord's Day, "the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God"?

Chrystie's reference to Calvin here being only a part of that section, Paragraph 28, could it we might find Calvin mentioned or implied the First Day of the week, or Sunday, or "the Lord's day", in the rest of this passage? Such hope disappoints. Calvin introduces this his first paragraph on the "Fourth Commandment", by quoting that Commandment word for word, its mention and command of "the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God" emphasised, since he only with an etcetera indicates the rest of the Commandment (making it virtually impossible to distinguish between 'ceremonial part' and 'spiritual rest' in the Commandment).

Will a reference to the First Day of the week, or Sunday, or "the Lord's day", be found in the next section, Paragraph 29, which Chrystie – for good reason to him it must have been – omitted? Calvin begins this Paragraph with, "*We are taught in many passages (Num.13:22; Ezek.20:12; 22:8; 23:38; Jer.17:21, 22, 27; Isaiah 56:2; Neh.9:14) that this adumbration of spiritual rest held a primary place in the Sabbath. Indeed, there is no commandment the observance of which the Almighty more strictly enforces.*" This outright implies *there is no "day" the observance of which the Almighty* not only "*more strictly enforces*", but *there is no "day" by definition the observance of which the Almighty* by way of more emphatic exception, "*more strictly enforces*"! Then Chrystie presumptuously arrogates its "change"? How absurd! And how false to allege Calvin argued its "change" to the First Day of the week! This we shall show here.

The paragraph (29) is finished without reference to or suggestion of the First Day of the week, or of Sunday.

Calvin – to conclude – maintained that in the "*observance*" of "*the Fourth Commandment*" and of the "*Sabbath*" the "*Seventh Day*" of the week, "*this adumbration of spiritual rest held a primary place*" (in Christ, without doubt), and that therefore, the "*the Almighty enforces ... no commandment ... more strictly*". This is language of "the Lord's Day" and its "*authority*" if ever there was – it breathes that "*adumbration of spiritual rest*" – it is language of "*the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD thy God*" – in my copy of Calvin's Institutions printed in capital letters. It cannot be mistaken for saying or for meaning anything, but the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD your God.

If Calvin "still maintained" the Sabbath or the Seventh Day "meant" the First Day of the week or Sunday, then Calvin was mistaken. But Calvin did NOT take the Sabbath or the Seventh Day to mean the First Day of the week. It would be most absurd if he did, only to argue it had been abolished! And Calvin as definitely and for the same reason did not regard the Fourth Commandment, "abolished". These are the two facts that stay fact, and that must be accepted as definitely as must be rejected the fact he divides the Fourth Commandment into a "part" "abolished" and a "halve" not "abolished".

8.5.1.5.3. The Divinely "Appointed Day"

Of peculiar interest to us, at this time, is the question, Is the First Day of the week now, the appointed day of rest, and of special religious observances? Or, is it the Christian Sabbath? And, which does Calvin say is it? It is obvious which to Calvin it was or ought to have been (in Chrystie's words), "*In this passage, Calvin vindicates the law of the Sabbath as of perpetual obligation*", and he vindicates the Sabbath of the law! Calvin vindicates the law of the Seventh Day (of the week), the law of the Christian Sabbath, the law of the Lord's Day – which in these paragraphs at least, for no moment is 'the law' of the First Day or of "*the first day*" of the week! Yet one must understand Calvin did not *mean* the "day" "mean" in "the law of" the Seventh Day? This is the difficulty with Calvin's exposition of the Sabbath Commandment – he 'means' the Law of the Seventh Day Sabbath, yet 'means' not the Seventh Day Sabbath of the Law.

Don't expect of anybody to explain why it cannot be the law of or 'the Sabbath' of the First Day of the week Sunday, thus "vindicated"! It would be as good as to prove 2 times 2 cannot be 5 – it only can prove 4! Calvin in this passage vindicates the law of the Sabbath of perpetual obligation, for no other day can be vindicated the Sabbath of perpetual obligation.

8.5.1.5.4. A Human 'Arrangement'

Calvin mentions the "Lord's day" meaning Sunday the first time in 33 in answer against "some restless spirits (who) are now making an outcry about the observance of the Lord's day". In 34a he attentively – almost parsimoniously – formulates his statement, "... the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath." "We call" it this nowadays; it wasn't called "the Lord's day" in the time of "the early Christians". "What we call the Lord's day" is Sunday; and "we", "call" it "the Lord's day", or, "the Lord's day for the Sa

These are the facts, although totally irreconcilable with much – but not all – that Calvin has to say about both the Sabbath and the First Day of the week-'Lord's day'. These are the facts although

totally irreconcilable, for example, with the passage – which Chrystie says, Calvin ‘proceeds’ with, writing,

“... (Inst., Bk.II; Chap.8; Sec.31,32),

“There can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished. He is the truth, at whose presence all emblems vanish; the body, at the sight of the which the shadows disappear. ...”

“... he (Calvin) proceeds (Inst., Bk.II; Chap.8; Sec.31,32)

Chrystie skipped two and halve sections, so it isn’t true Calvin “proceeds” with the words, “There can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished...”!

Now remember why Chrystie quotes these snips from Calvin? Was it not to adjure “the aspersion ... that he maintained “the abrogation of the fourth commandment as a ceremonial institution, and contended for a Sabbath or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary human arrangement””?

All right then, Chrystie vindicates the good name of Calvin by showing, first, that “this is all”, namely, that he, Calvin, “still maintained the divine authority of the Lord’s day ... in speaking of this institution (“the Fourth Commandment”) ... “under the rest of the seventh day ...””. Then he, Chrystie, proceeds (having jumped two and a halve sections), quoting Calvin where he says, “There can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished...”.

Chrystie argues that the “ceremonial part of the commandment” which Calvin says was “abolished”, is “the (Sunday-) Lord’s day”, “vindicated”.

One could still understand Calvin, but not Chrystie. One could still understand Calvin – that he meant the Commandment was abolished – could one understand what he meant with “the ceremonial part of the commandment”. But one is completely unable to understand Chrystie who first argues Calvin maintained the Sabbath Commandment, then that Calvin maintained it was abolished, only to himself maintain Calvin maintained the First Day of the week of perpetual obligation. Calvin got from the vindication of the Sabbath Law to its ‘ceremonial part’, being

abolished. How Chrystie – after his excursion – got from there to the First Day of the week, remains a riddle.

No, Calvin contended for a “stated day of worship” which of all things had to be NOT “a Sabbath”.

“Early Christian writers are wont to call it (this commandment) typical, as containing the external observance of a day which was abolished with the other types on the advent of Christ. This is indeed true; but it leaves the halve of the matter untouched.” (28)

“The Sabbath being abrogated, there is still room among us, first, to assemble on stated days for the hearing of the word, the breaking of the mystical bread, and public prayer; and, secondly, to give our servants and labourers relaxation from labour. It cannot be doubted that the Lord provided for both in the commandment of the Sabbath. The former is abundantly evinced by the mere practice of the Jews. The latter Moses has expressed in Deut. 5:14.” (32a)

“This”, “The Sabbath being abrogated”, “is indeed true”, says Calvin, “but it leaves the halve of the matter untouched”. In fact Calvin gives no explanation or indication how the Sabbath was “abrogated”, in any case, not from the Scriptures – absolutely NO explanation or indication. This is typical and exactly how he simply takes it for granted, “the Sabbath being abrogated”, “this is indeed true”. “It leaves the halve of the matter untouched”, yet hasn’t touched the first halve of the matter. All Calvin has to say is his own speculation, “It being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished”. (33c) For what reason on earth would the institution of just another day have the opposite effect, would itself not be ‘superstition’? Especially since this other day’s ‘adoption’ was not the doing of the Apostolic Church, but of the Church, because – Calvin feared – “the false prophets ... in later times instilled Jewish ideas into the people, alleging that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the commandment ... while the moral part remains – viz. the observance of one day in seven.” (34b)

(Here Calvin protests the allegation “that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the commandment ... while the moral part remains – viz. the observance of one day in seven”, was the work of “the false prophets ... in later times instilled Jewish ideas into the people”. Yet he himself in 31b asserts, “... call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord ... then shalt thou delight thyself in the LORD.” Still there can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished. He is the truth ...”. Calvin worked on his ‘Institutions’ from 1534 to 1559 and

never noticed ... Maybe, he on purpose did not give equal attention to the Fourth Commandment?)

This – Calvin says – was what the *“false prophets”* taught, not he or the Apostles. The *“false prophets”* could not explain why the Seventh Day cannot be *“the moral part”*, but *“the observance of one day in seven”*, can. It must have been, in Calvin’s words, *“their taxation of the seventh day”*. Calvin uses sarcasm, clearly; he doesn’t approve their nonsense.

Calvin supplies one indirect reason the Sabbath was – allegedly – *“abolished”*. *“It was not, however, without a reason that the early Christians (again, not the Apostolic Church, but Christians “of later times”) substituted what we call the Lord’s day for the Sabbath. The resurrection of our Lord being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified, this day by which types were abolished, serves to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony.”*

Sunday-enthusiasts will disagree, but Calvin is clear, that he means *“the Sabbath”* was *“substituted”*, by, *“what we call the Lord’s day”*.

(This is another instance where Calvin directly contradicts himself. He otherwise consistently argues that *“what we call the Lord’s day”*, was no ‘substitution’ for the Sabbath.)

In any case, this statement implies a development already *“of later times”* than Apostolic. There had also been developing *“superstition”* in the Church, and *“It being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished (by these Christians); and as a thing necessary to retain decency, order, and peace in the Church, another day was appointed for that purpose.”* There is some duplicity in this, but it is not contradictory.

8.5.1.5.5.

Resurrection and Sabbath

We have established this happened after the Apostles’ time. Now let’s see to which day Calvin applied the resurrection of Jesus as all the while having been the reason for its observance?

We are forced to consult two translations, and it is very disheartening to find glaring differences with vast implication between these.

First the translation by Henry Beveridge (Eerdmans, 1970). Let us remind ourselves of what John Murray in his *Introduction* to this edition quotes from *‘The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation’*,

“Calvin was far above the weakness of aiming at the invention of novelties in theology, or of wishing to be regarded as the discoverer of new opinion ”

Now then, Beveridge:

“33c: “... another day was appointed for that purpose (to overthrow superstition ... to retain decency, order, and peace).

34a: It was not, however, without a reason that the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord’s day for the Sabbath. The resurrection of our Lord being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified, this day by which the types were abolished, serves to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony. I do not cling so to the number seven as to bring the Church under bondage to it, nor do I condemn churches for holding their meetings on other solemn days, provided they guard against superstition...”

No honest reader can deny it seems Calvin associates *“the resurrection of our Lord”* with *“the ancient Sabbath”*, it – *“the resurrection of our Lord”* – *“being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified”*, and, it – *“this day”* the Sabbath – being the *“day by which the types were abolished”*. The Sabbath is *“this day”*, *“by which”* in and with its own ‘abolishment’, was taken with, the ‘abolishment’ of *“the types”* other than itself. Speaking of this day, Calvin says, *“The resurrection of our Lord being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified, this day ... serves to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony.”*

“... this day serves to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony.” How? Remember the Sabbath, that it was abolished, and with it, all types – so no more ‘Sabbaths’ for the Church, Calvin implies. ‘Sabbaths’ are *‘shadowy ceremonies’*, and this is in line with what Calvin says in broader context and perspective.

Another undesirable division of paragraphs: As it is, *“33c: “... another day was appointed for that purpose (to overthrow superstition ... to retain decency, order, and peace).*

34a: It was not, however, without a reason that the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord’s day for the Sabbath. The resurrection of our Lord being the end ...”.

The division of paragraphs should be:

“33c: “(to overthrow superstition ... to retain decency, order, and peace) ... another day was appointed for that purpose. It was not,

however, without a reason that the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath.

34a: The resurrection of our Lord being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified, this day ... serves to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony."

The sentence, "It was not, however, without a reason that the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath", concludes the fore-mentioned reason why "... another day was appointed for that purpose".

Compare Simpson, Schulze and Brink "from the original Latin", Calvyn Jubileum Boekefonds, 1986,

"33: ... ek herhaal: die apostel vererg hom oor hierdie voorbarige onderskeid tussen dae en nie oor die regmatige keuse van 'n dag om die vrede van die Christengemeenskap te dien nie. Want juis vir hierdie doel is die sabbat in die kerke wat deur hom ingestel is, behou. Hy bepaal trouens daardie dag vir die Korintiërs om bydraes te versamel ter verligting van hulle broeders in Jerusalem. As 'n mens bygeloof vrees, was daar nog meer gevaar in die Joodse feesdae as in die Sondae wat die Christene tans het. Want die godsdienstige dag wat die Jode onderhou het, is afgekaf omdat dit (die afskaffing) gedien het om die bygeloof te vernietig; maar omdat dit vir die welvoeglikheid, die orde en die vrede in die kerk nodig was dat dit (die welvoeglikheid, die orde en die vrede) behou moes word, is 'n ander dag vir dié doel bestem.

34. Die mense van die ou tyd het egter nie die dag wat ons die dag van die Here noem, sonder oorleg in die plek van die sabbat gestel nie. Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie ware rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, word die Christene juis op die dag waarop die skaduwees geëindig het, vermaan om nie aan 'n afgeskadude seremonie verknoeg te bly nie. Tog lê ek nie soveel klem op die getal sewe dat ek die kerk sou verplig om dit te onderhou nie. Want ek sou nie graag die kerke wil veroordeel wat ander plegtige dae vir hulle samekomste het nie, so lank as wat hulle hulle van bygeloof onthou. Dit sal wel gebeur as die dae slegs aangewend word om die tug en goeie orde te behou."

This "day upon which the shadows ended ..." ("die dag waarop die skaduwees geëindig het ..."),

... is the day upon which "the purpose ... of that true rest which the sabbath of old foreshadowed", went into "fulfilment".

(... is die dag waarop "die doel ... van daardie ware rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het", in "vervulling" gegaan het).

And Calvin here says that "fulfilment", "is in the resurrection of the Lord" ("is ... in die opstanding van die Here ...");

"Aangesien die doel en vervulling van daardie ware rus wat die sabbat van ouds afgeskadu het, in die opstanding van die Here is, ..."

"Since the purpose and fulfilment of that true rest which the sabbath of old foreshadowed is in the resurrection of the Lord, ..."

"... word die Christene juis op die dag waarop die skaduwees geëindig het, vermaan om nie aan 'n afgeskadude seremonie verknoeg te bly nie."

"... Christians exactly on this day upon which the shadows ended, are warned not to stay attached to a shadowed ceremony."

Any doubt that might still linger that Calvin in this place has the Sabbath of the Seventh Day in mind, is expelled, first by the fact he states the Sabbath was "... abolished with the other types on the advent of Christ". And, next, in that he in just the following words refer to the very day he speaks of, saying, "I do not cling so to the number seven as to bring the Church under bondage to it". With this statement Calvin implies, 'I don't want to force the Church to keep the Seventh Day for the reasons I have just given, as a Sabbath or as the observance of the ceremonial part of the Fourth Commandment.' Nobody would deny this inference; why then would any one deny it "is in the resurrection of the Lord" that "the purpose ... of that true rest which the sabbath of old foreshadowed" was "fulfilled"?

In the third place this deduction or corollary is confirmed by the interpretation of "Sabbath / Sabbaths", which Calvin consistently gives to the Greek words usually interpreted 'week', namely, the possessive of *sábbaton* – *sabbátou* / *sabbátouhn*. The only Scripture in the New Testament that (indirectly) mentions the actual resurrection of Jesus, is Matthew 28:1, and in this text it literally says, "Late sabbath's-time, afternoon before / towards the first Sabbath ... there was an earthquake ...". Thus Calvin would have understood the text in view of the fact he so understands it in 1Corinthians 16:2 and in Acts 20:7 – against traditional opinion.

I therefore won't retract my statement wherever encountered that Calvin not once relies on the Resurrection as grounds or motive for the observance of the First Day-'*Lord's day*'.

That brings me to a final point on the subject, and that is Beveridge's use of the name '*Lord's day*' for the "appointed" or "stated days" of Christian worship. I don't know the Latin, I say again, but have my doubts '*Lord's day*' renders it correctly. The able translators – and unprejudiced translators – of the Potchefstroom version looks much more trustworthy, and they don't

say 'Lord's day', but "Sunday". 'Dies Domini' ('Lord's day') I think is what the Roman Catholic Latin writers use for Sunday. So may be Calvin also used 'Dies Domini' but, as the translators surely must have felt, Calvin being a true Protestant, would not have followed the Vatican in this erroneous nomenclature. From there, perhaps, "Sunday" in the Afrikaans, instead of 'Lord's day' as in the translation of Beveridge.

I mention this to emphasise the remoteness of the possibility Calvin would have associated the resurrection with the First Day of the week and the far more likely possibility he associated it with "the ancient Sabbath", "The resurrection of our Lord being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified".

Possibly this could also explain Calvin's single –and singular – explanation in 34a, of "what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath". If he in the other instances where translated "Lord's day", actually speaks of "Sunday" as in Simpson's translation, then the single occurrence of "what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath", is self-explanatory, namely, that for Calvin the "stated days" were not 'the Lord's day', but plainly "Sundays".

But I realise full well I speculate, and must get my suspicions confirmed or toppled on this.

Calvinists won't like the above in general, and certainly will call it far fetched, and even corruption of Calvin's. But I answer, Get the whole picture of 2, 8, and bring into consideration Calvin's other writings, and see which fits the resurrection of the Lord Jesus best, the Sabbath or the Sunday; and which fits best the Promise, the Prophecy and the Covenant of Grace, from the creation to our final redemption in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead "in Sabbath's-time".

8.5.1.5.6.

"The Sabbath Abrogated ... There is Still Room"

"This", "The Sabbath being abrogated", "is indeed true", according to Calvin, "but it leaves the halve of the matter untouched." He yet again in 32 defines this "halve of the matter" – that is, 'the halve' of the Commandment which remains 'untouched' – saying,

"The Sabbath being abrogated ... the two other cases" or 'aspects' or other "halve of the matter" by nature, "ought not to be classed with ancient shadows, but are adapted to every age".

Calvin in different places changes the sequence of the three aspects or "cases" of the Fourth Commandment as he had them explained in 28 his first paragraph on the Fourth Commandment. Then having mentioned the "abolished" "case" in the end to 31 with

the words, "Christians, therefore, should have nothing to do with a superstitious observance of days", he refers to "the other two cases" (or 'aspects' or "halve of the matter") "which" by nature "untouched", "ought not to be classed with ancient shadows, but are adapted to every age". These "two cases" are,

"First", "... the spiritual rest by which believers were to cease from their own works, and allow God to work in them ..." (28), or, "to assemble ... for the hearing of the Word, the breaking of the mystical bread, and public prayer" (31),

"and",

"Secondly", "... that servants, and those who lived under the authority of others, should be indulged with a day of rest, and thus have some intermission from labour" (28), or, "to give servants and labourers relaxation from labour" (32).

The "third" in 28, comes "secondly" in 32.

"It cannot be doubted that the Lord provided for both" these the non-'ceremonial' or "untouched" aspects or "cases" "in the commandment of the Sabbath." It is difficult to see how the Lord not also "provided" for the other case, aspect or "halve", that allegedly is "abolished", seeing "It cannot be doubted that the Lord provided for both in the commandment of the Sabbath" which is the "Sabbath" of the Commandment on the Seventh Day!

"The latter Moses has expressed in Deut. 5:14" with these words: "But the Seventh Day is the Sabbath of the LORD your God: You will do no work ... and will remember you were a slave ...".

"Moses expressed" the practical necessity "the Lord provided" for "the Seventh Day the Sabbath"; yet Calvin just above asserts the Lord must have "no doubt ... abolished" it. Only he knows how; to his reader it appears a flat and inexplicable contradiction. And how "the Sabbath being abrogated, there is still room to assemble on stated days", no Bible Christian is able to know. So how the admittedly required "stated days" can or must be Sundays, also nobody but the headstrong would insist, or the attentive would view as "superstitious".

Calvin argues "the Sabbath being abrogated, there is still room among us" (that is, among the Christians of his day) "... to assemble on stated days for the hearing of the Word". He forgets the Commandment also commands the First to the Sixth Days must be devoted to our work, and that therefore to separate any of those days for worship would also be a violation of God's Command.

In this statement Calvin combines the 'case' he mentioned "first" in 28, namely, "the hearing of the Word" and "which ought not to be classed with ancient shadows", with "the ceremonial part of the commandment" which – according to Calvin – "was abolished".

Calvin combines the two aspects of the Commandment, I say, although he, did not think they were both aspects of the Commandment, "still". For Calvin the matter of fact was two things: "the Sabbath being abrogated, there is still room among us ... to assemble on stated days". He thus does not suppose it an aspect or "case" of the Commandment that the Church assembles on the First Day of the week – he reckons it a necessity occasion for which there was "still room" for in "Christian society". He still reckoned "the abrogation of the fourth commandment as a ceremonial institution, and contended for a Sabbath or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary human arrangement."

Calvin never "contended for" the First Day of the week "a Sabbath day of worship".

He never "contended for" the First Day of the week "a stated day of worship".

He never contended for "what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath".

He always contended the "stated day" should not be based on the Fourth Commandment.

Calvin inconsistently contended "the Sabbath the seventh day of the week" "was abolished ... on the advent of Christ" because he also contended "the Lord provided for ... room among us ... to assemble on stated days ... in the commandment of the Sabbath", 32a.

Calvin thus enters into direct contradiction. And the contradiction does not so much lie between the Sabbath abolished and the Sabbath provided, as between "stated days provided for in the commandment" and "stated days" NOT "provided for" but "abolished".

He contended he had "no objection" the "stated day" could be the Seventh Day Sabbath though.

He completely divorced from the Fourth Commandment, the practice of the Church of his day to assemble on the First Day of the week, or, as he says "we call" it, "the Lord's day".

He completely separated "the Lord's day" and Jesus' resurrection from the dead.

He completely withheld "the Lord's day" from Law, moral Law or ceremonial Law.

These are undeniable and unavoidable throughout his consideration of the article. That it caused Calvin to contradict himself is self-evident. Why? Because he attempted the impossible: To divide into two the oneness (which God put together there) of the Fourth Commandment concerning the keeping of the Seventh Day.

8.5.1.5.7. **A Justified Conclusion**

At this stage we can with confidence counter James Chrystie's denial of the statement,

"Calvin ... maintained "the abrogation of the fourth commandment as a ceremonial institution, and contended for a Sabbath or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary human arrangement."

It must be made clear though, this statement does not go far enough. Calvin never "contended for a Sabbath", or, "for a Sabbath or stated day of worship". For him it was no question of alternatives. He is categorical: The Sabbath is abolished. There still is room – of necessity – for stated days to worship on. And that brings the third thing to the fore that never for Calvin was a matter of contention, namely, that the "stated day" was no "day of worship" – no Day that belonged to the worship of the Church religiously or by Law. For Calvin the "stated days" were meant to worship on in mutual agreement and peace as every age may find it convenient and necessary. In fact, he looks with almost contempt upon the manner of some to employ the Sabbath "as a kind of religious observance; because they dreamed that by their cessation from labour, they were cultivating the mysteries which had of old been committed to them". Calvin's entire animadversion on the Fourth Commandment has in view to protect the Christian observance of the 'Lord's day' from developing such religious qualities – wrongly or rightly so. Which is where I beg to differ with Calvin.

Therefore, we conclude this 'asperse' statement is honest, fair and well-founded while it depends on Calvin's basic and consistent distinction of the three "cases" or aspects of the Commandment as he distinguished them in several places into two categories, one the ceremonial, and "the two other cases" the "spiritual" "halve". All that therefore "since the advent of Christ", "remains" of the Fourth Commandment – according to Calvin – is what is "spiritual" in it: The Fourth Commandment does not contain, nor is contained in, the First Day of the week—"Lord's day".

This 'asperse' statement is honest, fair and well-founded, and although it leaves the halve of the matter untouched, does Calvin no injustice and not in the least is derogatory, for it only states some truths about his opinion on the Fourth Commandment and Sabbath. It leaves the halve of the matter untouched, I say, seeing it mentions nothing about Calvin's positive

statements concerning Christian observance of the Sabbath Seventh Day. And also because it leaves unmentioned Calvin's rebuttal of exactly claims like Chrystie's – of the First Day of the week supposedly being "what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath". Calvin clearly implies / insinuates "we" are **wrong** to view the day "what we call the Lord's day", "for the Sabbath", for we as Christians, should not appreciate "what we call the Lord's day", "for the Sabbath".

Now either "the commandment was abolished" as a whole or not at all, seeing "the ceremonial part of the commandment" constitutes the very "spiritual" subject matter of the Fourth Commandment. The only issue is whether one sees "the ceremonial part of the commandment" its 'spiritual' 'meaning' – the thing verily divinely commanded in it, or not.

If the Seventh Day per se is understood for nothing 'spiritual' or 'meaningful' in the Commandment and for that reason 'ceremonial' and "the ceremonial part of the commandment" "abolished", then it should be asked, just what constitutes the 'spiritual' element, and how in separation from the 'ceremonial' element?

Then it should also be asked, what would make the First Day, not "ceremonial" and not "the ceremonial part of the commandment"? Simply because it is not the Seventh Day, but the First Day? Then surely Calvin's rebuttal applies, that the matter has become one of the *SUPERSTITION of numbers*! If simply because it is not the Seventh Day but the First Day, then "the trifling of the false prophets" has prevailed – which "in their language they term the taxation of the seventh day". Then indeed to "allege that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the commandment" – that is, nothing but the 'seventh day' – "is nothing else than to insult the Jews".

Calvin never so much as suggests the First Day is the 'Lord's day' because of Jesus' resurrection.

Says he though, "By changing the day" (from the Seventh to the First Day as by the "false prophets"), "yet mentally to attribute to it (the First Day) the same sanctity (as to the Seventh Day)", would mean "to retain the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews."

Not Calvin argues a "change" – he denies exactly what the adversaries of his day and the enthusiasts of today, pretend! "And of a truth", says Calvin, "we see what profit they ("the false prophets" or those Sunday-advocates of Calvin's own day) have made by such a doctrine (of a 'change'). Those who cling to their constitutions go

thrice as far as the Jews in their gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism."

Ending to 34, and, ending to Calvin's treatise on the Fourth Commandment and last word on the First Day-'Lord's day' *contentions* so popular – positively nothing positive or approving of the Christian Judaism of First Day-'Lord's day' "sabbatism"!

So this is what 'changing the day' is in the opinion of John Calvin!

This is Calvin's verdict against the Church having "changed" the day from the Seventh to the First Day of the week, this his denunciation of men like Chrystie's doctrine of 'the Lord's day-Sunday'. Compare this in greater perspective and context with Calvin's pronouncements above, on the sanctity and service of the Seventh Day Sabbath, and shall we agree with Chrystie that Calvin "still maintained the Divine authority of the Lord's day-Sunday? If we slandered Calvin – if we brought "aspersion" against "this eminent Reformer", yes! But not if we truly sympathise with Calvin at his brave attempt to come to terms with the enigma of his time – the Christian Judaism of Sunday-keeping for the Sabbath.

Those who 'study Calvin' are justified in their conclusion "that he maintained "the abrogation of the fourth commandment as a ceremonial institution, and contended for a Sabbath or stated day of worship, under the gospel, only as a wise and necessary human arrangement.""

It is not to say one must agree with Calvin; it only means one should not make Calvin teach what he does not teach, and should respect whatever truths he does teach.

Studied from the point of view of this Calvin's contemporary predicament with a Church that Judaised through Sunday-Lord's day' – keeping, he did well and better for truth, sanity and peace than any of the Reformers or modern Calvin-enthusiast.

8.5.1.5.8. A Shadow

"There can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished. He is the truth, at whose presence all emblems vanish; the body, at the sight of the which the shadows disappear. ..."

What is "the ceremonial part of the commandment" as defined by Calvin himself? It is this: "a stated day (the Seventh Day

Sabbath) on which they should assemble ... or which, at least, they should specially employ ... and thereby be trained". Of this "ceremonial part of the commandment" Calvin declares, "There can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ", it "was abolished." Therefore – to Calvin's logic – *abolished* is that *employed* servant, instrument and *special* help whereby the Church should *assemble* and be *trained* – *vanished* that *emblem* of Him who *is the truth*, and *disappeared* that very *shadow* of His *presence* in the light of His glory. What spiritual exercise could come of its abolishment, what truth trained, and which presence brought to light? I guess, none!

I have given much attention to the "shadow" in "Paul", Part 4, Colossians 2:16-17 and Appendix.

A shadow cannot disappear unless its casting body disappears, or unless the body is obscured in darkness. By the truth "He is the truth" – by the manifestation of Him The True Light – the Body that is Christ's, the Church, comes to light and in His Light stands the taller, its shadow cast the more distinctly by the very Light that is Christ's. By the truth "He is the truth" at His *presence* all *emblems* *vanish* so that only the real remains – which, in the context of the Fourth Commandment, is the Seventh Day Sabbath. By the truth "He is the truth" the *body* appears, which is the Church, *at the sight of which* also its *shadow* – its Sabbaths' Feastings – is made manifest. In Paul's exact words, "the shadow IS" – *estin skiá*; the shadow "disappears" not, "the emblem vanishes" not, but BY THE LIGHT OF CHRIST appears, and is given *emblematic* reality or significance.

The "body" – in the words of Paul and in their context – is not "our Lord Jesus Christ", but it "belongs to Christ", and is His Church. At the point in time of Paul's writing, the Church was still belonging to "things-a-coming" and was still "increasing with the growth of God", "nourishment being ministered by joints and bands" of usefulness – of which the Church's "Sabbaths' Feastings" are Paul's very subject matter. The Church's Sabbaths' Feastings are "these things" Paul protected and defended against the world, against its judgements, its cunning, its hypocrisy, its powers of darkness and wily men.

By "these things-a-coming" "the Body" is "knit together" with "the HEAD" which is Christ. Therefore the shadow goes with the Body, and the Body goes with the Head, which is the Body's Light. To make the shadow to *vanish* and *disappear* would require to make the Body disappear, which would require it to be severed from the Head – the very thing Paul warns against in this Scripture (Col.2:19a). Where the unity of "these things" is preserved however, there the Church's "Sabbaths' Feastings" are preserved and nourished – indeed defended and championed against

abolishment. So Paul admonishes, "Do not you (say I, Paul) by any means be judged, insulted or coerced by any man or power of the world in so far as your Sabbaths' Feastings are concerned" (the gist of verse 16).

The most pleasant application of Calvin's comes of precisely this Scripture, where he who is Calvin, defends the Seventh Day's legality and validity in the freedom which the Church enjoys, with these words:

"He (Christ), I say, is the true completion of the Sabbath : "We are buried with Him by baptism into His death : that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). Hence, as the Apostle elsewhere says, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Col.2:16, 17); meaning by body the whole essence of the truth as is well explained in that passage. ..."

Calvin wants this text to be appreciated 'spiritually'. "In meat or in drink" – or rather, "in eating and drinking" – is a spiritual 'feasting' of Christ as by faith partaking of His body and blood: "... to assemble on stated days for the hearing of the word, the breaking of the mystical bread, and public prayer". Calvin says what is involved in Colossians 2:16-17 is "requiring the whole course of our lives". In practical and congregational Christian faith – *as is well explained in that passage* – the "feasting" of the Sabbaths and of the Lord's ("monthly") Supper are for "hearing the word, and breaking the mystical bread". Calvin bases this "walk in newness of life" – "hence" his mention of the Church feasting her Sabbaths – upon the Father's raising up of Christ from the dead, thus connecting Christ's resurrection with the Sabbath – the Sabbath of the Seventh Day, of God's *sufficiency* and rest.

He doesn't bring the First Day 'Lord's day' into the picture, doesn't bring the First Day in connection with Jesus' resurrection at all – even where the best of opportunity invites.

8.5.1.5.9.

The Sabbath "Sufficient" in Every Respect

"The two other cases ought not to be classed with ancient shadows, but are adapted to every age. The Sabbath being abrogated, there is still room among us, first, to assemble on stated days for the hearing of the word, the breaking of the mystical bread, and public prayer; and, secondly, to give our servants and labourers relaxation from labour. It cannot be doubted that the Lord provided for both in the

commandment of the Sabbath. The former is abundantly evinced by the mere practice of the Jews. The latter Moses has expressed in Deut.5:14."

"By the mere practice of the Jews", "the former is abundantly evinced" ... What is this "former"? It is comprised of "the two other cases" (which) ought not to be classed with ancient shadows". What are these "two cases" further described to be? This: "... first, to assemble ... the hearing of the word, the breaking of the mystical bread, and public prayer; and, secondly, to give our servants and labourers relaxation from labour." This is Christian worship.

And what is this "practice of the Jews"? It is that which "the Lord provided for ... in the commandment of the Sabbath" ... Sabbath-keeping of course! Now Calvin says "the former" or the "first", which is, "to assemble ... the hearing of the word, the breaking of the mystical bread, and public prayer", "is abundantly evinced by" ... Sabbath-keeping, because Sabbath-keeping of the Seventh Day is "the mere practice of the Jews"!

Yet Calvin denies this very allowance of his by saying: "Still there can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished". He leaves his readers in total confusion, only finally to conclude: "Christians, therefore, should have nothing to do with a superstitious observance of days." It seems far the likeliest, Calvin had in mind First Day observance with "superstitious observance of days". The Sabbath though – which according to the "practice of the Jews" is to observe the Seventh Day – according to Calvin is "abundantly evinced" by the Scriptures. Says he, "the Lord provided for" "occasion" "to assemble", and "for ... hearing of the word", and "for ... the breaking of the mystical bread", and "for ... public prayer", "in the commandment of the Sabbath". Could he have said anything more worthy for or of the First Day-'Lord's day'? Then why did he not?

Calvin in saying, "the false prophets ... who cling to their constitutions go thrice as far as the Jews in their gross and carnal superstition of sabbatism", has in mind the Church in its insistence on the First Day of the week-'Lord's day'-observance as an obedience to the Seventh Day Sabbath Commandment. This belief and practice of the Church are in opposition to the drive and essence of Calvin's "Institutions of the Christian Religion".

It is a sorry state of affairs we so dishonour our beloved Reformer with our own lack of courage and honesty to admit error and accept truth.

The error we should admit and confess is our keeping of Sunday for all these "legitimate" reasons, uses and purposes "the Lord" in His very sanctification of the Seventh Day 'provided for'. And the truth we are to accept and practice is that we God's Church

should obey with an obedience His, from Him to Him, and stop our own obedience, and begin respect the one and only true Sabbath Day God's, the Seventh Day of the week. Come that day, come that suffering of Christ we so dearly need but completely lack.

8.5.1.5.10.1. Calvin, The Church, and the Status Quo

We may now attend to Calvin's excuse for the Church's respecting of the so-called "Lord's day"-Sunday.

Says James Chrystie, "In this passage (Sec. 31, 32), Calvin vindicates the law of the Sabbath as of perpetual obligation. (We have seen Calvin 'vindicates' the Seventh Day Sabbath 'in this passage'.) He then proceeds to vindicate the **church** from the charge of Judaizing; and in the same connection asserts that the change was made not by "human arrangement", but by apostolic, and, of course, Divine authority (Inst., Bk.2; Chap.8; Sec.33).

We must beforehand bring to the reader's attention, Calvin does not vindicate the Church in her folly of Lord's day-'sabbatism', but reprimands her for exactly it – for this her "Judaism" and "sabbatism".

"I am obliged to dwell a little longer on this, because some restless spirits are now making an outcry about the observance of the Lord's day. They complain that Christian people are trained in Judaism, because some observance of days is retained. My reply is, That those days are observed by us without Judaism, because in this matter we differ widely from the Jews. We do not celebrate it with the most minute formality, as a ceremony by which we imagine that a spiritual mystery is typified, but we adopt it as a necessary remedy for preserving order in the church. Paul informs us that Christians are not to be judged in respect of its observance, because it is a shadow of something to come, (Col. 2:16); and, accordingly, he expresses a fear lest his labour among the Galatians should prove in vain, because they still observed days, (Gal. 4:10,11). And he tells the Romans that it is superstitious to make one day differ from another, (Rom. 14:5). But who, except those restless men, does not see what the observance is to which the Apostle refers? Those persons had no regard to that politic and ecclesiastical arrangement, but by retaining the days as types of spiritual things, they in so far obscured the glory of Christ, and the light of the Gospel. They did not desist from manual labour on the ground of its interfering with

sacred study and meditation, but as a kind of religious observance; because they dreamed that by their cessation from labour, they were cultivating the mysteries which had of old been committed to them. It was, I say, against this preposterous observance of days that the Apostle inveighs, and not against that legitimate selection which is subservient to the peace of Christian society. For in the churches established by him, this was the use for which the Sabbath was retained. He tells the Corinthians to set the first day apart for collecting contributions for the relief of their brethren at Jerusalem, (1 Cor. 16:2). If superstition is dreaded, there was more danger in keeping the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's day as Christians now do. It being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished; and as a thing necessary to retain decency, order, and peace in the church, another day was appointed for that purpose."

"... He then proceeds to vindicate the **church** from the charge of Judaizing ...",

Chrystie would have liked to say Calvin then proceeded to vindicate the Sunday from the charge of Judaizing. However, that is impossible. Calvin does not here defend Sunday or the presumed "change" from the Sabbath to the Sunday-'Lord's day'. To make him do so is to corrupt his intentions and statements. Calvin, for example, specifically never uses the term "change" for whatever he might have understood Sunday-'Lord's day' observance for.

8.5.1.5.10.2. **To Confuse "Spiritual" for "Superstition"** **'Spiritual' of the Fourth Commandment** **Distinction by 'External' and Internal Manifestation**

No, says Calvin, you are mistaken – in fact, you must be blind for the "*obvious*" reasons I have *dwelt upon* above. Therefore, "*I am obliged*" to further explain.

(It will be noticed 33 has parallel halves. They repeat much – Calvin wants to be understood clearly (although it is difficult). I indicate the first half with 'a'; the second half with 'b'.)

You have "*no regard*", says Calvin, to the fact our '*retention*' of '*the Lord's day*' is a "*politic and ecclesiastical arrangement / policy and order in the Church*". (33b1) "*Those days are observed by us without Judaism.*" (33a)

You cannot perceive we don't "*retain the days as types of spiritual things*" – like the Sabbath of the Commandment is a type, 33b2. "*We do not celebrate it ... as a ceremony by which we imagine that a spiritual mystery is typified*" – like in many places explained, the Sabbath of the Commandment *typifies a spiritual mystery*. We "*the Christian People*" do not "*obscure the glory of Christ and the light of the Gospel*", 33b3, "*observing the Lord's day* (Sunday) **as a type**, but, "*in this matter differ widely from the Jews*" (33a2).

We *differ from the Jews* in that we "*retain the day*" as "*that politic and ecclesiastical arrangement*", "*... but we adopt it as a necessary remedy for preserving order in the church*", 33a4. "*They (the Jews) did not desist from manual labour on the ground of its interfering with sacred study and meditation*" (for which purpose we Christians use the '*Lord's day*'), *but as a kind of religious observance; because they dreamt that by their cessation from labour, they were cultivating the mysteries which had of old been committed to them*", 33b4.

However, "*We (Christians)*" – unlike the Jews – "*do not celebrate it (the Lord's day) with most minute formality, as a ceremony by which we imagine that a spiritual mystery is typified*", 33a3. "*It was, I say, against this preposterous observance of days (by Christians), that the Apostle inveighs*", 33b5.

"... *because in this matter we differ widely from the Jews*" who keep the Sabbath because of the Law. "*We do not celebrate it with the most minute formality*" as required by the Law a 'holy' thing. For Calvin, that is.

And this is the advantage of the First Day-'*Lord's day*' for not being the "Sabbath" as and for what we find it in the Commandment.

Says Calvin, "If superstition is dreaded, there was more danger in keeping the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's day as Christians now do", 33c.

Final decision and motive why Calvin says the "ceremonial part", the Seventh Day, of the Fourth Commandment, had been "abolished": his (justified?) dislike, aversion, yea, "dread", of "superstition"! And what superstition has come of it!

Then Why Not the Sabbath?

Calvin then, must have been aware of his meagre grounds for this Sunday-'*Lord's day observance*', for he asks,

"Why, it may be asked, do we not hold daily meetings, and thus avoid the distinction of days?" No! wishes he, "Would that we were privileged to do so!".

"Spiritual wisdom undoubtedly deserves to have some portion of every day devoted to it. But if, owing to the weakness of many, daily meetings cannot be held, and charity will not allow us to exact more of them, why should we not adopt the rule which the will of God has obviously imposed upon us ..." and keep the Sabbath?

Calvin never says, "God abolished" the Sabbath. He does not even say, "... with the other types was abolished – by or through – the advent of Christ", but, "... on the advent of Christ", which means, 'after' the advent of Christ. Calvin always in the Passive Voice says, the Sabbath "being abrogated" or, "was abolished", or, "was done away", and so indicates it was the Church that "abolished" the Sabbath. Why should we respect the Church in her doing so? If we respected the Church in her doing so, let us remind her of her sin in doing so. Unfortunately, in this argumentation of his, Calvin made no insignificant contribution to the Church's abolishment of the Sabbath.

Nevertheless everything Calvin says concerning the Sabbath isn't negative; there is much positive, far more than what he has to say for First Day-'*Lord's day observance*'. Calvin gives First Day-'*Lord's day observance*' not so much as one Scripture credit, and not so much as one typical advantage of '*spiritual mystery*'!

Speaking of the Seventh Day Sabbath in 33b, Calvin – in fact – gives to the Sabbath the very same advantage that he elsewhere contrived for the First Day, and much more. In "the churches established by him (Paul)", says Calvin here, "this was the use" "for

which the Sabbath was retained", "the use" namely, of "subservien(ce) to the peace of Christian society"!

Sunday advocates, Calvin-enthusiasts, take notice.

The Sabbath, according to Calvin, lacks nothing that may serve for it to be the '*stated day*' of worship of '*Christian society*'. What the Sabbath has, and the First Day-'*Lord's day*' does not have, is, the Sabbath is "the rule which the will of God has obviously imposed upon us".

That is Calvin saying.

"Paul informs us that Christians are not to be judged in respect of ... observance of days" – says Calvin – with regard to the Sabbath, plainly, the Seventh Day of the week, context and thrust of argument, with literal meaning, taken into consideration of 1Corinthians 16:2.

And, says he in 31a, "I have no objection to their taking it" ("the number ... that by the seventh day the Lord delineated to his people the future perfection of his sabbath ... that by continual meditation on the Sabbath, they might throughout their lives aspire to this perfection", end 30) more simply: that the Lord appointed a certain day on which his people might be trained under the tutelage of the law, to meditate constantly on the spiritual rest, and fixed upon the seventh, either because He foresaw it would be sufficient, or in order that his own example might operate as a stronger stimulus; or, at least, to remind men that the Sabbath was appointed for no other purpose than to render them conformable to their Creator." I Calvin, say, I don't say the Church must keep the Seventh Day – 34a – "I do not cling so to the number seven as to bring the Church under bondage to it, nor do I condemn churches for holding their meetings on other solemn days (than the Seventh Day Sabbaths) provided they guard against superstition."

Perhaps Calvin vents an illusionary fear, because it is most interesting what he deems as '*superstitious*' in this regard?

Calvin's understanding of the Fourth Commandment distinguishes between the '*ceremonial*' and '*spiritual*' "parts" within the Fourth Commandment.

The '*ceremonial part*' he understands as "on the advent of Christ" being 'abrogated' / 'abolished' / 'done away with', 2 / 8, 28a. "Early Christian writers (not the Apostles) are wont to call it (the Fourth Commandment) typical, as containing the external observance of a day (the Seventh Day) which was abolished with the other types on the advent of Christ."

Otherwise for Calvin, all the Ten Commandments, and in essence, are '*spiritual*'. The '*spiritual*' of the Fourth Commandment,

he believes, "should never be completed before the arrival of the last day ... shall not be consummated until ... God shall be all in all", 30b. "We must rest entirely"; this is a "complete cessation" though "an incessant warfare" in which the Christian "is engaged", "that by continual meditation on the Sabbath, they might throughout their lives aspire to this perfection" (29c, 30b). The keeping or "observance" of the Church of her own "stated days" – which is an "outward" "stated" 'case', which every time *ceases* when *completed* – therefore is not this, the believer's keeping or "observance" of the 'true', "spiritual" 'Sabbath' – which is an inward, individual striving after "the mystery of perpetual resting from our (own) works", 31.

For Calvin the two, "stated days" and "Sabbath" (which in Calvin has become the "continual meditation on the Sabbath") are completely UNRELATED. The first the believer's business, and his obedience to God's Law of the Sabbath; the second, the Church's business and "arrangement" expedient to the "order" of "Christian society" (for which the individual believer should have proper "regard") but which is NOT God's Law the Fourth Commandment.

Calvin doesn't give thought to the possibility 'society' could not be *Christian* and even antichristian. Such supposed circumstance would quickly prove what God's Law really requires for a "spiritual" obedience of it. It will soon show, there is no such thing as obedience to the Fourth Commandment unless the Day there commanded, is 'remembered' and 'observed' to God's order and Command, revealed in Holy Writ, even in the 'Letter that killeth'.

For me, the legitimacy or not of this distinction of Calvin's, is the first question about his doctrine on the Fourth Commandment. Compare, for example, his statement quoted above,

"We must not imagine that the coming of Christ has freed us from the law: for it is the eternal rule of a devout and holy life, and must, therefore, be as unchangeable, as the justice of God which it embraced, is constant and uniform",

with his introductory words to his consideration (28) of the Fourth Commandment,

"As this commandment stands in peculiar circumstances apart from the others, the mode of exposition must be somewhat different. Early Christian writers are wont to call it typical, as containing the external observance of a day which was abolished with the other types on the advent of Christ."

If this is further compared with his general *introduction* to "the Ten Commandments of the Law", 2, 28, 1 to 12 (See further on.), it becomes clear any Commandment "on the advent of Christ" only obtained greater, deeper and wider scope and application than

before, and never surrendered one bit of itself. And that greater, deeper and wider scope and application obtained "on the advent of Christ", runs parallel with and is fully relative to, the Law's endorsement to kill. Christ came as a judgement – The Judge.

The correctness or faultiness of Calvin's explaining away as "ceremonial" the Seventh Day of the Fourth Commandment therefore depends upon his conception of what is "ceremonial" and what is "spiritual". What is it that makes the Fourth Commandment not an "eternal rule of a devout and holy life", and why "must" it *be changeable*, and not "as the justice of God which it embraced", "constant and uniform"?

Calvin gives his unmistakable and ONLY answer to this dilemma,

The Fourth Commandment – and the Sabbath belonging to it – is "call(ed) typical, as containing the external observance of a day which was abolished with the other types on the advent of Christ."

Calvin presumes "a day which was abolished", and from this, concludes the Sabbath Commandment is "typical". Then, because it (presumably) is "typical", therefore the Sabbath is "a day which was abolished".

Calvin's logic seldom failed him, but here it does. Besides contradicting himself in general principle – as illustrated above, that the Commandment is unchangeable yet is changeable – he also never gets off the ground, but argues in a circle, that the Commandment is typical because it contains a day that is abolished because it is typical.

Calvin fails to show why the Fourth Commandment is "typical", and so everybody else who argue against the Seventh Day Sabbath as being "typical" because "abolished" and as being "abolished" because "typical".

Either no Fourth Commandment remains since being abolished and since being typical, or the Fourth Commandment *as containing the external observance of the day which was commanded* by God, remains, and remains not abolished, not abolishable, unchanged, and unchangeable, regardless of being typical or not. Or retract agreement reached the Fourth Commandment remains not abolished, not abolishable, unchanged, and unchangeable, and – most importantly – undivided, and undividable for being typical or not typical.

The Fourth Commandment as containing the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God, it is argued (by Calvin as by others) was abolished because it contained, or served as, a "shadow". All the reasons pro and con just given, that it was "typical", apply. To be a "shadow" is to be a "type".

I do not deny, indeed, the Fourth Commandment in fact the day of its Command, is typical. (Mainstream Sabbatharians deny.) That typicality of it though, implies not the Sabbath's abolishment, but its establishment by ultimate fulfilment of it through Jesus Christ. Typicality doesn't make Law temporary and changeable. The very qualitative typicality of the Sabbath's is what makes of it the *untouchable*, inviolable, immutable, eternal Day of Worship Rest of the Saviour God, the One and Unchangeable.

Calvin uses the words "superstition" and "preposterous" where he answers the "restless souls / spirits", 33a, who objected to the Church "observ(ing) of the Lord's day". "They complain that Christian people are trained in Judaism, because some observance of days is retained (by us the Church)", writes Calvin, and with this statement replies, "Sorry, sirs, your fears are for no reason, *because the fact some observance of days is retained by us, does not mean our Christian people are trained in Judaism. You're making an outcry for nothing; your fears are unfounded. "My reply (to you) is, that those days (we observe) are observed by us without Judaism, because in this matter (of our "observance of the Lord's day"), we differ widely from the Jews. We do not celebrate it (the Lord's day) with most minute formality, as a ceremony by which we imagine that a spiritual mystery is typified, but we adopt it as a necessary remedy for preserving order in the Church. ... And he (Paul) tells the Romans that it is superstitious to make one day differ from another. But who, except those restless men (among us), does not see what the observance is to which the Apostle refers? (The Apostle refers to the observance of those who in his day made one day to differ from another. 'We', are not guilty of that, sort of observance of days.) Those persons (who in Paul's day thus made one day to differ from the other) had no regard to that politic and ecclesiastical arrangement ("in the Church" – French, i.e., 'of our Church'), but by retaining the days as types of spiritual things, they in so far (i.e., in so far as they retained the "days as types"), obscured the glory of Christ and the light of the Gospel. They (of Paul's day) did not desist from manual labour on the grounds of its interfering with sacred study and meditation, but as a kind of religious observance, because they dreamed that by their cessation from labour, they were cultivating the mysteries which had of old been committed to them* (that is, committed to the "days as types")...." 33a.

Calvin DENIES the Church observes the Sunday-'Lord's day' by reason of the Scriptures or 'Divine authority'; he refers to Romans 14 and Galatians 5 to underscore this his categorical claim – NOT to 'prove' or support the Sunday-'Lord's day' or its supposed validity or its real observance. Anyone who thinks so, can't read.

denounced in 33a as "Judaism"
and "Superstition"

desist from manual labour as a kind of religious observance is a ceremony by which a spiritual mystery is typified
the days as types of spiritual things
interfering with sacred study and meditation
cultivating the mysteries of old committed

acclaimed (in 28) as ...

dead to own works we meditate on the kingdom, have recourse to means appointed containing external observance of a day call it typical
under the rest of the seventh day a type of the spiritual rest
a day to hear the Law, employ meditating, be trained in piety
to perform religious rites

This exercise may be repeated with reference to Paragraphs 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33b, with ease. For the sake of space and time the example will do.

The point I want to make with the illustration is, that these are the very things Calvin says, serve "the purport of the commandment". "The doctrine of the Law (is,) that God, as our Creator, is entitled to be regarded by us as a Father and Master, and should, accordingly, receive from us fear, love, reverence, and glory". (2, 8, 2)

But here, in 33, Calvin denounces these very same things "in so far ... as types of spiritual things they obscure the glory of Christ and the light of the Gospel"! These are the very things he calls "superstition"!

Notice the grounds on which Calvin makes these allegations: there are none! None however, if with reference to the Sabbath (Seventh Day); but in every instance a valid protestation if with reference to any day not instituted by 'Divine authority', like the Sunday-'Lord's day'. Calvin is perfectly right in this!

Paragraph 33a

we do not celebrate with most minute formality, as a ceremony it is superstitious to make one day differ from another
they in so far obscured the glory of Christ and the light of the Gospel
they dreamed they were cultivating the mysteries of old committed to days

Paragraph 29

There is no commandment the observance of which the Almighty more strictly enforces
He complains that His sabbaths were violated, not kept, not hallowed as if after it was neglected, there remained nothing in which He could be honoured
All this tends to celebrate the dignity of the mystery ... for it is a sign ... The analogy between the external sign and the thing signified is most appropriate

Calvin obviously does not here do justice to the crux of Romans 14, that in it Paul does not fight the Church's observance of days, but their spirit of intolerance and grudging. Also to the fact the chapter doesn't deal with a question of the observance of the Sabbath (Refer Part 4 of *The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace*,

Paul), but with the malpractice of making of the kingdom of God a (contemporary) status privilege of food and drink. Here is an example of that spirit:

We "*the Christian People*", says Calvin, do not "*obscure the glory of Christ and the light of the Gospel*", 33b3, "*observing the Lord's day* (Sunday)", "*as a type*", but, "*in this matter differ widely from the Jews*" (33a2), who observed the Sabbath "*... because it is a shadow of something to come, (Col. 2:16)*".

Unprejudiced fact is, Sunday-'*the Lord's day*' has no typical value like the Sabbath, and therefore, cannot have "fulfilled"-by-Christ-meaning and therefore being-fulfilled-by-Christ-advancement. Sunday must be an institution of wilful religion and therefore remains '*superstition*' and '*preposterous*'. It is different from the Sabbath, which, exactly for its typical properties and value, is the Sabbath of the LORD your God – it is not the property of humanity or of the Church. The Sabbath, in its very 'fulfilment' by Jesus Christ, receives its establishment in and through and by Him, who is the Sabbath's end and purpose.

Romans 14 has nothing to do with this.

Paul "*accordingly, expresses a fear lest his labour among the Galatians should prove in vain, because they still observed days, (Gal. 4:10,11).*"

Calvin's reference to the Galatians passage is in place only if applicable to Sunday. See 'Paul', 4.

Calvin with these words concludes his "*reply*" to the accusation of the antinomians that the Church observed "*some days*" because the Law so required. His referring to Scriptures such as Romans 14 and Galatians 4 – supposedly Scriptures that BY OTHERS, are said to annul the Law of the Sabbath – plays in their hands. Calvin unconsciously joins forces with the antinomians.

Alas Calvin is forced to resort to Sabbath Scriptures to contend the Church, in 'freedom' from the Law, keeps "*those days*" which are not the Sabbath for the sake and cause of "*order and discipline / decency*".

Using Sabbath Scriptures from the New Testament is an apt method to justify, not any or "*some observance by us*", not any or "*some*" of "*those*" arbitrary "*days*", but the Sabbath Day, "*by us*" Christians, "*without Judaism*"! It makes possible a keeping of the Sabbath for the Lord's sake and not for the Law's sake. It does not make possible a keeping for the Lord's sake of the First Day-'Lord's day' though – it makes it impossible, impossible by Law as well as by Grace.

Nevertheless Calvin honestly aims at exposing the counterfeit Sabbath: the 'legalistic' First Day-'*Lord's day*' observance of some in his Church. He agrees with the antinomians in the matter, but then tells them: You are wrong though, in that you are ignorant of our true motives. We, like you, believe the Sabbath was abolished, but you confuse our keeping of Sundays for an observance of the Sabbath. He goes further than the antinomians – we don't even observe Sundays by reason of the Law whatsoever.

Then people like James Chrystie want to tell us Calvin defended and contended the Sunday-'*Lord's day*' out of his respect for the Fourth Commandment, and for the '*Divine authority*' of the Apostles '*under the gospel*'!

Calvin tried to do exactly the opposite: he out of his respect for the Fourth Commandment, and for the '*Divine authority*' of the Apostles '*under the gospel*', tried to show the Sunday-'*Lord's day*' had nothing to do with the Law of Ten Commandments, nothing with the Fourth specifically. Of course he had to fail.

What Chrystie and company aver Calvin does, to "maintain" the First Day-'*Lord's day*' is the "Sabbath", is not true.

8.5.1.5.10.3.

No Antinomy?

Chrystie: "For the intelligent and candid reader this will suffice. Calvin needs to be studied. That the infidel should misunderstand him, we do not wonder;—we are surprised that any one taught in truth and capable of discrimination should do so."

These lines are representative of Chrystie's own line of thinking. Their verbose arrogance contributes nothing but insult. We find that there is also nothing true contained in his claim, "... (Calvin) asserts that the change (from the Sabbath to the First Day of the week-'*Lord's day*') was made not by "human arrangement", but by apostolic, and, of course, Divine authority (Inst., Bk.2; Chap.8; Sec.33)."

Chrystie writes as if quoting Calvin who "asserts that the change was made not by "human arrangement"" – inverted commas. Calvin did not write the words "human arrangement". Nor does he claim "the change was made ... by apostolic ... authority" – not ever! And, even

less according to Calvin was it made "by . . . Divine authority"!

On the contrary, Calvin writes, "*It was, I say, against this preposterous observance of days that the apostle (in Romans 14) inveighs.*" That is, against an observance of the First Day-'Lord's day' as were it the Sabbath (Seventh Day) of the Law. "... Who, except those restless men, does not see what the observance is to which the Apostle refers?"

Who, except men like Chrystie, do not see what the observance is to which Calvin refers? He refers to and denounces the keeping of Sunday as the Sabbath of the Commandment. It means Calvin opposes views like Chrystie's and those of tradition on the Sunday-'Lord's day'.

8.5.1.5.10.4.

To Divide the Indistinguishable

What Calvin tried to separate and differentiate, is without difference and inseparable. First he wanted to distinguish and separate the Fourth Commandment from the Sabbath Commandment. Then he wanted to distinguish and separate the Sabbath Commandment from the Sabbath. Then the Sabbath from the Day; then the Day from its 'number', "the Seventh Day". Then, and just as important and therefore just as impossible, Calvin tried to separate and distinguish the Law and its keeping – the one abolished, the other remaining, or the Law and its meaning – the one abrogated, the other maintained. Then he tried to separate and distinguish between the Law's reason and purpose, and between its purpose and its end. Which is all very confusing and even more unnecessary.

Yet, Calvin never distinguishes or separates by reason of, or, on basis of, 'moral' principle. He was not persuaded by 'natural' religion to "do away with" the Sabbath.

He was forced by an anomaly of his time which till today reigns, that the Christian Day of Worship Rest is called 'the Lord's day', yet has no connection with, from or to, the Lord or the Lord's resurrection from the dead whereby the Sabbath – of the Seventh Day – received its true fulfilment once for all. "He is the truth, at whose presence all the emblems vanish; the body, at the sight of which the shadows disappear. He, I say, is the true completion of the Sabbath." *He, I say, is the true completion / finishing of the rest of God – God's Sabbath-Rest ... God's Sabbath-Rest of the Seventh Day of His creating, "the Sabbath of the LORD your God". One is supposed – by God's Word supposed – to see the event and the Person of this event "the true completion of the Sabbath", IS ("He, I say, is"), Jesus Christ! Where else than in His resurrection from the dead?*

Calvin was unable to see this. He was unable to, by reason of his times, which could not see this. So the Church, the Church today, remains unable to see it, cannot see its connection with the entering in into the Rest of God by faith in Jesus Christ who has given them rest (as Hebrews speaks about it). The Church is not able to see the event and the Person of this event, "the true completion of the Sabbath", IS Jesus Christ in resurrection from the dead! And therefore, is unable to part with Sunday-worship.

Who has read the Pope's encyclical *The Lord's day*, will know how afraid he is the Church might discover this truth and find out his great deception of millennia. It is ONLY because of this lie that Calvin could write: "Still, there can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished."

What does Calvin mean with the word "Still"? He means that after everything he thus far has written, that what he had written way back in 28a, namely, that "Early Christian writers are wont to call it (the Sabbath) typical, as containing the external observance of a day which was abolished with the other types on the advent of Christ", was still valid here in 31.

With everything Calvin had written up to 31 and this word "still", he with every step reinforced the Seventh Day Sabbath for being the Christian, only, eternal and obligatory Holy Day of the LORD.

This despite, he "still" thinks it must be, that "on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished."

While Calvin has given every possible reason why the Sabbath (Seventh Day) can NOT be "abolished", and why "the analogy between the external sign (the Seventh Day Sabbath) and the thing signified" ("that Israel might know that God is their sanctifier") "is most appropriate" (29c), he "still" insists, "There can be no doubt, that, on the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, the ceremonial part of the commandment was abolished."

Calvin "still" insists on something he gave one reason for, and that, once only. The thing he insists on, is that "the ceremonial part of the commandment", "the external observance of a day" – the Seventh Day Sabbath – "was abolished". And his only reason, or grounds, or justification for what he insists on, is, that it consists of one explicit and one implicit, claim: that "Early Christian writers are wont to call it (the Sabbath) typical". He without question and "without doubt" accepts these "early Christian writers", and that they were correct, and what they alleged "was indeed true". And he without question

and "without doubt" accepts they were correct in *calling the Sabbath typical*.

Show me if I'm wrong where Calvin appeals to another reason or motive for the First Day-'*Lord's day*' or its "regard" except his '*ecclesiastical arrangement for peace and order*' reason / motive / justification / grounds? Remember that Calvin is the person who most emphatically forbids 'his' First Day-'*Lord's day*' any Scriptural, '*mystical*', '*spiritual*', 'Law-' or 'Sabbath'-meaning or -reason!

It has become impossible to conclude otherwise, that Calvin basis his claim of the Sabbath's abolishment, on his claim the Sabbath is of dual nature, containing a ceremonial and a spiritual case, and on his claim the ceremonial is temporary, and therefore is not spiritual, and that it therefore, was abolishable and in fact abolished. And that he accepts and puts these 'arguments' together, on authority of "early Christian writers", solely.

This is the one side of Calvin's answer on the Sabbath question – his argument AGAINST the Sabbath. The other side of Calvin's answer on the Sabbath question is his argument FOR the First Day-'*Lord's day*'.

8.5.1.6.

Bowman

'Reinstated', or, Covenant-Sign?

(Bowman: "Courier New Italics Underlined"; words used: *Courier New Italics*; emphasis CGE "Italics Bold Underlined"; Comments CGE Verdana.)

Understanding:

I use the nomenclature 'Lord's Day' for the Seventh Day Sabbath not only as presupposition, but mainly as derived qualitative description. The title of the Day tells whence it comes and to whom it belongs and is associated with, namely its Owner Master Jesus Christ, the Lord. Any qualities and properties are obtained from Him whose Name and Title the day bears and with whom it in Covenantal agreement had been closed.

Now even the Lord – whose title the day bears – bears the title, Lord, not only by Covenantal prerogative but by Covenantal merit. Christ obtained the titles Christ and Lord in the crowning act of all God's works He covenanted to fulfil and finish, His sabbatical act wherein Jesus Christ rose from the dead. Without this victorious accomplishment there was no rest for God as yet, no titles Christ or Lord for Jesus as yet. In the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead are earned both titles Christ and Lord, as also the Name: Jesus, Saviour. Therefore to think of the 'Lord's Day' before the event of Jesus' resurrection and without His exaltation would be like thinking of the Sabbath before God's finishing and without His rest.

I for this reason and on this basis use the nomenclature 'Lord's Day' for the Seventh Day Sabbath not only as presupposition, but mainly as derived qualitative description. Was Jesus not raised from the dead "in Sabbath's time" – unthinkable – the Sabbath had not been the Day of God's Great Accomplishment and earning of Title Lord Christ, and could not be called "the Lord's Day". By virtue of the "eternal purpose" and "sure mercies" of God, to contemplate the unthinkable is unnecessary. Faith's expectancy would confirm no otherwise in all eternity. The Sabbath is Prophecy of God, of His Christ, the Lord from the beginning. "For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and Him – the Living, Resurrected, Lord – crucified." (1Cor.2:2) Here is the confirmation – yea, the establishment – of God's Sabbath-Rest, and hence His Sabbath Day "was made", on this truth based and titled, "the Lord's Day".

"The Sabbath - a Sign of the Covenant"

By Rev C Bouwman

"In discussions relating to the Sabbath and how today's Christian ought to keep the Sabbath, one hears from time to time references to the thoughts of John Calvin on the point. Calvin, I once read in a reformed periodical, "strongly opposed any suggestion of an observance of days and a literal abstention from work or recreation on the basis of it being commanded by the 4th commandment." In the Catechism, the article continued, the church echoes this position, for LD 38 makes no mention of not working on the Sunday; LD 38 explains the fourth commandment in terms of resting not from work but from evil. So: the Christian may give himself to work and recreation on the Sunday as long as this work or recreation does not interfere with the worship services.

The question I wish to address in this article is this: what in fact does Calvin say?

Calvin

In his Institutes of the Christian Religion, Calvin begins his treatment of the fourth commandment with these words (II,8.28):

"The purpose of this commandment is that, being dead to our own inclinations and works, we should meditate on the Kingdom of God, and that we should practice that meditation in the ways established by him. But, since this commandment has a particular consideration distinct from the others, it requires a slightly different order of exposition. The early fathers customarily called this commandment a foreshadowing because it contains the outward keeping of a day which, upon Christ's coming, was abolished with the other figures. This they say truly, but they touch upon only half the matter. Hence, we must go deeper in our exposition, and ponder three conditions in which, it seems to me, the keeping of this commandment consists.

"First, under the repose of the seventh day the heavenly Lawgiver meant to represent to the people of Israel spiritual rest, in which believers ought to lay aside their own works to allow God to work in them. Secondly, he meant that there was to be a stated day for them to assemble to hear the law and perform the rites, or at least to devote it particularly to meditation upon his works, and thus through this remembrance to be trained in piety. Thirdly, he resolved to give a day of rest to servants and those who are under the authority of others, in order that they should have some respite from toil."

This opening paragraph requires a number of comments.

In the first sentence quoted above, Calvin claims that at the heart of the teaching of this commandment lies the conflict between spiritual meditation on the one hand and our own sinful inclinations and works on the other. Calvin sees the human race as so corrupted by sin that no man has it in him to spend his days in contemplation of God and His saving work in Jesus Christ. With the fourth commandment, says Calvin, God gave to Israel an opportunity one day in seven to step back from the works of this life and focus attention specifically on the Lord God. The Sabbath, then, is an institution belonging to the fallen world.

Calvin, in agreement with the early fathers, saw in the fourth commandment a "foreshadowing" of Christ's coming. Specifically, the pattern of one day free from labour after six days of toil foreshadowed for Israel the deliverance which Christ would obtain from bondage to sin and Satan. Since Christ has set His people free from bondage to sin and Satan, the Sabbath as a sign is fulfilled. So God's people today need not rest one day after six days of labour; instead, in the New Testament dispensation God's people may rest every day - not from work itself but from evil.

Calvin, in disagreement with the early fathers, saw more in the fourth commandment than they did. "They touch upon only half the matter." Calvin sees three "conditions" requiring attention in a consideration of the fourth commandment. They are:

the matter of "spiritual rest, in which believers ought to lay aside their own works to allow God to work in them" (see points 1 and 2 above);

the need for "a stated day" on which the people of God may "assemble to hear" the Word of God;

the will of God to give "a day of rest to servants".

Calvin appears to be unclear in his own mind why in the fourth commandment God gave one day free in seven (as opposed to, say, one in five or nine). He says:

"If anyone dislikes this interpretation of the number seven as too subtle, I have no objection to his taking it more simply, thus: the Lord ordained a certain day on which his people might, under the tutelage of the law, practice constant meditation upon the spiritual rest. And he assigned the seventh day, either because he foresaw that it would be sufficient; or that, by providing a model in his own example, he might better arouse the people; or at least point out to them that the Sabbath had no other purpose than to render them conformable to their Creator's example. Which interpretation we accept makes little difference, provided we retain the mystery that is principally set forth: that of perpetual repose from our labors" (II.8.31).

On the basis of his indefiniteness on this point, Calvin later says that it matters not to him which day of the week the New Testament church meets together for worship. Stronger, even a pattern of one in seven could be changed to a pattern of one in five....

Calvin is insistent that God wishes His children in all times and places to assemble together. However, Calvin does not base this habit on the fourth commandment. He says:

"Meetings of the church are enjoined upon us by God's Word; and from our everyday experience we well know how we need them. But how can such meetings be held unless they have been established and have their stated days? According

to the apostle's statement, "all things should be done decently and in order" among us [1 Corinthians 14:40]" (II.8.32).

Notice Calvin's argument. Both Scripture and experience teach us that we need to meet as church. How shall the frequency and dates of the meetings be determined? Calvin finds the answer not in the fourth commandment but in Paul's "decently and in order" argument.

In fact, Calvin would prefer that distinctions between days be removed altogether, and that God's people assemble "daily". He recognises, however, that the weakness and spiritual immaturity of many in this broken life makes the realisation of this ideal impossible. So, setting aside one day in seven provides for a partial realisation of the ideal, of which all people are capable (II.8.32).

I note: this accommodation to the brokenness of this life does not do much justice to the authority of (one of) the ten commandments.

As logical consequence of the above, Calvin does not consider the shift from Sabbath observance on the last day of the week to observance on the first day of the week as decreed by God (II.8.34). The shift instead came about by the will of the New Testament church. Calvin agrees that their decision to have God's people come together on the first day of the week was a happy decision, since Christ arose on this first day of the week.

As Calvin draws to a close his discussion in the Institutes about the fourth commandment, he gives this summary:

"To sum up: as truth was delivered to the Jews under a figure, so is it set before us without shadows. First, we are to meditate throughout life upon an everlasting Sabbath rest from all our works, that the Lord may work in us through his Spirit. Secondly, each one of us privately, whenever he has leisure, is to exercise himself diligently in pious meditation upon God's works. Also, we should all observe together the lawful order set by the church for

the hearing of the Word, the administration of the sacraments, and for public prayers. In the third place, we should not inhumanly oppress those subject to us" (II.8.34).

The reader will notice much of the above discussion repeated in Calvin's conclusion. His closing words on the matter are these:

"But we ought especially to hold to this general doctrine: that, in order to prevent religion from either perishing or declining among us, we should diligently frequent the sacred meetings, and make use of those external aids which can promote the worship of God."

Notice how this closing word focuses on the practical element of the fourth commandment. This is a rule, according to Calvin, valid for all people at all times.

Calvin, of course, wrote much more than simply the Institutes. From his hand have come also commentaries on most of the books of the Bible, as well as various tracts, letters and - not to forget? catechisms. Especially throughout his commentaries Calvin has commented at length about the Sabbath, specifically where he had to deal with passages of Scripture that speak of the Sabbath. Yet in all that Calvin writes further about the Sabbath, nowhere does he depart substantially from what he has written in the Institutes. Repeatedly we find the same three emphases as mentioned above, with the accent on the first of the three, the "spiritual rest".

Evaluation

The careful reader will have perceived in the above points that I disagree with Calvin's exposition of the fourth commandment.

In point 1 above, I draw attention to Calvin's claim that the conflict between spiritual meditation on the one hand and our own sinful inclinations and works on the other lies at the heart of this commandment. This claim presumes that the fourth commandment can only function in an environment of sin. Yet the Lord has told us in Gen 2 that He kept the Sabbath. And in the reason for the Sabbath as given in the

fourth commandment on Mt Sinai (Ex 20:8-10), God specifically connects the human Sabbath day to the divine Sabbath of Gen 2. It is a basic error in Calvin's teaching about the Sabbath that he failed to reckon with the Sabbath as a creation ordinance.

Furthermore, it is certainly true in the fourth commandment the Lord would teach His people that they need to rest from sin. But this instruction holds true for every commandment! When God says in the sixth commandment that I am not to murder, He tells me not only never to take my neighbour's life but also to love the neighbour, and show patience, peace, gentleness, mercy and friendliness to him. When God says in the seventh commandment that I am not to commit adultery, He tells me not only to avoid unchaste behaviour but also to be as pure and as faithful as He is pure and faithful. That is to say: with every command God instructs us to rest from (particular) sin. By loading the fourth commandment with an instruction that holds valid for all the commandments, Calvin in fact missed the fine point of the fourth commandment of God's covenant.

This is not to say that I see nothing in Calvin's insistence that God gave to Israel one day off from work per week as a symbol of the total rest-from-evil that God has promised His people in Jesus Christ. Calvin's argument has merit, and in LD 38 the church rightly supplies an echo. But to say that the element of rest-from-evil forms the heart of the fourth commandment is truly saying too much.

Again, that the Lord permits a less "stringent" command than He actually would wish on the basis of the weaknesses of fallen man, simply does not do justice to the nature of God's commands. In none of the other commandments does God allow for human weaknesses. The Lord Jesus, in His Sermon on the Mount, exposes the depth of the commandments with these words, "Therefore you shall be perfect, just as your Father in heaven is perfect" (Mt 6:48; see also vss 21-47).

In Calvin's writings about the fourth commandment, he nowhere does justice to the second side of the command, namely, the instruction to work. This is understandable since he lays such emphasis on the concept of "spiritual rest". But the Lord intended more in the fourth commandment than an instruction pertaining to one-day-rest; in the command God also gives instruction about six-days-work. In fact, one may rightly say that the one-day-rest was intended to give focus and purpose to the six-day-work. The whole ambit of the cultural mandate, then, comes into focus here.

Conclusion

The reader will understand that I do not intend these critical comments to erode appreciation for Calvin. He was and remained a man of God, greatly used by God as a blessing for His catholic church. But Calvin, like anybody else, was a child of his times, and reacted to the apostasy of his day. His teachings on the Sabbath were a vast improvement over the works-righteousness teachings of the Roman Catholic Church of his time, but did not do full justice to the Word of God.

Consider:

"Have you ever noticed that all 10 commandments are repeated in some way in the New Testament - with the exception of the fourth? You look in vain in the words of Jesus or of Paul or of Peter for an instruction to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. It's just not there. Does that not mean that the fourth commandment is no longer relevant for the church today?"

This supposition wholly is untrue.

To start with, not all the other nine of the Ten Commandments "are repeated in some way in the New Testament", and only a few are exactly 'repeated' – usually in abbreviated form. (Many writers have well illustrated this point, and can be researched in books like D.F. Nichol's *Answers to Objections*.)

Jesus though, boundlessly extended on the Commandments in his Sermon on the Mount; but also in all of his teaching, ministry and example.

Here's an article I wrote for a friend who brought up this question,

All the Ten Commandments Except the Fourth Reinstated

And so we have usurped the position of God who is "the only Lawgiver". This time only we, compile our own law of The Nine Commandments.

Finding it possible to fulfil the Law now as altered by us, we are justified by our own works, seeing it used to be the Fourth Commandment nobody was able to keep.

We never found that great Law so difficult to keep – you know the irksome one that says thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself and God above all?

Wasn't that Law nailed to the cross - that Law that if one should not fulfil it 100% one is condemned to eternal death?

If not, what did Jesus die for anyway?

So we have introduced our own law and brought ourselves back under it, under its bondage, and, under its curse! We have despised Christ who in every respect for the believer has become God's living Law.

All Law was nailed to the cross – 'moral' as well as 'ceremonial'. Jesus Christ personifies 'law' without exception. "Without blood there is no remission of sin" – it means, there is no remission of sin without the blood of the Lamb of God. Christianity is the religion of sacrifice – of

sacrifice and faith, the faith that believes in the once for all Sacrifice of Christ.

*"... (T)he demand of a blood covenant in the Law is not taken away, therefore the Law of the Former Covenant is not taken away. **We are required to have a blood covenant for sin now as formerly, and that commandment comes from the Former Covenant. Also, it is in this same general passage that the writer of Hebrews quotes the Old Testament in verse 16, "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says YHVH, I will put my Law [Torah] into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them." Therefore, the sacrifice of Yeshua works to transfer even more effectively the Law of G-d into the devoted ones.**"* David M Hargis (Abbreviations are Hargis'.)

All sacrificial Law is most 'moral' because of Christ, and therefore no sacrificial Law of the Bible has been annulled if moral quality determined whether a law should be annulled or not. Jesus Christ makes all 'ceremonial' Law real and valid with His fulfilment of it. The fact it is the Sacrifice of Him, makes them moral, real and valid. God never speaks for nothing. If 'ceremonial', means empty formality, then it is our fault, not God's. If 'ceremonial' meant to repeat animal sacrifices, we don't believe in Jesus. But if we believe in Him, we believe in what Old Testament 'ceremony' and sacrifice are supposed to show and mean and what they practically involve. They involve the One Sacrifice for the many. We believe in that Sacrifice; therefore we believe the Old Testament Law-principle of sacrifice, and have those sacrifices for us meaning and value to Christ-ward, and Christ to us-ward. The Old Testament saints believed no different than we do, and nothing besides. Our Sacrifice is the Real – theirs were the types of the Real.

The Law of sacrifices of the Old Testament is not the least less 'moral' or 'ethical' than the Ten Commandments. Also the Fourth Commandment – in exactly its Seventh-Day-ness as in its Sabbath-ness – is just as 'moral', 'ethical' and 'spiritual' as the Law that says, "You must love God above all". To differentiate between the complementary and reciprocal properties in the Fourth Commandment, is to undo the doing of God and to separate what He put together. The moment we make the Law two things, the one abolished, the other retained, it no longer is 'moral' or holy, but is mutilated and desecrated. (The Roman Catholic Church did this literally to the Second and Fourth Commandments.)

The Old and New Testaments always speak of the Sabbath as one thing, and of the Commandment of the Sabbath, as one thing. God calls it one thing, "My holy", and the single implied "holy" thing is the Day, the Seventh Day of His own making and perfecting a "sanctified" "Rest" unto Himself, and for, the People. Our 'keeping' of God's Sabbath is not the Sabbath; is not the Sabbath Commandment. (Calvin made of the appropriation of the 'Sabbath' principle the Law of the Commandment.) If the "Day" is the "*ceremonial part*" (Calvin) of the Commandment, then the 'ceremonial part' is the 'spiritual' and 'moral' and 'retained' and

'perpetual' 'part' of the Commandment. Then our obeying or not obeying the Commandment has no effect on this its spirituality, its moral quality. It stays, above human hallowing or desecration. It is built upon the Rock, the Christian's stronghold of peace and rest in storm or calm.

The Law having been nailed to the cross in and with and through Jesus Christ, Christ is the Law as Christ was the Law nailed to the tree. The same Jesus who died rose from the dead again, glorified. That's the only difference between before and after. That too is the only difference the Law underwent in the process of having been crucified and raised with Christ – it now is glorified – not nullified. Even the sacrifices and offerings and ceremonies in the resurrection of Him receive and are always receiving their essential importance, just as they receive and are always receiving their essential obliteration in Jesus in and by the dying and death of the Lamb of God.

When sacrifices were made, they instituted the laws in the past (OT). When sacrifice of Jesus was made, He instituted those very laws in Himself – the One for the many, once for all.

The Christian's is the generation that shall not live but by the faith in the blood of this Sacrifice of sacrifices.

The Jews used to live in the shadow of many sacrifices – we live in the Truth and Reality of them all, for Jesus took the sins of us upon Himself – every sort of sin, and so substituted every kind of sacrifice in his own flesh. Every sacrifice has found its perpetuity in Jesus' offering of Himself.

Thus is it with every law, every ceremony and every commandment that God had spoken. God's 'Word' is his Living Word Jesus, and never returns to Him "empty".

In Jesus Christ and in Him crucified, all 'law' had once for all obtained true meaning and real value. How? In that as they all in and with and through Him had been obliterated, they all in and with and through Him had been raised from death. Jesus who **IS** the Law nailed to the cross **IS** the Law raised to life in glory.

All law and laws were given by God and therefore are as eternal as He is. Yes, Christians are justified by the sacrifice of the Lamb of God and not without its blood shed for sinners – no ounce of our sins are forgiven us "without the blood" – the full weight and volume of the blood of Christ – at the full weight and length and price of God's eternal being and eternal faithfulness.

But let us see if it is true that all the Commandments except the Fourth had been reinstated after Christ.

First, why should they be reinstated if God's Word instated them? They should last for as long as God's Word that instated them lasts. They owe their existence His Word – to nothing and to nobody else. So how can the words of God be annihilated, obliterated, or whatever? **Only** if they are raised with Him and in Him and through Him in resurrection from the dead, in **glory!**

Yes, every of the “nine” Commandments are “repeated” or “reinstated”, despite the fact they are not repeated in the same formulation as in the Decalogue – they are confirmed in essence and in principle in and through and by Jesus Christ – and are magnified, in and through and by Jesus Christ.

But I say again, it is NOT true just nine of the Ten Commandments are found again in the NT exactly so or by way of implication. (I won’t now bother to indicate specifics. See this as some homework for yourselves.)

Let us concentrate on the Fourth Commandment and see if it is true or FALSE that it is not ‘repeated’ in the NT!

Jesus said: “The Sabbath was made for man – therefore the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath (Day)”. Where will you find in the OT a statement as strong as this of the Sabbath’s perpetuity? Right there in the Fourth Commandment: “The Seventh Day is the Sabbath of the LORD your God”. Aren’t these exactly the same, and one? Where will you find in the OT a statement as this that identifies its Author, Finisher and Lord? Where in the OT will you find a statement like this that gives the Sabbath’s very institution and origin? For the Sabbath of the LORD your God begins with Christ, in Him and through Him, and ends with Christ, in Him and through Him. Without Jesus Christ, no Sabbath! Then we can’t see the Fourth Commandment in the New Testament? We must be blind not to be able to see it!

Jesus said this (“The Sabbath was made for man – therefore the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath (Day)”) before he died – who denies? Now what could have caused Him no longer to be the Lord of the Sabbath Day after He had risen from the dead? Death? Did He not conquer death? In fact, the very terminology of this verse plays towards Jesus’ resurrection from the dead and grave and hell, for it calls Him the “Son of Man” and “Lord” – both appellations strictly reserved for the Conqueror, for the Victor and Triumphant! Jesus became “Lord” and “Son of Man” through resurrection from the dead and is called “Lord” and “Son of Man” by the authors of the Gospels even before He rose from the dead on strength of the retrospective consideration of the feat.

Which implies – unassailably – that the Sabbath and its institution and essential meaning, are based solidly on the resurrection from the dead of Jesus Christ. I infer this from Mark 2:27-28, you are right, yes! Could you infer differently? Then tell me, how? And what day do you find thus inferred? Sunday? I beg your pardon!

Why would the Church for 50 years after Christ’s ascension make such a huge issue of the Sabbath Day (in the Gospels) had it no intrinsic actuality and had it no validity in and for the ongoing life of the Church? To summarise the Gospels’ concern with the Sabbath Day: It was to orientate the practice and belief of the Church in keeping the Sabbath Day towards being the new and Christian, ‘Church-Day’, Day of Christian Worship-Rest – based and inspired by only one truth, the resurrection from the dead of the One worshipped and venerated!

Not so much do we see the adaptation of the Sabbath’s meaning to its Jewish opposite, as we notice the adaptation, confirmation, accommodation – call it a ‘change’ – of the Sabbath’s meaning against its new and Christian, resurrection-meaning.

The Church not only ‘discussed’ this issue through the Gospel-documents; it to greater extent lived the ‘changed’ Sabbath, and capitalized on it, with ordinary Christian practice and Church behaviour. The new believers went to Church on the Sabbath – never on another day than the Sabbath – and so would scarcely notice it a strange thing. It was such a spontaneous Christian custom built on the most obvious of Christian reason – the resurrection of Jesus their Lord – that nobody ever would make an internal issue of it, never would put the question before the councils. The one hundred percent consequential occurrence of Sabbath observance makes the cases of Sabbath observance mentioned, significant. One would rather have expected no mention of Sabbath observance in the New Testament seeing it was so customary. Exactly from this most natural conclusion, the real reason for the Sabbath-incidents’ mention in the Gospels become clear as daylight as becomes clear as daylight the basic reason for the Christians’ ordinary observance of the Sabbath. It in no case of conflict or customary incidence, was a matter of the Sabbath for the Sabbath’s sake; it in every incident and incidence was a case of Jesus’ divinity (or ‘deity’). Through the Sabbath Jesus’ divinity is signified, ratified, acclaimed and praised. No exception!

Make no mistake, the veneration of the ‘Sun’s Day’ claim the very same reasons, on the same grounds, only, not based and inspired by the truth, but by the lie.

3) Do not neglect the relevance Jesus’ resurrection as the ultimate healing-event, must have had in view of all the healing-issues in the Gospels so prone to occur on specifically the Sabbath Day. Those issues came and went; only this last one – God raising Jesus from the dead in Sabbath’s-time – has come to stay for as long as the works of God in Christ will be an offence to the effect if grace so will, of their salvation.

4) Is there any ‘direct repetition’ of the Fourth Commandment in the NT? More ‘direct’ ‘statement’ of the Fourth Commandment Sabbath, one could scarcely find in the Old Testament than in this, where the author of the Sermon to the Hebrew Christians before and after verse 9, gives as reason for the Sabbath’s validity the availing of Jesus Christ – wherein his resurrection from the dead is the core and substance – “For if Jesus had given them rest ...”. **This supposition is the strongest of ways to state a factual truth!** “For if Jesus had given them rest (through resurrection from the dead), then would He not afterward have spoken of another day of opportunity. There won’t be another sacrifice after this. (Hb.4:8) “These last days” are God’s final “day of visitation” wherein He “speaks to us ... in the Son” – in the sacrifice of the Son, and in His reward by virtue of His sacrifice, His resurrection from the

dead. This is said before verse 9. Then after the actual mention in verse 9 of the thing under consideration it is again confirmed in verse 10, "For He (Jesus Christ) that is entered into His rest – through resurrection from the dead – He also hath ceased from His own works as God, from His."

Both fundamental statements in verses 8 and 10 –fundamental of what is mentioned in between in verse 9 – start with the word "for". These words supply the reason for what is concluded in verse 9.

Verse 9 then actually depends on a very strong "THEREFORE" – which pertains to the sole reason twice given back in verse 8 and after in verse 10. So in verse 9, is concluded with utmost conviction on the strength of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, that: "There REMAINETH THEREFORE FOR THE PEOPLE OF GOD A KEEPING OF THE SABBATH DAY". (End Article)

Then certainly the Fourth Commandment is the Commandment most specifically and most emphatically repeated in the New Testament.

And it will be shown the New Testament differs from the Old in its statement of the Fourth Commandment only in that it is able to draw as it were live, the connection between it and its Author and Finisher, while the Old Testament was able to bring this relation to the fore only prophetically, symbolically and eschatologically.

The fact the Ten Commandments are not repeated either in all its parts or in whole – or the Fourth Commandment for that matter precisely – is most significant, it being indicated thereby the matter of course accepted Day of Worship-Rest throughout the New Testament as God's expressed will for Christian faith and conduct. It shows Christians believed in Jesus Christ as the divine embodiment of God's unaltered and unalterable Law. The Law for the New Testament believers was not only the Law of the Old Testament confirmed, fulfilled and vindicated in and by Jesus Christ, but He, for them, was the Old Testament, was, its Law. He, is the Message of the Old Testament, is, its Promise, is, its Truth, and is, its Law. He is these, the first time, He, is these things, 'given', the first time, revealed, the first time, validated and instituted, the first time – exactly in the crucifixion and resurrection of Him once for all. Christ is the once for all initiation and con-validation of God's Law. Under the New Testament Faith the indestructible Law of God confronts a man in the Person of the Risen Christ.

Now God in Jesus Christ "to us-ward",
Lord in resurrection from the dead,
He eternally, Author and Finisher of the Faith and Law,
Now, eternally, the Will and Word of God,
"Today" spoken in omnipotence and omni-presence,
God the Law, Jesus Christ,
Crucified, Raised and Exalted.

One could say, Confession of the Christian Faith!

The principle of it pervades every word of God revealed in all the Scriptures. Every Old Testament and New Testament Law or Commandment or Ordinance or Communication, is not only fulfilled in and through and by Jesus Christ, but, He creating, invests with all meaning, as out of nothing, all divine Law. Jesus Christ, I say again, is the Law of God, the essence and compendium of it.

Not one ceremony, institution, obligation, command, ritual – whatever – ever had meaning other than in the end encompassed, embodied, and, creating, acted by God in Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ in resurrection from the dead is God's Law in the act, in its beginning, and, in the act, is its completion.

Jesus Christ therefore is the Law's moral derivative and ethical denominator. He is what makes the Law of God, 'holy, just and good', that is, 'moral' in terms of Scripture. Jesus Christ is that Law of God "whereby, if a man shall do it, shall live"!

And Jesus Christ is all this to the Law, of the Law and in the Law where he dies by the Law of God, by the Law that kills; and where He rises from death and hell by the Law of God – by His one deed in Trinitarian Unity – the Law of Life, the Law that quickens.

In every dispensation of God's revelation, man is saved by the Law, which is God's very own Self, enacted originally in and through Jesus Christ. "He who has the Son, has life; he who does not have the Son of God, does not have life", 1Jn.5:12. This is God's Edict of Life. From this it followed – it did not come before – that "Moses describes the righteousness which is of the law" – he "describes" (Present Tense) Jesus Christ, God Incarnate the man of Nazareth – that the man who does those things, shall live by them". ... For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one who believes", Ro.10:5 then 4. Of course the real sequence is the other way round, Jesus from the beginning has been the Law of God whereby the believer, Jew or Gentile, shall live. The Ten Commandments – also the Fourth Commandment – is but the silhouette against the dark of the past, of Him who is the true Law, the living Law of Light and Life. Therefore the Seventh Day Sabbath there, of the LORD your God, how could it be but the reflection of Jesus Christ in resurrection from the dead who in the exceeding greatness of His power avails, earns, creating, vindicates the Rest of God?

The Ten Commandments "witness" to Jesus Christ; "all the Scriptures witness of Me", said He. Luke 24:25-27, "... believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not the Christ to have suffered these things – in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself – and to enter into His glory?" The Fourth Commandment specifically, for "to enter into His glory" is "to enter into His rest". It belongs to the Seventh Day, day of God's decision and of his

initiation, effectuation, exercise and accomplishment of decision – in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

God's own witness to the Fourth Commandment and the Seventh Day Sabbath cannot be silenced. Having been proven the faithful witness of Him, every sacrifice, every offering, every ceremony, ritual and institution obtained its essential worth and value and validity and trustworthiness in Jesus Christ, first. Having been also proven a faithful witness of Him, the Sabbath-institution of the Seventh Day of God's creating order, obtained its essential worth and value and validity and trustworthiness in Jesus Christ, first. By the blood of the Lamb of God his Covenant of Grace has been ratified – never ever 'annulled' or 'obliterated' but in the very annulment and obliteration of Him who gave His Life so that we may have Life. In the Day of Yahweh the Covenant of Peace by His Life is ratified – never ever 'annulled' or 'obliterated' but in the very annulment and obliteration of Him who gave His Life so that we may have Life

No forgiveness of sins without the shedding of blood – the blood of our Sacrifice gives meaning to every animal's that before witnessed of Him. No ceremony or sacrifice has ever been 'abolished' but validated, through and in Jesus Christ.

By what faith they of the Old Covenant lived! By what faith they of the New! It is the Gift of God the Righteous One who lived his death and resurrection, whereby the righteous shall live, believing, having entered into God's Rest by faith. Without this, the Sabbath is nonsense; this, without the Sabbath, is not what the Word says it is. (Why should I explain it if the Scriptures has it a condition? why, if the Gospel-principle of the whole Bible, makes it clear?)

He who discovers contradiction and animosity within the Law that is God's, and between Law and Grace, introduced and fancied the contradiction and animosity himself. He brings strange fire and strange incense before the Lord.

No word God has spoken will pass. All and every Law of His is 'of perpetual obligation' – "in all your generations" o Israel of God! – because of perpetual obligation in Christ!

Therefore, "Have you ever noticed that all 10 commandments are repeated in some way in the New Testament - with the exception of the fourth?"

The answer is, no! It must in fact be a blind man who *looks in vain in the words of Jesus or of Paul or of Peter for an instruction to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. It's just all over there. Does that not mean that the fourth commandment was relevant for the church in their day as never before?*

"Another question. If this command is still in force today, by whose authority has the day of rest been changed from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first in our practice? Again, nowhere in the New Testament do we read any explicit command from either Jesus or Paul or Peter or John that the Sabbath was to be changed from Saturday to Sunday."

It is alleged, "... the day of rest (has) been changed from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament, to the first in our practice". (See in the end of this consideration in Bouwman's own words.) Yet it is maintained, that "Nowhere in the New Testament do we read any explicit command from either Jesus or Paul or Peter or John, that the Sabbath was to be changed from Saturday to Sunday".

This contradiction is accepted for Gospel truth.

Bouwman just arrives at the assertion *this command no longer is in force today*. And everybody receives it with the same self-confidence. A priori the fact God "changed the day"! Did God forewarn us? Why should He? He must have held it secret for reasons of His own, for "everything revealed is for us", He assured us. The alternative is, some "authority" must have had "the day of rest ... changed from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first in our practice" because God never told us that, despite the fact it concerns us directly.

If we think of what His Law means to God, it must have been an antichrist, because He assures us that "My Sabbaths are a sign between Me and you, that I am your God, and you my People". It concerns us directly; He accordingly revealed it to us directly. God never would have kept the true Sabbath secret for us – so it must be fraud the First Day-'Lord's day' replaced His "appointed day" "the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God". Fraud, I say, or the Israelites all along kept holy the wrong Day!

Bouwman's is typical rhetoric of Sunday-worshippers – what must be proven is asserted fact then used for proof of what must be proven.

"If this command is still in force today ..." What 'if' can there be "this command is still in force today"? There is no 'if' about it. Just so there is no 'if' the day of rest has never been changed from the

commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first in our practice. "Our practice" is presumptuousness, arrogance!

There is no 'if' either that it was "by authority" of antichrist the day of rest – the Sabbath Seventh Day – has been changed from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first in our practice. Nowhere in the New Testament do we read any explicit or implicit command or reference from either Jesus or Paul or Peter or John that the Sabbath was to be or had been changed from Saturday to Sunday.

It's a fabricated lie that is easily recognised. It is first recognised by the use of the words "Saturday" and "Sunday". Neither Jesus or Paul or Peter or John calls the Sabbath Saturday. Neither of them ever speaks of or as much as insinuates a "change" from the one to the other.

It's a fabricated lie that as easily as recognised, is accepted for the sheer ignorance of innocently trusting followers of leaders who should know and do know better but headstrong resist promptings of a guilty conscience.

"A final question. We find ourselves in a society that no longer has respect for the Sunday as the Lord's Day."

Ha! Here's that antichrist's fingerprints again. He made the "change" long ago and we have become just as accustomed to it as the Apostolic Church used to be to the truth of the Sabbath. We so for granted took it, we scarcely noticed we accepted and practiced a lie. But the Apostolic Church accepted and practiced the common truth of the Seventh Day Sabbath for good reason – they had Jesus Christ their Law as they had Him their Ten Commandments. "Respect for the Sunday as the Lord's Day" – What draconic illusion the Apostolic 'society', suffered from the syndrome of the 'society' "we", "find ourselves in"!

"The Sunday as the Lord's Day", was the first time so called by Eusebius in the fourth century, parroting Justin, and just like Justin did, tried to smooth talk the emperor through veneration of this day. What better proof could one ask the Sunday was the lord emperor's day, by which Christians wanted to please both God and the world?

"To get for our children or ourselves a job that involves no Sunday work becomes increasingly difficult. Is it fitting, in such a culture, that we insist on maintaining the Sabbath as a day of rest?"

In a culture where confusion rules, the lie breaks in, and truth is murdered, in such a culture we maintain Sunday the Sabbath, suffering for our confusion and lie, and think we suffer for Christ.

Woe the obscure authority behind this confusion! Those in places of power who while it is forbidden think they may with unholy hand steer the Ark of the Covenant, or play Titus and burn it, do so for its gold. They are the 'translators', whose lord and father is the Pope who only in Satan has a competitor in the fine art of lying.

"Should we not, given the earlier questions, be more flexible on Sunday work - as long as one's work does not interfere with going to church at least once?"

In what follows, I seek to show that God's fourth word of the covenant remains as valid for the New Testament church as it was for the Old Testament people of God. In this fourth commandment the Lord impresses upon His people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ. I contend that to minimise the Sabbath is in essence to give up that covenant of grace."

"... to minimise the Sabbath ..."

Here is how contempt for the Sabbath is shown, perfected. Here, "that covenant of grace" that contains "God's fourth word of the covenant", is ridiculed. The contention that "that covenant of grace" or "fourth word", "remains as valid for the New Testament church as it was for the Old Testament people of God", is pretension only.

How could He be trusted if "In this fourth commandment the Lord impresses upon His people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ", yet, "impresses" falsely "the reality" of His own words, that "the Sabbath is the Seventh Day", and "the Seventh Day is the Sabbath of the LORD your God"?

Shall we call God a liar? God forbid. Then who is the liar who "contend(s)" and "seek(s) to show" that God "changed" "the day of rest from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first" if it is "in our practice" that it manifests? Who is the liar but we! If God never "insist(ed) on maintaining the Sabbath as a day of rest" but quietly gave up that covenant and word because He in essence is flexible and changeable like us, we accuse Him our own weaknesses and sins.

Would God not even have informed us or have thought to inform us of His intention to "change the day of rest ... from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first in our practice"? You look in vain in the words of Jesus or of Paul or of Peter for an instruction from God to change the Sabbath day and no longer to keep it holy, but to keep the First Day of "our practice", instead!

We make of God not only the liar, but also the great deceiver. It was the work of the conceited and audacious "little horn", I thought, to "change times and Law" (that only belong to God to change if His will would change).

Why, could God tell us His law and time of the Seventh Day Sabbath is for ever our duty to remember and keep, while the Promise it contained was vain and the Covenanting of it had been make shift and for make believe (for malicious pleasure it must seem)? What blasphemy is this pretentious innocent anxiety for the so-called Sunday -'Lord's day'!

Bouwman seeked to show the "change" of "the day of rest ... from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first in our practice". But his effort amounted to no more than "to minimise the Sabbath", and to destroy it with contemptuous thrill. Millions of men in high places have taken pleasure in minimizing God's Sabbath Day, His "fourth word of the covenant". And Bouwman's is just another such attempt, however saintly and holy it might appear. How do we, Protestants, play into the hands of the Antichrist! This attempt – without ado and perfectly consciously taking for granted and using as foreword of absolute truth, "the day of rest ... changed from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first in our practice", cannot "impress" "upon the people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ".

For God in Jesus Christ with us covenanted, impressing upon the people the day of rest in rich reality. "It is more than sufficient if they understand so far as to be unable to practice evasion without being convicted by their own conscience ..." "Reason certainly does not attain to the principle heads of the First Table, such as, trust in God, the ascription to Him of all praise in virtue and righteousness, the invocation of His Name, and the true observance of His Day of Rest. Did ever any soul, under the guidance of natural sense ("impression") imagine that these and the like constitute the legitimate worship of God?" (Calvin, 2.2.24)

Has not the Sabbath ever since creation "impress(e)d upon the people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ?" Is not that God covenanted with us **in Jesus Christ**, what makes "the Seventh Day concerning which God thus spoke" (Hb.4:4), the Sabbath? Is that not what makes "the Seventh Day the Sabbath, originally, by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead? Absolutely, yes! God to us His People revealed "the true observance of His Day of Rest" in and through Jesus Christ, "impressed" it upon our mind, reason and heart, indelibly. We shall not have peace of mind or conscience for so long as God confronts us through Jesus Christ in the Scriptures. We shall ever "be unable to practice evasion without being convicted by (our) own conscience".

The Sabbath, 'they' – correctly – say, is a type. Is this then – that "the Sabbath ... impresses upon the people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ" – is this then not the very maxim with which 'they', the anti-Sabbatharians, consistently try to argue the Sabbath **away**? In fact it is! They say the Sabbath is typical, and therefore, was abolished! Then how could 'they' with the same 'argument', indicate, yes 'prove', the **Sabbath** (like Bouwman does here), and what is more, again, with the same 'argument', 'prove' the Sabbath is **Sunday** (also like Bouwman does here)?

Is not the Sabbath's very "purpose" and function to "impress upon the people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ?" Isn't the Sabbath 'typical'? Then why bother with changing it, seeing it "impresses upon the people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ"! Is not the Sabbath Seventh Day's typicality, that it "impresses upon the people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ"? Nothing else and

nothing less! Then what 'change' it for to the First Day? What for? Would there be any good in "(changing) the day of rest ... from the commanded last day in the week in the Old Testament to the first"? What would God think of our reason, the reason of order and decency, *i.e.*, the reason of acceptance with men?

Sunday-'Lord's day' observance comes from the Bible, but the Bible as the work of our 'translators' and dogmatians, whose 'Apostle' – however ironic they might not be aware – is the Pope!

Wherefore Bouwman's *contention* "that to minimise the Sabbath is in essence to give up that covenant of grace", is false in that it is hypocritical. What Bouwman does, in *minimising the Sabbath*, is to magnify the Sunday. Which, *in essence is to give up that covenant of grace* in the height of haughtiness – it first requires fustian disregard for God's Word – and to enter into covenant with the pope.

"The Purpose of the Sabbath.

Why did the Lord tell His people of old to rest on the Sabbath?"

This is why: "The Sabbath impresses upon the people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ".

The Sabbath is eschatology, ganz und gar und restlos, eschatology, or it with Jesus Christ and with Christianity, ganz und gar und restlos, has nothing to do. (Karl Barth). The fact and truth "The Sabbath impresses upon the people the rich reality of the covenant He made with us in Jesus Christ", is, eschatology! We say things, having no clue what we are saying! We use the Name of Jesus Christ in association with the Sabbath of God, yet don't realise it implies the Sabbath associated with the whole Gospel, and the whole Gospel associated with God's Sabbath!

"The Sabbath (of old) was made for man", said Jesus, and explained what "the Purpose of the Sabbath" since of old has been! The Sabbath is a gracious providence of our Saviour Creator, and has ever been just, that His purpose with having "made" it was, His gracious providence in our Saviour Christ Jesus.

Through resurrection from the dead Jesus earned and obtained Lordship, and became Lord of both the Sabbath and the People – the very end to which God created / "made" People as well as Sabbath, for this purpose, "to be your God" – the very end to which God became Man in Jesus Christ.

"The Purpose of the Sabbath" is to enjoy it a providence of God in Christ to His honour.

"A great part of the pleasure and delight of the Christian life is made out of the observance of Providence. 'The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein' (Ps.11:2). That is, the study of Providence is so sweet and pleasant that it invites and allures the soul to search and dive into it. How pleasant is it to a well-tempered soul to behold and observe.

Observe and behold the sweet harmony and consent of divine attributes in the issue of Providence! ... In the winding up, they always meet and embrace each other. 'Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other' (Ps.85:10). **This is spoken with an immediate reference to that signal providence of Israel's deliverance out of the babylonish captivity, and the sweet effects thereof.** (As with Israel's deliverance out of Egyptian bondage whence the Sabbath's institution.) The truth and righteousness of God in the promises did, as it were, kiss and embrace the mercy and peace that was contained in the performance of them, after they had seemed for seventy years to be at a great distance from each other. For it is an allusion to the usual demonstration of joy and gladness that two dear friends are wont to give and receive after a long absence and separation from each other. Even thus it is here. The Hebrew word may be rendered 'have met us', and that also is true: for whenever these blessed promises and performances meet and kiss each other they are also joyfully embraced and kissed by believing souls. There is, I doubt not, an indirect reference in this Scripture to the Messiah also, and our redemption by Him. In Him it is that divine attributes ... have a sweet agreement and accomplishment. Truth and righteousness do in Him meet with mercy and peace in blessed agreement. What a lovely sight is this, and how pleasant to behold! O, if we would but stand upon our watchtower (Hab.2:3) to take due observations of Providence, what rare prospects may we have! ... (B)ehold the consent of God's attributes, the accomplishment of His ends and our own happiness in the works of Providence. For this is the very joy of the angels and the saints in heaven, to see God's ends wrought out and His attributes glorified in the mercy and peace of the Church (Rev.14:1-3:8)."

John Flavel, though he wrote this not of the Sabbath, wrote it as of the Sabbath. Would that so many great and godly men discovered the same truths in God's Sabbath truth: Sunday would have remained the polity of antichrist and would not have spoiled the worship of Protestantism.

"Why did the Lord tell His people of old to rest on the Sabbath? The two editions of the ten commandments give us two different reasons.

Exodus 20:8-11

At Mt Sinai, God mentions one reason:

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.

Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God. In it you shall do no work: you, nor your son, nor your daughter, nor your male servant, nor your female servant, nor your cattle, nor your stranger who is within your gates. For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

Notice the reason for the Sabbath: "in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." With this statement the Lord roots the Sabbath in creation. ..."

"With this statement the Lord roots the Sabbath in creation."

Bouwman has missed out on the bigger reason *why the Lord told His people of old to rest on the Sabbath*. It is of dual complication, and the main component is, "... but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God". The Seventh Day Sabbath belongs to God, therefore – fully – it is this day forever and for no man ever to change. The Sabbath has meaning and reason to be, in itself, only for being "the seventh day the Sabbath of the Lord your God". The Sabbath is untouchable, unchangeable – not because it is God, but because it is God's.

The second 'branch' within this main 'root' of the Sabbath's reason, consists of this, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy". It is the Lord's, we are told in the Law; that means, it is "holy" – holy unto Him. The Sabbath is God's, comes from Him, and is returned to Him by the People. We Israel are invited and privileged – obliged, and coerced by the love of God "to us-ward" – to share in His enjoyment of His Sabbath Day. That explains fully, "why the Lord told His people of old to rest on the Sabbath". In fact, it supplies the whole reason

why the Sabbath is of obligation to all Israel of all time, the Christian Church of all time.

God sanctified the Seventh Day, thus separating it unto Himself His Sabbath – Day of His Rest. Now God's act of sanctification He always does with the holy oil of anointing. No priest, no king, no heir, no first born, no elect chosen, or by anointing has been sanctified God's Chosen and Elect, God's First Born, God's 'Holy'! The Sabbath no different! With holy oil the Seventh Day was anointed 'My holy' in Isaiah; with holy oil the Seventh Day was anointed 'My holy' in Acts the second chapter. And thus with holy oil the Seventh Day was anointed 'My holy' in Genesis creation, and in Omega the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. For in every instance of its anointing, election and sanctification, it was by the oil of God's Holy Spirit. "Remember to keep the Sabbath holy" – remember its sanctifying Oil! The Seventh Day Sabbath is holy since the beginning of creation, for we read, "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created", Ps.104:30. But, The Seventh Day Sabbath is holy since the Beginning of the beginning of creation in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. For we read, "His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord ... declared Son of God with power according to the Spirit of Holiness by the resurrection from the dead"! (Ro.1:5) There is no such thing as the holiness of the Sabbath if not of the Seventh Day from the creation and from the resurrection of Jesus Christ. There is no such thing as the holiness of the Sabbath if not by the anointing of God's Holy Spirit. Its holiness confirms the Sabbath's belonging: it belongs to the LORD.

Could this God's faithfulness – thus sealed in sanctification by His Holy Spirit – be nullified? Then could the Sabbath of the LORD, Day and Sign of His faithfulness, be changed. Then puny man would sway right of power to nullify God's Sabbath Rest. Blasphemous thought God's Sabbath Day could be "changed" and "shifted"!

The main and first reason for the Sabbath contains and explains by inherent promissory and prophetic potential its eschatological essentiality, the presence of Jesus Christ in the purpose of God with making the Sabbath.

"With this statement ("in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it") the Lord roots the Sabbath in creation."

Quite rightly so; but the First Day was not endowed with the Sabbatical properties the Sabbath was endowed with, so why apply this Scripture to the Sunday-'Lord's day'?

Nevertheless, *with this statement the Lord roots the Sabbath* not only *in creation* but He roots all creation in the Sabbath of the LORD your God. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed, belong unto us" (Dt.29:29). "*The first is the rule of His own actions; the latter of ours ...*", (John Flavel, who applies the sequence the other way). The rule that is ours is obvious, that we should believe and obey God's Commandment of the Sabbath Seventh Day; the rule that is God's, is 'secretly', 'typically', 'mysteriously', His Promise and Providence in the Sabbath Commandment and in its Sabbath Day commanded. On this 'secret' which is "the Mystery of Godliness" Jesus Christ, all the Law and all creation, hang. Therefore, God roots all creation in the Sabbath.

Now all creation hang on the death and resurrection of Jesus from the dead. He, in His victory over death and nihil (nothingness, total extinction, non-being – call it hell), is God's Providence and Promise, His eschatological Word, His ultimate Rest through Completion in resurrection from the dead. In Christ and in the event of His resurrection "the Mystery of Godliness" is finished, and **creation** is established once for all, originally – by which the Seventh Day is confirmed the Sabbath of the LORD your God, and He, the Lord of the Sabbath Day, originally. By this, the Seventh Day is the Day expected, of Yahweh's entering through His Messiah upon His Kingly Rest. This Day is the day waited for, longed for and prayed for, all supplicants trusting upon the faithfulness of Him who swore the Promise. "It is the day the LORD has made."

But despising God's precise Day of Accomplishment the People show their contempt at God's faithfulness. *Ps.85:10 – spoken of with an immediate reference to that signal providence of Israel's deliverance **out of** the babylonish captivity* – by implication is also *spoken of with reference to that signal disobedience of Israel's deliverance **into** the babylonish captivity*, namely, specifically mentioned in the Prophets, her disregard of God's Sabbaths. Where because of Israel's unfaithfulness God because of His own faithfulness, brought them **into** captivity because of her disregard for God's Sabbaths, He, because of His own faithfulness alone, brought them **out** of captivity again (not because they got so good and started to obey the Sabbath Commandment so well, but) because of His own faithfulness alone. If you despise my Sabbaths, God in effect says, you despise Me. So I'll punish you for it; nevertheless I, for my faithfulness to my own Word in which I promised you rest, will bring you out again so that my Sabbaths will be believed and obeyed. Eventually this indicates, My Anointed One will be believed and obeyed. In my Sabbaths lie hidden my purpose, promise, providence and oath of word, my very Word in fact – I cannot be unfaithful to myself. So, taste *the sweet effects thereof. The*

truth and righteousness of God in the promises kiss and embrace the mercy and peace contained in the performance of them. God took Israel into exile, captivity and bondage because of His Sabbaths, and brought them out of it again because of His Sabbaths being the sign of His faithfulness.

The truth and righteousness of God in the promises kiss and embrace the mercy and peace contained in the performance of them – not in the wilful performance of a day never planned, promised or provided for in the eventuality of God's bringing out His People in His bringing out of His Anointed by resurrection from the dead. For this eventuality God prepared – sanctified – the Seventh Day. Not in the *changing of* the Sabbath into the First Day did God bring His People out in His Son, but in confirmation and elevation of the Day of His oath brought He his People forth out of death's bondage – the day "concerning which God thus spoke: And God the Seventh Day rested from all His works". God did not redeem by the improvement and promotion of any day with no connection to being called the Sabbath.

In the process of *minimising* and desecrating the Seventh Day Sabbath by transferring its holiness onto the First Day, the Church by turning the First Day into a pseudo-Sabbath, also *minimises* and despises the First Day's God-given usefulness. Thus the Church transgresses the Fourth Commandment not only by trampling on the Seventh Day, but also by abusing and neglecting the First Day's attributes and duties for what God had given them to be.

The rest and righteousness of God's final accomplishment and all his works he had created, are married on the Seventh Day, with God's Sabbath-Rest and Joy, Peace and Satisfaction. The eye of faith beholds Jesus Christ, in God's act of creation-rest on the Seventh Day, and discovers the soul's peace there, as it catches glimpse even of Jesus Christ in resurrection from the dead, "in fullness of Sabbath's-time".

Deuteronomy 5:12-15

At the end of 40 years of wandering through the desert, Moses repeated for Israel once again the 10 commandments. This time, though, the fourth commandment reads differently:

"Observe the Sabbath day, to keep it holy, as the Lord your God commanded you. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God. In it you shall do no work: you, nor your son, nor your daughter, nor your male servant, nor your female servant, nor your ox, nor your donkey, nor any of

your cattle, nor your stranger who is within your gates, that your male servant and your female servant may rest as well as you. And remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and the Lord your God brought you out from there by a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm; therefore the Lord your God commanded you to keep the Sabbath day."

Notice that the reason for the Sabbath has shifted from God's work in the week of creation to God's free gift of redemption to Israel from the house of bondage. And we understand that the redemption from Egypt was not a simple freeing from slavery to Pharaoh itself; this redemption foreshadowed the deliverance of God's people from slavery to Satan through the coming work of Jesus Christ on the cross.

So there appear to be two distinct reasons why Israel was to keep the Sabbath: the one reason revolved around God's action in creation, the other around Christ's work in redemption. ..."

So that in the end – according to Bouwman – the Seventh Day may be discarded, not confirmed, or, so that in the end – according to the Word of God – the Seventh Day may be confirmed, not, discarded. We have no choice!

In the expectancy of the Sabbath, and *in the performance of it, its truth and promises kiss and embrace the mercy and peace* it graciously contains. The eye of faith beholds Jesus Christ, in God's act of redeeming Israel on the Seventh Day, and discovers the soul's peace there, as it catches glimpse of Jesus Christ even in resurrection from the dead, "in fullness of Sabbath's-time".

"... Exodus 31

Now I need to make the matter just a bit more confusing. For Ex 31 gives another reason for the Sabbath:

"Speak also to the children of Israel, saying: 'Surely My Sabbaths you shall keep, for it is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations, that you may know that I am the Lord who sanctifies you'" (vs 13).

Here, then, is a third reason beside the first two; Israel must keep the Sabbath because

it's a "sign" to them from God so that they might "know that I am the Lord who sanctifies you."

It makes it all so confusing. Israel must keep the Sabbath because God rested in the beginning on the seventh day - that's Ex 20. Israel must keep the Sabbath because God delivered Israel from their bondage in Egypt - that's Dt 5. Israel must keep the Sabbath because it's a sign from God to His people that it's He who sanctifies them - that's Ex 31. Yes, it's confusing....

Synthesis

Yet, dear reader, it's not so confusing, nor so difficult. For that passage from Ex 31 about the Sabbath being a sign does not give a third reason for the Sabbath; it instead gives us the common denominator between the reasons of Ex 20 and Dt 5. In Ex 31 the Lord tells Israel that the Sabbath is given to them as a sign - of what? ? of the relationship between the Lord Himself on the one hand and His people on the other. What is that relation? This: "that you may know that I am the LORD who sanctifies you." And "sanctify", we know, means to set apart, to make holy. God has taken Israel out of Egypt and set them apart, made them different from the Egyptians and the Canaanites and the Moabites, distinct. What was distinct about Israel; how were they different? This: Israel was God's special people, and He was their God. And that's to say that God made His covenant with Israel. The Sabbath was the sign of that relationship between God and this people; the Sabbath was given as a sign of the covenant between the Lord and Israel. That's why the Lord also repeats in Ex 31:16 that Israel shall keep the Sabbath, and then God adds that they shall observe it "as a perpetual covenant." As the Lord also says through Ezekiel: the Sabbath is "a sign between Me and you, that you may know that I the Lord am your God" (20:20). 'I am the Lord your God', 'you are My people': that is - and God sets that language within the context of the Sabbath."

God sets that language within the context of the Seventh Day Sabbath. The truth is not the truth if not the whole truth and nothing but the truth. But what is of far greater significance is that God sets the Seventh Day Sabbath within the context of typically covenantal language. God in fact places the Seventh Day Sabbath within the context of the Covenant of Grace, perfectly. From the viewpoint of God nothing is wanting; He is at peace within Himself by virtue of Himself in Jesus Christ. That is God's satisfaction and sufficiency on the Seventh Day in that He sanctified it His holy Sabbath Day. "Day", the Scriptures say, not an idea about rest merely, but God's Day of Rest. And "the Seventh Day" the Scriptures say, not an idea about rest 'one day in seven' merely or one day in eternity, but God's holy Day of Rest, "the Seventh Day", now.

In this capacity and form exquisitely and exclusively, "the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God", it is ...

"Sign of the Covenant"!

"If that's what the Sabbath is? a sign of God's covenant with His people? how can creation and redemption serve as reasons to keep the Sabbath? To start with the redemption motif of Dt 5: Israel was redeemed from Egypt exactly because Israel was God's people. God chose them, delivered them, and promptly brought them to Mt Sinai to make a formal covenant with them. The redemption from Egypt, and so also our redemption through Christ on Calvary, is possible only because of the reality of the covenant. God's gift of redemption demands that the Sabbath be kept as a sign of the covenant between God and His redeemed people.

And how does the reference to creation in Ex 20 fit into the covenant? Covenant means that God is Israel's Father, and Israel is His people, His children. Well now: it is for the children to do as does the father; it's God's command that His people image Him. God makes clear that the people of Israel are indeed His children by commanding them to act as He did; as He worked six days and then rested on the seventh, so also Israel is to work six days and then rest on the seventh. The rest of the Sabbath spells out concretely that

this people is specifically God's people by covenant; they are to do as He did.

In a word: both of those reasons for keeping the Sabbath - both creation and redemption - draw the attention of Israel to that unique relationship between themselves and the Lord God. Because of that covenant is Israel to keep the Sabbath so carefully..."

"... Possible only because of the reality of the covenant ..." possible only because of the trustworthiness of the covenant and the faithfulness of the Covenanter. "Because of that covenant is Israel to keep the Sabbath so carefully", "... a sign of the covenant".

How, on earth then, does Bouwman manage to suppose the First Day of the week in place of the Seventh Day Sabbath of these Scriptures and Truths? Only on the strength or on the weakness of his supposition Jesus rose from the dead on the First Day of the week (Sunday). But forgetting instantaneously the promissory content and eschatological essence of all these Scriptures and truths, that it is the Seventh Day Sabbath therein and thus involved, therein and thus confirmed, therein and thus established, therein and thus sanctified and therein and thus blessed TO BE SIGN AND TO BE DAY OF Jesus' resurrection from the dead.

One Scriptures tells it all, Ephesians 1:19 further.

"Covenant Wrath

This explains too why God reacted so fiercely against anyone in Israel who profaned the Sabbath. Ex 31:14: "everyone who profanes [the Sabbath] shall surely be put to death." No wonder, for by profaning the Sabbath one undermines, denies the covenant relationship God has established between Himself and His people. And God will not tolerate that His people break or disregard His covenant of grace. ..."

It is not "profaning the Sabbath", not undermining or denying the covenant or its relationship to completely consciously ignore it is the Seventh Day and instead to shove it out and replace it with the Day of the Sun, the day of pagan superstition and idolatry - even worse, the day of antichrist's lies and fraud.

"Covenant Blessing

Israel, then, had to keep the Sabbath. That is: on that one day in seven they were to do no work. Please remember: in the land of Egypt the people of Israel - slaves as they were - were used to labouring for their hard task master seven days a week; their master in Egypt knew no respite, no mercy. But now they receive a new Master, the Maker of heaven and earth, their God by covenant (of which that one day in seven the Seventh Day Sabbath is the sign). And see: this Master is not hard; He gives a day off in seven! ..."

How quickly truth is corrupted in the hands of man! Why, the only thing Bouwman actually means with these words of his, "on that one day", is, 'a day off in seven'. As long as it is not the day of the Scriptures just referred to, namely the Seventh Day Sabbath. And as long as it is not any, 'day off in seven', but the First Day of the week! What has so suddenly become of Bouwman's preaching about the morals and judgements of the Sabbath Commandment?

"... And where, then, shall one's food come from if one doesn't work on the seventh day? This gentle Master promised to supply, freely. Their daily needs: He would provide it abundantly - witness the manna laying on the ground morning by morning. So God tells His people by covenant not to work on the Sabbath; they were instead to trust that their heavenly Father would give them their daily bread. By telling His people not to work on the Sabbath, God impressed upon them that He would supply their needs - He was a faithful covenant God. ..."

"... if one doesn't work on the seventh day..." / "telling His people not to work on the Sabbath". Notable fact here not noted by Bouwman - not even while he mentions it, it seems - is, that in this history of the Exodus and the manna in the desert, "God tells His people by covenant" specifically, "not to work on the ...", "Seventh Day" by trying to collect manna on it! So nobody could be in doubt which "one day in seven", "that one day", was, God's "Sabbath", called there by this name of it: "the Seventh Day". Yet suppose God speaks of the First Day of the week?

Suppose He supposes, yea, suppose He "decreed", "the shift from Sabbath observance on the last day of the week to observance on the first day of the week"? Is this my madness, or someone else's?

"... And the people for their part, by not working on the Sabbath ("on the Seventh Day", to be exact), demonstrated that they indeed trusted their **covenant God** for all their needs; by keeping the Sabbath, they showed their appreciation to God for the **covenant** He graciously made with them. ..."

Throughout Bouwman takes for granted the Day specific of the Covenant of Grace is the Seventh Day Sabbath in the Fourth Commandment, yet with full-scale furtiveness, which he is forced in the end to come to the fore with. What the Law demands and commands no longer fits his schemes, and no longer can tolerate such dishonouring to the Sabbath dishonesty. What Bouwman has meant throughout was not the Seventh Day Sabbath of the Commandment and Covenant, but "one day in seven", "a day off in seven". Even then, "one day in seven" or "a day off in seven" is not really what Bouwman intended. He really meant to say, "Sunday", or, at best, "the First Day of the week" - in fact, "one day in seven", "a day off in seven", as long as it is not the Seventh Day or any other day than Sunday! What mockery is it of every of God's words as well as of every of Bouwman's own smooth talk words about the 'Sabbath'. What mockery is this of "the **covenant** He graciously made with them"! What mockery of that faithfulness which is God's in which He closed in Covenant relationship with His People, the Sabbath being very sign of it! Bouwman doesn't talk about the Sabbath or its holiness or its Christian keeping; he speaks of that idol Sunday and of the wilful, daring and arrogant worship of it! He abuses the Words of God impudently and fearlessly.

Continues the reverent Rev Bouwman,

"Celebrate

This purpose of the Sabbath - a symbol of the fact that the Almighty had made Israel His own and now cared for His people day by day - also determined for Israel the character that this day had to have; the Sabbath was to be a day of rejoicing. Here was a day free from work, free from worries about work, a day set apart to delight in the redemption implied in the fact that the LORD was Israel's God. The Sabbath

wasn't for long faces, it wasn't for rigid laws of do's and don'ts; it was instead for celebrating the return of Paradise. Here's a day to remember specifically that 'God is not angry with us, God does not punish us for our sins, but rather forgives; the Lord is our Father who graciously supplies for all that we ever need each day anew.' So it was too that when God gave His legislation about the feasts that He wanted Israel to celebrate, the first feast mentioned is that of the Sabbath; the Sabbath was to be a feast day in Israel, a day for rejoicing (cf Lev 23:2f). In fact, on the Sabbath twice as many burnt offerings had to be offered to the Lord in the tabernacle as on any other day of the week (Num 29:9f). And a burnt offering was nothing else than a way of saying to God: 'Lord, I'm so thankful for the abundance we have in You.'

Rejoicing: that's what the Sabbath in Israel was to be all about. This day was a gift from a God of great grace to a people mercifully redeemed.

And where else could one rejoice in God's redemption better than in God's own presence, in God's tabernacle, God's house??! Hence the instruction to Israel that on the Sabbath they had to meet together in the place where the Lord God had put His name, there to rejoice in the wonders of His covenant of grace (cf Lev 23:3)."

Again we have this really beautiful Sabbath-sermon with underneath cold and venomous motives. Again "this day", even "the character that this day had to have", "a day set apart", "a day to remember specifically", "this day", "what the Sabbath in Israel was", "in God's own presence, in God's tabernacle", "that on the Sabbath they had to meet together in the place where the Lord God had put His name, there (and then, on "this day", "what the Sabbath in Israel was", the Seventh Day) to rejoice in the wonders of His covenant of grace (cf Lev 23:3)" ... all the time is not this day, but the First Day-'Sunday'! (And he is as legalistic and strict it must be Sunday as the Pharisees could have wished to be it must be the Sabbath.) All the time God has wasted his words,

telling us for nothing all these beautiful things about the Seventh Day Sabbath. Actually it amounts to God having lied to us.

"This day was a gift from a God of great grace to a people mercifully redeemed" – yet it is as common as any day. Then how specific, in other words, how gracious, favouring, merciful, is that "great grace", and how electing, in other words, how gracious, favouring, and merciful is the God of that "great grace", if this is how "this day was a gift from" Him – just any 'one day in seven' the usually First Day in stead of the irreplaceable Seventh Day? See how not only the sanctity, that is, the uniqueness and separated and holy character of the day gets involved with "shifting the day", but inevitably also the uniqueness and separated and holy character of the Grace involved, and of the Covenant involved, and of the God who involved Himself in this matter? Who bound Himself into Oath and Promise, who sanctified Himself into Covenant with this People and of which this day, which He chose – He, no strange god –, and separated, and set apart, and sanctified, is the sign of? See how easily and how inevitably, "shifting" or "changing" this sign and day, leads to the rejection of the electing grace, to the breaking of and contempt for the Covenant, and to the worship of other, strange, gods – to idolatry? Did it actually happen? It happens here, in front of our eyes!

"On the Sabbath they had to meet together in the place where the Lord God had put His name" – that is in Jesus Christ! The Lord God had put His Name in His Holy One in whom he "tabernacled among us". This is the Old Testament Scriptures, "(cf Lev 23:3)", which means, that on the Sabbath Israel in faith in Jesus Christ, had to meet together. This is the implication in Bouwman's words, precisely which he argues to make to nothing, and instead to supply his own insinuated day, that Christians now have to meet together in the place and on the day called Sunday.

Bouwman Versus Calvin

Bouwman does not state or explain the "shift" from the "Sabbath" the Seventh Day of the Scriptures to the day he has in mind all the time while speaking of the Sabbath, namely, Sunday, the First Day – not even where he criticises Calvin,

"... Calvin does not consider the shift from Sabbath observance on the last day of the week to observance on the first day of the week as decreed by God (II.8.34). The shift instead came about by the will of the New Testament church. ..."

Yes no, "the shift came about", not "as decreed by God" or "by the will of the New Testament church" Apostolic, but by clever use of words, just like these of Bouwman's. Anyone who has read Justin Martyr writing to the emperor will know what I'm talking about.

Bouwman of course objects to this Calvin's opinion, nevertheless he so insists the "Sabbath" is "the first day of the week" he so wisely refrains from touching on the issue altogether – he just passes the buck.

Bouwman's 'admittance' that "Calvin agrees that their decision to have God's people come together on the first day of the week was a happy decision, since Christ arose on this first day of the week", depends on his erroneous understanding of Calvin.

Bouwman's statement is far from correct. He refers to the first two sentences of paragraph 2, 8, 34, "It was not, however, without a reason that the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath. The resurrection of our Lord being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified, this day by which types were abolished, serves to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony."

Calvin refers to the Seventh Day Sabbath!

Here is Calvin, explaining the "reason" why "the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord's day for the Sabbath". His reason is typically 'Calvin' (not 'calvinistic'), "... this day ... serves to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony". For Calvin the "shadowy ceremony" is "the ancient Sabbath", "as containing the external observance of a day", the Seventh Day (of the week). But for Calvin the "shadowy ceremony", "the ancient Sabbath", contains more than "the external observance of a day". By declaring, "The resurrection of our Lord being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified", Calvin also declares the

*resurrection of our Lord which the ancient Sabbath typified was the end and accomplishment **OF THIS** ancient Sabbath's, and of this ancient Sabbath **as typically containing** "that true rest". Because the First Day of the week – "what we call the Lord's day" – **containing nothing** 'typical', and would **receive** no 'typical' 'ends' or 'accomplishments' that 'foreshadowed', it, for Calvin, was a suitable day – as suitable a day as any other. (Except perhaps the Sabbath, which Calvin, although inconsistently, advises and proposes as possible day for Christian worship. He never totally excludes or prohibits the Seventh Day as Christian Day of Worship-Rest, not even with his repeated and categorical use of words like "abolished" and "done away with". Anyone can read 2, 8, and see if I'm exaggerating, or lying, or making an objective adjudication.)*

The First Day-'Lord's day' exactly for its meaninglessness – with NO 'spiritual' strings attached to it, to or from anything promissory, prophetic, typical or eschatological, anything 'religious' – was a day fit "to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony". Any other day of the week could do for the same "reason", but Calvin would accept and abide with 'the early Christians' 'substitution' "for the Sabbath", namely, with "what we call the Lord's day" – which simply was Sunday.

Only Calvin's fear of "superstition" made him choose Sunday above the Sabbath: "If superstition is dreaded, there was more danger in keeping the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's day as Christians now do. It being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished; and as a thing necessary to retain decency, order, and peace, in the Church, another day (Sunday) was appointed for that purpose ..." and, "reason".

So does Calvin by his own unjustifiable fear for superstition with regard to the Sabbath Day, fall victim to superstition himself.

Don't make Calvin say what he never said. He no longer lives to bring his side of the story. All we know about his side of it is what he has left in written record. And in that record it still must be shown where he wrote or even between the lines "agreed", "that their (the early Christians) decision to have God's people come together on the first day of the week was a happy decision, since Christ arose on this first day of the week".

Clearly and undeniably Calvin for no moment creates the impression or so much as try to create the impression our Lord was raised from the dead on "what we call the Lord's day", the First Day (of the week). He would not have used for "reason" what he was not sure of for fact. Calvin never would have said, or have argued from the Resurrection allegedly on the First Day, because he was not so stupid as to contradict all else he had written about the "sabbath"

on other places of Scriptures, where he consistently attaches to the Greek word 'sabbaton' the meaning of "Sabbath" the ('Jewish') Seventh Day. And, consistently, to the typicality or eschatology of this day, Calvin attaches the ultimate and consummate of all the works of God in the resurrection of His Christ.

Therefore, Bouwman's inaccurate 'translation' not only in smaller detail like "a happy decision" in stead of apposite "reason", is misleading, prejudiced and predisposed. Also the word "since" is no true representation of Calvin's use of the word "being" which he directly and exclusively employs to the subject of his second sentence, the Sabbath Day. With this word "since", Bouwman makes the resurrection the reason for the early Christians' choice of the First Day – which is completely manipulation of Calvin's text. Most glaring forgery further is the interpolation "to have God's people come together". This idea not remotely exists in these lines, and its concept Calvin all over in 2, 8, first attributes to the Sabbath – "the ancient Sabbath" for that matter – for "spiritual" "reason", before he also allows it the First Day-'Lord's day' for the sake of "order" and by 'social' "arrangement"! Compare Bouwman's own appeal to "Lev 23:3 ... And where else could one rejoice in God's redemption better than in God's own presence, in God's tabernacle, God's house? Hence the instruction to Israel that **on the Sabbath** they had to **meet together** in the place where the Lord God had put His name, there to rejoice in the wonders of His covenant of grace (cf Lev 23:3)."

Par. 8.5.1.7.
Engelsma, 'Calvinist'
Engelsma in Courier New
CGE in Verdana

If one kills with the sword, with the sword he shall be killed. If one tests the Sabbath by the Law, by the Law he shall be tested.

An answer by Gerhard Ebersöhn – a Calvinist Protestant Christian – to

"David J. Engelsma – "The Evangelism Committee, Protestant Reformed Church, 16511 South Park Avenue, South Holland, Illinois 60473, Phone: (708) 596-1314."

Dear Ds. Engelsma,

I was so delighted and surprised by your zeal and frankness in this sermon, that I found it impossible not to respond. I pray you will patiently and sympathetically consider what I have to say on your sermon.

My writing to you interrupts my current work on 'The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace' - at a crucial stage, the specific section, 'The Sabbath, Cosmic Eschatological Sign' ... "of the approaching – even the Body that is Christ's" (Col.2:17).

You may find, read or offload the volume from www.biblestudents.co.za. (biblestudents@imagnet.co.za)

Allow me then to proceed according to your "Contents":

Preface

Great issues are at stake in the Sabbath-question. And, alas, it is a question today, not merely in a society that, having once showed some influence upon it from Christianity by "closing up shop" on Sunday, now works and plays on the Lord's Day as on any other day, but also among Reformed Christians. It is serious enough that the Sabbath is desecrated in practice--the poor attendance at the second worship service (where a second service is still held) and the extent to which professing Christians "skip church" altogether are witness enough to this widespread Sabbath-desecration. More serious still is the growing "solution" to the problem that consists of denying that there is any Sabbath Day at all! This denial of a special day of rest is an attack

upon the Law (in the Fourth Commandment); a misconception of the work of Christ (Christ abolishes the Law); an undermining of public worship and the ministry of the Word; a weakening of family worship, instruction, and fellowship; and a threat to the true rest of the saints, to say nothing of infidelity to their own creeds on the part of Reformed and Presbyterians (Lord's Day 38 of the Heidelberg Catechism for the Reformed and Chapter 21 of the Westminster Confession for Presbyterians)."

To all of which one is forced to heartily agree but for the question, how it is possible to speak of "on Sunday" as of "on the Lord's Day"? The answer it is assumed will emerge from the further reading of your sermon. **The purpose of my writing is to show its impossibility.**

"Although the apostasy from the truth of the Sabbath receives little attention, we consider it to be one of the most serious departures in our day; and we consider (it) our call to return to the old paths of our fathers, or to continue in those ways, as the case may be, to be urgent..."

The supposition "the apostasy from the truth of the Sabbath receives little attention" is only correct from a relative point of view. I believe this "apostasy", from the very fundamentals of it has through the ages received **more attention** than any other. Already in the second century Justin Martyr made the craftiest move with most lasting effect and effectiveness. He was so clever he started the corruption of and "the apostasy from the truth of the Sabbath" with the very corruption of and apostasy from the truth of the **Scriptures!** The Church at large has till today adhered not only to the resultant reading of Justin's corruption, but to his very method of falsifying the Word through translation of it, so that it is made possible to speak of "on Sunday" instead of "on the SABBATH" - Matthew 28:1! Where it matters most - the Scriptures itself - "the apostasy from the truth of the Sabbath" has received concentrated and undeterred attention. No single passage of New Testament Scripture that has to do with the ultimately ONLY reason for believing and keeping the Sabbath, has escaped unscathed from the adulterous corruptions of its translators. The CHURCH, even the Protestant and 'Reformed' "CHURCH", has become the "little horn" of the Daniel prophecy that

"thinks to change law ('the Holy Scriptures' and its authority), and times (the Lord's 'holy' times - his 'Sabbaths'). All the New Testament 'Sabbath-' and 'First Day-Scriptures' are involved.

Don't think "the apostasy from the truth of the Sabbath" is merely one of neglecting the Sabbath's due respect; it is "the apostasy from the truth of the Sabbath" to the lie and idolatry of the Sunday. Yes, it is the villainous robbing by a tour de force unequalled of the lord Sun's Day's strategists, of the Sabbath's God-given honour of to have been, and of being, "The Lord's Day" by the authority and power of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. (Consider this statement word for word and carefully!)

The Church I belong to, which I am a member of, which love and cherish, respect, adore and humbly seek to serve, has become a FALSE PROPHET ... as far as the Sabbath Day is concerned. My Church - your Church of the Reformers and Martyrs for the Faith of Jesus, the reformed protestant Church - is still subjected to the spiritual sway and slavery of the Romish Beast. We - the Church - still worship the Pope and deny the Scriptures ... when it comes to the test that the Sabbath puts us to.

"Introduction

The Dutch have called Sunday, "God's dike." In the Netherlands, the dike keeps back the threatening seas and, thus, preserves the Hollanders from watery destruction. So the Lord's Day holds back the raging waves of materialism, earthlimindedness, and pleasure-madness that threaten to engulf the Church and the Christian."

"Materialism" and "earthlimindedness" are the two things that were the reason for Justin Martyr's wooing the Emperor to accept the Christians' observance of Sunday - "Day of the lord Sun", Emperor August and Venerable! Why did Justin engage the ploy: 'See us Christians observing your very own Day, o Emperor'? To strike a truce with the enemy of the Church for the sake of "materialism" and "earthlimindedness", no other! This fact alone is reason enough to reject both compromise and motivation that pre-empts the Bible Seventh Day-Sabbath. This fact alone makes suspicious every possible attempt to promote Sunday-holiness. This tactics, guaranteed, requires the perversion of God's Word. Therefore says Justin: "After the Sabbath ... on the Sunday" - instead of: "In Sabbath's-time late, in fullness of day before the First Day...". "In Sabbath's-time late, in fullness of day before the First Day" Christ's resurrection from the dead occurred. Since Justin's corruption became the Word of God, God's unadulterated

Word has become the word of the 'Judaisers'. Only compare Matthew 28:1 in the King James Version with the 'New Authorised Version' to see the perfect application of Justin's distortion. No "watery destruction" awaits it, but a hellish, and nothing is going to hold back the raging flames.

"There are leaks in the dike. There are leaks in the dike among Reformed Christians, where once the Lord's Day was honoured and the Sabbath remembered. It is necessary that we stop up these leaks; we certainly must not allow these leaks to be enlarged, much less co-operate in tearing the dike down."

I'm afraid the dike had been flattened in the second century already, and we shall have to rebuild it with God's help and under His mercy and providence. We shall have to scoop out a lot of sea – humanly an impossible task.

"The matter of remembering the Lord's Day is one of urgency, as the figure of a dike and the angry waves indicates. First, remembering the Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments, indeed, a commandment that belongs to the first table of the law; not a minor matter, therefore.

Secondly, the day in question is the "Lord's Day" according to Rev. 1:10, *i.e.*, the day that belongs to the risen, glorious Lord Jesus Christ. In remembering, or forgetting, it, we have to do with Jesus Christ Himself.

Thirdly, our remembering the Lord's Day results, by the Lord's grace, in the greatest benefit for us: rest – the pricelessly precious benefit of rest. The Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27)." [See many places referred to in 'The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace', *e.g.* Par.7.7.1, p. 76, 199,204 - but especially Part 3/3, Par.7.3.2, p.185f.]

"The good of man that God had in mind is rest. Is there anything that we need more? Everywhere, there is unrest. There is unrest in the church; there is unrest in the family; there is unrest in the soul of the believer. Apart from every other consideration, it is sheer folly to

forfeit rest by forgetting, and even abandoning, the Lord's Day.

The importance of the Church's remembering the Lord's Day was clearly seen, and stated, by one of the fiercest enemies that the Christian religion ever had, the Frenchman, Voltaire: "If you want to kill Christianity," he said, "you must abolish Sunday" – advice that the French Revolution carried out."

How true! It seems it will require the destruction of Christianity *in toto* in order to have the true Sabbath Day of the Bible as it were raised from the dead with a new Christianity and to be re-instated to its former New Testament worth and worthiness. Sunday will never bow out and the curtain will never be dropped on its spell – not if the next act belonged to the Seventh Day Sabbath – a fact the French Revolution proved.

"A Special Day

There is one, simple truth that is fundamental to Sabbath-observance – the very foundation of the dike that is the Lord's Day. If this truth is confessed by the Church and if it lives in the hearts of the people of God, all will be well as regards remembering the Lord's Day. But if this truth is questioned or denied, we have not merely punched a hole in the dike, but we have demolished the dike. The basic question is this: Does Jehovah God, in the Fourth Commandment of His Law, still today **set apart one day of the week as a special day**; and does He still today, in the Fourth Commandment, require His people to remember **this day** by ceasing from their ordinary work and play, in order to devote themselves to the worship of, fellowship with, and special service of the Father of Jesus Christ?

The answer to this question is an emphatic, unequivocal "Yes." God still sets aside one day in seven as a special day for us and requires us to observe this day in a special way. In this sense, the day is holy, *i.e.*, it is set apart from the other days **by God for** the special service of **Himself**. In this sense, we hallow the

day, or keep it holy, i.e., we use it in the special way God wants us to use it, thus consecrating it to God. [Emphasis CGE]

God sets the day apart and requires us to remember it *in the Fourth Commandment*. Remembering the Lord's Day is not a matter of Christian liberty, i.e., something neither commanded nor forbidden by God. Rather, it is law, the law of God, just as are the matters of having no other gods, honouring our parents, and not stealing. It is the commandment of the Redeemer to His saved people. It is a commandment that at once teaches us to know our sinful nature more and more, so that we fly to Christ for righteousness, and directs us in the way of pleasing our Deliverer and of living a happy life. It is a commandment that the thankful believer gladly obeys, as a child willingly obeys the father whom he loves.

This is fundamental! Deny this, and you pull the dike down; for if the dike of the Lord's Day is not grounded in the good, solid, divine will of God, it cannot possibly withstand the pressures of worldliness and earthlimindedness exerted against it."

Sunday accepted for the Lord's Day already is "worldliness and earthlimindedness exerted against" the true Sabbath that is "grounded in the good, solid, divine will of God". The Lord's Day is "the Seventh Day concerning (which) God ... in the Son ... in these last days ... thus spoke, and God the Seventh Day from all His works did rest" - did rest "in the Son" in Whom He is "well-pleased". Jesus' resurrection from the dead "in Sabbath's-time" confirms the Seventh Day thus spoken of by God, "The Lord's Day"!

"Another view, steadily gaining ground in Reformed churches, is that the Fourth Commandment was wholly ceremonial - "Jewish" - and was, therefore, so fulfilled by Christ that it no longer holds for the New Testament saint. The observance of the first day of the week is merely a custom of the New Testament Church (albeit a good custom, it is usually admitted), based upon

a decision of the Church herself. Use of the first day of the week for public worship is not due to any binding law of God, but to the free choice of the Church; she could have chosen some other day of the week. The keeping of the first day is strictly a matter of Christian liberty."

How can you say, "The observance of the first day of the week is ... a custom of the New Testament Church" while you suppose the Seventh Day Sabbath by analogy of the Old Testament and Fourth Commandment? To claim so, means "worldliness and earthlimindedness exerted against" the true Sabbath "grounded in the good, solid, divine will of God" - also thus revealed in the New Testament Scriptures. For it is a lie to speak of "the observance of the first day of the week" as "a custom of the New Testament Church". Everything eventually boils down to a single text, Acts 20:7! The only day that was "a custom of the New Testament Church" was the Sabbath of the Seventh Day - the only Sabbath Jesus knew both before and after his death and resurrection and before the creation and after the creation of the New Earth. He knew the Sabbath all along being Himself its Designer, Creator, Law Giver, Maintainer, Protector and Re-Instator. Behold the Champion and Sovereign LORD of the Seventh Day Sabbath of God's creation and salvation, and ask: Could this day be changed - could it surrender its grace and right of birth to another like an Esau to a Jacob? Would the protector of Israel the Lord of the Sabbath Day allow his "holy" to be vanquished and to vanish? If God could change ...

Why wouldn't one use the Law's own words but man's when using the Law to vindicate the Day that is holy to the Lord? Why say: "Jehovah God, in the Fourth Commandment of His Law, still today set apart one day of the week as a special day" when the Law says "the Seventh Day"? Why say: "The observance of the first day of the week is ... due to (the) binding law of God", if the Law says, "the Seventh Day ... Sabbath of the LORD your God"? Why not use the words spoken by that "One" as well as by that Law: "The observance of the Sabbath Day is (not) merely a custom of the New Testament Church... it is law, the law of God"? Why? Because it is the denying of the Law that does not say "the First Day of the week" - that is why! Because it is disobedience to the Law - that is why! "One is the Lawgiver" - let Him speak on behalf of his Sabbath for Himself! The Law's word shall be His Word!

How is it possible to imply the observance of the Seventh Day is "wholly ceremonial" but the observance of the First Day of the week is not, if in either case it is an "observance of the ... Day"? The only thing that could make a difference and say: This now is purely and empty ceremonialism, is the fact it is contained in the Commandment of God or it is not contained in the Commandment of God. Sunday the First Day is the day that must emerge as the thing of wilful ceremonialism, of human legalism - the fraudulent thing - because the Law knows nothing of it.

What is wrong, what is unchristian, what is unbelief, what is not 'moral' in something "wholly ceremonial"? How could unbelief and an element of immorality be implied in the observance of something whether "ceremonial" in part or "wholly" - like the Lord's Supper, or baptism, or the Lord's Day? Only if something that is "wholly ceremonial" is not "according to the Scriptures", is it unbelief and therefore, immoral - like the Romish Mass and Sunday.

Then, what would it mean to "Remember the Lord's Day"? Would it not mean what it says "*in the Fourth Commandment*": "Remember the Sabbath ... because the LORD on the Seventh Day rested - therefore He sanctified and blessed the Seventh Day"? In any case, what could there be about God's act of the Seventh Day that is "ceremonial" - that could mean it ceased to be the will of God? No act of God is not fully 'moral' - and it is this - God's absolutely 'moral' act - that makes holy or sanctifies the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD your God. The most holy, most blessed, most perfect and perfecting, most restful act of God is what set apart the Seventh Day for to be the Sabbath Day of the Lord, the Lord's Day. It - God's act of finishing all his works in the raising of Christ from the dead by the exceeding greatness of his power - is what the Sabbath all along had been created for, all along had been instituted and reaffirmed for, weekly throughout the countless ages of promise and prophecy. God's ultimate purpose in the sanctification of His Sabbath is Jesus. God would - God could not have called the Sabbath "My holy", had Christ the Risen Lord not been Author of its sanctity. The Sabbath's holiness does not depend on man's keeping it holy or on the holiness of man. The Sabbath is the Lord's, and the Holy of the LORD, Jesus Christ, is its holiness. This is what it means to "Remember the Lord's Day" - "Remember the Sabbath (Seventh Day) to keep it holy" for this reason and on authority of this living truth only. Then change it to the First Day of the week? Audacious! God be merciful unto us!

"Confessional Proof

What proof is there, for the Reformed saint, that remembering the Lord's Day is the will of God?

First, there is the decision of an important church assembly, the Synod of Dordt..."

First - before any Synod - there is Jesus Christ in His death and resurrection from the dead. First, again, there is the decision of another important church assembly, the Synod of Jerusalem, that "sentenced" - "for it seemed good to the Holy Spirit": "That they (the Church) abstain from (idolatrous practices, and worship the only true God through Jesus Christ) ... for Moses (the Law) since the beginning (of the Christian Church) is preached in every city in the Church, every Sabbath Day. Then pleased it the apostles and the elders with the whole Church..."

Even historically before this first General Church Synod there was the event of the Christ, of His suffering and death and resurrection, and of Pentecost, as "proof" that confirmed: the "remembering the Lord's Day is the will of God". So whatever Synods afterwards might have assembled on the question of the Sabbath Day, they must be weighed against these historic facts.

"Unfortunately, it is not well known that among the other actions of this great synod (of Dordt) was the adoption of a doctrinal statement on the Sabbath. In his *Tractaat van den Sabbath (Treatise on the Sabbath)*, Abraham Kuyper informs us that the formulation and adoption of this statement took place in about three hours on May 17, 1619. Dordt's position on the Sabbath was expressed in six points:

1. In the Fourth Commandment of God's Law there is a ceremonial and a moral element."

The Fourth Commandment is one and undividable the fact - or perhaps the assumption - it is ceremonial or partly ceremonial despite. The Law itself calls the Decalogue God's "Ten Words", and God's Word is completely life and spirit, the Bible says, therefore, completely 'moral'. God's Ten Words were not eleven - two temporary and one 'ceremonial'. In fact this the single Fourth Word of the Ten, is the only affirmative and practical Commandment with roots reaching back to the creation and from there further back to the Eternal Council of God and His Covenant of Grace, and is spoken of by the prophets to reach forward to the New Earth - the Christian era - and from there even further into the eternal future

upon God's New Earth. Now if that – its eternal closing with its Maker - doesn't make the Fourth of God's Ten 'moral' Words, 'moral', what could?

"2. The rest on the seventh day after the creation, and the strict observance of the day with which the Jewish people were charged particularly, was ceremonial."

Isn't Sunday also charged with strict observance of the day? Like here in this sermon? And why is that which is "particularly ceremonial" about the Seventh Day, not also "moral" and morally "charged", so that also the so-called "ceremonial element" is "moral"? The thing commanded is commanded for its 'moral' worth and nature or it would not be 'moral', or 'moral' of God, to require. It is the Seventh Day which the Commandment requires as "the rest". The Seventh Day is "charged particularly", and although it "was ceremonial" was moral by reason of its being "charged particularly".

What would make the rest, but not the day of rest – the Seventh Day - 'moral', and the day of rest – the Sabbath – but not the rest of and on it, 'ceremonial'?

What would make the rest on the Sunday any different than the rest on the Sabbath Day? Humanly or logically speaking absolutely nothing! But "according to the Scriptures" nothing less than the fact "**God spoke** these words" – the Ten Commandments! And what would make the fact "God spoke these words" so significant? Nothing but the fact "God thus concerning the Seventh Day spoke ... **in the Son**"! I dare it be shown "spoken", by God, "thus", "concerning" the First Day of the week! What hollow, vain and blasphemous notion!

"3. That a definite and appointed day has been set aside to the service of God, and that for this purpose as much rest is required as is necessary for the service of God and for hallowed contemplation; this element is moral."

"As much rest" "is required", as much, the Seventh Day is that definite and appointed day set aside to service. The Seventh Day is required "for this purpose" "necessary for the service of God and for hallowed contemplation" – therefore the Seventh Day is moral. "(T)his element is moral" – the "element" of "the

Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God". Consider Who the Owner is of that definite and appointed day set aside to service – and realise its moral quality. The Sunday is not only a total stranger to this kind of induction, but under pretext of moral premises has supplanted the real, and morally, Lord's Day of the Covenant of Grace. In the process the Sunday has become immoral Christianly speaking.

"4. The Sabbath of the Jew having been set aside, Christians are in duty bound to hallow the Day of the Lord solemnly."

The Synod of Dordt attempted to show a "ceremonial element" of the Fourth Commandment that is not "moral" - and failed. It regardless went on to build upon its groundless presumption, and presupposes a "having been set aside" of the **Sabbath** – which is the same as to presuppose a "having been set aside" of the **Commandment**! Then to top its arrogance the Synod calls the Sabbath of the Commandment - which is *that definite and appointed day set aside for service* for being "the Sabbath of the LORD your God" – "the Sabbath of the Jew"! Which being the work of the same men who drew up that great Confession on God's free and sovereign grace, is scandalous. It took them only three hours to make of God's elect day a vagabond!

"5. This day has always been kept in the early Church since the time of the Apostles."

It should not be supposed "this day" is the First day of the week, for it is the Seventh Day Sabbath, as it was presupposed by the Synod of Jerusalem, as the Acts expressly shows of the Church's earliest history, and as the Christian theology in the Gospels of the later part of the first century proves and confirms, that "has always been kept in the early Church" – during "the time of the Apostles". Sunday was not observed **once** in the Apostolic Church – as even the two 'famous' texts, Acts 20:7 and 1Cor.16:2 indicate - **which fact these texts finally confirm by their being so manipulated by translators.**

"6. This day (Sunday) must be so consecrated unto the service of God that upon it men rest from all servile labours, except those required by charity and present necessities, and likewise from all such recreations as prevent the service of God."

While these noble things are presupposed of the First Day specifically and especially instead of the Seventh Day Sabbath of the Bible specifically and especially, the word applies: "But in vain

they do worship me, teaching doctrines the commandments of men." (Mk.15:9) "This day" the Sabbath of the Law that is the Sabbath of the Lord, is not Baal's or man's First Day of the week. "This day" is "The Seventh Day ... concerning which God spoke" – and concerning which He commanded, "Remember the Sabbath ... of the LORD your God ... to keep it holy"!

"Secondly, there is the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism in Lord's Day 38, Q. 103: "What doth God require in the Fourth Commandment? First, that the ministry of the gospel and the schools be maintained; and that I, especially on the Sabbath, that is, on the day of rest, diligently frequent the Church of God, to hear His Word, to use the sacraments, publicly to call upon the Lord, and contribute to the relief of the poor, as becomes a Christian. Secondly, that all the days of my life I cease from my evil works, and yield myself to the Lord, to work by His Holy Spirit in me: and thus begin in this life the eternal Sabbath."

The Catechism has a unique, beautiful slant on the Fourth Commandment...", except for the fact it presupposes not The Sabbath of the LORD which the Fourth Commandment indicates, but - as in the Afrikaans "Kategismus", "Sondag": "Sunday/Lord's Day 38" etc. That the Catechism does not have a genuine "slant on the Fourth Commandment", is clear from for example these words: "... that I, especially on the Sabbath, that is, on the day of rest, diligently frequent the Church of God, to hear His Word ...". What do the Gospels say on which day did Christ "diligently frequent the Church of God" to preach the Word? What does the Acts say on which day did the disciples and the Apostles "diligently frequent the Church of God, to hear His Word", or to preach it? Not on the day which the Catechism supposes, the First Day of the week – not once, but "on the Sabbath" - how many times!

If but the Catechism also intended it that way it would have had "a unique, beautiful slant on the Fourth Commandment"!

"It (the Catechism) deliberately safeguards the Reformed believer against the error of a legalistic observance of the Sabbath. Legalism

identifies obedience to the Fourth Commandment with mere external behaviour, especially the behaviour of doing nothing on the Sabbath. It stresses the scrupulous keeping of petty, man-made regulations, especially negative regulations."

The Catechism, not deliberately undoubtedly, safeguards the Reformed, unintentional believer, into the error of a legalistic observance of the "doctrines of men". Legalism identifies obedience to the Fourth Commandment with deliberate disregard for the day commanded in it, setting in its stead an arbitrary day of no intrinsic or derived holiness or blessedness. Legalism stresses the scrupulous keeping of petty, man-made observances and days, especially negative regulations, like the annulment of the Sabbath by the so called changing of it into the First Day of the week.

"The Pharisees of Christ's day, for example, forbade the picking of grain while travelling on the Sabbath, even though it was for the satisfying of hunger (cf. Mark 2:23-28). Others thought it unlawful to eat an egg that the hen had laid on the Sabbath. The purpose of legalism, in this observance of the Sabbath, is to earn righteousness. This was the error into which the Jews of Jesus' day had fallen and against which our Lord contended. This was the error that was prevalent in the Roman Church at the time of the Reformation and against which the Reformers, Luther and Calvin, reacted strongly in some of their writing on a proper keeping of the Sabbath."

We must appreciate and maintain the viewpoint of the Catechism. But we misunderstand and misrepresent the Catechism if we explain it to mean that in the Reformed tradition the day or "ceremonial element" is not regarded. The purpose of legalism, in the observance of the Sunday, is to earn righteousness regardless our disobedience. The purpose of legalism, in that all mention of observing the Sabbath Seventh Day must be banned is to earn righteousness by laws not God's but man's. And, therefore, our practice of Sunday-keeping is merely the audacity of the New Testament Church - its sin which it refuses to recognise, admit or repent.

"On the contrary, this creed teaches that there is a day of the week set apart from the other days; there is a special day. According to

the Catechism, there is a "day of rest," a "Sabbath," distinguished from "all the days of my life." **The reference, of course, is to Sunday.** On this day, special behaviour is required of the child of God, namely, that he rests, which behaviour consists primarily of diligently frequenting the Church of God. It is God Who sets this day apart, and He does so in the Fourth Commandment - it is the Fourth Commandment, after all, which the Catechism is here explaining."

"It is God Who sets this day apart, and He does so in the Fourth Commandment - it is the Fourth Commandment, after all, which the Catechism is here explaining."

Yet, it is claimed, "The reference, of course, is to Sunday." If that is not contradiction, what is? If that is not presumption, what is? If that is not audacity, what is? The Sabbath is distinguished from all days that might belong to man for God calls it His, and His "holy", and Jesus called Himself "indeed, Lord of the Sabbath Day", so that for the Christian Church the Sabbath becomes "the Lord's Day" - the Lord Jesus' Sabbath Day, yet, "The reference, of course, is to Sunday"!

Therefore, unfortunately, I cannot agree that "it is the Fourth Commandment ... which the Catechism is here explaining". "The reference, of course, is to Sunday ". The Catechism refers to Sunday; the Commandment refers to the Sabbath. This remark switches two things about - just like Justin did - and creates a lie.

"We may sum up the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism thus [... if we forget it supposes the Sunday, and think of it as supposing the Sabbath of the Bible...] : the Fourth Commandment still holds in the New Testament; it still sets one day apart as a day in which believers are to rest in their God, under the Word of the gospel. Because of this act of God, all days are not the same for Christians, even though we cease from our evil works all the days of our life. Because of this act of God, the Christian remembers and hallows a day [the day of God's commanding, the Seventh Day Sabbath]..."

Because of this act of God ("It is God Who sets this day apart"), the Christian should utterly reject the presumption: "Our Lord's Day Sunday corresponds to the seventh

day of the Old Testament; indeed, it is the New Testament Sabbath Day".

"(T)he teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism" is that **it** "sets one day apart". It is not the "act of God". God never set apart "one day", the Sunday. He set apart "the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God" - He "sanctified" it. "The Christian", therefore, "remembers" THIS day, "and hallows" IT, and not merely "a day" or even the Sunday. "Our Lord's Day Sunday" demands the sun is "our Lord" and not Christ who demanded Lordship of the Sabbath Day. Therefore "Our Lord's Day Sunday", corresponds to the "beggarly first principles" of the pagan "no-gods" of "days and moons and seasons and years". There is no day in all the universe that "corresponds to the seventh day of the Old Testament" for this very day "indeed ... is the New Testament Sabbath Day", even "The Lord's Day"!

The only difference between the Old Testament Sabbath Day and the New Testament Sabbath Day is this improvement of it through its being brought over and into the New Covenant of Grace by the very Lamb of God and by the very sacrifice of Him, and by the resurrection of Him from the dead. Thus, by the Word of God incarnated, revealed, attested, the Sabbath received its first, and Old Testament prophetic fulfilment, newly! Now for the first time in time and history, the Sabbath has become the Day of God's rest fully and finally - the day of His rest in Jesus the Christ. This has become the Sabbath's first institution - its last aim and the end of its lawful and covenantal contract: this, its verification in Christ and by Christ. The Sabbath has become the Lord's Day by virtue of Jesus Christ - by virtue of the Word of God redeemed.

'Biblical Proof' (of the Heidelberg Catechism)

"This teaching of the creed is Biblical. For it is the doctrine of the Fourth Commandment itself . . ." which is but the hollow repetition of lies. I respect the Creed, but despise this article. The doctrine of the Fourth Commandment without the very thing commanded - the day the Sabbath - no longer is "Biblical", but has become the vanity and haughtiness of man, abominable to God.

For indeed ... "The Fourth Commandment is part of the moral law of God, and the moral law of God is perpetually valid. No more is this commandment done away with than is the commandment against taking God's name in vain. Like the other nine,

it was engraved in granite by the finger of God. If it were the case that the Fourth Commandment was entirely ceremonial, we would now have only nine commandments, not ten, and should speak of the "Ennealogue," not of the Decalogue ..." Therefore let us not take God's Name in vain by taking His Word in vain, saying, "... The Fourth Commandment, perpetually valid, requires that we remember a day to keep it holy" - which is double lie. For the Fourth Commandment does not require that we remember a day to keep it holy - actually intending it requires that we remember the Sunday to keep it holy. But the Fourth Commandment requires: "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it Holy". And it gives this reason for it: "the Seventh Day is the Sabbath of the LORD your God". As perpetual as is the Commandment, as perpetual as is the Commander, is the Word: "The Seventh Day"! As perpetual is it, because it has been confirmed in act of God, twice - no, thrice - and once for all: In God's Eternal Purpose in Jesus Christ; in God's creation through and for the sake of Christ of everything that is; and in the consummation of all in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead ... "on the Seventh Day". As true as the Commander, as true as the Word, "God rested the Seventh Day" - which is the everlasting Word of guarantee, God entered upon His katapausis once for all in the raising of Jesus Christ from the dead "in the Sabbath in the fullness of day" (Mt.28:1). This "act of God" is the completion of His creation and of "all the works of God". This "act of God" is the Rest of God. Man is called upon to enter into His Rest, and to remember the Sabbath Day by reason of His Rest. The reason and the day are one in Old and New Testaments: God's Rest! The only change in the Sabbath came about by the making true of the promise it held, that in and through and for the sake of Jesus Christ "the Sabbath was made for man". "In connection with this ... we cease from our (own) work". "The New Testament Scriptures does not abolish the Fourth Commandment" but primarily and primordially is the very institution and establishment and confirmation of it because of the eternal efficacy of the "act of God" in Jesus Christ. The historic Christ-event is where all time and times are begun, and to where all time and times are returned by the exceeding greatness of God's power when He raised Christ from the dead. Therefore ...

"... Jesus did not abolish this commandment" - He instituted it; He "made the Sabbath" - He is the "One Giver" of its Law, of its blessing, of its sanctity, of its rest, and of its perfection. This Jesus was while being the incarnated Word of God. He was the God-Word that "in the beginning was", that was "spoken" - God's Eternal Word. Present with man, present on earth,

and in the flesh, "tabernacled" in Jesus Christ "God with us", God created everything that is, that was and that shall be in the act of his redeeming and saving it in and through Jesus Christ. Before this momentous event, God had but created and made all things and all his works seen and unseen, tentatively. He established all createdness in the hope of His coming in Jesus in the flesh in resurrection from the dead. The first creation is eschatological, and no created thing is eschatological like the Sabbath. The Sabbath is the day to remember for the Rest of God - it was a looking forward, as it is a looking back to the Rest of God! The Sabbath is a looking to God in His mercy. Why then would God not be true to His Word "concerning the Seventh Day", but change it to the First Day? Yes, it would involve the Word of God - therefore He would not! The Seventh Day is sign of God's institution of the everlasting and ever NEW Covenant of Grace - it isn't the First Day of the week. The Seventh Day of the creation and of the Commandment therefore, is **Christian** - which the Sun's Day cannot claim. The Sunday instead is the sign of the negation of God's institution of the everlasting and ever NEW Covenant of Grace! The Sunday is the sign of man's covenant of works because it is the day of his own choice for the worship of the God who never asked and who never gave that day for the worship of Himself. The Sabbath therefore, and not the First Day, two thousand years ago became the Day which according to the Law should be remembered for precisely the reason given in the Commandment, that "on the Seventh Day, God rested."

"... (N)or did He (Jesus) have a lax view of Sabbath-keeping, in comparison with the Pharisees. This is the notion that is sometimes found in the Church, so that those who are careless about remembering the Lord's Day are regarded as good Christians, whereas those who are careful about observing the Sabbath are suspected of Pharisaism."

This also is the notion that is universally found in the Church, so that those who are careless about remembering the Sabbath Day and are particular about the Sunday, are regarded as good Christians, whereas those who are careful about observing the Seventh Day are suspected of Pharisaism. This has been the case historically more than any carelessness about the Sunday. For the Church, Christ's "view of Sabbath-keeping" is of no concern while it eagerly and anon sides with the Pharisees in their corruption

of the true Sabbath-keeping that is acceptable to God and an honour to His Name. For God never forsook the works of his hands, but before He has even created it, had committed Himself to its redemption and salvation - **to be the works of his hands forever**. That is the meaning of God's making and sanctification of the Seventh Day – even of His blessing of it and of His finishing and rest on it. It all makes sense if in view of Christ only! Or, the Sabbath is merely Pharisaic, empty and senseless “ceremonialism”. If then the true Sabbath is so vulnerable to becoming idolatry, how much more a day that is completely foreign to the Sabbath's divine design, intent and nature? Remember the Sabbath, for God on the Seventh Day rested with the view to Christ – not on the First Day of the week. The First Day of the week is that day on which fallen man must start his work being that fallen and sick and dying - **but on the Sabbath - redeemed sinner**.

“It is true that the Pharisees charged our Lord with laxity regarding the Sabbath. They accused Him of breaking the Sabbath (John 5:18). They said, “he keepeth not the Sabbath Day” (John 9:16). But this charge was false.”

A little further Engelsma says, “He (Jesus) taught that remembering the Sabbath does not consist of idleness; it rather consists of working.” For none other was it more true than for Jesus and of Him. “He taught that this work must be the worship of God and the help of the needy brother. He taught that the Sabbath was made for man, for man's great good.” He taught that this work must be His own work and that the Sabbath was made for Himself for the purpose of these His works. Jesus taught the Sabbath was made for the ultimate help, redemption and salvation of His needy brethren the lost sheep of God's fold. He taught that the Sabbath was made for man, for man's great good – his justification, sanctification and glorification IN HIM, through his death and by his resurrection from the dead. This was the Sabbath's purpose from the lips of the Lord of the Sabbath Day Himself. Then Sunday agitators say for this very purpose Christ abolished the Seventh Day of the Commandment, Promise, and Oath of God, and replaced it with a day no one has ever heard of or could ever have expected.

“What was Jesus' teaching? What was the teaching of His behaviour, first of all? Where did the Sabbath Day find Him, and what did it find Him doing? Was he in the field harvesting

the crops? Was He taking scenic tours of the Mediterranean? Was He in the stadium watching the Nazareth Bobcats play the Capernaum Bears at some game of ball? Not at all, but He was always in the synagogue preaching the Word; and He was always doing good to distressed saints, healing them and destroying the power of the Devil.”

Jesus was destroying the power and the work of the devil in dying and rising again more than in any previous work of His, whether the works of his healing ministry or of the creation of the world. All else – every work of Christ's – culminated in this work of His, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead ... upon this Day of His – the Lord's Day, the Sabbath Seventh Day of the week and mid-day of the Yom Yahweh.

“What was the teaching of Jesus' word concerning the Sabbath? Did He ever admit that the Pharisee's charge was true? Did He ever say, “I am come, and, therefore, the Sabbath is no more”? Not at all, but He taught that remembering the Sabbath does not consist of idleness; it rather consists of working. He taught that this work must be the worship of God and the help of the needy brother. He taught that the Sabbath was made for man, for man's great good. And He taught that He is the Lord of the Sabbath. Note well, Jesus does not call Himself, “Destroyer of the Sabbath,” but “Lord of the Sabbath.” ”

What more could we say to confirm God's only, true and real Sabbath? Jesus “taught that the Sabbath was made for man, for man's great good” – which is his salvation at last and once for all in the fullness of time in and through and by Jesus Christ in dying and rising from the dead. No “materialistic” “earthlimindedness” this, Jesus' saying, “for man's great good”! Teaching “that He is the Lord of the Sabbath” Jesus taught that He is the Lord of salvation! Never dare man separate what God has joined together in the Sabbath and His Lordship of it! Never dare man divorce the Giver of the Law that says “thou shalt not be unfaithful” from what He has committed and joined Himself to, intimately and costly, even the Seventh Day Sabbath upon which He descended his choicest blessing, which he sanctified like a bride unto Himself, has finished with the beauty of his salvation, and upon which He rested His faithfulness in full

assurance and hope of His mercy, love and faithfulness. What could it be but the Christian Sabbath? Thou shalt not kill it. Thou shalt honour thy father and mother in the Faith in honouring it. Thou shalt not commit adultery in respect to it with strange days. Thou shalt not covet the favour of the world at the cost of it. For the Name of the Lord is in it, and is used through it - the jealous God. For there is no likeness unto Him, nor another Mighty Self-existing God besides the Yahweh Mighty Lord whose Sabbath is the Seventh Day of HIS making and of HIS salvation, of His blessing and of His sanctification.

"As the Lord of the Sabbath, Jesus fulfils the Sabbath, creating the perfect rest by His atoning death and resurrection ..." Let there be heard no further word! Be silent before this awe-inspiring truth. Don't blaspheme with another word of human wisdom.

"That the Sabbath is now fulfilled Jesus shows by changing the Sabbath Day from the seventh day of the week to the first day of the week."

O gracious and longsuffering Father, forgive us our sins. Forgive us thinking you would turn and spurn your own holiness, your own blessedness, your own perfecting and your own rest and peace you yourself have bestowed upon your own holy Day your Sabbath, and squander it, the heritage, wealth and honour of your elect, upon the first-born not of your most holy and jealous preference or doing.

As the Lord of the Sabbath lives, Jesus fulfils the Sabbath, creating the perfect rest by His atoning death and resurrection. That the Sabbath is now fulfilled Jesus shows, fulfilling and confirming the Sabbath Rest of God "on The Seventh Day" of His creation and Law, being raised from the dead "in the Sabbath in the fullness of day against the First Day of the week" - <opse de sabbatohn epifohskousehi eis mian sabbatohn>. Not the Church, but the Lord Jesus set the Seventh Day apart as the day of Sabbath-rest for the New Testament people of God. Hebrews 4, verses 8 to 10, literally says so. All the Gospels, and all the New Testament, so declare with Jesus in one voice of triumphant praise: Therefore the Son of Man is Lord indeed of the Sabbath Day!" Thus "the Sabbath was made". Thus the Sabbath Seventh Day of the week became "The Lord's Day"!

Therefore, away with asserting such audacious presumptuousness that declares, "Not the Church, but the Lord Jesus set the first day of the week apart as

the day of rest for the New Testament people of God." It makes of God the liar. It is no mere dogmatic or exegetical mistake. No more. Not after we have received the testimony of the unadulterated Word of God for so long. Away with the false prophets! Away with changing the Word of God. He is unchangeable and shall not allow his Word to contradict Himself or his works.

"The Church has no authority to change the Sabbath Day or to require believers to observe the first day of the week." - which is exactly what the Church is doing - simply by holding forth as authority in life and doctrine of the Christian Church a Word of God adulterated by tradition.

"The Church does not make laws; she only proclaims the will of her sovereign Lord, as that will is revealed in Holy Scripture. The Lord of the Sabbath Himself ordained the first day of the week as the day of rest for the Church come of age."

Please show me, and keep not from me God's Word after which panteth my soul! Or reveal thy cunning self! Where, o where, do I read or adduce from the Scriptures: "The Lord of the Sabbath Himself ordained the first day of the week as the day of rest"? Don't I read in Mark 2:27-28 of Jesus speaking of the Sabbath about which He was in contention with the Jews? Then certainly in Mark 2:27-28 Jesus speaks of the Seventh Day Sabbath! Doesn't Jesus speak of the Sabbath that was made for man? Then certainly He must have been speaking about the Sabbath of God's making, the creation Sabbath of the Seventh Day. But you, Pastor of Christ's sheep, declares: "The Lord of the Sabbath Himself ordained the first day of the week as the day of rest"?

You say more than this. You say, "The Lord of the Sabbath Himself ordained the first day of the week as the day of rest **for the Church come of age**"! But go read about the Day of Rest for the Church come of age in Colossians 2:16-17, and in context in 2:12- to 3:1. See Part 4, Par. 8.6, as an Appendix to the book, 'Paul', 'A Positive Re-assessment of Colossians 2:16-17'.

The Lord of the Sabbath Himself ordained as the day of rest, God's promised Day of Rest, Day of His finishing of all his works "by the exceeding, ultimate, greatness of his power when He raised

Christ from the dead", the Day of his Lordship thus attained: "the Seventh Day concerning which God thus spoke ... in the Son ... in these last days ... to us"! That is, to our salvation! "He did this by rising from the dead": "In the slow hours of the Sabbath, in the fullness of day against the First Day of the week"! This, is "the Scriptures", the "text", the "Greek", the "original", "sola Scriptura", "the only authority in doctrine and conduct". This, is "what the Spirit testifies" of the Christ. This, is "The Lord's Day"!

"(Lk. 24:1) [See Part 1, Par.5.3.3.2.2.3, p.124f.] by meeting with His disciples on the first day, prior to the Ascension (John 20:19; [See Part 2 Par.6.2, p. 197f.] John 20:26); [See Part 3/4 Par.7.4.1.2, p. 21f.] by coming back to the Church in the Holy Spirit on the first day (Pentecost was a Sunday); See Part 3/1, Par.7.1, p.1f.] and by directing the apostles and the Apostolic Church to gather for worship on the first day (Acts 20:7; [See Part 3/2, Par. 7.2, p.92 f.] I Cor. 16:1, 2). [See incidentally referred to in many places in 'The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace'.]

"Therefore, the Spirit of Jesus Christ calls the first day of the week, "the Lord's Day," in Revelation 1:10: "I (John) was in the Spirit on the Lord's day...". [See Rv.1:10 incidentally referred to in many places in 'The Lord's Day in the Covenant of Grace'.]

As if not enough that "the Lord of the Sabbath Himself" is made a false witness, also "the Spirit of Jesus Christ" is said to "call the first day of the week, "the Lord's Day," in Revelation 1:10"! Just show me that, I beg, because I don't want to speak of Christ and the Holy Spirit being made false witnesses! God cannot lie, cannot be a false witness, so the author of this allegation must be the false witness.

This unfortunate conclusion brings us to the culminating argument of Church tradition that the Lord's Day "clearly" and "conclusively" (see below) is the First Day of the week, Sunday. Because I have myself come to revolutionary conclusions regarding the etymology and meaning of the expression "the Lord's Day" in its occurrence in each and every second century source I know of, I shall, God willing, treat on it separately under Par.9, Book 5. While I have planned to continue on the next part of Paragraph 7, 'The Sabbath – Cosmic Eschatological Sign', it will have to be postponed once more because of the urgency of my new findings concerning the great words, "The Lord's Day".

Continues then Ds Engelsma,

"This one, brief text (Rv.1:10) is a mighty, a conclusive, Word of God for the whole Sabbath-question. All by itself, it utterly refutes the position of Seventh Day Adventism regarding the day of rest and worship for the New Testament Church."

"(T)he position of Seventh Day Adventism regarding the day of rest and worship for the New Testament Church" is of no concern to us here. We shall only deal with Ds. Engelsma's views in the light of the Scriptures – by the reformed protestant principle of *sola Scriptura*.

We absolutely agree: "This one, brief text (Rv.1:10) is a mighty, a conclusive, Word of God for the whole Sabbath-question". [So do most theologians each have his own 'mighty text' – see Prof. Christie Coetzee.] We agree because in it is found the end-result of two thirds of the first century's evolution in Christian belief, practice, doctrine and theology. In the words "the Lord's Day" – unique in the Greek, <en tehi kuriakehi hehmarai> - is captured the essence and content of Resurrection-Faith. In it the Church personified in John the martyr-witness both proclaims and worships Jesus Christ its Risen Lord.

"What is of greater importance to us is that it clearly teaches that one day of the week, the day on which Jesus arose in glory, is a special day and must be specially observed by those who love the risen Lord. Even though it is certainly true that all the days of the week belong to Christ; nevertheless, it is also certainly true that one of them is "the Lord's day" in a unique sense. The Church after the apostles saw this from the very beginning. ..."

Up to this point there is everything to agree with Ds. Engelsma. But after it there is nothing to agree on, because he says, to capture, "Ignatius, the most ancient church father wrote: "Let every one that loveth Christ keep holy the first day of the week, the Lord's Day." " This simply is misleading and the abuse of the readers' ignorance. Ignatius wrote no word of, and provides no allusion to, "the first day of the week". Neither did John.

"How We Remember the Lord's Day"

Description of the day of rest as the Lord's Day indicates how we are to remember the day. We remember it by devoting it to the Lord Jesus. We remember it by worshipping, knowing, fellowshiping with, and enjoying the crucified and risen Christ. We remember it as John did: by being in the Spirit; hearing Jesus' great Voice (the preaching of the gospel); and seeing Him (by faith) walking amidst the candlesticks (in the Church).

Specifically, we are to observe the Sabbath Day by diligently attending the worship services of Jesus' Church. This, according to the Heidelberg Catechism, is the first requirement of the Fourth Commandment. Remembering the Lord's Day is diligently attending church; willful absence from church, or attendance without diligence, is the grossest violation of the Fourth Commandment. The Catechism is Biblical, here. On the first day of the week, [On the Seventh Day Sabbath – not on the First day of the week.] the apostolic church gathered for worship: to hear the Word; to break bread; to pray; and to lay aside their gifts for the poor. [To lay aside gifts for the poor was a task Paul once instructed for the First Day of the week because he didn't want it to be done on the Sabbath when he would visit the Church in worship.]

It should be evident that diligent church-attendance very really is obedience to the Fourth Commandment of the Law of God. As part of the first table of the Law, the Fourth Commandment demands love for God by His redeemed people's diligent church-attendance is worship, the praise of God in Jesus Christ by a thankful people. The Fourth Commandment calls the saints to rest – at church we rest by enjoying God's wonderful work in Christ by means of the Word and the Sacraments. The Fourth Commandment ends in Christ Jesus – in attending the church of God we seek fellowship with Christ (Who is present by His Spirit and Word), and we strive to honor Him.

Attending church is a genuine remembering of the Lord's Day, if it is diligent. First, it must be an act of faith; no unbeliever can possibly remember the Lord's Day, regardless of whether he comes to church. Secondly, it must be faithful; believers are to gather every Sunday, [Sabbath – not Sunday] as often as services are held. Thirdly, it must be whole-hearted; our attendance is to be eager, joyful, lively. Good church-attendance is to be characterized by the attitude expressed in the Psalter, based on Psalm 122:

With joy I heard my friends exclaim,
Come let us in God's temple meet;
Within thy gates, O Zion blest,
Shall ever stand our willing feet.

This aspect of obedience to the Fourth Commandment is threatened today. There are leaks in the dike. There are those who attend only infrequently, missing entire Sundays [and all Sabbaths by the tradition of Rome] or consistently missing one of the services every Sunday ("oncercs") [and consistently all Sabbaths by the tradition of Rome]. There is the growing practice of missing the worship services, now and then, because they interfere with our pleasures, e.g., our vacation-plans. The Lord's Day is completely forgotten. It is used for traveling or for sightseeing, just as though it did not belong to the risen Christ, but to ourselves. The strange notion is found in the Church that the Fourth Commandment may be broken occasionally. Men suppose that, if they remember the Lord's Day 51 weeks of the year, they are warranted in forgetting it one week. What would these same people say if others would adopt this thinking in regard to the commandment against stealing, or the commandment against murder?

"But the Lord's Day gets in the way of my pleasures," says the man determined to enjoy his weekend vacation. Yes, the Law of God has a way of doing this. Throughout the Old Testament, the Sabbath-Commandment "interfered" with Israel's pleasures; and for this reason they broke it (cf. Isaiah 58:13 and Amos 8:5). May we bend and twist

the Law to suit our pleasures? Or are we to plan our lives according to the law and to find our pleasure in doing what it says?

Our would-be vacationer persists, "But I work hard during the year, and I need some rest." To be sure, we need rest; and this needed rest is the rest of the Lord's house and the Lord's Word.

Another threat to diligent church attendance is formalism in worship. The minister preaches dutifully, droning on; and the people listen dutifully, wondering all the while, when will he ever be done. How do we come to church? The early Christians greeted each other with the words, "The Lord is risen!" We might say, "Lousy weather, isn't it?"

Not the least of the dangers is this, that, at the church we attend, the Word of God is not preached. Attending some church ("the church of your choice") is not necessarily obedience to the Fourth Commandment; attending some church very *faithfully* is not necessarily obedience to the Fourth Commandment. For one concerned to remember the Lord's Day, the all-important question is: "What church do you diligently attend?" Is it a church that honors Jesus by proclaiming Him as the Lord, the eternal Son of God in the flesh, the only and sovereign Savior from sin? "Is it a church that gives the rest of God by preaching justification by faith alone and salvation by grace alone?" "Is it a church consecrated to the glory of God in teaching all of God's commandments, and upholding them by the exercise of discipline?"

Devotion of the Entire Day to the Lord

For the sake of this diligent church-attendance, we are to put aside the ordinary work of the other six days of the week, as well as our play. This is the Fourth Commandment: "thou shalt not do any work" (Ex. 20:10). Already in the Old Testament the purpose of ceasing from work was clearly pointed out: "that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou" (Deut. 5:14). There is no value in not working in itself; but not working is necessary for resting

the rest of the Sabbath. When the Israelite worked on the Sabbath (Numbers 15:32 ff.), the sin was not that he picked up some sticks, but that he despised the spiritual rest of God, *i.e.*, Christ and His salvation. He revealed himself to be a worldly man. This deserved, and still does deserve, the death penalty.

It is the same today. Working on the Lord's Day is destructive of diligent church-attendance. It is true that there are works of necessity that may be done. Jesus taught that one may pull an ass out of the ditch. But, as someone has said, if I have an ass that falls into the ditch every Sunday, I will either fill up the ditch or sell the ass.

The home-work of our children is included in this prohibition. Just as our ordinary work is farming or factory-work or some business or house-work, the ordinary work of the school-children is home-work; and God requires this work to be set aside in the interest of other, better things.

If obedience to this prohibition of work means financial loss and economic hardship, we should be perfectly willing to suffer such loss and hardship. Jesus Christ is not much of a Lord if His Day, and the worship He claims on His Day, are forgotten on account of bread.

Similarly, spending Sunday afternoon watching the football Bears or the baseball Cubs, apart from all other considerations, is destructive of the public worship of God that is required by the Fourth Commandment. Pleasure is the great threat in our society. The world corrupts the Lord's Day, so that there is more devilry on Sunday [Just think what it is like on God's true Sabbath!] than on all the other days of the week combined. This too is an old story. In his glorious call to proper Sabbath-observance in Isaiah 58:13, 14, the prophet *begins* by warning Israel against "doing thy pleasure on my (Jehovah's) holy day." If we are going to use the Lord's Day for our play, we

could better work--it is the lesser of the two evils. Augustine said long ago, concerning remembering the Lord's Day, "It is better to plow than to dance."

Ordinary work and play are forbidden *because they are destructive of the diligent church-attendance required by the Fourth Commandment.* What one does during the rest of the Day stands intimately related to the public worship of the Lord's Day. To throw oneself into his everyday work an hour or two after the morning worship service is to cut off the lingering effect of the house of God and to drown the hope of the world to come in the cares of this life. The man who spends all of Sunday afternoon wrapped up in the ball game cannot bring the evening sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to the house of the Lord. Very likely, he will not attend the second service. The appalling drop in the attendance at the second service is largely due to the use of Sunday [rather, God's true Sabbath the Seventh Day of the Law] for the people's personal pleasure - golf, picnics, visiting, watching television, or relaxing at home with a novel. If he does hurry from the end of the ball game to church, he does not come with a heart filled with the wonderful works of God in Jesus and with affections set on the things above, where Christ Jesus sits on the right hand of God.

What Am I To Do?

The entire day is to be given over to worship; the whole day is to be devoted to the Lord Christ. This is the answer to the familiar question, "What are we to do on Sunday?" [Obey God's Commandment and keep the Seventh Day which He sanctified, holy!]

God intends that we be active; work is required. Doing nothing is not obedience to the Fourth Commandment, e.g., "sacking out" all day. Jesus showed this in John 5. He healed the lame man on the Sabbath and, when the Pharisees objected, said, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" (v.17). The notion that one kept the Sabbath by doing nothing was part of the legalism

of the Pharisees. [The notion that the First Day replaces the Sabbath is the ultimate form of legalism - making one's own law to discard of God's.]

The work to be done, however, is spiritual exercises - private, personal worship of God. There is public worship, but there is also private worship. We should pray. We should read, not the Sunday newspaper, [of last week, or the Saturday News] but Holy Scripture, as well as books and magazines that explain Scripture. Just as our day witnesses a sad lack in private prayer - communion with God, so also is there a serious falling off of good, solid, theological reading and study on the part of all Christians. Earthmindedness comes in now on the floodtide. The Lord's Day is God's dike! The Synod of Dordt spoke of "hallowed contemplation" - even the words are strange to us today. We are so busy; our minds are so full of this world; we are so averse to an hour of quiet and solitude. Sunday is a day for thinking holy thoughts [as all days should be] - thoughts of my sin; thoughts of my redemption; thoughts of my privileged position and calling; thoughts of the beauty of the Church; thoughts of Christ; thoughts of the glory of God.

Permissible, requisite work on the Lord's Day includes "works of charity," i.e., good works of love for our neighbor, especially our fellow saints. The Heidelberg Catechism mentions contributing to the relief of the poor, or almsgiving, as an important aspect of church-attendance. There are other ways to help the needy. Jesus healed them. We can call on old folks languishing at home or in institutions. We can visit, or have over, the lonely saints. We can comfort the distressed. The Church is full of needy, if we only open our eyes.

On Sunday evenings, delightful Christian fellowship can be enjoyed [to introduce the Sabbath] - and practiced, as a duty. Then, we do not discuss our daily jobs, all the restaurants we have gone to, the pennant race, or the many faults of the other members of the congregation; but we speak

together about the Lord Christ. Isaiah 58 expressly warns us against "speaking thine own words."

On the Lord's Day, there should be family worship. There is public worship. There is private worship. There is also family worship. The Fourth Commandment is a family commandment. It is addressed by God to the head of the home, the husband and father: "in it (the Sabbath Day) thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor *thy son*, nor *thy daughter*..." The father is responsible for the obedience of his house. He is to rest, with the family. Historically, the Lord's Day has been a bulwark for the family among Reformed and Presbyterian people. [Regretably it hasn't been the Sabbath of God and his Word.]

Let there be family worship, especially in view of the threats to family life today. The family should discuss the sermon. (This is not the same as tearing the sermon to pieces or criticizing the preacher.) The family should read and study the Bible together. Parents should teach the children their catechism. How I love to hear a child say at the catechism class, "My Dad (or Mother) told me the story." The family should sing together.

There is so much to do on Sunday that the day is too short. [The Sabbath likewise!] "How long is the Lord's Day?" some have asked. Give the Lord a full day; it is the Lord's Day, not the Lord's hour. Really, this is an ominous question. It sounds suspiciously like the question of the Jews in Amos 8:5: "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" Nobody talks like this about his vacation. "Oh, when will it be over?" Such questions about the Lord's Day indicate a leak in the dike in my own soul - worldliness is pouring in. The man who tastes something of the rest of Christ talks differently: "Oh, when will the eternal Sabbath Day dawn?"

Still, our obedience to the Fourth Commandment is, at best, imperfect. We do not have perfect faith in Christ our Rest; we do not

come to church with that zeal for God's glory and with that thankfulness for His work in Jesus that we ought to have; we often hear the Word coldly - yes, and we preachers often preach it so; our use of the Sacraments and our prayers are often habitual; our thoughts are profane; our conversations are worldly; when all is said and done, on a Sunday evening, the most that can be said of our Sabbath observance is that we did nothing. [O God, forgive! O God, help!] The Fourth Commandment teaches us our misery, so that we fly to Christ for righteousness.

But the Lord Who justifies also sanctifies, so that we do have a beginning of obedience to the Fourth Commandment. This beginning, although small, is a victorious beginning. We do rest in Christ by faith on the Lord's Day. This then becomes the power by which we live and work the other six days of the week, ceasing from our evil works and yielding ourselves to the Lord to work by His Spirit in us. Thus, we begin in this life the eternal Sabbath. [Rather the eternal Rest of God, which the Sabbath is the remembrance and celebration of. The <katapausis> of God isn't identical with the <sabbatismos> of the People.]

Ours is a joyful Sabbath keeping. The Lord's Day is not a dreary day. It is not true of us what Thomas Babington Macaulay acidly (and unjustly) said of the Puritans and their Sabbath observance: "The Puritans opposed bear-baiting on Sunday, not because it gave pain to the bears, but because it gave pleasure to the people."

Rather, our experience is that expressed by the hymn:

"Day of all the week the best,
Emblem of eternal rest."

Our experience is that promised by the prophet long ago, in Isaiah 58:13, 14:

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the LORD, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, then shalt thou delight thyself in the LORD; and I

will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it." (Unfinished)

8.5.1.8.
Frost vs. Smith

'Ceremonial' and 'Moral'

(Minister Frost's argument in Courier New; my comments in Verdana; emphasis in **Courier, underlined**, mine)

"Here Is The Text Worth \$200

2 Corinthians 3:7-11,14, "If the ministration of death, written and ENGRAVEN IN STONES, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which IS DONE AWAY was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious . . . Their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in reading of the Old Testament; which vail IS DONE AWAY IN CHRIST."

When any law is done away, all of its parts vanish with it of necessity. For any part of the previous law to be of power it must be re-enacted into the new law. It cannot remain by reason of the old! The sabbath was "done away" in the law that MADE IT KNOWN.

Will Pastor Smith please remit the \$200? His honesty and the integrity of the Seventh-day Adventist Church are now at stake. Let's not have him say that the words "sabbath," "when," "where," "by whom," and "abolished" are not in the text and excuse himself of his obligation. He did not ask for a text using the words, but that "states" (To set; settle; fix. To set forth in detail or in gross; to narrate. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary) those points.

In the event he cannot see the points, let us examine the text and see what it "sets forth."

ABOLISHED -- The text uses the expressions "done away" speaking of the whole law of which the sabbath is a part. So if "done away" in whole, "done away" in part -- out goes the sabbath!

The text quoted next will "settle" this point even more firmly.

BY WHOM -- "Done away in CHRIST."

WHEN -- The expression "IN CHRIST" begs the time. Paul shows this to be his death in Hebrews 8:7; 9:16-17. Thus he speaks in Colossians 2:14-16, "nailed to the cross." That is when!

2 Corinthians 3:7-14 "states" WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the sabbath was ABOLISHED! It therefore satisfies the specification and claims the \$200.

The Clincher At No Additional Cost

Colossians 2:14-16, "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

The text mentions "sabbath" and "nailed to his cross," satisfying the inquiries of

WHEN -- The time of "his cross," AD 33.

WHERE -- "his cross" was just out of Jerusalem.

BY WHOM -- "his" is Christ (verse 11 and 17).

The \$200 well-earned!

Notice that the sabbath has not only been "nailed to his cross," but "let no man therefore judge you in respect of an holy day"!

Demonstrating fair sportsmanship, I'll give Pastor. Smith a chance to earn back the \$200 which should be forthcoming. I'll return the \$200

for the text ... that commands a Christian to keep the Sabbath."

"... let us examine the text and see what it "sets forth."

Before we start to examine the text to see what it sets forth, allow me to point out I do not argue from Pastor. Smith's point of view, because I am not a Seventh Day Adventist, but a Calvinist, 'Reformed', believer, whose sole allegiance should lie with simply what the Bible says.

Then from the start, let it be stated in "simplest of language" (3:12), examination of the text sets forth just the glory of Christ's ministration of righteousness. If to us it sets forth anything besides or over and above, we have been on the wrong track since long and it's too late and impossible to make u-turn. If in these lines we find set forth the proof of the annulment of God's Law, the Ten Commandments or the Fourth Commandment or the Seventh Day of the Fourth Commandment, we are mistaken -- tragically mistaken. Then it is of no use we continue on the same lines that will only lead to sudden death-plunge over the plateau's edge.

Consider: "ABOLISHED -- The text uses the expression "done away" speaking of the whole law of which the sabbath is a part. So if "done away" in whole, "done away" in part -- out goes the sabbath!"

"The text ... speaking of the whole law", as being "ABOLISHED", or, as being "done away".

It all depends on Frost's single word: "If": "**if** done away", and, "if "**done away**"", and, "if "done away **in whole**"!

But all I can see "the text uses" is, that Paul, "speaking of the whole law of which the sabbath is a part", uses, that it "was glorious" -- as follows, quoting from Minister Frost's quote: "If the ministration of death, written and ENGRAVEN IN STONES, **was glorious**...". It all depends on the text's use of the words: "is glorious": Speaking of the **law**, it says, it "is glorious"; and, speaking of the **whole** law, it says, it "is glorious"; and, speaking of the whole law of which the **sabbath** is a part, it says, it "is glorious"!

(*Egenétheth* -- "became" > (still) "is", like the creation "became", but (still) "is".)

It is quite the contrary of what Minister Frost alleges, that it was abolished!

Then also in verse 14 one may read, that the JEWS' "minds were blinded, for until this day (with them) remains the same covering (or concealment), UNTaken away in their reading of the Old Testament (the Law)". Paul says, that "veil" or "covering" or "impediment", namely the Jews' INABILITY to understand or to comprehend fully, "to see to the end" in the Old Testament or Law, to understand or to comprehend the hidden things, "that which is veiled" or "the mystery of godliness" in it behind, and the GLORY of it (which today even the Christians seem not able to notice), one reads that Paul says that THAT, the hindrance, "is done away" – and "done away IN CHRIST"! Christ fulfils the Law and is all its meaning. Behind the Old Testament's every "letter", Christ is hidden, waiting to be discovered through faith, the taking away of the "veil"!

In verse 7 the last part Paul defines what this "veil" was that "was to be done away": it was "the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance". Moses' face so shone with God's glory (whom he had seen "face to face"), "so that the children of Israel could not straight / "steadfastly" / while able to discern", look at his face", so impossible was this veil of the glory of the "ministration of death" to penetrate and "see behind" (*eis to télos*)! It was a spiritual blinding or covering / protection – a "veil" fully effective to prevent sight of either the glory upon Moses' face or the letters engraved upon the stones.

"How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be even more glorious?" asks Paul. By which he means: If God's reflected glory in Moses' face PREVENTED mortals from seeing and understanding God's WRITTEN Law, HOW MUCH MORE will the NEW "ministration", DO THE OPPOSITE and ENABLE men to penetrate the covering (God's glory being the "veil"), and "see behind" (*eis to télos*) the very MANIFESTION of it, that is, to look and in the face of Jesus, to behold God's Glory!

How, when and where could this be possible?

When, where and as "the veil over Moses' face" – the very glory of his "ministration" of the Law – "is done away in Christ". This is the sum of all.

How, when and where could this be possible?

When, there, and as Christ Jesus becomes the revelation of the Father to His child, the "covering is abolished". Then, there and thus, is that child, are those children, caused to see, and to see "to the end" and behind, the glory of God's glory manifested, its very image and personification in Jesus Christ Himself. If one is mercifully favoured to see and understand this, he understands "the Law", the Old Testament", "Moses", "the ministration of death engraven in stone" or whatever description is used of Jesus Christ in the Scriptures:

It is Paul's eschatology.

Those in Christ therefore, don't suffer the inability to "see

behind" or "to the end", but are ABLE "steadfastly", "to see the end / to see the purpose / to sense the realisation and fulfilment" (*eis to télos*).

The "veil" has been "destroyed", and "destroyed in Christ".
(13)

The Israelites could not see behind the covering the brilliance in Moses' face – received from God's drawing near to him and from seeing God "face to face".

Moses saw Jesus, and his face shone with glory.

("Moses saw Christ", Hebrews somewhere says.)

Moses veiled his face so that the Israelites could look at him and listen to his recital to them of God's Law. The children of Israel were unable to see Christ in God's Law, and therefore were unable to behold His glory that caused the face of Moses to shine. They still cannot understand that when God speaks to a human being, it is a divine and glorious demand and command in the happening, because it is to see to the Law's End, Jesus Christ.

Most Christians, it seems, also cannot see it.

"We all" though, says Paul, who are "in Christ", "we all, like in a mirror with open face beholding, see reflected the glory of the Lord, and seeing, we are all changed from glory ("the old testament") to glory ("the new testament") even as by the Spirit of the Lord." (18)

No one looks in the mirror with face covered and is able to discern. No one can see Christ in the Old Testament or Law with "mind blinded" and without the Holy Spirit enlightening him – without the Holy Spirit having "taken away" the sight-impediment.

The Jews still suffer that impediment because they hold fast to Moses' ministration – "the ministration of death", the "old testament", and would not come to God unhindered through Jesus Christ, the New Testament and "the ministration of righteousness". So they miss the Law's very aim.

Most Sabbatharians – Seventh Day or Sunday – obviously, also.

No one can be changed looking into the Law blind minded, and without the Holy Spirit changing all that.

Therefore notice what is "changed", in fact, "abolished"! The Law remains "in Christ" while "we are changed beholding" (Paul somewhere else saying) – rid of our blind mindedness and enabled to "see to the End" of the Law which is Christ.

"Letters engraved in stone" – the Law of Ten Commandments because, "engraved in stone" – the stone of unrepentant and unreceptive hearts. (Not the stones are the Law, but the letters.) The Law ultimately includes the New Testament Scriptures because no one is able, looking into the mirror of the New Testament that reflects the "image" of Christ, to "see to the end" in them, Christ in His glory, if not "from / by the Spirit of the Lord" (18) and without a

masked face – without a blinded mind.

“The letter” even of the New Testament – and for reason no different than of the Old Testament – WILL “kill” him who does not find Christ in its pages a personal Saviour, who does not find Christ’s glory there, “engraved” upon his own heart with God’s “finger” the Holy Spirit.

Paul further explains HOW glorious “the ministration of death, written and ENGRAVEN IN STONES, was”. He says it was “SO” glorious, “that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance” when he presented or “transmitted” or “administered” the stones to them.

Then Paul describes this Law as “death, written and ENGRAVEN IN STONES” – by God Himself. God’s engraving ‘finger’ is His Holy Spirit by Whom He drives out devils, casts down walls, breaks to pieces barriers and bridges gulfs – even digs ears to hear (says David). With this finger of His, God wrote and engraved “the Letter” of the Law “in stone” – in stone of both men’s hearts and earth.

“The Letter”, or, “the Law”, says Paul, “killeth”; therefore he thinks of the Law’s “application” / “ministration”, as “death, written and ENGRAVEN IN STONES”. Which is perfectly true and which is God’s perfect will – the transgressor of the Letter by the Law being applied by no one less than God Himself, must die! The Law is not killed, but the Law killeth whomsoever transgresses it! The Law killeth whomsoever does not find Jesus Christ his ransom and Saviour!

The Law – The Scriptures – must possess some kind of vital power in order to do this, which it would not have had, were it “ABOLISHED” or “done away”. And all the while remember, “the whole law of which the sabbath is a part” (which includes the New Testament) is endued with this vitality of ability to kill. The Sabbath-Law – especially the New Testament as Law – KILLETH if transgressed – because it killeth by its glory!

God then gave the Law its power to kill? Must be, because in itself the Law is no more than “death, written and ENGRAVEN IN (dead) STONES”. The vitality of those dead but killing letters is from God. Moses never received such authority nor could give such authority; God did it. For as long as death is the reward for the Law’s transgression one should be very hesitant to think “the whole law of which the sabbath is a part” is “done away” with, and “out!”.

Only God can give life, and only God can take life, and Paul still explains the Law as “death”. As much though – and here is the Good News – as a man is in Christ and under His Reign and Lordship, as much is he no longer under the power and dominion of

this glorious in killing Letter of Death Engraved in Stone. The glory of its ministration “was to be done away” – future – through the coming of God’s Christ. Death – its glory and its triumph – was to be done away by the glory and the triumph of God in the death of His Christ. And Christ’s Glory is obtained in the killing of hearts of stone and in their stead the raising to life of hearts of flesh and the writing upon them of God’s Law.

As only God is able to give the Law authority to kill, so only He is able to undo that authority and Himself to take it over from the Law, Sin and Death. As only by God’s glory the Law’s killing power is glorious, so only by God’s glory is Christ’s power to destroy death and to give Life, glorious. So “much more”, does Christ’s “ministration of righteousness” of the Law of Life, “exceed in glory the ministration of condemnation”, that “even that which was made glorious” (namely “the ministration of condemnation”) “in this respect”, by comparison, “had NO glory”.

“By reason of the glory that excels” and by measure of it, “that which remains is glorious”, so that it could over-rule and nullify the power, authority and glory of the ministration of the Law which killeth.

Christ now has unto His elect become The Law of Life and Victory, and the Gospel the “ministration of righteousness” – the glory of which is so much greater than the glory of the ministration that killeth, that this last fades into nothingness.

“How much greater then the glory”, says Paul, of Christ’s ministration of righteousness, if the glory of the ministration of the letter of the Law that killeth – even while being engraved in dead stone – was so glorious the Israelites could not behold it! “They could not endure to look (and live) though Moses’ ministration of God’s Law was but temporary”, is what Paul here says. But he who looks, and by grace through faith first dies, and “looses his life for My sake”, says Christ, “shall find it”. “How then shall not the ministration of the Spirit (Christ as our Law) be even more glorious?” asks Paul (verse 8) in effect answering: Incomparably! – incomparably more deadly in killing, and incomparably more victorious and glorious in Life, in the Victor, Christ!

Dear Minister Frost, Would you be able to look Christ the Victor – Who to the Christian has become the Law – straight in the eye and defame his Day of Rest and Worship on the grounds of your own arguments against it? But even worse, will you be able to erect your own day of worship and, in God’s face, on the grounds of your own arguments against His Sabbath, call it “Christian” – “the Lord’s Day”? I would re-evaluate your text by your reasons why you would, and won’t give it \$1! For it is a complete falsity that “the text uses the expression “done away” (ABOLISHED) speaking of the whole law”.

The text does use the expression “done away”

(ABOLISHED), but certainly NOT "speaking of the whole law" or of any part or aspect of the Law but its former mediation or "ministration". In fact, Paul here gives all the respect due the Law, and in the name of the Gospel explains its true Source and Power, even the Word of God who at the beginning instituted the Law Himself through Moses' divinely declared "glorious ministration".

The precise Greek says "the glory of Moses' face was powerless". Yet the Israelites could not even look at what has by now through Christ been abolished, or they would die. How then dare we who behold the unmasked and omnipotent mediation ("ministration") of God's Word / Will / Law "in Christ", say "the whole law of which the sabbath is a part" is "out!", "done", "away", as if we were God?

Paul here explains to us the confirmation of God's Law, not its "abolishment", it having been taken up and over "in Christ" and by His "ministration". What Paul says has been abolished, is all (previous) minor displays of God's Law's institutional eschatological glory to kill. But by the incomparably and infinitely superior glory that belongs to Christ's "ministration" of the Law (realised eschatology) it now once for all in Him has been gloriously vindicated in His glory to give life – which glory the Old Covenant had not. "In Christ", "the Law" indeed "is our righteousness", for Christ, Who "is our righteousness", in truth is our Law – which is God's, the Christian Law, of which the Christian Sabbath – God's Sabbath – "is part". Jesus "the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath indeed", in the words of Mark only what Paul says here. Jesus the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath indeed, and its "ministration", and its "glory".

"Now the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (17) – liberty to worship in the beautiful tabards of holiness of His Sabbath Day. Or would my opponent insist Paul means the 'freedom' NOT to worship – 'freedom FROM' all worship of which the Sabbath is part? It would not be the "freedom OF" true worship, the "liberty" of which Paul speaks! Or would my opponent insist Paul means 'freedom' to CHANGE God's Sabbath as were it like clay in the hands of man to form according to his liking? So it could be said, the text, speaking of the whole law but the Sunday uses the expression "done away" (ABOLISHED) – for that is what Frost ULTIMATELY (*eis to télos*) intends?

Consider then:

"ABOLISHED -- The text uses the expression "done away" speaking of the whole law of which the sabbath is a part. So if "done away" in whole, "done away" in part -- out goes the sabbath!

When any law is done away, all of its parts vanish with it of necessity. For any part of the previous law to be of power it must be re-enacted into the new law. It cannot remain by reason of the old! The sabbath was "done away" in the law that MADE IT KNOWN."

"... When any law is done away, all of its parts vanish with it of necessity..."

Logical conclusion, but possible of human laws only – not of God's Law. Or Minister Frost assumes it's Moses' Law, and therefore human, and therefore, when it is done away, all of its parts vanish with it of necessity? I don't think he does; but if he does, I can't argue with him because I think it is God's Law, not Moses' or the Israelites' Law. How often do we read God says HE "gave" the Law? Then in the New Testament we read God's Name: "Lawgiver". So it must be it's not necessary to argue the possibility or impossibility when it is done away, all of its parts vanish with it of necessity – it a priori is no possibility.

Does Minister Frost insist? Then think of it, he is free to have other gods – always above God when you have other gods, never besides Him. So again I'm in no position to argue further with Minister Frost seeing I believe one should at least have the common platform of faith in the true God only, before one could enter into debate.

But let's nevertheless consider further:

"... For any part of the previous law to be of power it must be re-enacted into the new law. It cannot remain by reason of the old..."

Which is true, not of the Law, but of its "ministration", and of its "ministration" or mediation again for the logic of it is God's eternal Law we are talking about, and for reason of the "ministration" or "service" of the Law here in Second Corinthians being the subject "done away" – not God's Law as such.

Then let us remind ourselves of the principle the whole for all the parts of the whole as stated by Mr Frost Himself, "when it is

done away, all of its parts vanish with it of necessity". One part of the Law only, like the making and worship of images, cannot be taken out of the Law and the rest retained like the Roman Catholics do – all must go or all must be retained. So for the Law that says, "The Seventh Day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God". One cannot have this part done away, but retain the rest – all must go or all must be retained. By which I mean not only all the rest of the Fourth Commandment, but all the rest of the Decalogue!

Mr Frost has painted himself into a corner, I see.

Now consider:

"... For any part of the previous law to be of power it must be re-enacted into the new law. It cannot remain by reason of the old! ..."

We cannot speak of "the previous law" and "the new law", for reasons just above given. God's Law is one and the NEW Law (of Christ) as He is one, and the same – "I AM", ever newly self-being God – from eternity to eternity. Which implies God's Law existed and was valid before man was even created and will outlast even creation that shall pass because of man's transgression of this very Law!

Sin came into the world, and death, before the Law was, says Paul; but where there is no Law there is no sin, says he. One must infer, the Law exists and is valid whether we the transgressors realise we are transgressors or not – and that the Law had been valid and had existed before sin, death, or the giving of the Law to the Israelites.

I fully accept Mr David F. Smith's explanation of this (See the Debate), coming from a Seventh Day Adventist or not.

Nowhere in God's dispensations is the Law once seen, going "out", or been "done away". Instead throughout and progressively God introduces and magnifies and intensifies His Law, constantly giving it a broader and deeper base, and wider and more intense reach. Jesus' Sermon on the Mount – there is God's Commandment from Sinai proclaimed by God Himself in Prophetic Office; Golgotha: there is God's Commandment from Sinai – in truth from the creation – proclaimed by God Himself in Priestly office; Jesus Christ in resurrection from the dead: there is God's Commandment from His inner and eternal council: The living God in Kingly Office, Rex Lex, Lex Rex, King and Law indistinguishable, Prince of Peace, of the Sabbath, Lord! (It is: Because day of resurrection from the dead, of that very Day, He is the Lord, and therefore, it is 'the Lord's Day'. There's no such thing as the Sabbath Day but for this eschatological and historical fact. The whole Bible constantly speaking of this the reason of God's Sabbath Day, it, must be the day. No other day can be the Lord's Day – no

other day than "the Seventh Day concerning which God THUS spoke, And God the Seventh Day rested from all His works", (Hb.4:4-5.)

Nowhere along did God cast out any 'part' – any "title or iota" of His Law – Jesus gave us that guarantee. All must remain because of the old, if one may speak of God as 'old' – which rather should be expressed as "eternal" –, because all must remain because of God and Jesus Christ Who is "the same, yesterday, today and tomorrow".

It must remain by reason of the old – the old Law, the Law given to Israel, because "the old" pointed to Christ, and is "finished", "fulfilled", "completed" and "perfected" by Him, and in Him, and for His sake – for no less than Him. Jesus is the meaning of the Law and the whole Law, and was it, from the beginning, and is it, forever. That's why the Lord's Day should be kept and His Sabbath Commandment so obeyed by any man who in faith calls on Jesus his Lord and Saviour. Paul in 3:4, 12 and 4:13 draws attention to the trust, the hope and the faith we have "to God-ward", "according as it is written", "knowing that He raised up the Lord Jesus". "We indeed believe, and therefore speak", says he, on this basis – none else or besides. "That the excellency of the power may be of God" 4:7: This is Paul's resurrection language – see Ephesians 1:19 further. The Sabbath means no more, it also means no less, than that Jesus is the Lord of one's life, of one's life redeemed into God's Elect, Christ's Body. On the Sabbath the Lord God is worshipped, and worshipped by the Body that is Christ's. That is what it means that "therefore remains valid for God's People their keeping of the Sabbath" (Hb.4:9). Because on this Day "He entered into His Rest" by resurrection from the dead into the life He has thus obtained, "as God" (verse 10), "having given them Rest" by victory, (8).

The claim I here make – that Jesus was raised from the grave on the Sabbath Day and that therefore the Sabbath Day is the Sabbath for the Christian Church to celebrate – is substantiated and proven by the here in Corinthians stated facts in their full meaning. The Scriptures I quoted here are by themselves enough to confirm Jesus rose from the dead "in fullness of Sabbath's-time" (Mt.28:1) because on this Day "He entered into His Rest" by resurrection from the dead into the life He has thus obtained, "as God" (verse 10), "having given them Rest" by victory, verse 8, and that "THEREFORE remains valid for the People of God their keeping of God's Sabbath Day". If this can be proven a false premise, I retract every word I have ever written on the validity of God's Sabbath Day the Seventh Day for God's Christian People, and regret I was ever born.

Consider:

"... The sabbath was "done away" in the law that MADE IT KNOWN..."

"... the law that MADE IT KNOWN..."

Let that LAW that MADE IT (the Sabbath) KNOWN, be identified!

"Thou camest down twice upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, ... and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commanded them...", Nehemiah 9:13-14.

(Now hear! "Moses and Aaron among His priests, and Samuel among them that call upon His Name; they called upon the LORD, and he answered them. Thou answeredst them, O LORD our God: Thou wast a God that forgavest them, though thou tookest vengeance of their inventions." Psalm 99:6-8

You think this is not the God and LORD of then – "that MADE KNOWN HIS Sabbath", that He does not take vengeance on our inventions nor on our libertine Feasts and Sundays?)

"... The sabbath was "done away" in the law that MADE IT KNOWN..."

We have seen from Nehemiah the Law that made the Sabbath known was in fact God Himself. Therefore then if the Sabbath had been "done away" in the law, it was "done away" in the LORD that "MADE IT KNOWN"! And if by reason of such institution or 'making known' by the Lord "out goes the sabbath!" then "out goes" the LORD who "MADE IT KNOWN"!

One can only greater blaspheme by saying these 'texts' are Old Testament, redundant, "done away" 'texts', and 'out', because they are 'Law'.

Or, if confessed these 'texts' are God's Word in Scripture, one only can confess the Sabbath was MADE KNOWN by the LORD, and was MADE KNOWN in His Word through His servants the Church, Moses, Aaron, Samuel, Paul, Jesus Christ the Head!

Another fallacy underlying Frost's arguments is the division of Christ's Church. But the Christian Church is the Church of all time and all times. Christ has but one Body that is His. God's will revealed to His one Congregation is single His will of Law – all laws in one – at least all laws "as it is written".

The Church let us be reminded is TWO loaves of First Bread Wave Offering before the LORD – not one loaf the 'Christian' Church. The true 'Christian Church', the 'New Testament Church', is one – it includes "the Church in the wilderness", the 'Old Testament' Church. First Member its Head, God in Jesus Christ Lord of the Body that is His; Adam and Eve and Noah and Moses ... to the last saint and martyr for Christ, the Body.

Continue:

"... The text quoted next will "settle" this point (the sabbath was "done away" in the law that MADE IT KNOWN) even more firmly (than what 2Corinthians 3 allegedly "settles" it)..."

"BY WHOM – "Done away in Christ""

"WHEN – Paul shows this to be his death in Hebrews 8:7; 9:16-17. Thus he speaks in Colossians 2:14-16, "nailed to the cross." That is when! 2 Corinthians 3:7-14 "states" WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the Sabbath was ABOLISHED! It therefore satisfies the specification and claims the \$200."

If death vanquished the Life of God in Christ in His death, it vanquished the Law of God in Christ in His death. But as much as the death of Christ meant life vanquished, as much meant the death of Christ the Law vanquished. For as much as the death of Christ meant death vanquished and life vindicated, as much meant the death of Christ transgression vanquished and the Law vindicated. God in Christ died; but in dying very death, God vanquished death and, vindicated life! The truth of this, the Scriptures describes "the mystery of godliness" – hidden ... and revealed – all in Jesus Christ. To remove the paradox in it, would be to remove the light and truth of it.

"... BY WHOM -- "Done away in CHRIST."

WHEN -- The expression "IN CHRIST" begs the time. Paul shows this to be his death in Hebrews 8:7; 9:16-17. Thus he speaks in Colossians 2:14-16, "nailed to the cross." That is when!

2 Corinthians 3:7-14 "states" WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the sabbath was ABOLISHED! It therefore satisfies the specification and claims the \$200."

Consider:

"Hebrews 8:7..." There's nothing there of relevance.

"9:16-17..." Here the negation and not the affirmation of Mr Frost's claims is found: "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator lives." If the 'testator' is Christ, His death must needs have confirmed His Testament, which it is agreed, in the context of Hebrews 8:7 and 9:16-17 is God's Law, His 'Old Testament'.

Frost's reference here obviously and correctly itself presupposes the "testament" is the Law. Christ's death then "strengthens" or validates the Law – it annuls it not.

"For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself now to appear in the presence of God for us." Why? In connection with what? He is our Mediator of course! – Mediator between God and sinners, the transgressors of His Law. Christ's intercession of necessity confirms God's Law and its validity, today!

Frost asserts the occasion WHEN the sabbath allegedly was done away / was ABOLISHED, can be seen where Paul writes in Colossians 2:14-16 of the Sabbath, "Thus he speaks in Colossians 2:14-16, "nailed to the cross." That is when!"

Yes, although the Seventh Day Adventists will say, no, Paul doesn't speak of the Law, but of the 'ceremonial' things which they suppose are not "the Law", and, that Paul is not using the word "Law" as for the Ten Commandments.

But Paul says here that the things nailed to Christ's cross were "that against us, which was contrary to us", which included "the handwriting of ordinances", and ultimately is God Himself. Christ died in judgement against US!

Surely the Law is against us? But surely just as much is "for" us? Jesus said the Sabbath was made FOR man", that is, NOT "against" him.

The Law is what includes our sins and is the record of our sins? Absolutely! Therefore Christ who included our sins and the record of it in His own body, who thus brought it to the cross and THERE, THEN and SO "nailed it to the cross", THERE, THEN and SO "for us" was the Law of God nailed to the cross! Christ our Lord our Law!

Where were our sins recorded? Our sins were put on Jesus, and in his body were carried to the cross, and there – in Him – were nailed to the cross, and in Him were on the cross, "obliterated". What do we see hanging on the cross then, there dying, there the very life of it extinguished? God's Holy Law! The Priest, carrying out the Law, is the Law, becomes one with it, and the same. "Against Thee alone have I sinned!" (David).

In fact I have no objection to Gene Frost's observation here. It only is lamentable he doesn't follow Paul through! For God's Law we see here "blotted out", the very thing against us removed – for making possible the forgiveness of our transgressions against it – is God's Law, BUT, which we here ALSO see, "raised from the dead", is God's Law!

Again one must be "blind minded" not to be able "to see to the end" of it! All the negatives Paul 'uses', all the "blotting out", all the "nailing to the cross", all the "spoiling" and "making a show of" – all the "things seen" here – are those cancelled out and overcome, being vanquished in the positives which Paul here 'uses'. Such positives are: "You have He quickened together with

Him", "Him" is He, who "through the operation of God" was "raised from the dead". Then, in one word, in verse 15, "God triumph(ed) over them IN IT", that – just like in 2 Corinthians 3 – is, "in Christ"! The reference in the words "in it" is to the foregoing context – to "the operation of God", "in Christ". The reference in the words "in it" is to God "who raised Him from the dead".

"You hath He quickened with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses".

We saw Christ crucified and raised, and in Him, we have seen US, crucified and raised. We saw Christ crucified and raised, and in Him, we have seen our SINS, crucified and obliterated. We saw Christ crucified and raised, and in Him, we have seen the LAW crucified and raised. We saw Christ crucified and raised, and in Him, we have seen the RECORD of our sins, crucified and obliterated.

We have seen Jesus Christ triumphs over death and the Law of death, over sin and the record of sin, "in His body", and "through the veil" (Hb), that is, through the offering up of his life. We have seen Him availing redemption, indeed salvation. He SAVED and in saving confirmed God's Covenant of Grace. The One crucified and offered, The One raised in triumph, and IN HIM us, crucified and offered and raised in triumph, and IN HIM the Law, crucified and offered and raised in triumph, for He is our Law.

Only sin, death and the grave, and the powers thereof, stayed behind, obliterated, abolished, done away! And in death remaining in obliteration, are our sins and the remembrance in record of it.

If the Law remained with these, then Christ contained it not in Himself as He went down, and as He came up. If the Law remained with these, Christ would not call, "Today, if you hear His Voice, don't harder your hearts!" for hearken, it is the Law that there from death appears in triumph!

However, the Law totally: also meaning "the handwriting of ordinances against us" – having been "nailed to the cross" and "taken out of the way" without a doubt – NON THE LESS HERE, in these lines, is not SAID to be "obliterated" or "nullified". It is inferred, not written, of the Law. What is written here strictly means the "account" "ordered", "issued", "against us", that is, OUR DEATH SENTENCE, has been "wiped out", "cancelled", "annulled"! We infer, the Law represents our death sentence; it is "DEATH engraved in stone" (2Cor.3). Let the contradiction stand! For the Law as a dividing, did disappear in Christ – it has been "taken out of the way" between God and us. "Law" no longer exists in "Law" for believers but for transgressors. "Law" for believers is their rule of life, their "Law", "in Christ" No longer as for the Jews is the Law for believers the Law "engraved ordinances", be it in whatever form or appearance. Although it never was the Law that separated us from God, but our "trespasses" of it, the Law no longer stands between God and us, but Christ. Our sins even today is the real division,

which "middle wall of separation" had not merely been moved to one side "out of the way", but removed and extinguished in the sacrifice of Jesus, His righteousness indeed having become the "ministration" or "mediation" between God and us. Instead of our sins there, we now enjoy Christ's righteousness, bringing to the fore remarkable resemblance between 2 Corinthians 3 and Colossians the second chapter.

But according to the thrust of Gene Frost's argument, we now may sin and revel in ungodliness – the Law is "done away", "out" and "abolished". Abominable thought! So now we may trample under foot the Sabbath and invent our own day of worship? Exactly what he aims at! And now we are free to bring our own righteousness an offering of ungodliness "for" us before God, Sunday, pagan day of idolatry and violation of Law and Scriptures? What he never thought it implies!

And what audacious practice and fashion to judge the Church in her feasting of her Sabbaths while God through Paul here in this passage, warns: "Do not you be judged by any man in regard to your feasting of your Sabbaths!"

"Do not you be judged" for the very reason of God's having "spoiled the principalities and powers" "against us"!

Throughout our passage Paul uses participles: "While God ...": "While God was blotting out our death-sentence"; "While God having forgiven you all trespasses"; "while God having spoiled principalities"; "While God triumphing over them". Through these contextual positives of God acting in Christ for us and not "against" us, rings Paul's defensive challenge, sounds this, his to all the world obtrusive specific: "Concerning your feasting of your Sabbaths: Do not you be judged by any man (of the world) in it!"

Then to say from these texts, God abolished His Sabbath – from these texts, where Paul admonishes the Church about its duty as the Body of Christ to IN DEFIANCE AND CONTEMPT OF THE WORLD celebrate in Christian freedom its Sabbaths, not adopting – or adapting to – the world's piety (2:20b-23), not trading in God's worship for man's (2:18) – to say from these texts, God abolished His Sabbath, is unthinkable, and, inexcusable.

To say it here of all places, that the Sabbath was abolished in Christ, exposes the world's weak and beggarly first principles 'behind' its 'veil' of hypocrisy.

Think "here is the text" "worth \$200" "satisfying the inquiries" "WHEN" "WHERE" "BY WHOM" the sabbath was "ABOLISHED"? Think this "the clincher"? I think Colossians 2:14-16 at the cost of Calvary the clincher that the Sabbath in Christ was endowed with meaning never before attached to it as to specification and claim, its Christian meaning!

To summarise:

Rejected:

The text mentions "sabbath" and "nailed to the cross," thus satisfying the claim the Sabbath was abolished and done away by Christ when and where he was nailed to the cross.

Accepted:

The text shows exactly the opposite: Here the Law is abolished in Christ on the cross, but never forget: "in Christ"! Then, immediately following: Behold! Here is the Church's Sabbaths, and God – through Paul – commanding: "Do not you be judged by any man in feasting your Sabbaths!" It confirms the Sabbath, 'Christian', is, 1, free (blessed); 2, just (holy) and 3, commanded (Law)! It shows the Sabbath God's gift for peaceful (un-interfered, unadulterated) celebration (feasting in remembrance) of His completed work through and in Jesus Christ. "All", and not while only some, of God's works (Hb.4:4-5) are His "finished" works – Christ the End of it, and in resurrection from the dead, the Amen to it! (The "and it was so", of God's Seventh Day.) Thought it wasn't said in Genesis' anecdote? Then you have missed out on eschatology in those verses. Here, in Colossians 2 it once again says it all, just open your eyes, and you'll see for yourself. Or rather, pray God, to open your eyes, and you may see – it all – for Christ's sake and to His glory. You'll never see it if you wish God's Law negated, His Sabbath reviled, or His People denounced for feasting her Sabbath Days. Rather with her, join and rejoice for her salvation wrought.

This is an imagined discourse with two persons who discoursed more than half a century ago and, who on their part, revived the Porter Dugger debate of the beginning of the twentieth century; yet it is as timely as ever (end of the year of our Lord 2003).

The reasons to hate God's Sabbath Day are the same; the reasons to love it though, are new, I believe. I believe if one believe the Sabbath for loving truth, it is not enough; one should love the Sabbath for the love of The Truth, Jesus Christ alone – alone and exclusively: He does not share His honour not even with His holy Law! If we find the two in conflict, or, on par, know for sure we're wrong.

The reasons to hate God's Sabbath Day are the same, I said. The veracity of my finding has proven and will prove itself further as we progress in this debate.

Consider then the debate from both Gene Frost's and David Smith's viewpoints – I'll skip all the personal interchange of words between them.

Above we have taken note of Frost's pretext "The Sabbath was "done away" in the law that MADE IT KNOWN", and that Second Corinthians 3 "settles the point" "BY WHOM", allegedly Christ. To believe Mr Frost, not God therefore "MADE KNOWN" the Sabbath, for He would not make void His own Word; nor the Law (or Moses) "MADE KNOWN" the Sabbath, for it is impossible God's servant would make Him the liar.

Mr Frost uses the words "MADE KNOWN" and "GIVEN" with the same meaning. "Let us first notice WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the sabbath was GIVEN." (Frost's emphasis)

In answer to the question – and challenge of Mr White's – of how, when, and by whom the Sabbath supposedly was ABOLISHED, Mr Frost proceeds with the following list of quotes of information on how, when, and by whom the Sabbath in fact was "MADE KNOWN" or "GIVEN"!

"Before I give the \$200 text showing WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM abolished, let us first notice WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the Sabbath was GIVEN. Study the following texts:

Exodus 31:13 (17), "Speak thou (Moses) also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths shall ye keep: for it is a sign between me and your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you."

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

Nehemiah 9:13-14, "Thou (God) camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgements, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: and madest known unto them thy holy sabbath ... by the hand of Moses thy servant.""

Now imagine Minister Frost's conclusion from these Scriptures. Says he, "Now we shall see what happened to the law given to the children of Israel on Mount Sinai, graven in stones, by which God MADE KNOWN His holy sabbath. What happened to the law happened to all its parts, including every part – including the Sabbath! ...". (What follows we are conversant with.)

"... what happened to the law ...?" Twice: "What happened to the law ..."? What "happened to all its parts, including every part – including the Sabbath...?"

Minister Frost heads for one conclusion only, his precluded success at proving, or 'clinching', the Sabbath had been "abolished"! For that purpose he quotes these texts! Did he think it would strengthen his (supposed) case to mention these Scriptures? I think he made a big mistake to contract these Scriptures. They nullify his thesis a priori.

What happened to the law, to all its parts, including every part – including the Sabbath? "By" these Scriptures, in Frost's own words, "God MADE KNOWN His holy sabbath", and I can't improve on what he has said or how he has said it. Maybe only I would have written GOD in capital letters too, so that we might know with WHOM we have to do here – no mortal, no imperfect being, but GOD, from eternity to eternity the Perfect Truthful Father and Creator Saviour of His children. I find it a disappointment HE would GIVE His children and MAKE KNOWN to them an imperfect, passing Law, and that, with such revelation of Himself in Power and Majesty, relying on His Word of faith and trust for the honour of His Name? This Word of God's, His Sabbath Day, contains and promises Jesus Christ, and He GAVE it only to do away with it, abolish it? What God is this? No! What misconception of Frost's is this!

Nevertheless, thanks for having quoted the precious promise of assurance of God, "It is a sign between ME and your generations; THAT YE MAY KNOW THAT I AM THE LORD THAT DOTHTH SANCTIFY YOU". Oh children of Israel, rejoice! Oh Christian Church, don't mind the world's judgements on you in your Sabbaths' feasting, for the Israel of God has become one, and the middle wall of partition has been demolished – the Body that is Christ's is "growing with the increase of God", "eating and drinking" of Priestly Shewbread and from Jacob's Well the Water of Life.

Minister Frost basis his reasons for the alleged abolishment of the Sabbath on three variables, 1, That the Law is changeable; 2, That the Church is transient; 3, That God's Word is corruptible. In the last analysis God's character is misjudged, the Scriptures ridiculed, and the believers' every stability and security removed. The Sabbath isn't called the Sabbath of the LORD your God for nothing – its very name shows forth God's faithfulness and the strength He has to back up His faithfulness: "I Am Who I Am, the Mighty – the LORD your God"! Of THIS NAME and GOD the Sabbath is a sign, that this God is the God of Israel and all its children – the Israel of all ages and generations, and the Church this God's Israel, through all ages and generations.

Frost's Claims Further Refuted – Smith's Rebuttal
Considering

Smith:

"... several misstatements of fact, which should be answered:

Sabbath Before Sinai

Misstatement No. 1 implied that the Sabbath was not given before it was presented to the Jews at Mt. Sinai.

Obviously before a band of ignorant slaves could be made into a great nation for God, they needed instruction. But to imply that such principles of right were not in effect before this time is contrary to Scripture. In Rom.3:20 the Apostle Paul writes, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." In Rom.4:5, he states, "Where no law is there is no transgression." ("Sin is the transgression of the Law.") In Rom.3:23 and 5:12 he states twice that all have sinned. Now if all have sinned, and yet where no law is there is no transgression; this indicates that the law has been in existence since the beginning of human life on this planet. He amplifies this further in Rom.3:23 by stating "For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed WHEN THERE IS NO LAW."

What law is the apostle talking about, which reveals sin? In Rom.7:7 he states, "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." What law is it that contains the rule against coveting? As every Sunday school child knows, this rule is part of the TEN COMMANDMENTS – the law that at Sinai was graven in tables of stone by the finger of God.

The apostle states further in Rom.7:12, "Wherefore the law is holy, and just and good." The enemies of the Law of God are shown up in their true light where the Apostle writes in Rom.8:6,7. "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is ENMITY AGAINST GOD for

it is NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF GOD neither indeed can be.""

Now what fault could be found with Smith's remonstrance? Frost's first attempt at evasion of the issue:

Whereas – as we have seen above – Frost at first made big issue of three things: "WHEN, WHERE, BY WHOM" the Sabbath ostensibly was "done away / abolished", he now changes tune and says,

"The issue before us is not whether God ever gave a Sabbath, which is the seventh day, for on this we agree. (On this Frost at first differed in fact.) The issue is, to whom did God make it known and when. Or, more aptly, is the Seventh-day Sabbath enjoined on Christians in this present dispensation?"

In other words, whereas at first Frost questioned the fact the Sabbath was "GIVEN" or "MADE KNOWN" by God – Himself – maintaining the Law ('Moses') "MADE it KNOWN", he now pretends to be champion of the true facts: God made it known! Frost must revert to his sole defensive, the question of "to whom did God make known (the Sabbath) and when". Instead of an honest admittance he was in the wrong, Frost persists in his error.

He goes on to show "when" it was that God blessed the Seventh Day – which everybody knows and nobody denies – was at Sinai; and "to whom" – which everybody knows and nobody denies was to the Israelites. In the meantime Frost – without knowing it (it appears), presupposes the only existent Sabbath "GIVEN" and "MADE KNOWN". He never attends to the implication where this "GIVEN" and "MADE KNOWN" Sabbath came from; he never attends to – but directly denies – the implication the only possibility of its origin was at the creation: it's real and final establishment eschatologically "in Christ".

Frost ironically implicates and presupposes the pre-existence "before Mount Sinai" of this very Sabbath Day in arguing where and when it was "blessed" and "sanctified":

"WHEN did he (God) bless and sanctify the seventh day as a Sabbath? Not possibly at CREATION, for he blessed it because He HAD RESTED. "Had rested" is past perfect tense of the verb and refers to an action already completed in the past. The seventh day was sanctified sometime following creation, his rest. It could not have been the day he rested because he blessed it because he HAD RESTED! There is no indication

that it was ever made known before Mount Sinai.”

It is two different things to bless the Sabbath and to make it known, yet to God, and in himself, it is one deed. God to Himself blessed the Seventh Day; He to Israel made it known – in creating it. Its creation was the Sabbath’s sanctification, its being put apart for holy use, its creation. These are deeds of different meaning, yet of the same time and occurrence for coming from the One Source and Maker of all things. (“In the beginning was the Word ... without Him was not anything made that was made.”

God to Himself blessed the Seventh Day; He to Israel made it known in Adam at creation, at its very blessing, at its very sanctification, at God’s very “completing” all His works he had made, He had made the Sabbath Day – the Seventh Day of His making. He to Israel made it known in Adam at creation – the Sabbath is the sign and seal of it. If the Sabbath had been the sign of the relationship between God and Israel, then it had to have been it when given and made known to Adam at the creation.

The making known of the Sabbath to Israel at Sinai of course happened long after it had been made – created by God when blessed by Him and blessed by Him when created by Him and when made known to Israel in Adam. That was at creation, the Seventh Day of God’s creating – “for he blessed it because He HAD RESTED”. Don’t tell me it could “not possibly” have been “at CREATION”, because it’s sheer stubbornness to negate. Frost has read this poorest of arguments from the Dugger Porter Debate, and clearly has no inkling of what he is talking. Rather come read with me from God’s Word on this issue: “And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made”, Gn.2:1. Truly, let us call the “Sunday school child”, to hear the truth from the mouth of the child, whether it was “at CREATION” when God rested, or not. Or that “Then ...”, “... God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that IN IT he had rested from all his work which God created and made.”

“Had rested” in its context here has Simple Past Tense meaning. It is ‘old English’ for “rested”. If regarded as “past perfect tense” its syntactical relation would demand God “had rested” before He “created and made”. Again it would mean, “had rested” has no bearing on when the Sabbath was made known in relation to when it had been created – which is as artificial pretence as one could find.

“These are the beginnings of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens.” “That is WHEN!” “On the Seventh Day God in his one creative deed, “made the Sabbath”, and in so doing, “blessed the Seventh Day” “sanctified the Seventh Day” and “on the

Seventh Day rested” and “in it completed all his works which God created in that He made it” – each deed of which the bigger deed is comprised, then and there present and acted.

Minister Frost must again hear himself.

Says he, ““Had rested” is past perfect tense of the verb and refers to an action already completed in the past.”

From the standpoint then of the Sabbath’s “giving” at Sinai, “the issue” is solved of “WHEN God made it (the Sabbath) known” – it had been “at CREATION”. But to accept this, and to accept this according to “Genesis 2:2-3”, Minister Frost declares, shows one has “fail(ed) to give it attention”, because, says he, “It (the Sabbath) was not given or sanctified before! (that is, before “at Sinai”). He thus supplies the perfect example of “foolish contentions and strivings about the law” (Titus 3:9). Minister Frost makes the “unprofitable and vain” assertion namely that the use of the Past Perfect Tense “HAD RESTED”, explains “WHEN” God “did bless and sanctify the seventh day as a sabbath” that had NOT been completed “a sabbath” at creation, but that “at Sinai”, was in the present, happening.

The emphasis – although not indicated by him – Minister Frost most certainly means to fall on the words “as a sabbath”. He means to say the Sabbath did not become the Sabbath before here “at Sinai”. “WHEN did he (God) bless and sanctify the seventh day as a sabbath? Not possibly at CREATION, for he blessed it because He HAD RESTED! “Had rested” is past perfect tense of the verb and refers to an action already completed in the past. The seventh day was sanctified sometime following creation, his rest.” Again Minister Frost does not indicate the emphasis on his words “his (God’s) rest”. He also in this clause does not again use the word “as” – “The seventh day was sanctified sometime following creation as God’s rest (day)”. But his intention is clear nevertheless: The Seventh Day Minister Frost says, never before used to be the Sabbath quite simply. “It” – the Sabbath no doubt according to Minister Frost – “was not given or sanctified before”, not “at CREATION”, and not “before Mount Sinai”, but only “on Mount Sinai after their deliverance from Egypt”. And all this certainty springing from Minister Frost’s observance, “... for he blessed it because He HAD RESTED ... an action already completed in the past”. “It (“the seventh day

sanctified") could not have been the day He rested because He blessed it because He HAD RESTED!"

If this is not flat contradiction there is no such a thing as flat contradiction.

But let's get to the pit of Minister Frost's making a pitch for a "Past Perfect Tense" here. It is verbal support, all pretension, to get himself out of trouble.

At the submitting of his "text" and "observations" Minister Frost "claimed" he "showed" (that is, 'proved') "WHEN, WHERE, and BY WHOM the Sabbath was given". An honest reading of his letter must conclude Minister Frost intended to prove the Sabbath had NOT been "MADE KNOWN" or "GIVEN" "before" this time" at "Mount Sinai" – and therefore NOT at the creation.

But that only 'proved' halve his claim. Not so for Minister Frost though! For him his "text" also 'proved' "BY WHOM" the Sabbath was THEN, that is, at Sinai, "MADE KNOWN" or "GIVEN": "by the hand of Moses thy servant"! "Moses had to explain..."; "he instructed"; "BY WHOM – "thou (God) ... madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath ... by the hand of Moses thy servant"; "Moses said, as the accepted author of Genesis, "An God blessed the seventh day ...". Moses gave the Law, and he gave it "sometime following creation". God did not give it or make it known "at CREATION"; God ONLY "HAD RESTED" "at CREATION". That is, according to Minister Gene Frost in his second "article".

((Many of the most highly esteemed scholars have said the same. I must still find any who have found or expressed something different. Only Calvin among those of note, differ as to these stereotype arguments. He maintains it is nonsense Christians during New Testament in the making times worshipped on the First Day of the week; and he maintains the word "Sabbaths" in the only two "Sunday texts", Acts 20:7 and 1 Corinthians 16:1, means "Sabbaths" – "the first of the Sabbaths" – Seventh Day of the week!))

Where I have emphasised Minister Frost in my quotes above, I did not write in capital letters, as his manner is. But the omissions are his; I quoted him literally except for my emphasis on 'Moses'. It would have defeated Frost's objective to emphasise 'Moses' or to fill in the gaps he left because it would have created too stark a contrast against his design. It against his liking would have obviated the fact his "text" actually states that GOD is the Giver and Maker Known of His Sabbath Day. It would have defeated Frost's objective of proving his WHOLE proposition of "WHEN, WHERE and BY

WHOM" the Law and Sabbath were given and made known: namely at Sinai, and by Moses, thereby DENYING it had been given and made known "at CREATION", and, by God.

Now, it is against this background and from this proposition departing, that Minister Frost in his second "article" uses his argument of a "Past Perfect Tense" of "HAD RESTED". GOD, at creation "HAD RESTED"; GOD, did not "GIVE" the Sabbath Day, THEN; GOD, did not "MAKE KNOWN" the Sabbath Day, THEN – MOSES "GAVE" the Sabbath AT SINAI; MOSES "MADE KNOWN" the Sabbath AT SINAI. Therefore the Sabbath was not "enjoined on Christians in the present dispensation", but on the Israelites in the old dispensation, and not by God, but by Moses: "It could not have been the day he rested because he blessed it because He HAD RESTED! There is no indication that it was ever made known before Mount Sinai" ... by God, is what Minister Frost really meant in his "previous" article". Therefore what Minister Frost really means is, it is possible and unavoidable the Sabbath should be "ABOLISHED!"

To prove the Sabbath was not "enjoined on Christians in the present dispensation" Frost argued it "certainly ... was enjoined upon the Israelites while they were travelling toward Sinai. ... It was not given or sanctified before!"

The implication is clear and irrevocable:

Had the Sabbath been given or made known "before", that is, at the creation, it must be "enjoined on Christians in the present dispensation".

Frost obviously is fully aware of this implication, that if the Sabbath had been "given or sanctified before", that is, at creation, then the CHURCH IS ONE in all dispensations, and the SABBATH must also be "enjoined on Christians in the present dispensation". He would not admit either.

Ultimately the "issue" about the perpetuity of the Sabbath boils down to the nature of God: Is GOD changeable, yes, or, no? If God is perpetually the ONE and TRUE God, He won't play around with 'sabbath' days, but His Sabbath Day will ever be the ONE and TRUE. The Seventh Day will always be God's "Holy" and "blessed" "Sabbath" – Day of HIS rest at creation, IN CHRIST, in the "finishing" of "all his works", and in and through the resurrection of HIM from the dead.

However, one cannot expect more than the milk of the Word from a child (Pastor Smith's 'witness' above). The solid food of the

Word is for mature believers, who are supposed to be able to see God "had rested" "at CREATION" in historical as well as in eschatological sense. They are supposed to be able to see that His truly and ultimately completed works AND WORK OF REST of perfection in Jesus Christ ARE ALREADY CONTAINED in promise and in covenantal oath in God's rest "at CREATION".

"In plain language", it already was absolute certainty in God's rest on and of the Seventh Day of His creation, and in His sanctification of the Seventh Day "at CREATION", that His Word of Rest and Life on the Seventh Day would confirm His Word of Promise and Prophecy and the last things already contained in it the creation, THAT JESUS WOULD RISE from the dead "on the Sabbath, in the fullness of its daylight's hour, before the First Day of the week", Mt.28:1.

God would act in mercy and rest BEFORE man would begin to work his own works.

God "HAD RESTED" "at CREATION" in the LAST day, "at the turn of the *yom Yahweh*" – the day of salvation, the day of Christ, the day "the LORD has made", the Lord's Day! And thus God "blessed it because He HAD RESTED". (Say I, not Frost, daring to give to God's Past Perfect, a Past Future meaning, in fact a Future Past Perfect meaning – that of God's prophetic, promised and Living Word in Jesus Christ in His creation: eschatology it is!)

Find it strange it was the Seventh Day? How come? How else? It could not have been otherwise; it had to be the Sabbath and it had to have been the Sabbath – the Sabbath of the LORD your God! And actually it had been.

Think God would have been our God had Jesus not died and risen for our justification? Think God would have been our God had Jesus not been God's Law crucified for us? I think not. He signalled His Lordship of us in the righteousness of Jesus Christ – in the ministration of the Death of the New Covenant – with His Sabbath Day its sign – that He unto us His People, will be LORD in Resurrection from the dead – a relationship in righteousness and of righteousness, even "the righteousness of God" ... in Jesus Christ! Yes, the Sabbath was at and in the death of Christ, so that also at and in the resurrection of Him, it was raised from the death of dead men's trampling underfoot of it.

That's it! Hate God's Sabbath for it, or love it. The Sabbath is a barometer and thermometer in one, that measures both our love and hate. It also shows to where the mercury rises when contained in the hand of God. This measuring instrument works for any user, whether he is a Jew or a gentile, a sinner or a hypocrite, a champion or a loser, God or man: it's "for all your generations" and genealogy is about the only thing it does not measure. This barometer / thermometer actually shows the Body's temperature and elevation – how near to heaven it lives. It correlates heartbeat

to exercise to temperature to energy spent to increase in effectiveness and strength. It's the best indicator of the Body's 'productivity' and 'growth'. Believe it or not, the Sabbath is an indicator of the condition the Body's immune system is in – how penetrable it is to the bugs of the world's "weak and beggarly principles". The Doctor won't know his patient nor would work on him, had he not his Sabbath thermometer at hand.

((Speaking or writing on the Sabbath cannot be speaking or writing on the Sabbath per se because it inevitably will and must be a speaking and a writing on relationship – the relationship between God in His condescending love "to us-ward", and that Love's raising up into eternal life by grace through faith. I won't say a word about the Sabbath Day for its own sake not because I have any antipathy towards it, but because it won't permit it, and because it only draws forth glory and praises to God – God has made it that way. Therefore I also cannot speak or write on the Sabbath in the singular, but must do so in the plural: "God to us-ward", for the Sabbath stands in the reality of that relationship between God and Christ and the Church, the relationship of Christian worship.))

Frost 'asks',

"Why did they ("the Israelites", "a band of ignorant slaves") need instruction to keep the Sabbath if it had already been given?", thinking with his question he "certainly" has settled "Sabbath keeping" never existed "before", but was first "enjoined upon the Israelites". In his "previous article", Frost also tried to prove this – as we have seen above: Moses gave the Sabbath and made it known – so the Sabbath owed its introduction to Moses and therefore, did not exist before Moses. Frost comfortably forgets the presupposition underlying all this "Moses"-involvement (by divine Authority!), that Moses explained that which had been reality, and in fact of essential obligation, from the beginning, or he could not have been instrumental in its 'giving', 'making known', explanation or 'instruction'. Nowhere since creation does the Scriptures in so many words make mention of such reality or obligation. The inducement ("*the introductory part that leads up to and explains the matter in dispute*" – Collins *Dictionary*) is, Moses dealt with the day which in the Scriptures the first and only incidence of it is called the Seventh Day: at the creation; and described the Day of God's ACT / WORK of "resting" or "Sabbath". So the Sabbath it was, whether in the form of God's activity, or in the form of the Day of this activity of God's. In actual fact, the living God doing, divine event, gives the content, nature and meaning of this 'day' – yet not, if not God in Christ.

Why didn't Frost think God's Sabbath Day – the creation Sabbath – could have got lost, or, did get lost, in other words, that it was man's fault we don't hear of God's Sabbath again, before the Exodus? No, he rather argues it's God's fault – God had not given man His Sabbath Day at his creation!

Then fallen, sinful man – would he remember the Sabbath of the LORD your God? Most probably not; he most assuredly would forget. Man is prone to forget – to forget God, and to forget His mercies, including every part; man is prone to forget wholly God's mercies, including His holy Sabbath.

To give man His Sabbath and to make it known to him, God revives His Sabbath day, and, confirms it again and again ... until He finally thus revives and confirms His holy Sabbath Day in Jesus Christ, through Jesus Christ, and to the glory of Jesus Christ. God could not have done this better – and to have done it worse would have meant not to have done it at all – than to have done it in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, and, for the sake of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This is His glory and His Sabbath Day's glory.

Meaningless, nothing, is the Sabbath Day if not Day of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead – “the Sabbath of the LORD your God”, “the Lord's Day”! The fact God in the Exodus had given and had made known His holy Sabbath Day to His chosen People the first time, is God “thus, concerning the Seventh Day speaking” – Who has ears to hear, let him hear! – “And God on the Seventh Day rested from all His works”.

NOWHERE is this true, but in and through Jesus Christ. Delete this from Christ's works, and reduce God's to unfinished and restless!

Not only “The Levitical law tells of many ceremonial MEAT and DRINK offerings (that) pointed forward to Christ, and therefore come under the list mentioned in Col. 2 ...”. (Smith) The Ten Commandments, and the Fourth Commandment in particular, tell of that spiritual MEAT and DRINK Offering pointed forward to: Christ, and therefore come under the list mentioned in Colossians 2.

Although the Law and Laws contained in the Ten Commandments are a “shadow of things to come”, namely of Jesus Christ and of His ministration of Life and Righteousness – we don't deny it, but here, wish to emphasise the truth of it – this, is not what is said in Colossians 2:17.

“Which things” – in Colossians 2:17 “a shadow of the nearing (things)” – “is indeed the body that is Christ's”.

Colossians 2:16-17 in so many words therefore declares the Church “in regard to her Sabbaths' feasting” – verse 16 – “belongs

to Christ” – verse 17. It not in the least is true that “It merely abolishes those that it SAYS it abolishes: Those which are a shadow of things to come!” (Smith the SDA) But see discussed in Part Four, ‘Paul’.)

2 Corinthians 3-4 brings to the fore no different Gospel than found in Colossians 2 – The Glad Tidings. Moses brings to the fore no different Gospel – The Glad Tidings. God's Word is One as He is ONE – The Glad Tidings. Christ is the Fulfilment of the New Testament as He is the Fulfilment of the Old Testament. The MESSAGE is ONE: God, true to His Word. What we receive through the Word of God is unto our salvation and incorruptible good, today, as before, and to the glory and worship of Jesus Christ our Lord, today, as before, and before, as today. “There is NO OTHER NAME”. His Name is: “Lord of the Sabbath Day”.

“We find”, says Smith (the SDA), “that there are OTHER OLD TESTAMENT REGULATIONS (besides “regulations regarding eating and drinking”) that are still in force in the New. The Bible mentions some specifically in Acts 21:25. “Abstain from THINGS STRANGLED, from things OFFERED TO IDOLS and from BLOOD.” These are Old Testament regulations which Acts definitely mentions as being in force in the New!”

The ambiguity of Smith's observation goes beyond limits. It is not our wish to discuss these things here, for they are besides the point – which is the Sabbath and its “validity for the People of God” (Hb.4:9). Unfortunately defence of the Sabbath truth invariably is associated with this kind of nonsensical confusion, so that one is forced to remark on it. We also in Part Two of Part Three have dwelt on the issue here already. Let me only ask here, then, what makes Smith think to “abstain from THINGS STRANGLED, from things OFFERED TO IDOLS and from BLOOD” implies “OLD TESTAMENT REGULATIONS”? These were perhaps (or surely) Old Testament PROHIBITIONS – direct laws against having anything to do with THINGS STRANGLED ... things OFFERED TO IDOLS or its BLOOD. These were NOT “OLD TESTAMENT REGULATIONS” that “pointed forward to Christ, and therefore come under the list mentioned in Col.2”!

These were idolatrous rituals implied that pointed to pagan belief and practices. The Jerusalem Council decides: WE don't load you, dear heathen brethren, with scruples and senseless, valueless beliefs and practices. WE only bring you the Good News of Jesus Christ who freed you from false religion. We only warn you – just like God in the time of Israel warned His People – “Abstain from

THINGS STRANGLER, from things OFFERED TO IDOLS and from BLOOD"! Don't "return to your former beggarly principles of worship" as Paul in the letter he wrote to the brethren in Galatia, warned.

The Apostles' warning today is as relevant as at that Council. It does not allow the Christian Community the licence it took in Sunday worship as a thing offered to idols – a thing for the worship of which the truth of God's Sabbath Day is strangled and the blood of its ratification under the New Covenant slighted.

In his second "article" Gene Frost appeals to Romans 4: 14-15, writing, "If so ("that "law" refers to the ten commandments"), it "worketh wrath (verse 15) and "faith is made void" (verse 14)." He writes this to 'prove' neither the Ten Commandments nor the Sabbath "was given or sanctified before (Mount Sinai)." That means – according to Frost – that if any of the Ten Commandments or the Sabbath had in fact been given and made known before Sinai, the faith of Christians would be empty and useless.

The text (14 to 16) – unfettered – though, proves just the opposite, that the Law had been given and had been made known BEFORE Sinai: "For if the ones from the law (Israel according to the flesh) be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: because the law worketh wrath ... therefore OF FAITH (were they heirs), so that by grace!" Exactly for the wrath "worked" by the Law, to become an heir must be by faith ("through faith by grace"). This Law applied to Abraham as it applies to us "called Uncircumcision" (Ephesians 2:11) – "to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed: not to those only who (were seed) by strength of the law (and believed), but to those also who on strength of faith (like) Abraham's (were seed)". Ro.4: 16.

Abraham had been justified by faith because the Law works wrath where justification is attempted through works. The Law had been: It means both it's over, no longer playing a part, its use finished, and, it's there, immediately interfering, ever ready, working wrath where crossed. Its biggest transgression is to step down on it and reckon it a steppingstone to holiness instead of an avenger of the proud. "For the promise that Abraham should be the heir of the world was not made to him or to his seed (those "of the law") through the law, but through the righteousness of faith."

The fact "the law worketh wrath" is not what "makes void faith" as Frost asserts, but the impossible thing which Paul supposes, that a sinner could be heir to the kingdom of heaven by virtue of his genes, or even by virtue of his good works. If that were a man's passport to everlasting life, what would he need faith for, and who else than those who are heirs by physical descent would have received the promise? Exactly the Law sees to it that this

never happens – "the Law worketh wrath", that is, damnation, so that it drives us to Christ for refuge.

Which man is able to stand the Law's wrath? Paul here declares: This had been the condition from the beginning, from Abraham the father of both the circumcised and those who believe, who himself had no lineage to lean on but became heir of God's promises through faith.

What in any case has this to do with the supposition the Law did not exist before Abraham? Why argue the Law did not exist before Abraham if at Sinai it was given? Next one will have to argue the Law did not exist before Noah, then before Adam, and so on to before the creation. In the end one's finding must bring one before the choice either the Law had been for as long as God had been, or had never been! God's eternal council man shall be justified by faith implied Christ and the sacrifice of Him, and therefore implied in the own and eternal Being of God and "before the foundation of the world" even the Laws of sacrifice and ceremony that would one day have pointed to Christ.

The only reason Frost tries to disprove the Law before Sinai is he wants to disprove the Sabbath before Sinai, it so "in whole" being "a part" of it and such an irritation to Frost. Then he rebukes Smith, who "reasons that "law" refers to the ten commandments", and that "he assumes the very thing he sets out to prove"! But what if one assume the very thing one sets out to disprove? For against his will, that is what Minister Frost by the nature of things is forced to do: To prove by the Law the Law existed not.

Frost blames Smith for assuming that where there is Law, there is the Sabbath and where there is no Law – theoretically – there is no Sabbath. Frost blames Smith for common sense and honesty.

"For He is our peace, who hath made both one."

"Both": that is, First, "Gentiles in the flesh, ye who were sometimes far off, without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope and without God in the world", 2:12, in a word, "who are called Uncircumcision" (11). Therefore: You who were without Law were under the Law! And, Two, "WE, who ALSO had our conversation in times past in the lust of our flesh ... by nature the children of wrath, even as others" (2:3) – in a word, "called the Circumcision" (11). Therefore also: We who were without Law were under the Law! A lawless man is one who lives under wrath and curse of the Law! We, Gene Frost, David Smith and I, we all will never get away from the Law of God – whichever form or manifestation it may take on – especially not when confronting us in the Person of our Law of Sacrifice, our Law of Life, our Judge and Saviour Lord, Jesus the

Christ of God. All sacrifice in The Sacrifice of God; all law in The Law of God; all wrath in The Wrath of God; all judgement in The Judgement of God; all justification, all setting free, all righteousness, all peace and all celebration, contained and exercised "in Him", promised, prophesied and sworn "in Him" from the eternal council of God, now, and forever more.

"For He is our peace, He who has made both (Gentiles and Jews? Or God and man?) one. (For) He is our reconciliation, He, who having broken down the middle wall of partition, and who, in His flesh having abolished the enmity (between God and man – sin), abolished the law of commandments contained in ordinances. He is our peace – our reconciliation – for to make in Himself of the two (enemies), one New Man, indeed so as to reconcile both with respect to God in one body (His own) on the cross for that very purpose. Having slain the enmity, He made peace."

Read Ephesians 3:9-11.

(Kindly help me render this text more faithfully?)

The body of Jesus sacrificed in the place and to the fulfilment of "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" availed and obtained peace in that it abolished the very Law the power and wrath of judgement against us all. All men of all ages prove its rule by their death. It proves the Law alive and vicious against both Jew and Gentile, and in context of this debate and Scripture, it proves God's holy and valid Law BEFORE Sinai, and WITHOUT and BEFORE Israel.

Seventh Day Adventists deny THIS Law the total Law was abolished in the body of Jesus on the cross; I have no issue with then as Minister Frost had, but I do not what they believe. If Christ and in Christ the Law it was, then the "Law" it was in perfection and in the Person of Him – no less or part only of the Law. Else the enmity would still rule between saved and unsaved and between God and Children, as though by measure of the Law the one is better than the other – which by measure of the Law they are NOT nor can be. By measure of the Law are they equal – equal in condemnation. Which condemnation shall stand for as long as the Law whereby condemnation stands, stands. If not this Law had been abolished in the body of Jesus on the cross, salvation is by self-righteousness, for NOBODY can keep the Law perfectly and everybody must be his own judge and own law – which is lawlessness. "The righteousness which is of God" presupposes the Law of God, and it presupposes it working wrath – not life. It is only after Christ – that means, THROUGH Christ and BY Christ even from the beginning – that the Law the first time has become idle, retrenched and retired because its role having been taken over all together by Christ. In the beginning till Sinai and after Sinai it never had been different. Do not make Christ your judge in the last day; make Him your judge now, and He shall save you from the Law's

condemnation, "today as you hear His voice". Christ is ever present and wherever the Law is.

The Law spoken of in Ephesians 2 is the 'ceremonial' Law, yet as much as the Sabbath is "a part of" the Law in "the whole of it", as much the 'ceremonial' Law is "a part of" the Law in "the whole of it". By this Law in "the whole of it" – which Paul here says is abolished – by this Law enmity is created and reconciliation prevented. Or else it's a useless Law! And if this is the Law by which enmity is created and reconciliation prevented, then it not merely contains 'ceremonial law', but all Law, the crux of which is, Love God above all else or die. The highest Law – Love – according to Paul in this Scripture – is abolished "in his own body": Love, abolished in Love; the Anointed laying down His Life of Himself and taking it up again of Himself! What must come of it? "Peace"! "He, is our peace!" Christ is our Law. He is our 'ceremonial' Law; He is our Sabbath Law; He is our Law of Ten Commandments; He to us is God's Law of Love; He, at the cost of God's love – at the cost of its abolishment – is our peace. At the cost of the life of God the Son extinguished, He purchased our life, which was at the price of His love offered up and taken out of the way of the living and into the land of oblivion and "the dead"! Who would reduce the cost of our justification and salvation to less than the price of the Law? "Christ rose from the dead" – He is the New Man, the New Creation of God – He came from oblivion in the land where death holds sway over everything overcome by its power, "the power of darkness". Christ returned from that far country, and He with Him, brought the love of God – from there.

Unfathomable love of God! We are his children even though we do not understand this love of His. It is easier to grasp if we know there is no Law that any longer is able to condemn us or separate us from God's Love To Us-Ward. (That's what 'condemnation' means – to according to the Law and by the power and wrath of the Law be separated from God's love.)

The partition today, between God and us, is Christ; we come to God through Him, through the veil of His flesh. Through Him we "enter in" – no longer through sacrifices but through the sacrifice of Him; no longer by ceremonies but by the intercession of Him before the Father. He IS that LOVE which the Law demands: You must love God above all else and with all your strength and with all your heart. Jesus Christ is the earning of that love the Law requires at our hand. We crucified it on a cross on a hill called Skull. We abolished it from our sight. God today returns our evil with this very Love.

Christ therefore is the simple reason why we, his Church, "still finds the keeping of His Sabbath Day, necessary". How and when else, should we celebrate as the Body that is Christ's, His Salvation,

and worship Him for this Love of His – the Law unto His own Self?
 “It is the day of the LORD’s making, let us rejoice in it!”

Such are Scriptures which the Holy Spirit inspired for the Sabbath Day, but which men not sparingly but totally, not ashamedly but haughtily and arrogantly, have transferred to the glory of their own chosen day, their false sabbath day, that thing even on their coffins offered to an idol, “the Lord Sun’s Day”. Can we offer it to Christ in stead of the Sabbath HE is Lord of, “the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God”? “Do not you be judged by any man in your feasting your Sabbaths!” Col.2:16.

Asks Minister Frost Pastor Smith a question, means he to make a statement of fact,

“If every transgression means that the ten commandments had been broken ... which of the ten did Adam and Eve break? The men of Israel in 1Sam. 14:33? All of his arguments are based on assumption.”

The (supposed) fact is a (fancied) implication: Not one of the Ten Commandments are the Law transgressed by Adam and Eve or by “the men of Israel in 1 Sam. 14:33”, therefore the Ten Commandments did not exist in the days of Adam and Eve and the men of Israel in 1 Sam. 14:33. And therefore the Sabbath didn’t exist then.

(I must refer people who think along these lines to John Calvin in his *Institutes* where he discusses the Ten Commandments – extracts in Paragraph 6.2 of *The Lord’s Day in the Covenant of Grace*.)

This question of Frost’s is best answered with Jesus’ answer to the rich young man. He thought he never broke the Law of Ten Commandments, meantime he has been transgressor of its every commandment – in fact of its “greatest” Law, to love God above everything even more than one’s riches.

Man will always believe whom he loves most. Adam and Eve believed the devil – whom did they love most? They sinned in that they broke God’s “Greater Law” – of which the Ten Commandments are a manifestation and confirmation. And “the men of Israel in 1 Sam. 14:33” sinned in that they broke God’s “Greater Law” – of which the ordinance not to eat the blood with the flesh is a manifestation and confirmation. Whether the prohibition is not to eat of a tree, or not to eat the blood, the positive of it is the same: to love God above all. To love God above all means to believe Him and to obey Him only. It is the elementary principle, the “first (grade) law” of God’s Reign and Rule. Today, ‘after Christ’ (Christ always was; so to say ‘after Christ’ is but metaphoric.) we (Christians) still believe and obey the two laws here exemplified in the histories of Adam and Eve and “the men of Israel in 1

Sam. 14:33”. We metaphorically – in faith believing – don’t eat blood but that of Christ. Those who lived ‘before Christ’ showed this very faith and obedience of faith in that they also, didn’t eat blood but that of Christ. Nor eats the Spiritual Israel of any food but as by faith partaking of the body and flesh of Christ their Bread of life. (Those of ‘before’ received and practised an even more ‘spiritual’ and more ‘believing’ faith (‘religion’ / ‘dispensation’ / ‘ministration’ / ‘service’) than we of ‘after’, it almost seems.)

8.5.2.1. Seventh Day Adventist

Distinction by 'Moral' Standard

At this point it is appropriate to quickly refer to some Sabbatharians' distinction between Law and Law, the one supposedly 'moral' and the other supposedly 'ceremonial', and therefore not 'moral'. It will help to understand what 'moral' Law is, and from that, will help to decide whether Law, if God's, may be 'abolished'.

Without permission:

"The distinction between the moral law of God – the Decalogue – and the ceremonial law can be seen in the following:

The Decalogue

Spoken by God Himself. Ex. 20:1, 22.
Written by God. Ex.31:18; 32:16.
On stones. Ex.31:18.
Handed by God, its writer, to Moses. Ex.31:18.
Deposited by Moses "in the ark." Dt.10:5.
Reveals sin. Rm.7:7.
Breaking of "the law" is "sin." 1 Jn.3:4.
Should "keep the whole law." Jams 2:10.
Because we "shall be judged" by this law. James 2:12
The Christian who keeps this law is "blessed in his deed." James 1:25
"The perfect law of liberty." James 1:25. (Cf. James 2:12.)
Established by faith in Christ. Rm.3:31
Christ was to "magnify the law and make it honourable." Is.42:12
"We know that the law is spiritual." Ro.7:14. (Cf. verse 7.)

The Ceremonial Law

Spoken by Moses. Ex.24:3.
Written by Moses. Ex.24:4; Dt.31:9.
In a book. Ex.24:4, 7; Dt.31:24.
Handed by Moses, its writer, to Levites. Dt.31:25, 26.
Deals with ceremonial, ritual matters. (See parts of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.)
Prescribes offerings for sins. (See book of Leviticus.)
No sin in breaking, for now "abolished." Eph.2:15. "Where no law is, there is no transgression." Rm.4:15.)
Apostles gave "no such commandment" to "keep the law." Acts 15:24.
Not to be judged by it. Col.2:16
The Christian who keeps this law is not blessed. (See for example, Gal.5:1-6.)
The Christian who keeps this law loses his liberty. Gal.5:1, 3.
Abolished by Christ. Eph.2:15.
Blotted "out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us." Col.2:14.
"The law of a carnal commandment." Hb.7:16.

This is an artificial and unsatisfactory dividing up of God's Laws. God spoke the Decalogue – He also spoke the ceremonial Laws whether by Moses or by whomever or in whatever manner. God wrote the Decalogue; so did 'Moses'; God wrote the 'ceremonial' laws; so did Moses. Whether on stone or in a book, all God's Law is Law that kills. Only if in Christ, God's Law is Law that quickens. If deposited in the ark by Moses makes the Law 'moral' and 'perpetual', it is the Decalogue that is not moral and not perpetual for it no longer is deposited in the ark. And if depositing the 'ceremonial' laws beside the ark makes of them not moral and not perpetual laws, then the 'ceremonial' laws are moral and are perpetual because they no longer are deposited beside the ark. If to deal with moral precept is not to deal with 'ceremonial', 'ritual'

matters, then what but 'moral' is precept that deals with 'ceremonial', 'ritual' matters?

The very 'moral' worth of the Law is its typicality, and its typicality its moral worth. The typicality or moral worth of the Commandment is its eschatology, that in everything and in whole, it has to do with Jesus Christ and nothing else.

(Calvin never affects 'moral' difference of Law, never depends on 'natural religion'.)

If the Ten Commandments reveals sin, what else does 'ceremonial' law do while prescribing offerings for sins? If breaking of the law is sin, what is it to decline the provision for atonement of sin but sin? It is the worst of sin.

If one should keep the whole of the Law how much more should he hold fast the forgiveness of sin. We shall be judged by the Law but be declared righteous by the Offering for sins.

The Christian who keeps the Law keeps more than the Ten Commandments for he is loosened from the Law to serve Christ.

The morality of law is worthless, but faith in Christ is precious above all else. "For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith", Gl.5:5.

There' no difference of 'morality' between physical and spiritual Law as long as it is Law of God. Circumcision of the heart is true keeping of the Ten Commandments!

"For as many as are of the works of the Law – the works of 'moral' Law whether in the form of Ten Commandments or whether in the form of sacrifices, "written in the book of the Law (the Bible)" – as many are under the curse", morally! "... Subverting your souls, saying, You must be circumcised, saying, you must keep the Law". 'Ceremonial' or 'moral', either, "subverts the soul", morally. "To this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written." "We believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ (manifested in the sacrifice of Him) we shall be saved, even as they (who sacrificed and believed in ceremonies)." There is just as great 'morality' in 'ceremony' as in 'morals' because faith goes – and comes – with both.

We shall be judged by this Law, if the blood is not on the door posts, the death angel will not pass by that house. Who, ever, appropriated the blood in another way than in faith?

The Christian who keeps the Ten Commandments is blessed, only if he is blessed by the Substitute having obeyed also the Law that cannot bless but through its killing. Together they make the perfect Law of liberty – "wherewith Christ has made us free", Gl.5:1. The Ten Commandments is incapable to make free, but through the Law of Sacrifice.

Which is the more 'moral', the more 'spiritual'? The Bible does not draw such distinction between 'ceremonial' and 'spiritual' Law. Both are in Jesus Christ become 'moral' and 'spiritual', or both

'ceremonial' and 'spiritual' law are become 'carnal' in every respect and sense – the work of unrighteous self-righteous man.

So both 'spiritual' and 'ceremonial' Law are established in Christ by faith – whose establishment simultaneously is the very abolishment of it as a 'carnal law' of self-insurance against the wrath of God. Ephesians 2:15 precisely declares this truth in strongest and clearest language, "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity – conceited self-righteousness the work of the Law which to show it is – even the law of commandments contained in ordinances". Instead, Christ, "for to make in Himself of twain (of both "uncircumcision" and "Circumcision", verse 11) one new man, making peace". So the thing 'abolished' is that which causes pride, the 'moral'; and that of which one new man is 'spiritually' created, is the 'ceremonial' 'truly' in Christ appreciated.

Yea, Christ "magnified the Law and made it honourable", making no distinction between law God had given whether 'moral' or 'ceremonial'. Having blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us He did so through 'ceremonial' Law – divine ceremonial Law. It is 'moral' for no reason less it is the Law of God.

"We know that the Law is spiritual" and the whole and every "part" or "case" of it, and that whatever is against it for being "spiritual", must wage warfare against God's Law, must be "the law of a carnal commandment" (Hb.7:16), in other words of the Scriptures, must be "the commandment of men" after the manner of Abraham who provided his own carnal means whereby to raise a posterity. (This comparative scheme in this place insults God's 'ceremonial' Law by comparing it or identifying it with the "carnal commandment" of man's self-righteousness.)

The Bible never distinguishes between 'ceremonial' and 'spiritual' Law on 'moral' basis. Only the practical or "external observance" are different – from the nature of the matter of course.

The attempt to distinguish between 'ceremonial' and 'spiritual' Law on 'moral' basis goes far farther than did Calvin who distinguished between a '*ceremonial*' and a '*spiritual*' "halve" in the Fourth Commandment. Nevertheless, it does not say Calvin was right. He very basically was wrong, and from this illegitimate distinction of his followed his whole and wrong approach to the problematic of the Fourth Commandment, the Sabbath Commandment.

'Defence' of What?

"Christ made this pronouncement ("My Father is working until now and I am working" (John 5:17)) to defend Himself from the accusation of Sabbathbreaking for healing the paralytic and ordering him to go home with his mat." (Bacchiocchi)

Christ made this pronouncement, "My Father is working until now and I am working" (John 5:17), to defend His royal Lordship of the Sabbath Day, His very Divinity (or Deity). Jesus showed and underscored His royal Lordship of the Sabbath; He employed the Sabbath Day the herald of the coming God: He has come! He is here! (John the Baptist you beheaded; who is able to silence this messenger of God?)

Not one instance in the Gospels (or in the New Testament) is there wherein the bone, of contention was the Sabbath DAY. It in every controversy was an issue over the 'Sabbath' –the 'Rest'– whether That Rest, was, or, was not, HE, this ever present Jesus – to the point of noisome ever present on the Sabbath – the Man from Nazareth, Saviour of His People, God!

Some would shake the head, some the fist, and some would scorn. But who would see Him God, and therefore, Fountain of Peace and Rest? Who would see Him Lord of the Sabbath Day? Who, today? Few, if at all! Chosen they must be. Who expected it would be he, the lame one?

Jesus, defying, challenged all authority, all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that which is to come, Behold the Word – the Word of GOD! Hear with your eyes while you have no perception with your ears, o Pharisees, behold Who, is God, here among you, blind leaders of the blind, and Satan, father of liars and haters of God! "Then Jesus saith unto him, rise, take up thy bed, and walk!" "That we should be to the praise of His glory".

"Your sins are forgiven" – I created you in the image of GOD again, in the image of myself the Sinless One, "sin no more"! It is, be you not afraid of these uncured. "It is lawful for thee to carry thy bed."

Sabbath-breaking? If ever there was Sabbath-fulfilling – Sabbath-rest – this was it! "And on the same day was the Sabbath!" Rest! In the hustle and bustle among the unsaved God brought rest to His elect, the lame of men. With mighty, yea divine deed of work, Jesus wrought rest. GOD, wrought rest. Jesus: Who brings the rest of GOD, HE, IS, the meaning with, the meaning for, the meaning of, the meaning in, God's Sabbath Day!

Poor Jews, they were unable to see. Poor Christians, they equally are unable to see. The Sabbath for God! The Sabbath "was made for man" – but unless to the service of Him who is Lord of the Sabbath, it's no "good for man"!

Has God opened our eyes to see the pertinence of this Sabbath-incidence and Sabbath incident? One might think so, yet vainly! For, unless one has seen in this case-scenario the Ultimate case-scenario of Sabbath-incidence and Sabbath incident, one has seen nothing yet. What do I mean? I mean this, this Sabbath, was but "a shadow of things to come, the Body of which belongs to Christ"! What do I mean? I mean Christ Himself in resurrection from the dead "in Sabbath's time", the Rest in God, of God, at last, eschatological moment of past, future and present, God, all in all, God crucified, buried, resurrected and exalted! "For I – declaring unto you the testimony of God – determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified!"

The proclamation of God is the proclamation of Jesus Christ the Risen Victor, the proclamation of Jesus who was crucified, yet raised! This was and is it, what made and still makes of the Sabbath Day, what it is, "the Sabbath of the LORD your God", LORD even the Lord of the Lord's Day. In Hebrew terms – if I may try – His Name is, I Am your Mighty Master. Now it is this One, Who is, Saviour, and by virtue of being Saviour, "is Lord, even of the Sabbath Day"! One cannot avoid to mix up John 5:17 and Mark 2:27-28! I think it is quite legitimate. This 'Sabbath episode', in John 5, has nothing to tell save that Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath Day and of the lost but by grace, saved. Mark tells exactly the same thing, and nothing less or more. It means, Jesus Christ is High Almighty God, and is High Almighty God by feat of overcoming hell and nihil. You, me, He favours, this Conqueror, our Saviour Lord our God, or both you and me, stay lame and prevented, from rest, from peace, from health, from life, from joy – in hell! This is the important point: He favours us in resurrection from the dead ... or not and never – neither before death, nor after death.

God willed not ever to use the First Day of His own creating for this use; He decided, and in exercise of His purpose with and for it, in grace created the Day He had chosen for His purpose. Then God employed it in this HIS Eternal Purpose in Jesus Christ – for this, the showing and proving of Himself to the lost The Redeemer Mighty God, especially, "on, the Sabbath", when, "it was the Sabbath" – "that Day", especially, like "on", no other day! That is why I believe the Sabbath – because I believe in the Lord of the Sabbath Day, and in His love "to us-ward", proven in Jesus Christ through resurrection from the dead – of whom I am chief. (No need to tell you, "In Sabbath's fullness, midst of being light, the First Day approaching ..." opse de sabbátohn tehi epiphohskóusehi eis mian sábbaton ...)

8.5.2.2.
Rome's Arraignment
of Protestant Sabbath-Breakers
by Rev. J. O'Keefe

The following sermon by Rev. J. O'Keefe, a priest of some prominence in the Roman Catholic diocese of Baltimore, Maryland, was first printed in the July 3, 1897, issue of *Catholic Mirror*, the leading Catholic paper in America, and the official organ of James Cardinal Gibbons.

Apparently this sermon was based on a series of four editorials, which previously appeared in the *Catholic Mirror* on September, 2, 9, 16, and 23, of 1893

Catholic Mirror - Sunday, July 3, 1897

ON last Sunday Rev. J. O'Keefe delivered a sermon at St. John's* Church, which will be of interest to our readers to reproduce in full. He spoke as follows:

"But these men blaspheme whatever things they know not; and what things so ever they naturally know, like dumb beasts, in these they are corrupted." (Jude 10).

The morning paper of last Monday spread before its readers a compendium of seven sermons delivered the day before, by as many Baptist preachers, on the topic of [Sunday] Sabbath desecration. This simultaneous concert of action was the result of previous arrangement.

As it is the duty of every citizen who has at heart the public welfare to aid, as far as possible, in promoting the diffusion of knowledge, and at the same time in the correction of error, I feel I would be guilty of a gross injustice to my fellow citizens were I not to furnish them with the exact truth, especially since false ideas are being constantly promulgated by men either grossly and criminally ignorant of what they should know, and who, assuming the office of public guides, convey false information derived either from false premises, or inconsecutive conclusions from the same, or, knowing better, maliciously and unscrupulously abuse the influence they accidentally wield over simple and unsophisticated people, by deliberately impregnating their ductile and plastic minds with erroneous views that practically interfere with the rational exercise of their liberty in the ordinary routine of life.

In the fifteenth chapter, tenth verse, of the Acts of the Apostles, we read of a case in point. A sect of the Pharisees gave much annoyance to the primitive Christians by requiring circumcision and the full observance of the Mosaic law. Peter arose in the assembly and asked, "Now therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke on the necks of the disciples which neither our fathers, nor we have been able to bear?" (Acts

15:10). A sect of the same order of modern Pharisees, in their self-righteousness, gave vent to their mock solicitude for the spiritual welfare of their contemporaries by denouncing most emphatically the practices of barrooms, cigars, tobacco, soda water, bicycles, confectionery, parks, trolley cars, Sunday papers, reporters, ice-cream saloons, etc., etc., on Sunday, with a highly commendable and virtuous indignation; but it is my purpose to meet their crusade in the spirit of common sense, and ask with St. Peter, "Why, therefore, tempt ye God to put a yoke on the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?" And this is precisely what these self-constituted guides of the people undertake to do, when they assume to dictate into what is permitted and what is forbidden on the Sabbath.

And, just here, I boldly proclaim that this meddling interference with the God-given liberties of our citizens is an assumption of authority that has no warrant whatsoever in God's law, and amounts to what may be truthfully designated an impertinent attempt at an unauthorized despotism. For whilst the American people are tolerant of every law, divine and human, that appeals to their reason, yet they must be convinced that the ordinance has a divine or human sanction for the enforcement of its obligations.

It is my purpose to submit to my fellow citizens **the true grounds** for the obligation of cessation from labor one day of the week, and of the duty of sanctifying the same day. The seven reverend gentlemen who on last Sunday assumed to impose their views on their fellow citizens anent [concerning] the question of [Sunday] Sabbath desecration, have no warrant whatsoever for such imposition, save what can be found in their acknowledged teacher, the Bible. Let us then open the pages of this guide and teacher, and learn from it the commands of God on this point. We are at least equally intelligent with them in construing the expressed will of God, in drawing rational conclusions, and in inferring conclusively the correctness or falsity of their claim to impose their views on us.

The first intimation that reaches us of God's will on this important point is found in Genesis 2:2: "And on the seventh day He [God] rested . . . from all His work which He had made." And it is conclusive that the patriarchs under the immediate direction of God, continued, by oral tradition, the same observance of God's Sabbath, until He gave through Moses the same commandment by written tradition (Exodus 20:8-11), "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" and the sacred text informs us He did so command *for that reason*, viz.: "Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and sanctified it." (Exodus 20:11). Again, the Lord calls the Sabbath "a perpetual covenant." (Exodus 31:16).

Once more, we will refer to the most positive repetition of this command: "Six days shalt thou labour, and shalt do all thy work. The seventh is the day of the Sabbath, that is, the rest of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not do any work therein," etc. (Deuteronomy 5:13-14)

On a careful examination of the Old Testament, we find this reference to the Sabbath 126 times. And now it is incumbent on us to ascertain **which is the seventh day** on which God rested, and which He blessed and sanctified: which day, also, He designated as "a perpetual covenant." The answer to this question is furnished by the Hebrew race, who all through the patriarchal age to Moses' day, over 2,500 years, thence from Moses 2514 A.M. [B.C.] to A.D. 1897, a period of 5,897 years, have scrupulously kept every Saturday, from the days of Adam, who walked with God, through the days of the patriarchs, the law, and the prophets, and through the full period of the New Law to yesterday [Saturday]. Thus the Hebrew race form a living historical chain of nearly 5,900 annual links — a perpetual, living testimony of God's rest (His Sabbath) to today, through oral and written tradition. Therefore, if the testimony of men could ever be regarded as an infallible motive of credibility, it must be recognized as such in the constant weekly keeping of God's [Saturday] Sabbath synchronous with time itself.

The Old Testament is also, from the days of Moses, the living witness of this undeniable fact, sustained by the oral living testimony of the Hebrew people to the advent of the Messiah. To deny this effectively, it would be necessary to destroy the Jewish people and the Old Testament.

Having placed beyond the reach of all successful denial; the grand historical fact that up to the coming of the Messiah, the Lord's Sabbath — that of the seventh day — was *alone* recognized and kept, from the last day of Creation to the coming of the Messiah — this by the positive precept of God in the Old Law and the ever-living testimony and practice of the Hebrew race, it now behooves us to trace the history of this arrangement to date, or as far, at least, as the apostolic records testify under the New Law. On approaching this period, involving as it does an era of nearly nineteen full centuries, we naturally inquire whether a divine statute, which God Himself was pleased to designate a "perpetual covenant," continued to be observed by the people of Israel and Christians collectively; that is, whether the day enjoined by God (Saturday) has always been kept by Christians and Jews collectively for these nineteen centuries, or, if not, where in the pages of the New Testament is found **a divine decree** cancelling the mandate of the Old Law, and at the same time specifying the day to substitute [for] Saturday. For inasmuch as Saturday was ordered to be kept by divine authority, so, also, divine authority, under the form of a cancelling decree, is absolutely

necessary to do away with Saturday, and another decree emanating from the same divine source is equally necessary to appoint another Sabbath. A close and critical examination of the New Testament is now necessary to discover these two decrees — the one cancelling Saturday, the other selecting another day to replace it.

The Hebrew Sabbath, or Saturday, is referred to in the New Testament 61 times. In the four Gospels the same Sabbath (Saturday) is mentioned 51 times. We find that the Saviour during life constantly adopted the same day to teach in the synagogues and to work miracles.

In one instance, quoted by Matthew and Luke He designated Himself the "Lord of the Sabbath;" ^[1] but to the last hour of His life He utilized that day and gives no indication of a desire to change it. After His crucifixion, His apostles and personal friends kept it (Saturday) strictly, whilst yet in the tomb; that St. Luke informs us of: "And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested *on the Sabbath day according to the commandment.*" (23:56) And having strictly kept the Sabbath, as St. Luke has just now described, they felt themselves free to commence the new week with the corporal work of mercy, viz., embalming the body of their Master.

This proceeding is quoted by St. Luke in the next verse: "And on *the first day* of the week, very early in the morning, they came to the sepulchre, bringing the spices they had prepared." (24:1) Can anything be more conclusive than that up to the day of Christ's death, from St. Luke's testimony?

Thus we are forced from all we read in the Gospels to conclude that the "Lord of the Sabbath," as Christ calls Himself, **never kept during his mortal life any other Sabbath than Saturday**, testifying His respect for it on several occasions by His severe rebukes to the scribes and Pharisees for their fanatical mode of keeping it; and after His death the apostles, and the holy women, who were the best exponents of His will, *followed His example by doing on Sunday what the commandment forbade them to do on Saturday.* It is then undeniable that the Jewish Saturday was alone kept by the Saviour, His apostles, and friends up to the period of His death, covering thirty-three years of the Christian era.

Come we now to examine the history of this interesting question for thirty years more after Christ's death, as recorded by the evangelist St. Luke, in his Acts of the Apostles. Surely we must find some trace of the cancelling act during this period involving a lifetime. But, alas! not a vestige of it can be discovered; and what is worse, we find in the nine passages referred to in the Acts of the Apostles that they invariably kept Saturday. I shall quote them: "They . . . went into the synagogue *on the Sabbath day*, . . . And after the reading of the law and the prophets," etc. (Acts 13:14-15). Again, verse 27: "For they . . . because they knew Him

not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which *are read every Sabbath*," etc. Behold here the testimony of St. Paul to the practice of reading the Scriptures *every Sabbath*. He does not say "were read," but "are read," thus bearing witness to a time-honoured practice.

Again, verse 42: "And when the Jews had gone out, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them *the next Sabbath*," not the next Sunday. Observe next how the Greeks or Gentiles kept the Sabbath with the Jews: "*And the next Sabbath* came almost the whole city to hear the Word of God." (verse 44) *Not Sunday*, but the Sabbath still!

Once more: James, the apostle, publicly says: "Men and brethren, hear now to me. . . . For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues *every Sabbath day.*" (Acts 15:13, 21) No vestige of a change to Sunday yet. Again: "And Paul, *as his manner was*, went unto them, *and three Sabbath days* reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." (Acts 17:2) And, to cap the climax and exhaust all scriptural resources: "And he [Paul] reasoned in the synagogue *every Sabbath*, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." (Acts 18:4)

Thus it is absolutely certain that neither our Lord during His life of thirty-three years, nor His apostles for thirty years subsequently, ever kept any Sabbath save Saturday.

But, before I close my argument, I propose to answer the argument of the apologists for the **change of day** not to be found in the New Testament. Their arguments are grounded on the words "the Lord's day" and "the day of the Lord," as the drowning man grasps a straw. The first of these (Acts 2:20): "The sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood before that great and notable day of the Lord shall come." Is this Sunday? Again: "Who shall also confirm you unto the end, that you may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Corinthians 1:8) Who is silly enough to interpret these words of Sunday? Again: "To deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." (1 Corinthians 5:5) Is this Sunday? Again: "And I trust ye shall acknowledge even to the end . . . even as ye also are ours *in the day of the Lord Jesus Christ.*" (2 Corinthians 1:13-14) Is this day Sunday or the day of judgment? Whilst once more: "Being confident of this very thing that He who hath begun a good work in you will perform it *until the day of Jesus Christ.*" (Philippians 1:6) Until next Sunday, of course! Sixth text: "That ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ." (Philippians 1:10) Till next Sunday, forsooth! Seventh text: "But *the day of the Lord* will come as a thief in the night." (2 Peter 3:10) Sunday next! Eighth text: "Looking out for and hastening unto the coming of *the day of the Lord*,

wherein the heavens being on fire, shall be dissolved." (2 Peter 3:12) Look out for the fireworks on [next] Sunday, if not too late today [Sunday]!

I have thus disposed of eight of nine texts from the apostolic writings which the apologists for the change of day grounded on the words, "the day of the Lord," "the Lord's day," "the day of Christ," and shown the absurdity of their application to Sunday, referring in each instance to the day of judgment. There is a ninth, and the only one left which does not bear its own interpretation like the others. St. John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." (Revelation 1:10) The rule of analogy, a certain motive of judging whereby we are enabled to conclude with certainty of an unknown quantity from the known, applies here unqualifiedly. Eight texts, of a similar form and character to a ninth, have been shown to unite in one meaning exclusively. Dialecticians conclude that the ninth must be so interpreted. Or, to present a more intelligible example from physical laws: Eight stones thrown into the air fall by the law of gravity to the surface; the ninth it is conclusive must obey the same law. Hence the words of St. John admit of the same interpretation by analogy as the eight preceding texts.

Any attempt to interpret the above texts, the day of the Lord or the Lord's day, as meaning Sunday, is therefore absurd. And what will confirm this reasoning beyond all doubt is the language of the same St. John in two passages in his Gospels; speaking of Sunday (Easter) he does not say, "on the Lord's day," But, "on the first day of the week" (John 20:1); and speaking of the following Sunday, he does not designate it "the Lord's day," but, "Now when it was late that same day, *the first of the week*." (chapter 20:19) This disposes forever of St. John's, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day," (Revelation 1:10) interpreted as Sunday.

A False Supposition

To conclude my proofs, I propose to call attention to and reply to an argument that would suppose a change of day. Five times the first day of the week is referred to as being the day substituted for the Sabbath in five passages of the Gospel, Acts, and Epistles. St. Luke 24:33-40 and St. John 20:19 both refer to the meetings of Jesus with the apostles on Easter Sunday. This would appear to furnish a clue to the substitution of Saturday; but the texts themselves record **the motive of their meeting**. It was not for prayer, for exhortation, or reading of the Scriptures, but they were huddled together in that room "for fear of the Jews," as St. John tells us.

The third occasion was the meeting of Christ arisen with the eleven (including Thomas), for the purpose of confounding the

incredulity of Thomas, as St. John assures us (chapter 20:26-29). There is not a word to be found in these texts of prayer, praise, or reading of the Scriptures. Again, "The apostles were all of one accord in one place" (Acts 2:1) on the feast of Pentecost (Sunday). Nor can this fourth instance of meeting on Sunday afford the slightest hope of finding an escape; for Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the Passover, which was called the Sabbath of weeks, consisting of seven times seven days; and the day after the seventh weekly Sabbath was the chief day in the entire festival, necessarily Sunday, which had been kept by the Jews annually for over 15 centuries before Christianity. This was over a festival, and no comfort can be derived from its introduction in favor of a change of day, from the sacred volume.

And the apologists for the change of day call attention to Acts 20:7: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together *to break bread*," etc. the application of the axiom in logic, "Quod probat nimis, probat nihil" (What proves too much, proves nothing), puts a quietus on this text when I introduce words from the Acts: " And they continuing *daily* . . . in the temple, and *breaking bread* from house to house," etc., (2:46) which shows that this was *a daily practise* which is claimed in this instance for Sunday.

Fifthly and finally, we are invited to 1 Corinthians 16:1-2: "Now concerning the collection for the saints. . . . On the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store," etc. Presuming that this was done as St. Paul requested, I will call your attention to what was *regularly* done the day before (Saturday) and contrast the acts of each day. I have already quoted St. Paul's testimony of the practise of reading the Scriptures "*every Sabbath day*." (Acts 13:27)

What more absurd conclusion than to infer that the reading of the Scriptures, exhortation, and praying, which formed the routine duties of every Saturday, or Sabbath, were overslaughed, by a request to take up a collection, on a particular occasion, another day of the week? Which occupation was more in keeping with the service of the Lord's day?

The Summing Up

Having placed before you all the references in the sacred writings — Gospels, Acts, and Epistles — I will now sum up the result of my examination of the relative use of the Sundays and Saturdays from these same records, constituting the New Testament, and covering a period of over 60 years. Every Sabbath, or Saturday, was kept, according to the record, 3,276 times by Christ and His apostles, whilst the beggarly record of the Sunday meetings by the apostles number *five* within the same period, viz., Easter Sunday comes first; next, [the] Sunday when Thomas was converted; but not a prayer, nor reading of the Scripture, nor

preaching on either occasion; Pentecost Sunday, a part of the ceremonial law of the Jews kept for 1,500 years before; the Sunday referred to in Acts 20:7, where the breaking of bread alone is referred to, but which in Acts 2:46 is designated a daily work; and fifthly, collection Sunday (1 Corinthians 16:1-2) has no vestige of prayer, reading of Scripture, sermon, or any other act of divine worship connected with it. Add to these, nine references to the "Lord's day;" "the day of the Lord," "the day of Christ," mentioned nine times, each one of which refers, as I have proved, to the day of judgment, and you have every vestige of any claim that might be made of a change of day from Saturday during the period of over 60 years from the dawn of Christianity.

With this truthful and exhaustive exposition before us, based in the Sacred Writings, and against which I defy successful contradiction, let us apply our valuable information practically to the existing position of Protestantism and its relative bearing on Judaism, because they both acknowledge the same teacher, the Bible, with this difference, however, whilst the Jew's teacher, the Old Testament, closes with the Messiah's coming, the Biblical Christian has the New Testament superadded to the Old, whilst he enjoys the teaching and practise of the Saviour together with those of the apostles for over 60 years, and all these *in perfect conformity* with the Old Testament. For whilst the Jewish people — patriarchs, law, and prophets — have, after the example of God Himself, kept "the Sabbath of the Lord" for nearly 6,000 years, up to yesterday [Saturday], the New Testament, the supplemental teacher of Protestantism, testifies to the positive teachings of the Saviour, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" and His life and those of the apostles, as we learn from the Sacred Record, were in perfect keeping with the practise of the Jewish people. Today, however, so-called followers of Christ, (who was Himself to the hour of His death an obedient follower of the law of the Sabbath), in direct contradiction of the law and the Gospel, have for over three centuries raised the flag of revolt against this "perpetual covenant." as God Himself is pleased to call it, and for fully 10 generations not one representative of Protestant Christianity, with a feigned and hypocritical affection of respect for his teacher, the Bible, has *once* kept the day ordered to be kept over 160 times by the Old Testament and over 60 times by the New.

A more transparent contradiction, involving millions of human beings, does not exist in the earth today — a teacher, assumed to be of divine origin by its disciples — utterly ignored, and the voice of God Himself echoing in every page, as they profess to believe, utterly disregarded by every Protestant Christian on earth today, for not one ^[2] of them has once obeyed His command to keep His Sabbath, during life. Christ, as their teacher, informs them, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep

the commandments," and the chief and most emphatic of these is, "*Remember the Sabbath day.*"

Viewing the situation from a common-sense standpoint it is almost incredible that men endowed with average intelligence could consent to occupy before the world, for an hour, such a self-stultifying, self-contradictory position as this. Professing to adore God, professing to obey His commands, yet they stand today before heaven and earth, with His Written Word clasped to their breast, and which they profess to obey, the most pronounced Sabbath-breakers on earth.

The Jew is rational; he obeys his teacher, the Bible, pointing to the command, "Keep holy the Sabbath;" the Catholic is ever rational, he obeys the teacher appointed him by Christ [the Church]; but the Protestant *obeys neither God nor his teacher, the Bible*. Thus I have in this sermon shown his utter abandonment of his professed teacher, the Bible, and his public apostasy from the positive injunctions of God, speaking to him through it; but he had descended to a still lower depth of degradation. Having abandoned the teachings of his Bible, and having poured out the vials of his apparently honest indignation against the Catholic Church, all his life he is found today, after having consummated his apostasy from his own religious principles and teacher, knocking at the door of the Catholic Church to notify her *that he is about to borrow her day*; thus this traitor to his professed teacher and guide throws open the doors of his meetinghouse on each Sunday with a notice overhead, "**OPEN EVERY ROMAN SABBATH.' 'CLOSED EVERY BIBLE SABBATH.'** whilst the notice on every synagogue on Saturday reads, "**OPEN TO-DAY, THE BIBLE SABBATH.**" Nor does his unscrupulous treachery to his Bible end here; but with insolent swagger and cool effrontery, like Cain, addressing his descendants on brotherly love, with the broad brand of murderer on his brow; like Judas moralizing on deicide; like the squatter who insolently intrudes himself; and like the robber glorying in his ill-gotten goods; in a word, like Satan rebuking sin, he inveighs, through his seven clerical drummers, against barrooms, cigars, tobacco, soda water, bicycles, confectionery, parks, trolley cars, Sunday papers, reporters, ice-cream saloons, etc., etc., whilst there is not a living representative of these different avocations whose records before the bar of reason, religion, and God are not comparatively immaculate when contrasted with the record of these very people who stand before God, reason, and religion *as the most inveterate Sabbath-breakers on earth*.

Before closing this discourse, I publicly invite those seven reverends, and all their confederate Sabbath-breakers, *to purge themselves from the above imputation*. But I predict with absolute

certainty that the seven eloquent orators of last Sunday will be mute and dumb next and future Sundays on this subject.

EDITORIAL REMARKS by The Editors of the *Bible Student Library*, July 1897, “In the foregoing paper we do not adopt nor do we commend the harshness, sharpness, or acerbity of language in which Mr. O’Keefe has set forth the two solemn facts: (1) That the only Bible Sabbath is the seventh day; and (2) that for first-day sacredness or observance there is no Bible warrant. We would that these facts had been told in a milder manner, in language which it seems to us would be more consonant with the Gospel of Christ; but we beg the Protestant reader to forget the acidity of the writing, and weigh the solemn facts in the light of the Bible and the judgment.”

I say, nonsense! When truth hurts, it should hurt – it is the Law’s function to hurt, either to drive us to Christ, or into perdition.

If only O’Keefe had not submitted everything he wrote to the authority of the (Roman Catholic) Church, most of it would have been wholesome truth and amenable to discipline. But let us rather – Calvinists believing and endeavouring to honour the Sabbath of the Bible whenever being heard defending the Sabbath of the Bible – let us not be recognised for Jews, or, for Roman Catholics, but –let it be– let us rather be recognised for Bible punchers or resurrection romantics.

Conclusion

This article then will supply the reasons we believe the Seventh Day Sabbath, not like, and not why, the Roman Catholics believe the Seventh Day is the Sabbath.

As Calvinistiese en Protestantse gelowiges, let ons dadelik op – ná ons vele besprekings reeds oor Calvyn en die Sabbat en die Sondag – dat Calvyn van al die, sal ons maar sê, feite, waarvan O’Keefe in die negentiende eeu gebruik gemaak het, al in sý dag, deeglik van bewus was. In Bybelkennis staan Calvyn natuurlik vir g’n niemand tot vandag toe terug nie. Dit is egter geen saak van blote Bybelkennis nie, of van logiese gevolgtrekkingsvermoëns nie, of van EQ ‘emotional intelligence’ nie, maar van Geloofsoortuiging. “Geloofsoortuiging” met ‘n hoofletter geskrywe, want ek praat nie van die subjektiewe geloofskrag nie. Dit gaan oor die goddelike en reddende Waarheid soos in Jesus Christus vervat, bevat en verspersoonlik, en soos so mooi en raak uitgedruk deur Calvyn juis hier in sy hoofstuk oor die Sabbatsgebod in die *Institusies* (2,8,31b *et al*). Calvyn kon – omdat hy die saak van die Hervorming so trou was – nie die Protestantse Gemeente so kras oordeel soos O’Keefe dan doen nie, maar het nogtans nie die Kerk so heeltemal soos O’Keefe as outoriteit bo die Skrifte gestel nie. Eenvoudig: Calvyn het gladnie Sondag vir die Kerkdag van die Skrif gehou nie, maar het duidelik heimlik na die Sewende Dag Sabbat gehunker. Dit is my gevolgtrekking na aanleiding van die duidelik ondubbelsinnige én net so duidelik dubbelsinnige standpunte wat hy inneem.

8.5.3.

Sabbath Abolished, Changed?

Second Corinthians 3, verses 7 to 11, and verse 14 Sabbath Abolished, Changed? Letters of Recommendation

“While we look not at the things which are seen,
but at the things which are not seen:
for the things which are seen are temporal;
but the things which are not seen are eternal.”

2 Corinthians 4:18

Have you read the third chapter of Corinthians for what Paul meant it to be, The Glad Tidings of Jesus Christ? Have you read it in context from start to finish? And have you seen there, Paul in his letters to Christ’s Congregations light hearted as rarely? I must confess, I only very recently have started to see it myself. And it gave me a pleasant new perspective on the content of this chapter, which traditionally, is so clouded in morose debate. I so much enjoyed the exuberance of this chapter it prompted me to share with you my findings.

In a word this chapter is about the Gospel, the Good News of God in Jesus Christ our Lord, and we should enjoy it and assimilate it with deepest appreciation for that, and for nothing else.

Chapter three of the Letter is the Gospel in similitude. Paul uses symbols to illustrate to us the Message of How God Loved The World So Much That He Gave His Only Begotten Son To Save It.

Says Paul, I am God’s postman! And He made me a jolly good postman for Him. (3:6a, “Who also has made us able ministers of God’s Latest Letter.”) Friends, exclaims Paul, Listen to the story this postman of God’s has to tell! (‘Freunde, vernehmet die Geschichte von diesem jungen Postillion!’) “For God hath shined in our hearts, to pass on the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ”, 4:6.

In bygone years the postman and his arrival have perhaps been one of the most important events in many people’s lives. He obtained an intimate relationship with his customers. The postman’s arrival was punctual and eagerly awaited and at last announced with fanfare and blasting of the coach bugle. Spectacular occasion! But more often than not, before and even during the age of the post coach, the postman was charged on errand on foot. So he carried all his letters in a bag on his back and wherever he delivered letters, he received other letters for safeguarding and destination.

In times of crisis, judgement or war, the postman’s job got more indispensable and more dangerous. (Remember David how he anxiously sought first sight of the messenger who should have brought him news of his son?) Failed the postman to render service, he could forfeit life.

The general, or the king, or the judge, sends him with a single letter – written on paper in later times, but in earlier ages scratched out on wood panels or “engraved in stone”. So the postman under the king’s protection undertakes his long and dangerous journey or voyage. On this letter’s faithful delivery a life or many lives may hang; a battle or a war or a lawsuit be won or lost.

I am God’s postman, says Paul. I have letters I carry with me on my journeys which at every place I stop over, have read before the people, at the same time to receive more letters for farther places’ attention. You know what my letters are? Not letters written on paper or engraved in stones, but living letters: You! Yes, “You are our epistles, written in our hearts”! (2) Here was a postman of intimate relationship with his customers if ever there was. You my patrons are my letters engraved on the tables of my heart, and “you are known and read of all men” whom I on my missions introduce you to.

But I take One Letter with on all my journeys, written on my own heart, above all, whence my apostolate is of God – I don’t need a CV of myself, or your recommendation (1), because you are, my CV and my letters of good reference. (Do do following up, please.) I am God’s postman, and his efficient (“sufficient”) postman at that. (5)

My faithful delivering / “ministration” of my letters is my real “recommendation”. But you being the actual letters, bear the message not of me, but of Someone else, of Jesus Christ. Verse 3: “For, as much as you are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ – ministered (faithfully delivered) by us – so much are you letters not written with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God. (Which Spirit witnesses not of Himself, but of Christ, don’t forget!) You are His letters then, “not written in stone” (hard cold and impersonal hearts), but in human, “touchable tables of the heart”. “We trust this of you, (this to us is your credentials) through Christ and through His relationship of trust with God.” (4) (Not ethereal language, Paul’s!)

So then we have Paul’s story of his postman for God job. But Paul only tells his story as an example of a greater story – a story revealed in the most beautiful Personal Letter of God’s Love for humankind – His Living Letter Jesus Christ. In this greater story, God is the Postman and Paul His assistant. God sends Paul to deliver “minister” this Letter to the addressee: “the Church”, address: “All the world”.

It is God’s Letter of “recommendation”, His own “witness” or “testament” (6) in which He exposes His heart to His beloved. In it we read of God’s love “to us-ward” ... “in Christ”. In fact this is the second Letter God has had delivered to his “children”. (7) The first delivery has long become forgotten (and nowadays even gets despised). Its contents therefore are re-stated and re--instated fully and with greater glory in the second, and for that matter, last delivery.

Oh it was a glorious letter, that first one. In most sublime terms God with own finger wrote His holy Love – “engraved in stone”: Thou shalt love no other gods; Thou shalt not love my resemblance but only

the real Me; Love my Name, for I am your jealous Husband; Love my proprietorship – I am your Redeemer-Creator – and honour my appointment day. (“Meeting” and “worship” have become synonymous in God’s New Testament.) This is how God persuaded and commanded His Love – even in jealous and zealous anger demanded it for it was His every right to have His love returned! What an austere Letter – “glorious” indeed! Never would one title or iota of it pass away – even had its “ministration” been “temporary” and “done away” with – it being God’s Word, His Will, the very Law of His love!

The letter was “delivered” “ministered” “attended to” long ago – and spurned, its very “delivery” / “ministration” / “preaching” by its “able minister” Moses, regretted. As to the “splendour” / “glory” of its contents, the message as the messenger was discarded, “put away”, “abolished” – its discovery prohibited, the “veil untaken away in the reading of the “old testimony” / the old “recommendation” / the old “witness”.

So this letter came in anticipation of its Finisher – its actual Writer-Author Himself – Who personally would “bring over” / “minister” / “deliver” the originally intended message: Himself the Claimer, the Demander of man’s allegiance and answering love. As a result the Claimer’s / the “Lawgiver’s”, “old preaching” / old “ministration”, old “witness”, “old testament” – became unnecessary and the Law retired. (Don’t double-cross on him though or his liveliness will be discovered soon!)

We Christians are Christians by Law of Jesus Christ; not by Law of Moses.

That was the intricate, intimate, and intensely interesting, personal “business”, “covenanting”, “contracting” of the Letter and of the letters which Paul was the “deliverer”, the postman, of – God’s covenanting with man through and in Jesus Christ. “How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious”, says Paul – proud servant and deputy-administrator in this business. That is: How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be more glorious in the New Testament than in the Old Testament? Paul knows first hand, from practical experience and trial, it could not be otherwise! So in having gained much, the “Old” lost nothing; in having been proven faithful, the “Old” received more honour in the “New” than it had in its own. Jesus “magnified” the Law of God – He in no wise distracted from the old man, now retired.

As promised in the “Old”, the “New” and “Faithful Witness” Himself would contain all content and “do service” / “minister” in superior glory what had been contained and ministered in the “Old”. The Living Letter the Coming God Himself indicated and implied in the first or “old testament” would “deliver” God’s love in Person and demand and command the return of His love with love.

The coming of God in Person made the service or “ministration” – the application or mediation – of the first “letter”, “engraved in stone”, obsolete, and re-introduced the heart and principle of worship in this

One from God, Jesus Christ. Paul says he stands in the "service" / "ministration" of this Writer-Author who now wrote in letters not of ink but of Spirit. "You my recommendation", says Paul, are "witness" thereof. And it gives Paul great pleasure to present these letters, as he presents the Letter from God, challenging, "we all, with open face beholding, in (these, living) mirror(s) see reflected the glory of the Lord, and seeing, are changed from glory ("the old testament") to glory ("the new testament") even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

Nowhere and in no manner does Paul say God's Law has been "abolished" or "done away". What Paul here in Corinthians boasts about, is that he stands employed in God's updated postal services "by the Spirit", no longer in the old dispensation of "letter"-carried messages. Also instrumental in useful service in the spreading of God's Last and Eternal Message, are the Congregation – every believer a letter written by Christ to each of His faithful.

In this God's Law receives an honour and a glorification unprecedented. It has become the Law of the Christian dispensation.

An Image of the Gospel

The passage now really becomes interesting. Chapter three should not be read without reading chapter 4 as well. Our introductory text was from chapter 4, in fact its last verse! This verse comes as a summary of Paul's argumentation that occupied both chapters 3 and 4.

"While we look not at the things which are seen ("while reading", namely the "veil over Moses' face"), but at the things which are not seen (reflecting behind Moses' veil "God's glory in the face of Jesus"): for the things that are seen (the "cover" of "blind mindedness") are temporal ("having been taken away in Christ"); but the things which are not seen (the New Covenant of Jesus' "ministration of righteousness" "as by the Spirit") are eternal."

What 'things' does Paul speak of? Those he has spoken of thus far, which are, first, the old or first letter which God had written to His Church, the "old covenant", 'Moses' (3:7).

Notice that Paul not once employed the word "Law" – *heh entoleh*, or, *ho nómos* – although the Law eschatologically encapsulates most perfectly what he had in mind, namely, the "invisible things" which are, simply, Jesus Christ the Gospel or New Testament!

In chapter three we have seen how Paul supposes "the letter" – *grámmatos*, for the 'old' covenant, and its "ministration" for the Law itself, by describing both "the letter that killeth" and its "ministration", as "death engraved in stone"(6-7). God originally wrote the Law in stones. Applied, "ministered", "the letter" (of the Law) as well as its "ministration" mean "death", death not of the Law, but of the transgressor!

(("Dead to the Law" – dead to "death" – to live to Christ, Ro.6:8; 7:4; Gal.2:19. Whom the Stone not fatally confronts He raises not. The New Covenant Law: You shall die to live; your death's glory be the glory

of Christ's Resurrection! While we have this exceeding glory in Jesus' mediation of the Covenant of Grace and Life, who needs the "ministration of death, written and engraven in stone, of which the "glory was to be done away" "in Christ"? Oh we still need it, just like Paul here necessarily employs it – to sing the praises of Jesus Christ.))

Paul along the same lines further develops this reasoning in 3:14, 15, 18 and 4:3-4,

"But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament, WHICH VAIL is done away in Christ. But even unto this day when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart."

Here clearly Paul identifies "the old testament" with "Moses" and the "reading of the Old Testament" with the "reading of Moses". Then of course it follows "Moses", "the Old Testament" and the Law as seen in verses 6 and 7, will be one and the same, and all, must be understood as having been "death engraved in stone", so that its "ministration" or "mediation", KILLS. (It BECOMES this while being weighed against Christ's ministration of the New Covenant, the ministration of righteousness that quickens.) Paul could not in a more comprehensive way have condensed God's total revelation during the old dispensation into one concept, that of the Law – without using the word 'law' once, saying, it kills! "For if the ministration of condemnation had been glorious, much more does the ministration of righteousness – of Jesus Christ – exceed in glory."

Paul repeats and strengthens the identification as seen in 3:7, in verses 14, 15, 18 and 4:3-4. We still need the "done away" "ministration" – i.e., the "ministration" or "teaching" or "instruction" of and through the Old Testament – however enigmatic it may sound – for one advantage only, TO HAVE IT DISCOVERED IN THE LIGHT OF CHRIST'S "ministration of righteousness".

This advantage to us of the New Testament then, is an advantage to the "Old Testament", which it obtained through the excelling advantage of Jesus' ministry. Without the New, the Old would have been incomplete, and without the glory of the New, the glory of the Old would have been deception and vainglory. Without the ministration of the New, the ministration of the Old, WOULD HAVE BEEN MEANINGLESS, simply because "behind the veil" one sees "to the end", namely, God's Christ. The glory of the Old Testament GAINS by Christ's glory of "more glorious "mediation"; Moses' "service" is IMPROVED by Jesus' "ministration of righteousness".

But, Christ's exceeding glory would have been no glory if not the glory of perfection. It would have been no excelling glory if it not ADDED glory. It would not have been "the image" of God's glory, if it did not LET SHINE "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ", "mirrored" in Moses' face behind the veil.

Were it not the related and compared gloriousness, the glory of the New Covenant would not have been the "excellency of the power of

God" (4:7), the "MORE exceeding", and the MORE "eternal weight of glory" (17). Paul would not have been able to say, "by reason of the glory that excels" – that excelled the FORMER glory of indeed the "ministration of condemnation". The "righteousness (that) exceeds in glory" His glory where in "the face of Moses" would not have been that, were it not "all things are for your sakes, that the ABUNDANT grace ... might REDOUND to the glory of God" (4:15).

In another word of Paul's, We would not have had the "teacher" that "brought us to Christ". The New Covenant would have had its glory in a vacuum if it were so. "In great plainness of speech" (3:12), "NOT AS MOSES" – which is comparison, not of fifty with fifty, but of hundred with zero. We would have had no Mediator, no Ministrator of the NEW Covenant – would have had no Jesus with an "eternal weight of glory, FAR MORE exceeding" the Old Covenant.

God's Letter of New Covenant, in the major premiss of the syllogism, is "engraved", indelibly and eternally in the "granite stone" of His faithfulness; in the minor premiss is "engraved", indelibly and eternally, in "granite stone" of Moses' faithfulness (Hb.3:2).

The New Covenant by its incomparable comparability, is the UTTER Good News of Salvation – the salvation of the LOST and the raising of the DEAD. "For God who commanded light to shine OUT OF DARKNESS, hath shined IN OUR (dark) hearts, to kindle (there, in our darkest darkness) the light of the knowledge of God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ". (4:6) The First Covenant (No, not the "First", but the "Old", seeing the New Covenant actually is the "First Covenant") obtained glory by virtue of and by contrast to the New Covenant, and the Old, by its death, darkness and condemnation compared, added lustre to the Light of the New. The light of the New MUST be seen against the pitch black of the Old – it must be seen behind the covering – or not be seen at all – which is the Old Covenant's glory. (Not to be seen for Jesus to be seen.)

Paul uses these two chapters to not so much explain this inexplicableness, as to extol it: "glory", "glorious", "more glorious" "exceeding glorious", until Christ is found as shining forth in and from the darkness. Christ the Light of the world does not come in man's light and enlightenment. We do not light up our little candle to see God's sun. God's light is not and cannot be seen in or be improved by any lesser light – it must shine in full darkness. It is God-determined that it should. The wisdom of the world is foolishness with God and the wisdom of God is foolishness to the world. Paul has but one Gospel to proclaim; it's everywhere the same. He knew and proclaimed his Gospel from the Law through the witness of the Spirit of Christ. That was Paul's FULL Gospel – not half of it; not more than it, just it. The Law does not compete with Christ – it serves Him: Oh wondrous glory of that ministration TO Christ, glory from glory, glory from the ministration OF Christ!

Paul says that God has made him an "able minister of the new testament" (6). He was enabled and 'inspired' to create true perspective and lift out real meaning! And here the real application of the text comes

to the fore, wherein Paul challenges the believers to be Christ's letters "not written with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God" (3). Here the purpose is fulfilled, the mark struck. JUST LIKE, AS, "SUCH TRUST as we have ABOUT CHRIST" – verse 4. Christ and his work is God's Letter of guarantee to us. According to this trust, Christ, and no longer "the ministration of death, written and engraved in stone" (7), is "the ministration of the Spirit" (6, 8, 9) "by reason of the glory that excels" – verse 10.

In verse 4 Paul 'declares', just "such trust" – as we have concerning you, that you are Christ's letters that declare Him – just "such trust, have we through (or 'about', *diá*) Christ to (or 'in relation to', *pros*) God". Just as you are Christ's Letters of "recommendation", so Christ is God's Letter of 'recommendation'. On this we place our firm trust, says Paul. On this, the "sufficiency is of God" (5).

"For if that which is done away was glorious, if God's letter – His bringing the message to us – in letters in stone was glorious, much more is glorious that which remains", namely God's Living Letter, His Living Way of getting the Message to reach us. "The ministration of Righteousness" and Life "remain". It remains with His, the spiritual "children of Israel". This means "the remaining" of the Law of God, bodily living on in Christ. As far as the Fourth Commandment is concerned, this, to the thrust of Hebrews, means, "There therefore for the People of God remains their keeping of His Sabbath Day".

The Law of God can now under the New Testament be read more readily and with better understanding, and we can behold God in the unveiled face of Jesus Christ His Living, Personal Letter of Word to us. Not like the Israelites who with "their minds blinded" had to look at Moses' veiled face as a cover against God's glory. Divinely glorious nevertheless it had been, unquestionably, that that Letter from God had left His People dying in the wilderness "because of their unbelief". But thank God, "the same veil" by which God's face had been covered so that we could not see Him in the glory of His mercifulness in Christ, that "covering", has "as by the Spirit of the Lord" been "taken away" by "the ministration of righteousness". "Now the Lord (God) is that Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" – liberty from the rule of sin and death. There is LIFE and the Law of Life "in Christ"!

Where was this veil "taken away" and "abolished"? At one moment: "When they shall turn to the Lord" (16); when "changed into the same image (of the Lord)" (18)! At the Gospel's most glorious moment: in the killing to raise to life again. At their being regenerated, at their repentance and conversion, at Israel to the flesh becoming Israel after the Spirit, at their eyes being opened, at their beholding God as in the face of Jesus Christ (4:6), at "the veil (being) removed in the reading of the Old Testament" (14). God at the instant of the regeneration and the new creation became to the believer the living embodiment of His Law in His all-excelling glorious "ministration", even "in Christ".

The Law done away with? What blindness! What Judaism! The Jews were they who could not stand the Law; the Christians are the Jews who were freed (see verse 17) to receive the Law of God's Love through Jesus Christ with all their heart, God "speaking of the whole law of which the sabbath is a part".

I do NOT 'spiritualise' the text or context. I would in any case rather spiritualise than manhandle, manipulate or mutilate the Text. The Body in tangible realisation of "witness" / "ministration", "belongs to Christ"; "Where two or three come together in My Name there I am." He who rips the Sabbath Day out of God's Commandment that teaches us to love Him with all our heart, is he who tears it from the Body whom Christ loves with all His heart. He who denies God's Sabbath Day is the one who makes of Christ's Body that vaporous transcendental non-entity without Day or Congregation, or witness or worship.

From the Perspective of a Calvinist Sabbatharian
Uit die oogpunt van 'n Calvinistiese Sabbatariër

Ek glo die Sewende Dag Sabbat van die HERE jou God, máár, nóg vir die redes wat die Jode die Sewende Dag Sabbat glo, nóg vir die redes wat die Rooms Katolieke glo die Sewende Dag die Sabbat is.

Want ek glo die Sewende Dag Sabbat van die HERE jou God vir die redes wat die Protestante glo die Sabbat nié die Sewende Dag nie, maar die Eerste Dag van die week is. Want alhoewel hulle hulle met die dag vergis, vergis hulle hulle geensins met die rede daarvoor nie. Ek glo naamlik die Sewende Dag Sabbat volgens die Verborgene van God se wil en die Hoop van Sy roeping na die werking van die krag van sy sterkte wat Hy gewerk het in Christus toe Hy Hom "In volheid van die Sabbatdag" uit die dode opgewek het. (Matteus 28:1 en Efesiërs 1:17-23).

We believe the Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD your God, neither for the reasons the Jews believe the Seventh Day Sabbath, nor for the reasons the Roman Catholics believe the Seventh Day is the Sabbath.

Because we believe the Seventh Day the Sabbath of the LORD your God for the very reason the Protestants believe the Sabbath is not the Seventh Day, but the First Day of the week. For although they are mistaken as pertains the day, they are not mistaken with the reason of its validity. We believe in fact the Seventh Day Sabbath according to the Mystery of God's will and the Hope of His calling according to the working of His mighty power to us-ward which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead "In the fullness of the Sabbath" (Matthew 28:1; Ephesians 1:17-23).

Waar Calvyn so treffend verduidelik het dat God die mens die Sabbatdag gegee en deur die gawe daarvan bevéeel het, sodat ons daarop tot rus kan kom sodat Hy **in** ons kan werk, wil ek graag benadruk hoedat God die Sabbatdag aan sy Volk gegee het en deur die gawe daarvan bevéeel het sodat hulle daarop kan gaan stilstaan en kyk en sien, en mag weet, en ervaar, hoedat Hy **vir**, sy Volk gewerk hét, en steeds, **vir**, sy Volk, wérk! '**In**, ons' ... '**vir**, ons' ... wérk – God, '**vir**' ons – is die Essensie van God se Sabbatdag "vir, die mens, gemaak". "*Want op die Sewende Dag Sabbat ... Sabbat van die HÉRÉ jou God ... het God van ... al, Sý, werke, gerus*", sê die Nuwe-Testamentiese weergawe van die Vierde Gebod. Ja, die klein woordjie met die groot betekenis, 'al', sal u nié in die Ou-Testament vind nie! Want in die Ou-Testament word in die Vierde Gebod aangegee hoedat God geskep het, en daarna op die Sewende Dag, gerus het, en hoedat God omdat Hy die Volk op die Sewende Dag uit Egipteland uitgelei het, gerus het. Telkens is dit in die Ou-Testament net een gedeelte van God se werk wat as grondrede en motief vir die 'maak' sowel as vir die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag dien. Want telkens was nog geen van God se werke – hetsy skepping of verlossing – voltooi nie. Voltooiing het op die Belofte gewag, en nadat Die Belofte gekom het en 'al' God se werke, "klaargemaak het", eers tóé, sou God verklaar, "En God het op die Sewende Dag gerus", ja, "... van al, Sý, werke, gerus". Christus Jesus is die Volbragting; Hy is die Eskatos; so, alleen, in Christus Jesus, is God, Skepper. Alvorens Skepper, is God Verlosser-God. Om te sê dat "God op die Sewende Dag al sy werke voltooi, het", is om te sê dat "God op die Sewende Dag, gerus, het." God se **rus** van die Sewende Dag is God se **werk** van die Sewende Dag, en God se Rus en God se Werk van die Sewende Dag, was, en is, Christus Jesus ... was en is, Christus Jesus in die 'klaarmaak' en in die 'volmaking' van 'al die werke van God' ... in Opstanding uit die dode! Die Sabbat is Evangelie-Dag, Blye Dag, "geldend vir die Volk van God"!

Nou hoe anders ... die ewige vraag ... hoe anders, as dat God in Christus Jesus en deur Christus Jesus, "op die Sewende Dag al sy werke klaargemaak het" en in Christus Jesus en deur Christus Jesus, "op die Sewende Dag van al sy werke gerus het"? Die Sewende Dag Sabbat is dus Nuwe-Testamentiese Sabbatdag, en daarom alleen, bly dit vir die Volk van God ... die Nuwe-Testamentiese Volk van God, geldend!

Die Wet mee weggedoen?**Gerhard Ebersöhn vs. Philip du Toit****Philip du Toit:****Standpunt:** (bls. 1 tot bls. 21)

Lyk my u praat van die 10 gebooie. U sê nogal interessante dinge. U sê die Sabbat regdeur die Bybel dui op Christus. Ek kon egter nie met sekerheid aflei wat u onder die Sabbat verstaan nie. Sê u die sabbat is in Christus vervul, sodat ons nie nodig het om 'n sekere dag as sabbat te onderhou nie, en dat ons net onself aan Christus moet verbind en in Hom moet rus? Of verstaan ek u verkeerd?

Ek verstaan dinge wel anders as u op 'n paar punte. Ek self het die afgelope tyd baie geworstel met die Skrif oor die Sabbat. Ek dink nie ek is al klaar nie. Vir my is dit belangrik om telkens terug te gaan na die Skrif en dit as finale gesagsbron te gebruik vir enige afleidings oor enige iets.

Ek self het egter baie ruimte vir mense wat dinge anders as ekself verstaan, want ek dink nie ek as een mens het die volle waarheid in pag nie. Ek glo wel dat die Skrif betroubaar en gesagvol is en dat God se Gees ons in die hele waarheid lei. Ek glo dit is beide van ons se strewes.

Soos ek dit verstaan:

In Christus het enige vorm van wet verval. As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing. Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie. Die Sabbat vind vervulling in Christus in die sin dat ons in Hom rus. Volgens Heb 4 bly daar 'n sabbatsrus oor. Die manier hoe mens toetree tot hierdie rus is deur die **geloof** (4:3). God het eens die sabbat bepaal as rusdag (4:10), en Hy bepaal nou weer 'n sekere dag in die plek van die

Sabbatdag, naamlik **vandag** (4:7). God vra dat ons nie ons harte verhard nie, maar dat ons in geloof ons harte oorgee aan Hom. Dit is die ware betekenis van die sabbat. Die skrywer van die Hebreërbrief wys daarop dat die rus waarvan Josua praat (4:8) nie die finale vervulling van die belofte van rus is nie (sien bv. Jos 1:15; 22:4; 23:1). Die uiteindelijke vervulling van God se belofte van rus is die rus waarin mense gaan as hulle **glo** in Christus en daardeur in 'n **verhouding** met God tree (Heb 4:3). Hierdie rus noem die skrywer 'n **sabbatsrus**. Dit is dus die vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan en waarvan die sabbat 'n skaduwee is. Omdat Jesus die Sabbat in Homself vervul het, nooi Hy ook mense uit om hulleself aan Hom oor te gee, hulle las af te lê en in Sy **rus** in te gaan. **Dit is die ware sabbat.**

1. Soos ek jou verstaan bou jy die argument vir die onderhouding van die sabbat hoofsaaklik op Genesis wat sê dat God gerus het van sy werk.

2. Ek verstaan ook dat jy nie sabbatsonderhouding sien as 'n werk wat 'n bydrae kan lewer tot jou verlossing nie, maar dat dit deel is van God se geskenk aan ons deur Christus en dat sy Gees dit in ons harte werk.

Let wel dat ek nie 'n voorstander is van Sondag-onderhouding, asof dit in die plek sou kom van Sabbats-onderhouding nie. Ek is oor die algemeen nie 'n voorstander van "in-die-plek-van"-teologie nie. Ek glo bv. ook nie dat die doop in die plek van die besnydenis gekom het of dat die nagmaal

in die plek van die pasga gekom het nie. Volgens die NT is die ganse wet (alle geskrewe wette, insluitende die tien gebooie, asook die ganse

pentateug) en profete: dit wil sê die totale Ou Testament in Christus vervul. Niks is daarvan uitgesonder nie. Ook nie die sabbat nie. Die onderhouding van die sabbat is 'n Ou-Testamentiese instelling, saam met al die ander wette. Dit alles was slegs 'n skaduwee, wat op

Christus gedui het en in en deur Christus vervul is.

Alles wat nodig is tot die ewige lewe in die Nuwe-Testamentiese tyd, het Christus gegee. Vir Nikodemus het Jesus gesê mens moet geestelik wedergebore word, deur geloof in Hom (Joh 3). Hy het die gebod van die liefde ingestel en die doop ingestel. Hy het nagmaal met sy dissipels gehou en gesê dat ons daardeur sy bloed en die Nuwe Testament in gedagtenis bring. Hy het ons nooit beveel om die sabbatsgebod te onderhou nie. Inteendeel, vanuit die NT is dit duidelik dat die sabbatte slegs 'n skaduwee was van die toekomstige dinge wat sou volg in Christus.

Kol 2:16-17 "Laat niemand julle dan oordeel in spys of in drank of met betrekking tot 'n fees of nuwemaan of sabbat nie, (17) wat 'n skaduwee is van die toekomstige dinge; maar die liggaam behoort aan Christus."

As mens sê dat die wet nie meer van toepassing is op Christen-gelowiges nie, **behalwe** die sabbat - wat is die Skriftuurlike gronde om te sê alle wette is opgehef in Christus **behalwe** die sabbat? Wat is die Skrif daarvoor? Is dit Nuwe Testamenties of Ou Testamenties? Soos ek dit verstaan is die Nuwe Testament die volle vervulling van die Ou Testament - die oue is verby, kyk **alles** het nuut geword (2 Kor 5:17).

Daar is geen Nuwe Testamentiese gronde vir die onderhouding van die Sabbat nie. Heb 4:9 vereis **juis nie** die onderhouding van 'n spesifieke dag nie, maar dui op die ewige rus in Christus (vers 10), waarin mens **vandag** (vers 7) toetree in verhouding met Hom. Die term "vandag" is "semeron" in Grieks. Kyk na Heb 3:13 "Maar

vermaan mekaar **elke dag** so lank as dit **vandag** (semeron) genoem word, sodat niemand van julle deur die verleiding van die sonde verhard word nie." Dit is duidelik dat die Hebreërskrywer nie 'n spesifieke dag in gedagte het met die gebruik van die term "vandag" (semeron) nie. Hy bedoel daarmee: enige dag, nou, elke dag. Die sabbatsrus waarvan Heb 4:9 praat is dus 'n geestelike rus, nie 'n fisiese rus nie. Alle

fisiese wette is in Christus vervul. Die aanbreek van die Nuwe Testament dui die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte aan. Dit is die manier hoe mens deel raak van die Nuwe Verbond. Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette. Hy het weggedoen met vlees. Dit word bekragtig in ons lewens deur die wederbarende werk van die Gees. Rom 8:2 "Want die wet van die **Gees** van die lewe in Christus Jesus het my vrygemaak van die **wet van die sonde en die dood.**"

Kom ons kyk gou weer mooi na die konteks van Heb 4.

In Heb 3:11, die vorige hoofstuk, is dit duidelik dat die rus waarin die volk moet ingaan, nie die sabbat is nie, maar die ewige rus in Christus. Iemand wat nie God se weë leer ken het nie en afvallig geword het, gaan nie in die rus in Christus in nie (Heb 3:10,12).

Heb 4:1-3 praat van presies dieselfde rus, die ewige **rus in Christus**, nie die sabbat nie.

Nou belangrik, vers 4 sê: "**Want** (gar) Hy het êrens van die sewende dag so gespreek: En God het op die sewende dag van al sy werke gerus." Nou praat hy van die 7'e dag, die sabbatdag. Dus, die skrywer begrond die ewige rus in Christus in die beginsel dat God gerus het van sy werke op die 7'e dag. Die diepere betekenis van die sabbatdag, dit waarvan die sabbatdag 'n skaduwee was, vind dus vervulling in die ewige rus in

Christus: as ons in Hom glo en onself aan Hom verbind. Heb 4:6-7 sê: "Terwyl dit dan so is dat sommige daar ingaan, en diegene aan wie die evangelie eers verkondig is, deur ongehoorsaamheid nie ingegaan het nie, (7) bepaal Hy **weer 'n sekere dag**, naamlik **vandag**, as Hy soveel later deur Dawid spreek, soos gesê is: **Vandag** as julle sy stem hoor, verhard julle harte nie." Nou bepaal God weer 'n "sekere dag." Wat is die "sekere dag" wat vroeër bepaal is? Dis die sabbatdag! Maar nou bepaal God **weer 'n sekere dag**, maar nou is dit nie 'n spesifieke dag van die week nie, dit is "vandag" - elke dag, nou, enige dag! (vroeër verduidelik). Nou

tree ons tot die rus in Christus toe **enige dag** as ons nie ons harte verhard nie, maar die belofte van sy ewige rus glo, waarvan die fisiese sabbatdag maar net 'n skaduwee was. Wat sê vers 8? Dit sê "Want as Josua aan hulle rus gegee het, sou Hy nie van 'n ander dag daarná spreek nie." Josua het dus nie die werklike rus vir hulle gegee nie. Die werklike rus is slegs in Christus, juis omdat die fisiese sabbatdag daarvan 'n skaduwee was, en daarheen gewys het, en daarin (in Christus) vervul is. Daarom bring hy juis in vers 9 die ewige rus in Christus en die sabbatsrus **in verband met mekaar**. Dus (ara) bly daar 'n sabbatsrus oor. Behels dit die onderhouding van die fisiese, Ou Testamentiese sabbat, wat slegs 'n skaduwee was van die werklike ewige rus in Christus? Verseker nie. Die konteks maak dit duidelik dat die term "sabbatismos" hier figuurlik gebruik word. Dit word in verband gebring met die ewige rus (katapausis). Dit word verder versterk deur vers 10. Vers 10 is kardinaal: "**want** (gar) wie in sy rus (katapausis = ewige rus) ingegaan het, rus ook self van sy werke soos God van syne (sabbatsrus)." Vers 10 sê dus in soveel woorde, dat hulle wat in die katapausis ingegaan het, die ewige rus in Christus (waarvan die fisiese sabbatsgebod slegs 'n skaduwee was), "rus ook self van sy werke soos God van syne." Is dit nie pragtig nie? Wat sê dit? Dit sê dat hy wat in Christus se ewige rus ingegaan het, het ook die sabbat vervul. Anders gesê, hy wat in Christus rus het ook dit nagekom wat die fisiese sabbatsrus bedoel was om te doen. Sou dit dus nodig wees om die Ou Testamentiese, fisiese sabbatsgebod tot nou steeds te onderhou? Verseker nie, want dit is vervul in Christus, en deurdat ons deur geloof aan Christus verbind is, tree ons toe tot die eintlike rus, waarvan die fisiese sabbatsgebod slegs 'n skaduwee was.

Artikel, Philip du Toit:

Moet 'n Christen die Sabbat hou? Is dit Saterdag of is dit Sondag? Het die onderhouding van die Sondag in die plek gekom van die onderhouding van die Saterdag? Moet 'n Christen hoegenaamd een dag bo 'n ander ag? Hierdie artikel was vroeër "Die wet en die sabbat." Daar is nou 'n aparte artikel: Die wet (uitgebrei). Dit lê ten grondslag van hierdie artikel en moet hiermee saam verstaan word.

In die artikel: Die wet, word bespreek dat Christus by sy dood en opstanding die Ou Testamentiese wet vervul en beëindig het. Hy het die Nuwe Testament ingelei waaronder ons as Christene nie meer onder die wet is nie, maar onder die genade. Ons is nie meer onder die verpligting om die Ou Testamentiese wette te onderhou nie, maar die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van die sonde en die dood. Dit vind praktiese uitdrukking in die liefdesgebod van Christus: liefde vir God en die naaste.

As mens verstaan hoe die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat, spreek dit eintlik vanself of dit nodig is om die Sabbat te hou of nie. Hoe kan ons "ontslae" wees van die wet en dit "afgesteef" het (Rm 7:6) en "nie meer onder die wet" wees nie (Rm 6:14,15), maar steeds verplig wees om die Sabbat te hou? Paulus sê uitdruklik dat **al die gebooie** ("watter ander gebod ook al") saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm 13:9). Die **hele wet** word vervul deur die gebod van die liefde (Gl 5:14). Die gebod van die liefde vir God en jou naaste is dus die enigste gebod wat nodig is om te onderhou. Enige ander gebod word as't ware opgeneem onder die groot gebod. Die groot gebod sluit alle ander gebooie in. Die Sabbat is geen uitsondering nie. Maar ter wille van volledigheid sal ek al die relevante verwysings na die Sabbat bespreek.

Die Sabbat in die Ou Testament

1. Die eerste vraag wat mens moet vra is: Waar kom die Sabbatsgebod vandaan? Die eerste teken van 'n Sabbatsgebod in die Ou Testament is

in Eks 16:23-30 waar die volk dubbel die hoeveelheid manna op die sesde dag moes insamel sodat hulle op die sewende dag kon rus. Dit kom dan weer voor in Eks 20:10 waar dit deel vorm van die geskrewe wet wat Moses direk van God ontvang het. Hoewel God op die sewende dag van die skepping gerus het en dit geseën en geheilig het (Gen 2:3), was dit nie as sodanig as 'n gebod ingestel vir elke sewende dag nie. Sommige meen dat daar sprake van Sabbatsonderhouding was voor Eks 16 n.a.v. Noag se sewe-dag-siklusse waarin hy die duif uitgestuur het (Gen 8:10,12) of die feit dat Jakob twee keer vir sewe jaar moes werk vir Ragel (Gen 29:27-28), maar dit dui eerder op die feit dat mense wel met "vaste tye" vir sowel dae as jare gewerk het (Gen 1:14). Die begrip "jaar" kom reeds voor in Gen 5:3 en "maand" in Gen 7:11. Gen 7:11 gee 'n vaste datum aan vir die vloed - 'n spesifieke dag in die lewe van Noag. So, hoewel die term "weke" eers voorkom in Eks 34:22, lyk dit redelik seker dat die mens van die begin af ná die skepping met sewe-dag-siklusse (weke) gewerk het. Die Sabbatsgebod self is egter eers **heelwat later** (+- 2500 jaar ná die skepping) as 'n gebod ingestel (430 jaar na Abraham: Gal 3:17). Die hele wet is **bygevoeg** weens die oortredinge (Gal 3:19). Regdeur die Bybel is God se openbaring **progressief**. Die Ou Verbond(e) is opgerig, daarna het die wet gekom, daarna het nie Nuwe Testament en die Nuwe Verbond gekom. Die nuwe vervul en gee altyd dieper betekenis aan die oue. So ook het die Sabbatsgebod wel gebou op die **beginsel** van God se rus op die sewende dag (Eks 20:11), maar het eers in die woestyn as gebod en deel van die **Ou Verbond** tot stand gekom. In Deut 29:1,9,12,14,21,25 word die term "verbond" (*berit*) verstaan as die **hele wet** wat uiteengesit is in die voorafgaande Deut 6-28. In hierdie sin is die terme "verbond" en "wet" uitruilbaar.

2. Een van die belangrike beginsels oor die Sabbat is dat die **Sabbat gemaak is vir die mens**, nie die mens vir die Sabbat nie (Mk 2:27). Die Sabbat is deur God ingestel met die oog daarop dat die mens en al sy mense en diere gereeld kon

rus van hulle werk. Hiervan is die volgende twee gedeeltes sprekende voorbeelde:

Eks 23:12 "Ses dae moet jy jou werk verrig, maar op die sewende dag moet jy rus, dat jou os en jou esel kan uitrus en die seun van jou slavin en die vreemdeling **kan asem skeep**."

Deut 5:14 "maar die sewende dag is die sabbat van die HERE jou God; dan mag jy géén werk doen nie—jy of jou seun of jou dogter, of jou dienskneg of jou diensmaagd, of jou os of jou esel of enige dier van jou, of jou vreemdeling wat in jou poorte is nie; sodat jou dienskneg en jou diensmaagd **kan rus soos jy**."

3. Die Sabbat was 'n "teken" of 'n "sein" tussen God en die mens dat die mense kan **weet dat God die Here is**, en dat God se mense daardeur **heilig en afgesonder** vir God is (Eseg 20:12,20; Eks 31:13). Dit gaan oor die feit dat die mens 'n sekere dag aan die Here moes wy en dit moes heilig en God moes erken as Here en Skepper van hemel en aarde in ses dae, net soos Hy op die sewende dag gerus het na sy skepping en dit geheilig het (Gen 2:2-3). Ten diepste het dit daarom gegaan dat hulle een dag van die week moes eenkant sit om met God te ontmoet en Hom kan aanbid en erken vir wie Hy is. Dit was ook 'n getuienis teenoor almal dat God die enigste Here is - soos 'n vlag of 'n banier vir God. Net soos met baie ander wette, moes mense **gedood word** as hulle dit nie hou nie (Eks 31:41). Na aanleiding van die leringe van Ellen White, die stigtersprofeet van die Sewende Dag Adventiste, vertaal hulle die Hebreeuse *ôth* in Eseg 20:12,20 en Eks 31:13 met "merk" - wat slegs een van die moontlike vertalings is. Ellen White het gesê dat die merk van die dier in Op 13:16-18 verwys na Sondag-onderhouding wat volgens haar deur die Pous ingestel is (wat nie bewys kan word nie - dit word later bespreek) en dat diegene wat nog die Saterdag onderhou nie die merk van die dier dra nie. Maar die Griekse *garagma* in Op 13:16-17 verwys volgens Strong's eerder na 'n gegraveerde skraap, ets of stempel, of 'n uitgekerfde figuur: "a scratch or etching, that is, stamp (as a badge

of servitude), or *sculptured figure (statue)*: - graven, mark." Volgens Thayer beteken dit: "1) a stamp, an imprinted mark 1a) of the mark stamped on the forehead or the right hand as the badge of the followers of the Antichrist 1b) the mark branded upon horses 2) thing carved, sculpture, graven work 2a) of idolatrous images."

4. Die sabbat is bedoel om 'n dag van **vreugde en verlustiging** te wees waarin die Here se kinders hulleself in Hom kan verbly, en nie 'n uiterlike bykomende plig om die lys van wette nog swaarder en nog langer te maak nie.

Jes 58:13-14 "As jy jou voet terughou van die sabbat—om nie jou sake op my heilige dag te doen nie, en as jy die **sabbat 'n verlustiging noem** en die heilige dag van die HERE hooghou; en as jy dit eer deur nie jou gewone gang te gaan nie, nie geleentheid vir jou sake soek of ydele taal spreek nie; (14) dan sal jy **jou verlustig in die HERE**, en Ek sal jou laat ry oor die hoogtes van die aarde en jou laat geniet die erfdeel van jou vader Jakob; want die mond van die HERE het dit gespreek."

5. Daar is reeds in die Ou Testament sprake van God se misnoë met 'n uiterlike vormgodsdienstige rituele aanhang sonder dat hulle hart daarin is.

Jes 1:13-17 "Bring nie meer skynheilige offergawes nie; gruwelike reukwerk is dit vir My. Nuwemane en **sabbatte**, die uitroep van samekomst—Ek verdra geen ongeregtigheid en feestyd nie!

(14) Julle nuwemane en julle feestye haat my siel; hulle is My 'n oorlas. Ek is moeg om dit te dra. (15) En as julle jul hande uitbrei, bedek Ek my oë vir julle; ook as julle die gebed vermenigvuldig, luister Ek nie: julle hande is vol bloed. (16) Was julle, reinig julle, neem die boosheid van julle handeling voor my oë weg, hou op om kwaad te doen, (17) leer om goed te doen, soek die reg, betuel die verdrukker, doen reg aan die wees, verdedig die saak van die weduwee."

Jes 30:15 "Want so sê die Here HERE, die Heilige van Israel: In **terugkeer en rus lê julle heil**, in stil wees en vertrouwe bestaan julle

krag; maar **julle wou nie**" Hierdie teks dui daarop dat die volk nooit in die ware rus (in Hom) ingegaan het soos Hy dit bedoel het nie. Hoewel die Sabbat veronderstel was om hierdie ware rus te help fasiliteer, het die volk nooit werklik in die ware rus in God ingegaan soos Hy dit bedoel het nie.

Die Sabbat in die Nuwe Testament

1. Jesus is die Here van die Sabbat.

Mt 12:1-8 "In daardie tyd het Jesus op die sabbat deur die gesaaides geloop, en sy dissipels het honger geword en are begin pluk en eet. (2) Maar toe die Fariseërs dit sien, sê hulle vir Hom: Kyk, u dissipels doen wat nie geoorloof is om op die sabbat te doen nie. (3) Maar Hy sê vir hulle: Het julle nie gelees wat Dawid gedoen het nie—toe hy en die wat saam met hom was, honger gehad het— (4) hoe hy in die huis van God gegaan en die toonbrode geëet het wat vir hom en die wat saam met hom was, **nie geoorloof was om te eet nie**, maar net vir die priesters alleen? (5) Of het julle nie in die wet gelees dat die priesters **op die sabbat in die tempel die sabbat ontheilig** en onskuldig is nie? (6) En Ek sê vir julle: **Een wat groter is as die tempel, is hier**. (7) Maar as julle geweet het wat dit beteken: Ek wil barmhartigheid hê en nie offerande nie, sou julle die onskuldiges nie veroordeel het nie; (8) want die **Seun van die mens is Here óók van die sabbat**." (sien ook Mk 2:28; Lk 6:5)

Dit beteken Jesus het die **Sabbat in Homself vervul**. As Here van die Sabbat het Hy die mag om **nuwe inhoud** aan die Sabbat te gee. Jesus is groter as die tempel. Hy is die nuwe **sentrum van aanbidding**. Hy is die persoon wat die diepere betekenis van die Sabbat beliggaam. Hy is ons Middelaar waardeur ons kan toetree tot 'n **ware bewussyn en erkenning** van God.

2. Jesus het die gebod van die Sabbat verbreek.

Jh 5:15-18 "Die man het gegaan en aan die Jode vertel dat dit Jesus was wat hom gesond gemaak het. (16) En hieroor het die Jode Jesus

vervolg en probeer om Hom dood te maak, **omdat Hy dit op die sabbat gedoen het.** (17) En Jesus het hulle geantwoord: My Vader werk tot nou toe, en Ek werk ook. (18) Hieroor het die Jode toe nog meer probeer om Hom dood te maak, omdat Hy nie alleen **DIE SABBAT GEBREEK** het nie, maar ook God sy eie Vader genoem het en Hom met God gelykgestel het."

Joh 9:16 "En sommige van die Fariseërs sê: Hierdie man kom nie van God nie, omdat **Hy die sabbat nie hou nie.** Ander sê: Hoe kan 'n sondige mens sulke tekens doen? En daar was verdeeldheid onder hulle."

Mar 2:24 "Toe sê die Fariseërs vir Hom: Kyk, waarom doen hulle op die sabbat **wat nie geoorloof is nie?**"

Johannes (5:18) skryf self dat Jesus die Sabbat **verbreek** het, hoofsaaklik omdat Hy telkens **mense op die Sabbat genees** het (bv. Lk 13:14; 14:3; Jh 5:10; 7:23; ens.), omdat Hy mense wat Hy gesond gemaak het, beveel het om hulle **beddens opneem om te loop** (bv. Jh 5:8-9), en omdat Jesus dit ook **goedgekeur het dat sy dissipels koringare** op die sabbat gepluk het. Jesus se verbreking van die wet van die Sabbatdag was een van die vernaamste redes waarom die Joodse owerstes vir Jesus tot die dood veroordeel het (Mt 12:1; Mk 2:23; Lk 6:1).

3. Die ware **sabbatsrus** is om toe te tree tot die **ware rus in Jesus Christus.**

Heb 4:1 praat van die **rus** waarin ons moet ingaan terwyl die belofte nog standhou. Vers 3 sê: "**...ons wat geglo het, gaan die rus in...**"

Heb 4:4-10 "Want Hy het êrens van die **sewende dag** so gespreek: En God het op die sewende dag van al sy werke gerus; (5) en nou hier weer: Hulle sal in my rus nie ingaan nie. (6) Terwyl dit dan so is dat sommige daar ingaan, en diegene aan wie die evangelie eers verkondig is, deur ongehoorsaamheid nie ingegaan het nie, (7) **bepaal Hy weer 'n sekere dag, naamlik vandag**, as Hy soveel later deur Dawid spreek, soos gesê is: **Vandag** as julle sy stem hoor, **verhard julle harte nie.** (8) Want as Josua aan hulle rus gegee het,

sou Hy nie van 'n ander dag daarná spreek nie. (9) Daar bly dus 'n **sabbatsrus oor vir die volk van God;** (10) want wie in sy rus ingegaan het, rus ook self van sy werke soos God van syne."

Die manier hoe mens toetree tot hierdie rus is deur die **geloof** (4:3). God het eens die sabbat bepaal as rusdag (4:10), en Hy bepaal nou weer 'n sekere dag in die plek van die Sabbatdag, naamlik **vandag** (4:7). God vra dat ons nie ons harte verhard nie, maar dat ons in geloof ons harte oorgee aan Hom. Dit is die ware betekenis van die sabbat. Die skrywer van die Hebreërbrief wys daarop dat die rus waarvan Josua praat (4:8) nie die finale vervulling van die belofte van rus is nie (sien bv. Jos 1:15; 22:4; 23:1). Die uiteindelijke vervulling van God se belofte van rus is die rus waarin mense gaan as hulle **glo** in Christus en daardeur in 'n **verhouding** met God tree (Heb 4:3). Hierdie rus noem die skrywer 'n **sabbatsrus**. Dit is dus die vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan en waarvan die sabbat 'n skaduwee is. Omdat Jesus die Sabbat in Homself vervul het, nooi Hy ook mense uit om hulleself aan Hom oor te gee, hulle las af te lê en in Sy **rus** in te gaan. **Dit is die ware sabbat.**

Mt 11:28-30 "Kom na My toe, almal wat vermoeid en belas is, en Ek sal julle **rus** gee. (29) Neem my juk op julle en leer van My, want Ek is sagmoedig en nederig van hart, en julle sal **rus** vind vir julle siele; (30) want my juk is sag en my las is lig."

Sien ook die profesie in Jes 11:10: "En in dié dag sal die nasies vra na die wortel van Isai, wat daar staan as 'n banier van die volke, en sy **rusplek** sal heerlijk wees."

4. Die Nuwe Testament **veroordeel wettisisme.**

'n Goeie voorbeeld van mense wat geneig was tot wettisisme is die Galasiërs. Paulus is baie ontsteld oor die manier hoe hulle, nadat hy aan hulle die evangelie van genade verkondig het, weer teruggeval het in wettisisme. Hy sê onder andere:

Gl 3:1-5 "o, Onverstandige Galasiërs, wie het julle betower om die **waarheid nie gehoorsaam** te

wees nie, julle voor wie se oë Jesus Christus afgeskilder is as onder julle gekruisig? (2) Dit alleen wil ek van julle weet: het julle **die Gees ontvang uit die werke van die wet** of uit die prediking van die **geloof**? (3) Is julle so onverstandig? **Nadat julle met die Gees begin het, eindig julle nou met die vlees**? (4) Het julle verniet so baie gely? As dit maar verniet was! (5) Hy wat julle dan die Gees verleen en kragte onder julle werk, doen Hy dit **uit die werke van die wet of uit die prediking van die geloof**?"

Dit lyk of die Galasiërs geneig was tot 'n klomp "moets" en "moenies." Hulle het onder andere steeds van Christene verwag om hulle te laat besny, wat deel was van die Ou Testamentiese wet. Daarom sê Paulus aan hulle (Gl 5:1-4): "Staan dan vas in die **vryheid** waarmee Christus ons vrygemaak het, en laat julle nie weer onder die **juk van diensbaarheid** bring nie. (2) Kyk, ek, Paulus, sê vir julle dat as julle jul laat **besny, Christus vir julle tot geen nut sal wees nie**. (3) En ek betuig dit weer aan elke mens wat hom laat besny, dat hy onder **verplichting is om die hele wet te onderhou**. (4) Julle wat geregverdig wil wees deur die wet, is **losgemaak van Christus; julle het van die genade verval**."

Paulus beskou dit as so 'n ernstige saak dat hy aan hulle sê dat hulle deur wettisisme hulleself **losmaak van Christus** en selfs dat hulle van die **genade verval** het. In Gl 4:10-11 sê hy hierdie insiggewende woorde: "**Julle neem dae en en maande en tye en jare waar**. (11) Ek vrees vir julle dat ek miskien tevergeefs aan julle gearbei het." Dit verwys na die Joodse feeste en dae, waaronder die Sabbat ook een is, wat hulle waargeneem het. Net soos wat dit nie meer nodig is om hierdie feeste waar te neem nie, is dit nie meer nodig om die Sabbat waar te neem nie. Al hierdie dae was in elk geval net 'n skaduwee op die evangelie en die ware rus wat sou kom in Jesus Christus (Kol 2:16-17; vgl. Heb 10:1).

Paulus spreek 'n soortgelyke probleem aan by die Romeine (Rm 14:1-23). Daar was diegene onder hulle wat gemeen het mens mag nie vleis eet nie,

en vaste wette voorgehou het oor wat mens mag eet. En daar was ook diegene wat gemeen het dat mens **sekere dae moet waarneem** (soos die Joodse feeste en die Sabbat) en sekere **dae as belangriker as ander** beskou het, en waarskynlik van die ander Christene verwag het om dit ook te doen (vers 5). Daar was duidelik onenigheid in die gemeente hieroor. Hy vermaan hulle om die wat "swak is in die geloof" in liefde aan te neem (verse 1-2). Hierdie "swakkeres" was diegene wat klaarblyklik nie die **genade-karakter** van die evangelie reg verstaan het nie en telkens terug wou val in wettisisme. Dieselfde tipe probleem word ook by die Korinthiërs aangespreek waar sekere mense ander verbied het om vleis te eet wat aan afgode ge-offer is (1 Kor 8:1-13). Paulus sê dit is belangrik om ruimte te maak vir mense wat swak is in die geloof en hulle nie te benader vanuit 'n posisie van oordeel of selfs vanuit 'n posisie van 'n nuwe tipe wetmatigheid nie, maar in genade en liefde: liefde wat alles bedek.

As Paulus met die Kolosssense praat, beskryf hy die volkome werk van Jesus wat hy deur sy dood en opstanding gedoen het. Daardeer het Hy die skuldbrief teen ons wat met sy **insettinge** ons vyandig was, uitgedelg en weggeruim aan die kruis en getriomfeer oor alle owerhede en magte (Kol 2:9-15). Daardeer kan ons deel en identifiseer met alles wat Christus gedoen het, waarin Hy vir ons 'n nuwe vryheid gebring wat ons losmaak van alle vorme van wettisisme. Daarom sê Paulus in vers 16-19: "Laat niemand julle dan oordeel in spys of in drank of met betrekking tot 'n fees of nuwemaan of **sabbat** nie, (17) wat 'n **skaduwee is van die toekomstige dinge**; maar die liggaam behoort aan Christus. (18) Laat niemand julle van jul prys beroof nie, al sou hy behae hê in nederigheid en verering van die engele en indring in wat hy nie gesien het nie, en sonder oorsaak opgeblase wees deur sy vleeslike gesindheid, (19) en nie vashou aan die Hoof nie, uit wie die hele liggaam deur die gewigte en verbindings ondersteuning ontvang en saamgebind word en so met goddelike groei groot word."

Paulus sê "laat niemand julle dan oordeel..." juis omdat die Nuwe Testamentiese Christene nie moets en moenies gehad het oor wat hulle eet nie, en hulle het ook nie vaste verpligtinge en wette gehad oor feeste of die sabbat nie. Hy sê dit omdat hulle alles geëet het, drank gebruik het, en **nie die Joodse feeste of die sabbat onderhou het nie** - anders sou hierdie uitspraak van Paulus geen sin maak nie. Dit was nie nodig om hierdie dae te onderhou nie, want Christus het alles in almal vervul. Paulus som 'n wettiese instelling ten opsigte van eet, drink, feeste en sabbat baie goed op in die daaropvolgende woorde aan die Kolossensiërs:

Kol 2:20-23 "As julle dan saam met Christus die **eerste beginsels van die wêreld** afgesterf het, waarom is julle, asof julle nog in die wêreld lewe, onderworpe aan **insettinge** (21) soos: **raak nie, smaak nie, roer nie aan nie?** - (22) almal dinge wat deur die gebruik bestem is om te vergaan - volgens die gebooie en leringe van mense, (23) wat, alhoewel dit 'n skyn van wysheid het, in eiesinnige godsdiens en nederigheid en in gestrengheid teen die liggaam, geen waarde het nie, maar strek tot **versadiging van die vlees.**"

Kom die Sondag in die plek van die Sabbatdag?

Die Nuwe Testament praat van die dissipels wat op die "eerste dag van die week" vergader het en brood gebreek het (Hand 20:7) en van fondse wat vir die heiliges ingesamel is op die eerste dag van elke week (1 Kor 16:2). Jesus het op die eerste dag van die week opgestaan uit die dode (bv. Lk 24:1) en het ook op die eerste dag van die week aan sy dissipels verskyn (Jh 20:19). Daar is aanduiders in die geskiedenis dat die eerste Christene op die eerste dag van die week bymekaar gekom het om nagmaal te hou en saam te bid. Daar is bv. aanduidings in *Die brief van Barnabas* (ongeveer 74 nC) dat Christene die agste dag herdenk het. Dit sê: "Ons onderhou die agste dag met vreugde, die dag waarop Jesus ook weer opgestaan het uit die dood." (*Die brief van Barnabas* 15:6-8). Die *Didaché* (ongeveer 90 nC) praat ook telkens van hierdie praktyk, asook

natuurlik heelwat van die kerkvaders (bv. Ignasius, Justinus, Tertulianus, Origenes, Augustinus, ens.) Die eerste historiese optekening van Christene wat egter die Saterdag herdenk het, was die Anabaptiste-leiers: Andreas Fisher en Oswald Glait in 1527 nC.

Nêrens in die Nuwe Testament is daar egter 'n aanduiding dat die Sondag die Sabbatdag **vervang** het nie. Dit sou neerkom op 'n nuwe wet. Dieselfde geld vir die besnydenis. Die Bybel sê ook nie dat iets anders (soos die doop) **in die plek van** die besnydenis gekom het nie, want dit sou ook weer 'n nuwe wet veronderstel het. Kol 2:11-13 sê dat **Christus se besnydenis** (sy dood) in die plek van die besnydenis gekom het. Op dieselfde manier is nie nagmaal (of die paasfees) nie 'n nuwe wet of 'n nuwe fees wat in die plek van die pasga gekom het nie. Christus self is die **Lam** (Joh 1:29,36), waarvan die lam op die pasga 'n afskynsel was. Trouens Christus het **ALLES** waarvan die Ou Testamentiese Wet, Profete en Psalms praat in Homself vervul:

Luk 18:31 "En Hy het die twaalf by Hom geneem en vir hulle gesê: Kyk, ons gaan op na Jerusalem, en **ALLES wat deur die profete geskrywe is, sal aan die Seun van die mens vervul word.**"

Luk 24:44 "En Hy sê vir hulle: Dit is die woorde wat Ek met julle gespreek het toe Ek nog by julle was, dat **ALLES wat oor My geskrywe is in die wet van Moses en die profete en die psalms, vervul moet word.**"

Ef 1:22-23 "En Hy het alle dinge onder sy voete onderwerp en Hom as Hoof bo alle dinge aan die gemeente gegee, (23) wat sy liggaam is, die volheid van Hom wat **ALLES in almal vervul.**"

Die herdenking van die Sondag kan dus nie verstaan word as 'n nuwe wet nie. Dit is nêrens deur Christus spesifiek ingestel nie. Christene moet daarom versigtig wees om inherente waarde te heg aan die Sondag. Streng Sondag-onderhouding (veral as dit gepaard gaan met allerlei wette soos: "moenie dit op 'n Sondag" of "moenie dat op 'n Sondag") kan aanleiding gee tot wettisisme en mense van die genade laat vervreem. Dit kan ook

aanleiding daartoe gee dat mense net een dag aan die Here wil wy en dan as't ware deur die week leef soos hulle wil en die sonde wat hulle deur die week gedoen het skielik op die Sondag wil bely. Dieselfde kan egter van Saterdag- onderhouding gesê word. Die hele punt van Christus wat die ware Sabbat is, is juis dat ons 24 uur van die dag elke dag in verhouding met Hom staan. Ons tree toe tot die Sabbatsrus as ons tyd maak met die Here - vandag! (Heb 4:7) - enige dag. Paulus sê implisiet dat die "sterkere" in die geloof **alle dae gelyk ag** (Rm 14:5). In beginsel moet die Christen dus elke dag van die week in God se Sabbatsrus toetree. Die kern moet altyd Christus self bly. Hy is die middelpunt van die Christelike geloof. Selfs die doop en die nagmaal - hoewel deur Christus ingestel - kan nooit inherente waarde dra los van Christus se dood en opstanding en sy werk in en deur jou lewe nie. Mense wat werk deur die week (waarvan baie oor naweke werk) kan egter nie 24 uur van elke dag aktief tot God se rus toetree nie - hoewel mens altyd deur God se Gees en in sy teenwoordigheid moet leef. Persoonlik dink ek daarom dit is 'n goeie beginsel om ten minste een dag van die week slegs op jou verhouding met die Here te fokus, maar dan nie as 'n nuwe wet nie. En dit hoef nie noodwendig 'n Saterdag of 'n Sondag te wees nie. Dit kan enige dag wees.

Die lering wat die kerk ontstaan het dat die onderhouding van die Sondag **in die plek van** die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag gekom het, kan dus nie Bybels verantwoord word nie (baie van die Sewende Dag Adventiste sê dat 'n sekere Rooms Katolieke Pous die Sondag as 'n sabbat in die plek van die Saterdag-sabbat ingestel het op 'n sekere dag en datum. Dit kan egter nie histories bewys word nie. Dit kom hoofsaaklik van een Van Ellen White se visioene. Dit is eerder 'n lering wat in die vroeë Rooms Katolieke kerk ontwikkel het

Gevolgtrekking

Vanuit die regte verstaan van die posisie wat die wet moet inneem in die lewe van die Nuwe

Testamentiese Christen, spreek dit vanself dat die wet - waarvan die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag deel was - slegs 'n tugmeester en 'n skaduwee is van die toekomstige weldade in die evangelie van genade wat aangeneem word deur die geloof.

Heb 10:1 "Want die wet, wat 'n **skaduwee** het van die toekomstige weldade, nie die beeld self van die dinge nie, kan nooit deur dieselfde offers wat jaar na jaar gedurig gebring word, die wat toetree, tot volmaaktheid lei nie."

Deur geloof in Christus tree ons toe tot die ware **sabbatsrus** in Hom (Heb 4:9), wat spreek van die Nuwe Testament van sy bloed wat 'n volkome regverdiging en vrymaking is van die wet van die sonde en die dood. Dit spreek van die nuwe vryheid (Gl 5:1,18) en lewe in 'n persoonlike verhouding met Christus self. Dit is waarheen die Sabbatdag gewys het. Christus self kom dus in die plek van die Sabbatdag, nie die Sondag nie.

Ek kan die kern van die Christen se nuwe stand in Christus nie beter saamvat as in die woorde van Paulus nie:

Rm 8:1-4 "Daar is dan nou geen veroordeling vir die wat in Christus Jesus is nie, vir die wat **nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees.**

(2) Want die **wet** van die **Gees van die lewe in Christus Jesus** het my vrygemaak van die **wet van die sonde en die dood**. (3) Want God het wat vir die **wet onmoontlik was**, omdat dit kragteloos was deur die vlees deur sy eie Seun in die gelykheid van die sondige vlees te stuur, en dit ter wille van die sonde, die sonde **veroordeel in die vlees**, (4) sodat die **reg van die wet vervul kon word in ons wat nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees.**"

Gl 5:18 sê daarom: "Maar as julle deur die **Gees** gelei word, dan is julle **nie onder die wet nie.**"

As ons deur die **Gees** van God wandel en ons altyd aan Sy leiding oorgee, sal ons alles doen wat God van ons verlang. Dit vind praktiese uitdrukking in die liefdesgebod: vir God en die naaste. Saam met die werking van die Gees in en

deur ons lewens gaan **geloof**. Die **wet van geloof** kom in die plek van die wet van werke (Rm 3:27-28). Geloof berus in alle opsigte op die verdienste van Christus. Hy het die wet kom vervul. Hy het alles gedoen wat nodig is vir ons om gered te word. Daar is geen addisionele voorwaardes en wette (insluitende Sabbatdag-onderhouding) wat as voorwaarde kan dien vir redding of 'n bydrae kan lewer tot ons saligheid nie. Alles waarvoor die Ou Testament staan; al God se wette en profesieë is **vervul, nagekom, ingesluit en vervat** in Jesus Christus self en die werk wat Hy op aarde gedoen het en nog gaan doen. Daarom, om Christus te ken **oortref alles in waarde**.

Flp 3:7-11 "Maar wat vir my wins was, dit het ek om Christus wil skade geag. (8) Ja waarlik, ek ag ook alles skade om die uitnemendheid van die kennis van Christus Jesus, my Here, ter wille van wie ek **alles prysgegee** het en as drek beskou, om Christus as wins te verkry (9) en in Hom gevind te word, **nie** met my geregtigheid wat **uit die wet is nie**, maar met dié wat **deur die geloof in Christus** is, die geregtigheid wat uit God is deur die geloof; (10) sodat ek **Hom kan ken** en die krag van sy opstanding en die gemeenskap aan sy lyde terwyl ek aan sy dood gelykvormig word, (11) of ek miskien die opstanding uit die dode kan bereik."

Het die onderhouding van die Sondag in die plek gekom van die onderhouding van die Saterdag? Moet 'n Christen hoegenaamd een dag bo 'n ander ag? Hierdie artikel was vroeër "Die wet en die sabbat." Daar is nou 'n aparte artikel: Die wet (uitgebrei). Dit lê ten grondslag van hierdie artikel en moet hiermee saam verstaan word.

Bespreking begin:

'Sabbat' en 'Onderhouding' van die Sabbat

Philip du Toit:

"Lyk my u praat van die 10 gebooie. U sê nogal interessante dinge. U sê die Sabbat regdeur die Bybel dui op Christus. Ek kon egter nie met sekerheid aflei wat u onder die Sabbat verstaan nie. Sê u die sabbat is in Christus vervul, sodat ons nie nodig het om 'n sekere dag as sabbat te onderhou nie, en dat ons net onself aan Christus moet verbind en in Hom moet rus? Of verstaan ek u verkeerd?"

"Soos ek jou verstaan bou jy die argument vir die onderhouding van die sabbat hoofsaaklik op Genesis wat sê dat God gerus het van sy werk.

2. Ek verstaan ook dat jy nie sabbatsonderhouding sien as 'n werk wat 'n bydrae kan lewer tot jou verlossing nie, maar dat dit deel is van God se geskenk aan ons deur Christus en dat sy Gees dit in ons harte werk."

"Soos ek jou verstaan bou jy die argument vir die onderhouding van die sabbat hoofsaaklik op Genesis".

Gerhard Ebersöhn:

Nee! Ek bou 'my', 'argument van die Sabbat' en, "vir die onderhouding van die Sabbat" uitsluitlik, enkel en alleen, op die "*Rus* (wat) *Jesus aan hulle verskaf het*" met Opstanding uit die dood en dode en die graf. "God het van sy werk gerus" = **Efesiërs 1:19-22!** Dis hoe – nie ek nie, maar – die Skrif, Genesis-Rus en Evangelie-Rus bymekaar bring; dis hoe – nie ek nie, maar – die Skrif, Genesis-Sabbat en Evangelie-Sabbat, bymekaar bring.

Daar is die betekenisvolle maar onlosmakelike verskil en onderskeiding tussen 'Die **Sabbatdag**' as sodanig, die Sabbatdag **geglo**, en, **onderhouding** van die Sabbatdag.

'Die **Sabbatdag**' is die Here s'n; sy skepping; Hy mag dit vir die mens gee, of nie gee nie. (Tussen Genesis 2 en Exodus 20.) Nogtans het God by die skepping al vir **Christus** in die Sabbatdag verborge gehou met die oog op die 'Vandag' van die Evangelie. Die Sabbatdag **geglo** is genadegawe van die Here aan die mens. Tog loop eer die mens die gawe meer as die Gewer. (Tussen Exodus 20 en Markus 2.) Maar die Sabbatdag **waarlik** geonderhou, is die Kerk

en gelowige se **teruggee** aan die **Here** wat aan Hom **behoort** en wat Hom **toekom**. Dan word "*Sabbatdag geonderhou*", "*Sabbattefees*" van **Christus**, en "*gevier*". "*Gevier*", as en omdat, **Opstandings-
"Dag – uit die dode – van die Here"** – '*kuriakee heemera*'!

(Kolossensiers 2)

'Die **Sabbatdag**' én net so, die Sabbatdag **geglo**, is die werk en wilsbesluit van **God**; Sabbats-**onderhouding** is God se gee van die Sabbatdag in die hart, in die hand, en in die geleentheid van die **mens as verlose en die mens as Gemeente**— en is daarom en word so, '**Wet**' vir die mens as Gemeente van Christus se Eie.

("Christus **se Eie**" – Kol2:17 – Gemeente én individu!) Dit "*bly oor vir* (hierdie) *die Volk van God*" – dit "*bly oor vir die* **Volksburger** om te doen – om te gehoorsaam. Die mens kan nou met strooi of met stene op hierdie fondament gaan bou. Die Here sal elkeen se bouwerk, self toets.

U verstaan my reg, **én**, verkeerd.

U verstaan my **reg** as u noem dat:

(1) "die Sabbat regdeur die Bybel dui op Christus";

(2) "die sabbat is in Christus vervul";

(3) "ons onself aan Christus moet verbind en in Hom moet rus".

U verstaan my **verkeerd** as u veronderstel dat ek praat van:

(1) "die 10 gebooie";

(2) "ons nie nodig het om 'n sekere dag as sabbat te onderhou nie" mits u bedoel die Sewendedag Sabbat.

Beperkinge ('Wet') oor hoe ons onself van die Skrif gaan bedien: Toets elke toepassing asseblief aan die riglyne hierin gevind:

Die Woord: "*Maar ons weet dat die Wet goed is as iemand dit wettiglik gebruik en solank hy weet dat die Wet nie gegee is vir die regverdige nie, maar vir die wettelose en ... wat daar anders met die gesonde leer in stryd is volgens die Evangelie van die Heerlikheid van die salige God.*" 1Tm1:8v. Hieruit is klaar duidelik die Wet van God stel sy eie '**Wet**' oor hoe hy gehanteer '**moet**' word. Ons **aanvaar** hierdie Wet van God as "*steeds geldend*". Dis by voorbaat ooreengekom!

Hierdie onbuigbare reël maak uitsprake soos die volgende van uself, dat u uself onder die kategorie, 'onder die Wet', inbring:

(1) "Hoe kan ons "**ontslae**" wees van die wet en dit "afgesteef" het (Rm 7:6) en "nie meer onder die wet" wees nie (Rm 6:14,15)";

(2) "Die aanbreek van die Nuwe Testament dui die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte aan. ... Daarmee het Christus **weggedoen** met alle vorme van fisiese wette."

(3) "Hy het die Nuwe Testament ingelei waaronder ons as Christene **nie meer onder die wet** is nie, maar onder die genade. Ons is nie meer onder die verpligting om die Ou Testamentiese wette te onderhou nie, maar die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons **vrygemaak van die wet** van die sonde en die dood."

Let by voorbeeld op u laaste stelling – die ander kom op dieselfde neer. U **identifiseer** absoluut die Sabbatsgebod ("Die onderhouding van die sabbat is 'n Ou Testamentiese instelling"; "die Ou Testamentiese, fisiese sabbatsgebod"), en "die wet van die sonde en die dood".

Dit is noodsaaklik dat hierso twee dinge eers uitgeklaar word, want dit gaan die hele gang van ons gesprek vorentoe bepaal.

(1) U sou na alle waarskynlik nooit verklaar het dat "ons as Christene nie meer onder die wet is nie, maar onder die genade ... die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van die sonde en die dood", as u regtig bedoel het, "die Ou Testamentiese wette" nie: **U sou geen saak** met die Ou-Testament of met die 'ou wet' van Tien Gebooie gehad het as dit nie vir die **Sabbatsgebod van die Sewende Dag Sabbat-dag**, gewees het nie. In al die jare wat ek in gesprek met mense was het ek nog nooit een teëgekome wat nie **eintlik** bedoel nie, '*ons as Christene is nie meer onder die wet van die **Sewende Dag Sabbatdag** nie, maar onder die genade ... die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die **Sewende Dag Sabbatdag** van die sonde en die dood*'. (Dit sou natuurlik té reguit en té eenvoudig gewees het.) Nog nie één mens nie, en u sou óók nie van "die Ou Testamentiese wette" gepraat het was dit nie dat u eintlik en **uitsluitlik** die Sabbat en Sabbatsgebod, en spesifiek, '**Die Sewende Dag Sabbat**', bedoel nie. Daarmee – het u gevrees – sal die hele sak patats uitgegooi daar lê: Die Sabbat is nie uit of onder die genade nie; dit is wetlik van die sonde en die dood. Dit sou té naïef en té blatant gewees het (té onnosel). Daarom gaan u slimmer en meer effektief, te werk.

(2) So ook hierdie tweede ding: Dit moet ook eers duidelik gestel word: **Dit wat** u met "die wet van die sonde en die dood" bedoel. Want uit u hele betoog is dit onontkenbaar dat u bedoel die sonde en die dood self; nie die 'Wet' daarvan nie. Dis die

universele taktiek wat universeel hoogs suksesvol die vraende denke mislei en verkul. Sommer met die intrapslag word die Sabbat na aard en oorsprong gebrandmerk: *Sonde en dood; vervreem van die genade; onder die vloek; vir God self, haatlik en wegwerplik*. Dit op die keper beskou, is alles wat u met hierdie uitlating van u, verklaar: "Ons as Christene is nie meer onder die wet nie, maar onder die genade ... die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van die sonde en die dood". **Ek glo u het dit self nie beseef nie**. Maar hoeveel duisende kere was ek al daarmee gekonfronteer! By meeste 'debateerders' ly dit geen twyfel nie dat hulle niks anders bedoel nie. Dis hoekom ek dit eers wou afhandel. Ek gaan voort met hierdie bespreking seker daarvan dat u uitlating wel neerkom op wat ek hier uitgewys het, maar dat u dit nie so bedoel het nie. As u bereid is, mag ons voortgaan.

Ons weet nou om op twee dinge te let: (1) Dat die Sabbat soos enige 'Wet' – Ou-Testamenties of Nuwe-Testamenties – beooredeel moet word; (2) Dat daaruit sal volg dat alle 'Wet' op dieselfde beginsel en gronde as God se 'Liefdesgebod' gerespekteer en heilig geag sal word, Want: "**Een is die Wetgewer. Hy wat mag het om te red!**", die God van Liefde, soos ons almal Hom ken en deur Hom geken wil word.

'Waar kom die Sabbat, dan vandaan?'

PdT: "Die eerste vraag wat mens moet vra is:

Waar kom die Sabbatsgebod **vandaan**? Die eerste teken van 'n Sabbatsgebod in die Ou Testament is in Eks16:23-30 waar die volk dubbel die hoeveelheid manna op die sesde dag moes insamel sodat hulle op die sewende dag kon rus."

PdT: "Die eerste vraag wat mens moet vra is: Waar kom die Sabbatsgebod vandaan?"; "As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing. Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie'?"

Waarom die Christen die Sabbat hou

Die **Sabbatdag** as "Die **Sewende Dag**" is **God** se Dag by wyse van en op grond van **sy eie wil, welbehag** en **genadebetuiging**. Geen ander dag van watter Goddelike verordening of uitverkiesing ookal, is dit, was dit of het dit op enige wyse geword nie. Die Sabbatdag as "Die **Sewende Dag**", kom van God af, en is deur God bedoel om as "Die **Sewende Dag**",

na God toe terug te keer – nie as leë Woord nie, maar vol van lofbetuiging aan Hom wat "die Sabbat gemaak het". "Gemaak het" is 'n ontsaglike begrip; nog groter die Here wat die Sabbat gemaak het! Die oorsprong van Sabbatsheiliging aldus, vind in **Christus Jesus** plaas, en vind in Hom in **opstanding** uit die dood en dode plaas, om een enkel rede van Sabbatsheiliging: Dat God in Christus Jesus "**op die** Sewende Dag (van die week) **gerus het**". Hier, is die direkte profetiese Woord van God, dat Christus "**op die** Sewende Dag (van die week)" uit die dood uit opgestaan het. Vat dit as jy kan! Wêreld, vat dit as jy kan! Of val maar weer terug op jou floutes en hersinskimme van "totale geestelike wedergeboorte ... (w)aarmee Christus met alle vorme van fisiese wette weggedoen het".

Die oorsprong van Sabbatsheiliging vind in **Christus Jesus** plaas, en vind in Hom in **opstanding** uit die dood en dode plaas, om een enkel rede van Sabbatsheiliging: Dat God in Christus Jesus "**op die** Sewende Dag (van die week)", **in Christus Jesus**, "gerus het". Want God het nooit "gerus" nie, het Hy nie in en deur en ter wille van en om rede Christus Jesus gerus nie; want God het nooit "**voltooi**" nie, het Hy nie in en deur en ter wille van en om rede Christus Jesus voltooi nie; want God het nooit "**geseën**" nie, het Hy nie in en deur en ter wille van en om rede Christus Jesus geseën nie; want God het nooit "**geheilig**" nie, het Hy nie in en deur en ter wille van en om rede Christus Jesus geheilig nie. En finaal: Dit alles, het God nooit gedoen, voltooi en "**volmaak**" nie, het Hy dit nie in en deur en ter wille van en om rede **Christus Jesus** in en deur en met, en ter wille van en om rede **Opstanding van Hom** uit die dode, gedoen en voltooi en volmaak nie! Dit is die enkel en uitsluitlike gronde van en vir Sabbatsviering— nie '**die Wet**' nie— niks, anders as Christus Jesus in Opstanding uit die dode nie— Die Wet van God! Christus Jesus as '**Die Wet**', ja!

Ontbreek die **Opstanding van Christus** uit die dode as allesinsluitende en terselfdertyd alles anders uitsluitende rede vir of verklaring van Sabbatsonderhouding by die Christen, ontbreek alles wat Christelik is, ontbreek alles wat geloof is, alles wat waarheid is, alles wat lieflik en alles wat loflik is daaromtrent— trouens, ontbreek alles wat Goddelik is en het die Sabbatdag mét sy onderhouding die verderflike eie geregtigheid van wettesistiese **mens**, geword.

NB!

Met die wettesistiese Sabbat, of Sabbatsgeloof, of Sabbatsonderhouding, wil ek seblief tog niks mee te doen hê nie. Want hoe tog sou ek daardeur gronde vir 'my' 'Sabbatsgeloof' kon gevind het; en hoe tog, gronde teen 'jou' 'Sondaggeloof'? Want as jy dink ek **allenig** het al hierdie 'opstandingsargumente' van my vir die Sabbat 'opgemaak', het jy nie geweet dis juis waar al daardie 'opstandingsargumente' van jou, vir Sondagonderhouding, vandaan

gekom het nie! Nou bly net een vraag oor – of duik, die enkele vraag op: **Staan dit Geskrywe? / Wat, Staan Geskrywe?** (PdT: “Wat is die Skrif daarvoor?”) Dan sê ek maar wêr: Kyk byvoorbeeld maar net na die woord so pas genoem, “God het die Sewende Dag, **gerus ...**”, en spoedig tel jy die spoor op, en kan jy dit regdeur die Bybel volg, tot op daardie laaste eerste Woord van Mt28:1-4. En maar nie eenkeer nie, sal jy op 'n dwaalspoor beland wat jou op Sondag gaan uitbring nie. Solank jy by die Skrif bly.

PdT: “Moet 'n Christen die Sabbat hou? Is dit Saterdag of is dit Sondag? Het die onderhouding van die Sondag in die plek gekom van die onderhouding van die Saterdag? Moet 'n Christen hoegenaamd een dag bo 'n ander ag?”

Hier is reeds 'n illustrasie van my bogenoemde ‘persepsie’. Hierdie vrae voorveronderstel ‘'n Christen moet die Sabbat hou’, want die enigste vraag is, “Is dit Saterdag of is dit Sondag” wat, ‘'n Christen die Sabbat moet hou’? So, ons stem dan saam, ‘*n Christen moet die Sabbat hou*’. Of, as hy nie die Sabbat moet hou nie, dan ook nie Sondag nie. Enige ‘*óf – óf*’ benadering, is vanuit die staanspoor asem mors. As daar 'n saak vir die Sabbat uit te maak is, sal die Christen die Sabbat moet hou—punt. As daar nie 'n saak vir die Sabbat uit te maak is nie, moet die Christen géén dag as Aanbiddingsdag, hou nie.

Dit is kenmerkend van enige en alle Sondag-voorstaan-redenasies, dat hulle sonder uitsondering eers die Sabbat takel om te probeer om dit af te takel; en as hulle die Sabbat klaar platgeloop het – egte Don Quixote styl – dan verbeel hulle hulle, hulle het nou die stryd vir Sondagheiliging gewen.

Maar die Sabbat is die werk van God se hande, en “*Hy sal die werke van sy hande nie laat vaar nie.*” Die Sabbat is 'n lofprysing aan hierdie Skepper God, méér nog omdat God die Sabbatdag Verlossingsdag “gemaak het”! Die hele skeppingswaarde van die Sabbatdag het van die begin af oorgegaan in die **verlossings-aandeel** en essensie wat dit van die begin af **voor geskape** was.

Ons weet immers almal die Sabbats-**gebod** kom van Sinai af. Maar, die Skrif nog vóór die Wet gegee was, spreek: “*God het op die Sewende Dag sy werk voltooi wat Hy gemaak het, en God het op die Sewende Dag gerus van al sy werke wat Hy gemaak het. Daarom* (van ‘en’) *het God die Sewende Dag geseën en dit geheilig, omdat Hy daarop gerus het van al sy werk wat God geskape het deur dit te maak.*”

Let op die herhaling van die Naam van God, om duidelik te maak alles omtrent die Sewende Dag Sabbat en sy instelling moet direk na God terugherlei word. Die mens het niks daartoe bygedra

nie. Die skeppingstorie van die Sabbatdag noem nie die mens nie. Die mens se enigste moontlike betrokkenheid by God se instelling van die Sabbatdag was as gevolg van sy sondeval. (Dit is egter nie nou ter sprake nie.)

Watter soort mens is dit wat gaan hoera skree omdat hy ontdek het daar is geen ‘wet’ in Genesis 2 wat die mens aanspreek om die Sabbatdag te onderhou nie? Juis omrede hierdie **sondige begeerte** van jou na “Wet op Wet, reël op reël”, o mens, het “*Ek vertoornê geword ... sodat Ek in my toorn gesweer het: Hulle sal in my rus nie ingaan nie!*”

Die mens het nóg in ‘praktyk’ nóg in gees ooit, **omdat die Wet so sê**, die Rus van God ingegaan—dis so 'n Ou-Testamentiese realiteit as wat dit 'n Nuwe-Testamentiese realiteit is --- **sodat God sy Genade in die dag van ontferming sou kon betoon!**

Ontvang. of verdien?

PdT: “Die eerste vraag wat mens moet vra is: Waar kom die Sabbatsgebod vandaan?”

Dit moet ons weet, **vóórdat** ons kan vra, ‘*Waar kom die Sabbat vandaan?*’— Die Christen het die Sabbat van God deur Christus Jesus uit die genade deur die geloof, **ontvang!**

Veronderstel net dat ons die Christenmens wêl die Sabbat ontvang het, en **vra dán**: Sou ons dit **só** ontvang het— van God deur Christus Jesus en uit die genade— of, anders, nié van God nie, nié deur Christus Jesus nie, en nié uit die genade alleen en deur die geloof alleen nie? Omdat dit anders sou beteken het dat ons die Sabbat uit die werke en verdienstelike van die mens en van die werke van die Wet sou moes gaan **verwerf** het. Daarmee sluit ons uit dat die Sabbatdag, die glo van die Sabbatdag, of ons onderhouding van die Sabbatdag ooit uit die werke van die Wet of eiegeregtigheid voort kon kom, maar gebore sal **móét** wees uit die saad van die geloof in ons harte deur die werking van die Gees van Christus, tot die eer van God en tot opbouing van die Gemeente van Christus, **alleen**.

Teenvraag: Hoe sou Christus deur die Sabbatdag of deur die viering van die Sabbatdag **nié geëer en vereer word nie** maar tog deur Sondagwaarneming? Die vraag mag op hierdie stadium vreemd voorkom. Maar ons gaan nie koeitjies en kalfies gesels nie; hieroor gaan dit, en uit die staanspoor is dit my persepsie van die hele ‘kwessie’: As daar geen saak vir die Sabbat uit te maak is nie, dan a priori ook nie vir die Sondag nie. Uitskakeling van die Sabbat beteken uitskakeling van Sondag. Dit gaan nie help om agterna ‘n saak vir Sondag te probeer uitmaak nie. *Ek is oor die algemeen en spesifiek nie 'n voorstander van aanplak-teologie nie.*

Waar kom die Sabbatdag dan vandaan? Van God se toorn of van God se genade? Ontvang die mens “die Sabbat van die Here

jou God" van die Wet af, of van **Christus Jesus** af? Of vanuit die **Meesterskap** van Hom wat die Sabbat gemaak het? Vanuit vóór die Verborgenheid van die Godheid Geopenbaar, of van ná die Verborgenheid van die Godheid Geopenbaar? En die antwoord is:

Vanuit die Verborgenheid van die Godheid Geopenbaar in Christus Jesus, self en direk, vanuit vantevore, en, vanuit daarna. Die Sabbat kom nie uit of van 'n tydvak nie; die Sabbat kom van die Here van die Sabbat af. Die Sabbat was die Sewende van die eerste sewe dae: net die Here kon dit gemaak het; dit het nie uit 'n vorige wêreld in ons tyd en wêreld in oorgespoel nie. God het die Sewende Dag Sabbatdag soos "*al die werke van God*", "*geskape: deur dit te gemaak het*". En hoe het God die Sewende Dag Sabbat gemaak? soos al sy ander werke: Deur te **gespreek** het: "*U het gespreek, en dit was.*" "*Want aldus het God aangaande die Sewende Dag gespreek: En God het op die Sewende Dag van al sy werke gerrus.*" God het met Wetspreking, alles gemaak wat Hy geskep het: ook die Sabbatdag. Nou wil ons God se Werke, sy Spreke en sy Wet, van hierdie dag losmaak en daarvan 'ontslae wees' asof dit van ons afhang of ons kan! Waar kom die Sabbat vandaan? Is die mens heer oor die Sabbatdag? Kom die Sabbat nie van God Drie-Enig Vader, Seun en Heilige Gees af nie? Of het dit op kliptafels geografeer eerste van die berg Sinai afgekem? Dit was dieselfde Sabbat van die Skepping wat by Sinai in **Wets**-vorm ontvang was, ja. Maar die **Wets-vorm** was tydelik; die **Wets-inhoud** en **Wets-werklikheid** was wat en soos dit **uit die hand van God ontvang** was: **Na Inhoud: Genade.**

Die Sewende Dag

U standpunt(e) kom daarop neer dat die Sabbatsgebod saam met sy Sabbatdag en onderhouding, **vir die Christen taboe** is. Ja, as wat ek nou gesê het nie u standpunt verduidelik nie, hoef ons immers geen gesprek te voer nie. Is dit nie waarop u argumente neerkom nie? U vrae soos: "Die eerste vraag wat mens moet vra is: Waar kom die Sabbatsgebod vandaan?"; "As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing. Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie"? Trouens, dis waarop u uself met u hele poging toespits, om te wys en te 'bewys', hoedat die '*Sabbatsgebod saam met sy Sabbatdag en onderhouding, vir die Christen taboe is*', of te wel, téén die Nuwe-Testamentiese Gebod van die liefde en die Gees en vryheid: "*volgens die Evangelie in stryd met die gesonde leer*". U kannie verkeerd verstaan word nie.

Wat maak die Sabbatsgebod, sy Sabbats-dag en Sabbatte-onderhouding, vir die Christen iets wat téén die Nuwe-

Testamentiese Gebod van die liefde en die Gees en vryheid sou wees? En ek sal u self antwoord: Die feit dat dit steeds "**Die Sewende Dag Sabbat van die HĒRĒ jou God**"— soos in beide die Ou- en Nuwe-Testamente geïdentifiseer— is. Dat dit 'Ou-Testament' en 'Ou-Testamenties' is? --- Nee wat, want die "Liefdesgebod" is ook 'Ou-Testament' en 'Ou-Testamenties'. Dis net oor die ongerief, aanstoot en skande van "*Die Sewende Dag Sabbat*", en dat dit "*Die Sewende Dag Sabbat van die HĒRĒ jou God*" genoem durf word, **wat maak dat** die Sabbatsgebod, sy Sabbats-dag en Sabbatte-onderhouding, vir die Christen iets geword het wat téén die Nuwe-Testamentiese Gebod van die liefde en die Gees en vryheid sou wees. Daarom is die Sabbatsgebod saam met sy Sabbat-dag en Sabbatte-onderhouding, vir die Christen die grootste verleentheid en toets van respek of disrespek vir die Skrifte. Want volgens die **Skrifte**, is dit in ewigheid onmoontlik om hoegenaamd 'n **ander** aanbiddingsdag vir die Volk van God van alle tye en dispensasies aan te toon – en hoe ookal gehaat – verpligtend te maak. En volgens die **Skrifte**, is dit in ewigheid onmoontlik om hoegenaamd **sonder** Die Aanbiddingsdag vir die Volk van God van alle tye en dispensasies klaar te kom, of, om daarvan "ontslae te wees". Om "*Sabbatdagonderhouding vir die Volk van God*" te **negeer**, vereis om die **grondslae** van "*Sabbatdagonderhouding vir die Volk van God*" te negeer, **naamlik dit** wat vervat word in Hb4: 7-8 vóór vers 9, **én dit** wat vervat word in Hb4: 10 ná vers 9. Eerder gaan die hovaardige 'Christen' aan en stuit nie eers voor Skrifverdraaiing en Skrifverminking om sy eie afgodsdag van aanbidding bó Die Dag van die Here "*Aangaande waarvan God aldus gespreek het: En God het op die Sewende Dag van al sy werke gerus*", te verhef nie.

Die Wet het verval

PdT: "In die artikel: Die wet, word bespreek dat Christus by sy dood en opstanding die Ou Testamentiese wet vervul en beëindig het. Hy het die Nuwe Testament ingelei waaronder ons as Christene nie meer onder die wet is nie, maar onder die genade. Ons is nie meer onder die verpligting om die Ou Testamentiese wette te onderhou nie, maar die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van die sonde en die dood. Dit vind praktiese uitdrukking in die liefdesgebod van Christus: liefde vir God en die naaste."

PdT: "In Christus het enige vorm van wet verval. As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar

ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing. Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie."

PdT: "Ons as Christene is nie meer onder die wet nie, maar onder die genade ... die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van die sonde en die dood".

"Die Wet is gegee ... vir die wettelose en ... wat ... met die gesonde leer in stryd is volgens die Evangelie".

Volgens elke argument van u en volgens die geheel van almal, verklaar u eenvoudig dat die Wet en spesifiek die Sabbat-Wet,

(1): nie gegee is of, vir die Christen nog geld nie;

(2): en volgens die Evangelie

(3): met die gesonde leer in stryd is.

U maak op niks anders aanspraak nie met uitlatings soos die volgende (Want wat sou u dit anders voor gemaak het?):—

(1) "ons het nie nodig om 'n sekere dag as sabbat te onderhou nie";

(2) "As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing. Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie."

(3) "God vra dat ons nie ons harte verhard nie, maar dat ons in geloof ons harte oorgee aan Hom. Dit is die ware betekenis van die sabbat."

(4) "Hy bepaal nou weer 'n sekere dag in die plek van die Sabbatdag, naamlik vandag (4:7)."

(5) "Die uiteindelijke vervulling van God se belofte van rus is die rus waarin mense gaan as hulle glo in Christus en daardeur in 'n verhouding met God tree (Heb 4:3). Hierdie rus noem die skrywer 'n sabbatsrus."

(6) "Dit is dus die vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan en waarvan die sabbat 'n skaduwee is."

(7) "Omdat Jesus die Sabbat in Homself vervul het, nooi Hy ook mense uit om hulleself aan Hom oor te gee, hulle las af te lê en in Sy rus in te gaan. Dit is die ware sabbat."

(8) "Volgens die NT is die ganse wet (alle geskrewe wette, insluitende die tien gebooeie, asook die ganse pentateug) en profete: dit wil sê

die totale Ou Testament in Christus vervul. Niks is daarvan uitgesonder nie. Ook nie die sabbat nie."

(9) "Die onderhouding van die sabbat is 'n Ou-Testamentiese instelling, saam met al die ander wette. Dit alles was slegs 'n skaduwee, wat op Christus gedui het en in en deur Christus vervul is."

(10) "In Heb 3:11 is dit duidelik dat die rus waarin die volk moet ingaan, nie die sabbat is nie, maar die ewige rus in Christus."

(11) "Nou bepaal God weer 'n "sekere dag." Wat is die "sekere dag" wat vroeër bepaal is? Dis die sabbatdag!"

(12) "Maar nou bepaal God weer 'n sekere dag, maar nou is dit nie 'n spesifieke dag van die week nie, dit is "vandag" - elke dag, nou, enige dag!"

(13) "Behels dit die onderhouding van die fisiese, Ou Testamentiese sabbat, wat slegs 'n skaduwee was van die werklike ewige rus in Christus? Verseker nie."

(14) "Die konteks maak dit duidelik dat die term "sabbatisme" hier figuurlik gebruik word."

(15) "Dit sê dat hy wat in Christus se ewige rus ingegaan het, het ook die sabbat vervul. Anders gesê, hy wat in Christus rus het ook dit nagekom wat die fisiese sabbatsrus bedoel was om te doen."

(16) "Moet 'n Christen die Sabbat hou? ... Moet 'n Christen hoegenaamd een dag bo 'n ander ag?"

(17) "Hy het die Nuwe-Testament ingelei waaronder ons as Christene nie meer onder die wet is nie, maar onder die genade."

(18) "Ons is nie meer onder die verpligting om die Ou Testamentiese wette te onderhou nie"

(19) "maar die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van die sonde en die dood."

(20) "Dit vind praktiese uitdrukking in die liefdesgebod van Christus: liefde vir God en die naaste."

(21) "Paulus sê uitdruklik dat al die gebooie ("watter ander gebod ookal") saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm13:9)."

(22) "Die hele wet word vervul deur die gebod van die liefde (Gl 5:14)."

(23) "Die gebod van die liefde vir God en jou naaste is dus die enigste gebod wat nodig is om te onderhou."

(24) "Enige ander gebod word as't ware opgeneem onder die groot gebod. Die groot gebod sluit alle ander gebooie in. Die Sabbat is geen uitsondering nie."

My hoofbesware teen u metode in die algemeen is:

(1) Die onverantwoordelike manier waarop u Skrif gebruik.

(2) Dat u kategories, ongegronde aansprake maak.

(3) Dieselfde 'basiese argumente' oor en oor herhaal maar net met effense anderse woorde.

(1) "nie nodig" 1 en 23 = "verpligting" 18

(2) "byvoeg" 2 = "in die plek van" 4 = "Maar nou weer" 12

(3) "harte geloof" 3 = "oorgee" 7 = "glo, verhouding" 5.

(4) "vervul" 5,6,7,8,9,15,22; "nagekom" 15; "saamgevat" 21; "opgeneem" 24; "sluit in" 24.

(5) "sabbatsrus" 5, "figuurlik" 14,

(6) "ewige rus" 10, 13, 15.

(7) "skaduwee" 6, 7, 13 = "Ou-Testamentiese", "gedui" 9.

(8) "sekere dag" 11, 12, 13.

(9) "fisiese" vs. "werklike" 13.

(10) "dag ag bo" 16.

(11) "Nuwe-Testament" 17

(12) "nie meer onder wet" = "vrygemaak van wet" 17, 19.

(13) "onder die genade" 17.

(14) "wet van die Gees" 19.

(15) "liefde" 20, 22

Hierdie groeperinge kan verder saamgevat word, by voorbeeld: Onder "nie nodig" 1, 4, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; Onder "hart, geloof", "wet van die Gees" 3, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15.

Wat bly oor? 'Tegniese' aspekte soos "sabbatismos" se betekenis, 5, 6, 7, 8; en "een dag bo die ander ag", 5,7, 10. U vele argumente so ver, reduseer tot maar enkeles (ook maar sonder kern).

Waarmee PdT bedoel die Sabbat het 'verval'

Met valse logika:

Sou dit nodig wees om die Ou Testamentiese, fisiese sabbatsgebod tot nou steeds te onderhou? Verseker nie, WANT: dit is vervul in Christus ... Alle fisiese wette is in Christus vervul ... Die Sabbat vind vervulling in Christus ...

Met valse woorde:

In Christus het enige vorm van wet verval ... Christus het weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette ... sabbat 'n las af te lê ... opgehef in Christus ... geen Nuwe-Testamentiese gronde ... Ou-Testamentiese instelling ... nooit beveel om sabbatsgebod te onderhou nie ... die Ou Testamentiese wet vervul en beëindig ... Ons is nie meer onder die verpligting ...

Met valse Skrifture:

Christene is nie meer onder die wet nie maar onder die genade ... om die Ou Testamentiese wette te onderhou nie, maar die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van die sonde en die dood ... die oue is verby, alles het nuut geword ... Hy het weggedoen met vlees

Met valse beelde:

sabbatdag 'n skaduwee ... in die plek van die Sabbatdag / Sabbats-onderhouding ... niks uitgesonder behalwe die sabbat? ... vereis juis nie die onderhouding van 'n spesifieke dag nie ... Hy wat in Christus rus het nagekom wat die fisiese sabbatsrus bedoel was om te doen op Christus gedui ... daarheen gewys ... "sekere dag" vroeër bepaal die sabbatdag! Maar nou bepaal God weer ... enige dag! (behalwe die Sabbatdag)

Met skyn:

moet geestelik wedergebore word ... Gebod van liefde ingestel ... bekragtig deur wederbarende werk van die Gees ... juis nie ... geestelik nie

fisiese nie ... **God se weë** leer ken het ... **Nuwe Verbond** ... as ons nie ons **harte verhard** nie maar **glo** ... aan Christus verbind, tree ons toe tot die eintlike rus waarvan die fisiese sabbatsgebod slegs 'n **skaduwee** was.

Romeine 8

U verwys na **Romeine 8**. Maar hoe geregverdig is u toewyding van hierdie Skrifuur as onderlegging van u teorie, "Die wet vervul en beëindig ..."?

Wat is nié u 'teorie' nie?

Dit is Bybels waar dat: "Ons nie meer onder verpligting is om die Ou Testamentiese wette te onderhou nie"; **Dit is Bybels waar dat:** "die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus ons vrygemaak het van die wet van die sonde en die dood";

Dit is Bybels waar dat: "Christus die Ou Testamentiese wet vervul het".

Maar, dit is nié waar dat: "die Ou Testamentiese wette", "die wet van die sonde en die dood" is nie; (Sien hieronder onder Romeine 8.)

Dit is nié waar dat: "Die wet vervul" beteken "die wet beëindig" nie.

U teorie is daarom: "die Ou Testamentiese wette", **is**, "die wet van die sonde en die dood";

U teorie is daarom: "Die wet vervul" **betéken** "die wet beëindig".

Hier is hoe ú, die Bybel láát 'verstaan':

"Vanuit die regte verstaan (dit is nou, ú, 'verstaan') van die posisie wat die wet moet inneem in die lewe van die Nuwe Testamentiese Christen, spreek dit vanself dat die wet – waarvan die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag deel was", géén plek meer mag 'inneem' nie. Hoekom sê u dit nie reguit nie?

In Romeine 8 – die teksgedeelte wat u sonder om die teksplaas aan te toon, probeer gebruik – praat Paulus op sy besondere manier oor die wet. Hy praat naamlik van die **onderliggende 'wet' van alle 'wet'**. **Romeine 8:**

"1 Daar is dan nou geen veroordeling vir die wat in Christus Jesus is nie, vir die wat nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees. 2 Want die Wet van die Gees van die lewe in Christus Jesus het my vrygemaak

van die wet van die sonde en die dood. 3 Want God het – wat vir die wet onmoontlik was, omdat dit deur die vlees kragteloos was – deur sy eie Seun in die gelykheid van die sondige vlees te stuur, en dit ter wille van die sonde(-vergiftig), die sonde in die vlees veroordeel, 4 sodat die reg van die wet in ons wat nie na die vlees wandel nie maar na die Gees, vervul kon word. 5 Want die wat vleeslik is bedink vleeslike dinge, maar die wat geestelik is, geestelike dinge. 6 Want **wat die vlees bedink, is die dood**, maar wat die **Gees bedink, is lewe en vrede**, 7 omdat **wat die vlees bedink vyandskap** teen God is: want dit onderwerp hom nie aan die **wet** van God nie, want dit kan ook nie, 8 en **die wat** in die vlees is, kan God nie behaag nie; 9 julle is egter nie in die vlees nie, maar in die Gees as naamlik die Gees van God in julle woon. Maar as iemand die Gees van Christus nie het nie, dié behoort nie aan Hom nie. 10 **Maar as Christus in julle is, dan is die liggaam dood vanweë die sonde, maar die gees (of / en) Gees is lewe vanweë die geregtigheid**. 11 En as die Gees van Hom wat Jesus uit die dode opgewek het in julle woon, dan sal Hy wat Christus uit die dode opgewek het, ook julle sterflike liggame lewend maak deur sy Gees wat in julle woon. 12 Daarom dan broeders, is ons skuldenaars, nie aan die vlees om na die vlees te lewe nie; 13 want as julle na die vlees lewe, sal julle sterwe, maar as julle **deur die Gees die werke van die liggaam doodmaak**, sal julle lewe. 14 Want almal wat deur die Gees van God gelei word, dié is kinders van God. 15 Want julle het nie ontvang 'n gees van slawerny om weer te vrees nie, maar julle het ontvang die Gees van aanneming tot kinders, deur Wie ons roep: Vader! Vader! 16 Die Gees Self getuig saam met ons gees dat ons kinders van God is; 17 en as ons kinders is, dan ook erfgename, erfgename van God en mede-erfgename van Christus, **as ons naamlik saam met Hom ly**, sodat ons ook saam met Hom verheerlik kan word."

Wat is nou die onderliggende 'wet' van alle 'wet'?

"1 na die vlees ... 2 **die wet van die sonde en die dood** ... 3 die wet ... die vlees ... die sonde in die vlees ... 5 wat vleeslik is ... 6 wat die vlees **bedink** ... **die dood** ... 7 **vyandskap** teen God ... dit onderwerp hom nie ... 8 in die vlees ... **kan** God nie behaag nie; ... 9 die Gees van Christus **nie het nie** ... **behoort** nie aan Hom nie ... 10 die **liggaam** ... dood ... vanweë die **sonde** ... 11 julle **sterflike** liggame ... 12 die vlees ... om **na die vlees** te lewe ... 13 na die vlees lewe ... sal julle sterwe ... die **werke** van die liggaam ... 15 **gees** van **slawerny** ... om weer te **vrees**".

"Die wet van die sonde en die dood": "Die siel wat sondig, die *sál* sterwe!" of, "dié *móét* sterwe!" (Es18:4) = 'Wet'. Wie het gespreek? Gód het gespreek! **Die onderliggende 'Wet' van alle 'wet', is God!**

Hier is "die wet van die sonde en die dood":— "Die siel wat *sondig*, die *sál* sterwe!" of, "dié *móét* sterwe!", is méér as maar net 'natuurwet', vóór die 'wet van oorsaak en gevolge', stérker as, 'Doen sonde en vernietig jousef'. Want dit is 'Wet' naamlik van **Gód**; deur God 'ingegee'. "Die *krag* van die sonde is die *Wet*" ... die krag van die Wet, is God en sy Woord. 1Kor15:56-57. Daarom weerspieel hierdie Wet die karaktereenskappe van God waarvolgens dit ewiglik 'blywende' en 'geldende', ja, heilige, onveranderlike, 'Wet', is! "**Een is die Wetgewer: Hy wat mag het om te red!**" Jakobus het die Evangelie net so goed as Paulus verstaan. Hulle beskou dit net vanuit verskillende hoeke. Ons sal nou sien hoe Paulus presies dieselfde as Jakobus op net 'n heel ander manier, sê. "**Hy wat mag het om te red!**", is Hy wat **mág** – die alleenmag – het, om te **dóód!**

Hierdie "**Wet van die sonde en die dood**", is die Wet wat sê, "Die siel wat *sondig*, die *móét* sekerlik sterwe!" Es18:4. "Die *dag* as jy daarvan eet, sal jy sekerlik sterwe!" Gn2:17. Hierdie Wet:— 'Wet' van Gód se verordening en van geen mens nie, verwys Paulus na as 'die Wet' van **Verbod** eerder as Gebod: **Verbod** ván 'n "*gees van slawerny*", **Verbod** téén "*julle sterflikse liggame*", **Verbod** úit "*vyandskap teen God*", die 'Wet' van **Verbod** óór wat "*die vlees bedink*". Hierdie 'wet' waarvan Paulus in Romeine 8 praat, is "**Die wet van die sonde en die dood**"— dit is méér as 'natuurwet'; dit is **Goddelike 'Wet'!**

Die onderliggende "**wet van die sonde**" is: "*die dood*" – "*die engel van die dood is die sonde*", 1Kor15:56b. Die onderliggende "**wet van die dood**" is: "*die sonde*": die siel wat sterwe, het **gesóndig!** "*Want die loon van die sónde, is die dood*". Ro6:23. Nou praat ons van Goddelike Wet as 'natuurwet' of 'logiese' aksioma van oorsaak en gevolge of aksie en reaksie. Dis nie hoe die Woord hierdie Wet sien nie. Want die dood heers weens die **sonde**, en mens kan nie eers sê: Ja, maar as daar geen wet meer is nie, dan is dit ook nie sonde om daardie nog nie gegewe of verbygegane wet te oortree nie, want, sê die Woord: "**Tóg** het die dood geheers van Adam af tot op Moses" (Ro5:14) ... toe die Wet die eerste keer eers gegee was! Want hoe het dood in die wêreld gekom? "**Deur die sónde** het die dood in die wêreld gekom ... die dood het tot alle mense deurgedring **omdat** almal **gesóndig** het." Ro5:12b. "**Die krag van die sonde is die wet**"

(1Kor15:56b) en daarom was die Wet eerste dáár, ongeskrewe, in die geregtigheid van God naamlik bevat, en geldende, van vóór die sonde en van vóór die mens gesóndig het – wat bewys, "**wet van die sonde**" is: "*die dood*", en, "**wet van die dood**" is: "*die sonde*". God het dit vasgestel. As God hierdie Wet van Verbod nie spreek het nie, sou selfs die vrese van God bewaarheid moes word: "*As die mens net tog nie sy hand uitsteek en ook van die boom van die lewe neem en eet en lewe in ewigheid nie!*" Gn3:22: omdat niks teen die verordeninge van God kan geskied nie: "*Toe stuur die HERE God hom weg uit die tuin*"

Die poging om die Ou-Testamentiese Wet veral die Tien Gebooie en in besonder die Sabbatsgebod as 'die wet van die dood' of van 'die sonde', of van 'die sonde en die dood' te bewys, is die vlak, agtelose en lasterlike onderneming waarvoor mens geen simpatie mag koester nie. Want dit weerspreek God direk, waar Hy verklaar, "**Die siel wat sondig, die móét sekerlik sterwe!**" Dit weerspreek God óók direk, waar Hy verklaar: "*Wat 'n mens moet doen dat hy daardeur kan lewe!*" Neh9:29. "*Dit is jou lewe en lengte van dae.*" Dt30:20. Sekerlik moet hierdie relevante Skrifvergelings – al verduidelik hulle vergelyking met mekaar nie alles nie – mens waarsku nog voordat hy op die verkeerde pad land en die **Wette van God** wil uitmaak asof hulle vandat Christus gekom het die **sonde self** geword het. Dit is nie waar nie. "*Wat sal ons dan sê? Is die Wet sonde? Nee, gladnie! Intendeel, ek sou die sonde nie anders as deur die wet geken het nie.*"

En hoe sou ek God anders kon gedien het?

Begin mens net die 'eerste beginsels' van die Wette van God verstaan, begin jy dalk verstaan hoe die Nuwe-Testament oor die Wet spreek. Wat eerste en allerduidelikste opval, is dat die Wet "*steeds geld*" en allereers "*steeds geld*" in hierdie vorm: "**Die siel wat sondig, die móét sekerlik sterwe!**" En wat tweedens en onvermydelik opval is hierdie gebod: Dat juis vir hom wat wedergebore kind van God geword het, die Gebod "*steeds geld*": "**Die Gebod wat vir my die lewe moes wees, dié het geblyk vir my die dood te wees.**" 7:10. "*Ek het vroeër sonder die Wet gelewe.*" Noudat God my genadig was, nadat ek "*ten opsigte van die wet dood is deur die liggaam van Christus ... wat uit die dode opgewek is*", 7:4a, **nou**, "*vind ek 'n ander wet in my lede wat stryd voer teen die wet van my gemoed en my gevange neem onder die wet van die sonde wat in my lede is*", 7:23.

Moenie dink dis die wet van die bose nie, want dit is nie! Hier is **God in sy genade** na sy kinders toe werksaam:— "*Sonder die*

Wet het ek (Christenmens) *vroeër gelewe; maar toe die Gebod kom* (vandat en nou dat ek gelowige geword het en is), *het die sonde weer opgelewe --- en ek, het gesterwe!*" Ro7:9. "*Dwase mens! Wat jy saai word nie lewendig as dit nie gesterf het nie!*" 1Kor15:36 "*Ek, ellendige mens! Wie sal my verlos van die liggaam van hierdie dood? Ek dank God deur Jesus Christus onse Here*" ... "*Ek sterf elke dag ... hy wat gesterf het is geregverdig van die sonde.*" Ro7:24-25, 1Kor15:31, Ro6:7. "*Maar God gee dit 'n liggaam soos Hy gewil het.*" 1Kor15:38. "*Want alles wat uit God gebore is, oorwin die wêreld: en dit is die oorwinning wat die wêreld oorwin het, ons geloof.*" 1Jh5:4. Waar en hoe het Christus oorwin? Waar en hoe gaan ons oorwin, anders as in Hom en met Hom— aan die kruis deur dood en opstanding? Die Wet van die Gees en van vryheid en lewe, kom nie na ons toe alvorens Hy ons as die Wet van die sonde en die dood gekonfronteer en oorwin en gedood het nie.

God se **Verbodswet** – sy **Oordeelwet** wat die **dood gebied** oor die sondaar – is **Genadewet** tot redding oor hulle en vir hulle wat uit genade gered word deur die geloof. Dis God se weg wat Hy met elkeen van sy verlostes allenig loop deur Christus Jesus: "*As ons dan saam met Christus gesterf het, glo ons: Dat ons ook saam met Hom sal lewe!*"

"*Die Gebod wat die lewe moes wees*", Ro7:10a, is hierdie Wet: "*Die dag as jy daarvan eet, sal jy sekerlik sterwe!*" Ek herhaal! "*Die Gebod wat die lewe moes wees*", 7:10a, is hierdie Wet: "*Die dag as jy daarvan eet, sal jy sekerlik sterwe!*" "*Want as julle na die vlees lewe, sal julle sterwe*", 8:13a. **Hoe, en waarom?—** "*Die mens wat hierdie dinge doen, sal daardeur lewe!*" 10:5. "*As julle deur die Gees die werke van die liggaam doodmaak, sal julle lewe*", 8:13b. "*Maak dood dan julle lede wat op aarde is!*" Kol3:5. Dit is een en dieselfde Wet van God en is **al gronde** waarop Paulus konsekwent voortgaan: "**Dié Gebod** wat die lewe móés wees, **dié** het vir my geblyk die dóód te wees!" 7:10. Hy praat van hierdie Goddelike Wet: "*Die siel wat sondig, die moet sterf!*" Es18:4. Paulus veronderstel die heel eerste Wet en sê daarvan, "**Dié Gebod** wat die lewe móés wees, **dié** het vir my geblyk die dóód te wees!" **Sonder hierdie Wet het geen Christen ooit tot geloof gekom of ooit in die geloof kon bly nie.** "*Die Wet was ons tugmeester na Christus toe.*" Gl3:24. "*Wie sy kruis nie neem en My (deur die dood) volg nie, is My nie werd nie. Wie sy lewe vind, sal dit verloor; en wie sy lewe om my ontwil verloor, sal dit vind.*" Mt10:38-39. En daarmee val die 'argument' dat die **Sabbatsgebod** 'mee

weggedoen' is omdat dit 'wet van die sonde en die dood' was, self, in duie, want dit is met **my** waarmee eers én agterna mee weggedoen moet word, en nie die Woord van God waarmee ooit weggedoen kan word nie.

Nou praat Paulus van die (een) Wet van God; dan praat hy van " 'n ander Wet" van God, amper asof daar twee wette van God is. Dit is God, "*wat in ons werkzaam is*". Paulus se bedoeling is: Hoe daardie Een Wet van God "*in ons werkzaam is*" om in ons ons behoefte aan die God van genade wakker te maak: — naamlik **ons behoefte om gedood te word**; om soos die saad, eers te sterwe, voordat God ons liggaam wat Hy gewil het aan ons gaan gee. God gee dit **eers** wanneer "*deur die Gebod die sonde aanleiding vind en my verlei en daardeur gedood het*", 7:11; eers wanneer "*'n ander Wet in my lede stryd voer ... en my gevange neem onder die wet van die sonde wat in my lede is.*" Geen Christen, geen gelowige ooit was dit wat nie deur die Heilige Gees hierdie stryd in gebore was nie. Die Evangelie werk so en nie anders nie, vriend! Watter 'ander Wet' dan sal dit wees wat "*my gevange neem onder die wet van die sonde*", as dié Wet waaronder "*ons dien in die nuwigheid van die Gees*", "*die Wet, heilig en regverdig en goed*"? 7:6c, 12. "*Ek het vroeër sonder die Wet gelewe.*" Ro7:9a en 6a,b: "*Sonder hoop en sonder God in die wêreld*", Ef2:12. "*Maar toe die Wet gekom het -- " die Wet (waar)sonder die sonde dood is" en sonder krag, 7:8b -- het die sonde weer opgelewe en ek het gesterwe.*" 7:9c. "**En die gebod wat die lewe moes wees, dié het vir my geblyk die dood te wees.**" 7:10. "*Sodat die reg van die Wet vervul kon word in ons wat nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees.*" Ro8:4. Ja, dit is God se "Gees van lewe" wat die vyandigheid in ons **gedurig** dood en die knegskap **tot aan die einde** vernietig deur **elke dag** se afsterwe van die ou mens **saam met, in, en deur Christus Jesus**. Ro8:11, 17. "*As Christus in julle is, dan is die liggaam dood vanweë die sonde, maar die Gees is lewe vanweë die geregtigheid.*" Ro8:10. Lewe en dood in dieselfde siels- en lewenservaring en 'praktiese uitdrukking' van die wedergebore kind van die Here volgens hierdie die Grootste Gebod is: "*Ons het God lief omdat Hy ons eerste lief gehad het*".

Die Wet van die sonde en die dood, blyk dieselfde Wet as die Wet van die Gees en die Lewe te wees. Die enigste Gebod van God is die Liefde, want dit is net die Liefde van God wat mens tot sondebef bring— waardeur ons ou mens die stryd aangesê en gedood word: Om te kan lewe na die Gebod van God.

Geen mens beskik oor die reg of mag om daardie Wets-Woord, "*Die siel wat sondig, dié moet sterwe*", te mag spreek nie. Dis

geen vanselfsprekendheid dat "Die loon van die sonde die dood is" nie. Dit is Godswet. En onder daardie wet bly juis die **verloste** mens: "die wet heers oor die mens so lank as hy lewe", Ro7: 1b.

(Paulus sê, "Ek praat met mense wat die wet ken" — (7: 1a) proefondervindelik, 'ken' deur 'praktiese' ervaring van die **gelóóf**: "Want as ons met Hom saamgegroeï het deur die gelykvormigheid aan sy **dood**, sal ons dit tog ook wees deur die gelykvormigheid aan sy opstanding." Ro6:5. Paulus voorveronderstel die wedergebore gelowige Christenmens en hy voorveronderstel homself as die voorbeeld van een in hoofstuk 7. "Die gelykvormigheid aan sy **dood**" is die begin van en voorwaarde vir "die gelykvormigheid aan sy opstanding"; dit is die volgorde by die mens. In Christus het die beginsel andersom gewerk: Dit is die opstanding van die Here wat aan sy sterwe enigsins waarde verskaf. "As Christus nie opgestaan het nie, was julle nog in julle sondes", en het Hy – menslik gesproke – verniet gesterwe!)

So het God gewil sal die mens wat so geneigd is om te dink daar is niks met hom verkeerd nie en hy het aan niks behoefte nie, sy hele lewe deur daaraan herinner word dat God **net sondaars verlos**. Want God is Heerser oor lewe **én** dood, en iets is sonde omdat God dit sonde, wil, en, sonde, verorden. En die dood is die loon van die sonde, nie soos oënskynlik, in sigself nie, maar presies omdat Góð die sonde met die dood strafbaar wil, en, met die dood strafbaar, verorden.

Hierdie 'Wet' van 'vyandskap' en 'slawerny'— "**Die Wet van die sonde en die dood**"— in die vorm van die Tien Geboie of watter ander Wet ookal —, is geen 'natuurwet' nie, al geld dit vir al wat geskape en 'natuur', is. Al "vind" "die Wet van die sonde en die dood" "aanleiding" (Ro7: 11) na aanleiding van of "deur die Gebod" **van die Sabbat Dag**, is die Gesag en Krag van die Wet steeds dié van God alleen.

Iemand wat reken die Wet van God is geen faktor meer nie, weet nie eers wat hyself praat nie, wat nog "verstaan hoe die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat".

Die vraag, "Hoe kan ons 'ontslae' wees van die wet, dit "afgesterf" het (Rm 7:6) en "nie meer onder die wet" wees nie (Rm 6: 14, 15), **maar steeds verplig wees om die Sabbat te hou?**" is die vervolmaking van skynheiligheid, want dit negeer die Wet as Verbod sowel as Gebod, wat "oor die mens heers solank as wat hy lewe" – gelowige of ongelowige: oor die ongelowige " 'n verskriklike verwagting van oordeel", Hb10: 27; oor die gelowige om "in die nuwigheid van die Gees te dien", Ro7: 6.

Die eiesinnige wettiesheid wat aanspraak maak daarop dat 'Paulus uitdruklik sê dat al die geboie ("watter ander gebod ook al") saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm 13:9)', **maar dan eintlik daarmee bedoel** dat van die **Sabbatdag** 'ontslae' geraak en mee 'weggedoen' is, kan aan daardie verskriklike verwagting van oordeel nie ontkom nie. Asof daar geen Wet van God is wat meer geld, of vir die Volk van God oorgebly het nie, en dus ook nie meer " 'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag" nie, spog hulle: "In Christus het enige vorm van wet verval. As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing. Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie."

Hier is weereens die perfekte voorbeeld van en bewys vir my aantyding dat niemand oor die Wet as sodanig sou geprotesteer het as dit nie was vir die Sabbatsgebod daarin nie. Maar net soos hulle geraas, 'tale' en hulle gesigte insig is, is hulle 'kennis', verstaan, en hulle 'waarheid', waaragtigheid.

Die sabbat was nooit " 'n addisionele vereiste **vir** verlossing" nie; dis 'n leuen wat nou teen die Sabbat as vereiste **ván** verlossing, gehou word. "Ons" is nie by magte om een jota of tittel by te voeg of weg te neem van die Woord van God nie; dis nog 'n 'addisionele' leuen teen "die Sabbat van die **HERE** jou **God**", 'bygevoeg' met 'n ywer niks kort aan 'n "vereiste vir verlossing" nie. Die Sabbat, sy Dag en sy onderhouding is nooit " 'n vereiste **vir** verlossing" nie, "addisioneel" al dan nie. Die Sabbat volg die Verlossing na en is eerstens **gawe ván**, en dan gehoorsaamheid en vereiste **ván**, die verlossing wat ons uit **genade, deelagtig** gewórd het— **nie verdien nie!** Die Sabbat is ons onvoorwaardelike gehoorsaamheid so onvoorwaardelik as ons **verlossing** self. Die Sabbat is gehoorsaamheid **ván**, **soos áán**, die Evangelie van ons Here Jesus Christus. Die Evangelie van Christus sonder die "**Sabbatsonderhouding vir die Volk van God**" – dié 'evangelie' kom nêrens in die Nuwe-Testament voor nie; is heeltemal onbekend in die Nuwe-Testament. Gaan soek daardie 'evangelie' elders; gaan soek hom en kry hom in die eeue ná die eeu van Christus en van die lewende apostels.

Dus ken ons die Wet van God eerstens as **Verbod en Oordeel** (uit God se Liefde vir ons tot wedegeboorte, vrymaking en redding), **vóórdat en sódat** ons die Wet daarná, ook mag begin verstaan as **Gebod** uit God se **liefde** vir ons tot 'praktiese uitdrukking' van **innerlike vryheid en vreugde**. Hy wat nog nie deur die Wet van God as **genadegawe van oordeel en die dood** gekonfronteer was nie, sal ook nie deur die Wet van God as

genadegawe van lewe en oorvloed gekonfronteer gewees het nie. (Ons praat in Voltooide Tyd van die Wet. Hy kom nie in dele nie. Hy neem nie gedeeltes nie. Want God gee en neem alles of niks.) Hier kan ons nou begin praat van die Sabbats-**Gebod** as Sabbats-**Dag** en Sabbatte-**Fees**; nie meer slegs as Verbod nie, "nie jou sake doen nie ... nie jou gewone gang gaan nie, nie geleentheid vir jou sake soek nie of ydele taal spreek nie", maar ook "Onthou die Sabbatdag ... **want God het jou verlos**" — **Gebod!** (Uit Jesaja 58 en die Tweede Wetgewing, Dt5:12-15.) Al twee is 'nodig' en 'nog nodig'; en "geld daarom steeds": - Want **altwee** is God se enkele Woord van **Wet**.

Kyk hoe die Eerste Wetgewing, Eksodus 20, se Sabbatsgebod sonder die verlossingsmotief was; dit het nog net met die **begin** van Wets- en Genade-**Openbaring** te doen. Die Vierde Gebod is omtrent suiwer Verbod, tog ook nie só suiwer Verbod nie, want soos ander Gebooie soos "*Eer jou vader en jou moeder*", is dit nie in die vorm van '**Jy mag nie**' nie, maar is positiewe bevel: - "*Gedenk die Sabbatdag dat jy dit heilig!*" "*Ek is die HERE, jou God*", "*Ek het jou uitgelei*", as Hoof-Opkskrif, het ook op die Vierde Gebod betrekking. "*Want God het die Sewende Dag, gerus*", is **Gebod**.

Wie staan onder die Wet?

"Nou weet ons dat alles wat die Wet sê, hy dit sê vir **dié wat onder die wet is**, sodat elke mond gestop en die hele wêreld voor God doemwaardig kan wees." **Ro3:19**.

Paulus skryf in Teenwoordige Tyd: So staan sake **vir jou en my**: "*Die wat onder die wet is*" sluit vir my en vir jou in, anders het God nie "*elke mond gestop*" nie, en is nie "*die hele wêreld voor God doemwaardig*" nie, maar moet party mense soos ek en jy, met iets beters as God se Wet vorendag gekom het, en Hom, doemwaardig bewys het. Lasterlik, maar waar! Is dit wat u glo? Dis nie wat ek glo nie!

"Maar nou is die geregtigheid van God geopenbaar sonder die wet, terwyl die wet en die profete daarvan getuig." **3:21**.

Paulus skryf weer in die Teenswoordige Tyd, "... terwyl die wet en die profete (van) die geregtigheid van God getuig" — "*Vandag as julle sy Stem* (sy Woord, sy Bevel, sy Wet) hoor (sê): *Moenie julle hart verhard nie!*" Dis ek en jy aangespreek deur "*die Wet en die profete*" — dis nie Israel nie. Die Wet van God geld steeds. En let wel, "*die wet en die profete getuig*", **wanneer?** : "*Terwyl*", "*die geregtigheid van God geopenbaar is sonder die wet*". Die Wet is soos die heilige wesens wat

voor die Troon van God staan. Hulle verlaat nooit hulle pos nie "*en het sonder ophou dag en nag gesê: Heilig, heilig, heilig is die Here God die Almagtige, wat was en wat is en wat kom!*" Sing hulle nie van Christus nie?! Getuig die Wet nie van die heiligheid en lof van Christus nie? Nou maar dan geld die Wet mos nog, want waarvoor anders as om **die heiligheid en lof van GóD groot te maak** sal die Wet nog voor geld? Waarvoor anders sal die Wet nog geld as om **in die lewe van die Vólk** van God die heiligheid en lof van God nog groot te maak? Die bestaan en geldigheid van die Wet bestaan nog omdat dit vierkantig rus op sy **grond- en bestaansreg**: Die Reg van God en van God alleen, naamlik Sy alleen-Reg op **Heiligheid**; en sy alleenreg op **aanbidding**. Mens sal eers van hierdie bestaansreg van die Wet ontslae moet raak alvorens mens van die Wet "*ontslae sal kan wees*".

Is hierdie nou alles sover gesê verkeerd bewys? --- 3:22: "*Daar is geen onderskeid* (tussen 'ou' Israel en ons) *nie, want die geregtigheid naamlik van God deur die geloof in Jesus Christus (is geopenbaar sonder die wet) vir almal en oor almal wat glo* (Israel of Christen)." Ook Israel was "*sonder die wet*" geregverdig; ook Israel word "*deur die geloof in Jesus Christus*" alleen geregverdig. Geensins, want hierso is dit duidelik hoe die Wet **ten opsigte van die gelówige**, en die gelowige **méns** staan; nie hoe dit ten opsigte van sy gronde en kraggeldigheid **voor GóD**, staan nie. Dit is "*die wet vir almal en oor almal*", maar, "*almal wat glo*". Waar gaan u meer direkte woorde en begrippe vind wat presies die teenoorgestelde verklaar as dat die Christen van die wet ontslae is en nie onder die wet lewe nie! Die geregtigheid van God word sonder die wet: sonder beperkinge, sonder uitsluiting, geopenbaar. **Jy: onder die wet verworpene, verlorene, jy**, voor die geregtigheid van God in Christus Jesus, geen veroordeling meer geld oor of ten opsigte van jou nie – 'die wet' ten spyte en 'Die Wet' te danke! Want in Christus Jesus word dit bevind dat Wet en Saligmaker Een, en Dieselde, is, **en jy? Jou lewe saam met Christus, verborge in God!** Geen veroordeling meer oor jou nie! Maar "*die wet, vir solank as wat die mens lewe!*"

"Want almal het gesondig en dit ontbreek almal aan die heerlikheid van God." **3:23**. "*Waar geen Wet is nie, daar is ook geen oortreding* (sonde) *nie.*" **4:15**. Daar het ook nooit verlossing gekom nie! "*Almal wat sonder die wet gesondig het, gaan sonder die wet*" --- hemel toe? "*Die wet is vir die wettelose*", "*vir die oortreder*", **geen** "*tugmeester na Christus toe*", nie! Al daaraan gedink?

"Hulle (almal) word deur sy genade sonder verdienste geregverdig deur die verlossing wat in Christus Jesus is." **3:24**. "Nie die **hoorders** van die Wet (Israel) is by God geregverdig nie." "Ons sien dat hulle deur **ongeloof** nie kon ingaan (in die rus van God) nie." **Hb3:19**. Dis hoekom hulle nie "by God geregverdig is nie"—nie oor hulle onder die Wet was nie!

"Maar die **daders** van die **Wet** ("heidene", Christene, gelowiges, **2:14**) sal geregverdig word." **Ro2:13**— "**daders**, van die **Wet**!" "Want terwyl dit dan so **is** dat sommige in die Rus van God ingaan ... ons wat geglo het, **gáán** die Rus in." **Hb4:3, 6a**— ons, **Christene**, is "**daders** van die **Wet**!" Wie wil stry? "**Moenie dwaal nie! Geen hoereerders of afgodedienswaarders of egbrekers sal die koninkryk van God beërwe nie!**" Praat ek miskien van die Tien Gebooie? Ek praat van Paulus, 1Kor6:10! Ek praat van die Wet van God; en as die Israeliet dieselfde Wet in Exodus 16 gelees het, het hy die Wet van God wat ek gelees het, gelees; en dieselfde Stem van dieselfde God gehoor. "**Hoorders van die Wet!**" Die Wet verval? Nee! Vervul!

Daders sonder verdienste, net hulle word geregverdig en verlos – Israeliet of heiden. Daders **vir** verdienste – Israeliet of heiden –, hulle kan maar vergeet! Maar wat vir ons bespreking belangrik is, Paulus praat hier van die **Wet** wat deur **Christengelowiges** gedoen word, 'geonderhou' word, nie om verdienste nie, maar uit verdienste. Uit die verdienste naamlik van almal se Verlosser, van Jood én heiden se Verlosser – Jesus Christus naamlik – Verlosser van hulle wat die Wet "**gehoor** / **verneem** / **ontvang**" het en '**onder die Wet**' gelewe het, sowel as van hulle wat "**aanskou**" het en '**onder die genade**', die Wet van God uitgelewe en gedoen het— as Die Wet van God, gehoorsaam en geonderhou het— "**daders van die Wet!**" "**Want daar is geen aanneming van die persoon by God nie.**" **Ro2:11**.

"**Waar is dan die roem? Dit is in ieder geval** (hoorder of dader) **uitgesluit**. Deur watter wet is dan die roem? Deur die wet van die werke (wat vir die Christengelowiges geld, onthou hierbo!)? **Nee, die roem is deur die wet van die geloof** (wat vir die Israeliet-gelowiges gegeld het, onthou hierbo)! **Ons neem daarom aan dat die mens geregverdig word deur die geloof sonder die werke van die wet ... aangesien dit een God is wat die Besnedenes (Jode) uit die geloof sal regverdig en onbesnedenes (heidene of Christengelowiges) deur die geloof.** **3:27-29**. "**Want daar is geen aanneming van die persoon by God nie!**" **Ro2:11**. **Maak ons dan die wet deur die geloof tot niet? Gladnie! Inteendeel, ons bevestig die wet.**" **3:28**.

Niemand (behalwe die dwase) het ooit gestry dat die heidene deur die geloof geregverdig word nie; met ander woorde, Paulus sê eintlik hier, '**Ons bevestig dat die Jood deur of uit die geloof alleen, geregverdig word.**' Nou as die Jood deur die geloof alleen geregverdig word net soos die heiden-Christen, vir wat moes die Jood die Wet nog daarby ontvang het as die Heidengelowige dit nie ontvang het nie? Al wat oorbly is dat albei uit en deur die geloof alleen geregverdig word én dat vir albei "**die Wet daar bygekóm het sodat** (albei se) **sonde meer kon word**".

Waarom moet u reken die Wet moet mee weggedoen word alvorens mens van die regverdiging as suiwer deur die geloof kan begin praat? Solank mens van regverdiging praat, praat jy van vergifnis; en solank as wat mens van vergifnis praat, praat jy van die vergifnes van konkrete sondes – sondes wat oortreding van die konkrete Wet is.

Al tans moontlike verskil is in watter '**vorm**' die Wet ná Christus bestaan en funksioneer. Dat die Wet nog ná Christus bestaan en funksioneer is net so seker as vóór Christus. Daarom, as ek praat van in watter '**vorm**' en '**funksie**', dan praat ek nie vanuit die menslike standpunt nie – Wat moet **ek** nog doen? Wat mag **ek** nie meer doen nie? Nee! Ek dink vanuit die standpunt van die Wesenlikheid van die **Wet** self: '**Is** die Wet'? **Hoe** 'is die Wet'? **Wat** 'is die Wet'? En elke moontlike vraag word met een **Naam** geantwoord en beantwoord: Jesus Christus. "**Maak ons dan die Wet tot niet deur die geloof? Nee! Gladnie!** ("**God forbid**" --- Wet!) **trouens, ons bevestig die Wet.**"

Hoe die Skrif-Woord verdraai word

Romeine 8:1-4.

Philip du Toit:

Letterlike verskille met 'geestelike' betekenis

<p>Daar is dan nou geen veroordeling vir die wat in Christus Jesus is nie, vir die wat nie na die vlees wandel nie X maar na die Gees [die Wet van God hou.] Want die Wet van die Gees van die lewe in Christus Jesus het my vrygemaak van die wet van die sonde en die dood [in ooreenstemming met homself.] Want God het wat vir die Wet (van die Gees van lewe) onmoontlik was, omdat dit deur die vlees kragteloos was – deur sy eie Seun in die gelykheid van die sondige vlees te stuur – en dit, ter wille van die sonde(-vergifnis), die sonde in die vlees veroordeel</p>	<p>X Ons is nie meer onder verplichting om die OT wette te onderhou nie [want die OT wette is nie geestelike wette nie] maar die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van sonde en die dood – [asof in teenstydigheid met homself] dit ('die wet van die Gees') vind praktiese [dit is, in onssself [wat van die wet van sonde en dood ontslae is] uitdrukking</p>
--	--

sodat die reg van die wet in die liefdesgebod van Christus:
 vervul kon word in ons wat [deur onself vervul in ons]
 nie na vlees wandel nie maar na die Gees liefde vir God en liefde vir die naaste.

'Implisiete' verskille van geestelike belang—

Romeine 8:1-4, bedoelend:

Philip du Toit, bedoelend:

Daar is dan nou geen veroordeling –
 geen veroordeling deur die Wet steeds geldend –

Ons is nie meer onder verplichting
 – verplichting van die Wet mee weggedoen –

vir die wat in Christus Jesus is nie;
 vir die wat nie na die vlees wandel nie
 (vir die wat nie na die wet van die sonde wandel nie)

om die OT wette te onderhou nie –
 waarvan die Sabbat een was, wat die wet

maar na die Gees –
 wat in Christus en in die genade inbring –

van sonde en die dood geword het omdat dit
 van Christus losmaak en van genade laat verval.

Want die Wet van die Gees van die lewe
 in Christus Jesus, het my vrygemaak
 van die wet van die sonde en die dood
 – soos in “na die vlees te wandel” –

Maar die wet van die Gees van lewe –
 in Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak
van die wet van die sonde en die dood
 – soos in Sabbatsonderhouding –

sodat die reg
 van die wet vervul –
 dit is, die reverdiging deur die geloof – vervul
 kon word **in ons** wat
 “uit genade deur die geloof” en
 nie na die vlees wandel nie –
 nie na “die wet
 van die sonde en die dood” nie –
 maar na die Gees
 en na “die Wet van die Gees van die lewe”.

Dit (die wet van die Gees) vind
 praktiese uitdrukking –
 dit is, ‘vervulling’ deur dade van ons eie
 van die liefdes-gebod van Christus:
 behalwe t.o.v. Sabbatsonderhouding
 want Sabbatsonderhouding wanneer van die
 Sewende Dag, is om onder “die wet van die
sonde en dood” te wandel; Sondag onderhouding
 om vrygemaak van die wet te wandel in
 liefde vir God en liefde vir die naaste.

Waaruit duidelik is:

Dat PdT (per ongeluk?) by gebreke gebly het om aan te toon
 dat Romeine 8:14 die Skrifuur was na aanleiding waarvan en
 waarop hy sy ‘bespreking’ van ‘die wet’, gebaseer het;

En dat Paulus in Ro8:14 geensins:

(1) die Sabbat ingedagte het nie; ook

(2) dat PdT nie ‘n woord of gedagte daarin rakende die
 Sabbat gevind het of kon vind nie anders as deur valse suggestie;

(3) dat valse suggestie die basis en substansie van teen-
 Sabbatsargumente is, moet wees, en sal wees.

Ou-Testament en Christus word as **vyande** voorgestel
 daarin dat u sê, “Ons is nie meer onder die
verplichting om die Ou Testamentiese wette te
 onderhou nie” – wat die direkte en verloënende weerspreking
 van die teks is wat sê, “Daar is dan nou geen veroordeling vir die
 wat in Christus Jesus is nie”, of hulle Ou- of Nuwe-Testamentiese
 gelowiges is.

“Om die Ou Testamentiese wette te onderhou”
 beteken nou om “onder die verplichting” “van die wet
 van die sonde en die dood” te wees (soos wat PdT dit
 verstaan). Hy wat enige wet uit die Ou-Testament – trouens,
 “enige wet” – mag onderhou, is nie “van die wet van die
 sonde en die dood” “vrygemaak” nie, maar is nog “onder
 die wet” – vanselfsprekend dieselfde “wet van die sonde en
 die dood”. Nou word **Ou-Testament** en die “wet van die
 sonde en die dood” as een en dieselfde voorgestel, **asof nie
 ook die Nuwe-Testament net so** die “Wet van die sonde en
 die dood” vir ons en oor ons móét wees nie, **sodat ons ou mens
 daardeur gedood kan word, en ons weer na die Gees van
 Lewe en Geregtigheid opgewek mag word om God in
 nuwigheid van die Gees te dien.**

Dit is wat die “Wet van sonde en die dood” vir ons beteken
 het: *Deur ons te dood het Christus weggedoen met ons lede op
 aarde – lede van die vlees – geestelik sondige dinge. Saam met
 Hom in sy dood het ons dit afgesterwe. Hierdie wegdoening met
 die ou mens deur die doding daarvan volgens die Wet van die sonde
 en die dood, word bekragtig in ons lewens deur die wederbarende
 werk van die Gees. Rom 8:2 “Want die wet van die Gees van die
 lewe in Christus Jesus het my vrygemaak van die wet van die
 sonde en die dood.”*

En dit is dan nie wat die “Wet van sonde en die dood”
 gedoen het nie: “Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met
 alle vorme van fisiese wette. Hy het weggedoen
 met vlees (of die “fisiese”). Dit word bekragtig in
 ons lewens deur die wederbarende werk van die
 Gees” – want dit is geensins waar nie. Nóg Christus nóg die Gees
 het “weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette” –
 dis ‘n infame leuen.

PdT: “... die wet van die Gees van lewe in
 Christus Jesus het ons vrygemaak van die wet van
 die sonde en die dood. Dit vind praktiese
 uitdrukking in die liefdesgebod van Christus:
 liefde vir God en die naaste.”

PdT verswyg of weet nie dat “die wet van die Gees
 van lewe in Christus Jesus”, “die liefdesgebod van
 Christus”, “liefde vir God en die naaste”, die Groot
 Gebod vanuit “die Ou Testamentiese wet” is, en dit
 “vervul” nie? dat Christus Jesus Self die “praktiese
 uitdrukking” en “vervulling” van die “liefde vir God
 en die naaste”-Gebod van die Ou-, – én Ewige-Testament – is
 nie? PdT weet dit nie? Beteken dit dat Christus “die

liefdesgebod van Christus vervul en ... beëindig”? Dat God die Sabbatsgebod sou vervul en ... beëindig het?

Die Wanbegrip 'Vervul' = 'Beëindig'

PdT maak hierdie verklaring, “In Christus het enige vorm van wet verval”, op grond daarvan dat hy van mening is: ‘Omdat in Christus vervul, het enige vorm van wet verval’. Hy stel ‘vervul’ en ‘verval’ gelyk; hy identifiseer die twee.

“Vervul / vevulling” x 31 met herhalings ingesluit.

- 1) “vervul, sodat ons nie nodig het om 'n sekere dag as sabbat te onderhou nie”
- 2) “Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie. Die Sabbat vind vervulling in Christus in die sin dat ons in Hom rus.”
- 3) “die rus waarvan Josua praat (4:8) nie die finale vervulling van die belofte van rus is nie”
- 4) “Die uiteindelijke vervulling van God se belofte van rus is die rus waarin mense gaan as hulle glo in Christus”
- 5) “(Heb 4:3). Hierdie rus noem die skrywer 'n sabbatsrus. Dit is dus die vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan”
- 6) “Omdat Jesus die Sabbat in Homself vervul het ... in Sy rus in te gaan. Dit is die ware sabbat.”
- 7) “die totale Ou Testament in Christus vervul. Niks is daarvan uitgesonder nie. Ook nie die sabbat nie.”
- 8) “Dit alles was slegs 'n skaduwee, wat op Christus gedui het en in en deur Christus vervul is.”
- 9) “die Nuwe Testament die volle vervulling van die Ou Testament - die oue is verby”
- 10) “Alle fisiese wette is in Christus vervul. Die aanbreek van die Nuwe Testament dui die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte aan. Dit is die manier hoe mens deel raak van die Nuwe Verbond. Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette.”
- 11) “Die diepere betekenis van die sabbatdag,

dit waarvan die sabbatdag 'n skaduwee was, vind dus vervulling in die ewige rus in Christus”

12) “Die werklike rus is slegs in Christus, juis omdat die fisiese sabbatdag daarvan 'n skaduwee was, en daarheen gewys het, en daarin (in Christus) vervul is. Daarom bring hy juis in vers 9 die ewige rus in Christus en die sabbatsrus in verband met mekaar. Dus (ara) bly daar 'n sabbatsrus oor. Behels dit die onderhouding van die fisiese, Ou Testamentiese sabbat, wat slegs 'n skaduwee was van die werklike ewige rus in Christus? Verseker nie.”

13) “hy wat in Christus se ewige rus ingegaan het, het ook die sabbat vervul. Anders gesê, hy wat in Christus rus het ook dit nagekom wat die fisiese sabbatsrus bedoel was om te doen. Sou dit dus nodig wees om die Ou Testamentiese, fisiese sabbatsgebod tot nou steeds te onderhou? Verseker nie,”

14) “want dit is vervul in Christus, en deurdat ons deur geloof aan Christus verbind is, tree ons toe tot die eintlike rus, waarvan die fisiese sabbatsgebod slegs 'n skaduwee was.”

15) “die fisiese sabbatdag daarvan 'n skaduwee was, en daarheen gewys het, en daarin (in Christus) vervul is.”

16) “Christus by sy dood en opstanding die Ou Testamentiese wet vervul en beëindig het.”

17) “saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm 13:9). Die hele wet word vervul deur die gebod van die liefde (Gl 5:14). Die gebod van die liefde vir God en jou naaste is dus die enigste gebod wat nodig is om te onderhou. Enige ander gebod word as't ware opgeneem onder die groot gebod. Die groot gebod sluit alle ander gebooe in.”

18) “Die nuwe vervul en gee altyd dieper betekenis aan die oue. So ook het die Sabbatsgebod wel gebou op die beginsel van God se rus op die sewende dag (Eks 20:11), maar het eers in die woestyn as gebod en deel van die Ou Verbond tot stand gekom.”

19) “Dit beteken Jesus het die Sabbat in

Homself vervul. As Here van die Sabbat het Hy die mag om nuwe inhoud aan die Sabbat te gee."

20) "die rus waarvan Josua praat (4:8) nie die finale vervulling van die belofte van rus is nie"

21) "Die uiteindelijke vervulling van God se belofte van rus is die rus waarin mense gaan as hulle glo in Christus en daardeur in 'n verhouding met God tree"

22) "Hierdie rus noem die skrywer 'n sabbatsrus. Dit is dus die vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan en waarvan die sabbat 'n skaduwee is."

23) "Omdat Jesus die Sabbat in Homself vervul het, nooi Hy ook mense uit om hulleself aan Hom oor te gee, hulle las af te lê en in Sy rus in te gaan. Dit is die ware sabbat"

24) "Dit was nie nodig om hierdie dae te onderhou nie, want Christus het alles in almal vervul."

25) "Christus self is die Lam (Joh 1:29,36), waarvan die lam op die pasga 'n afskynsel was. Trouens Christus het ALLES waarvan die Ou Testamentiese Wet, Profete en Psalms praat in Homself vervul"

26) "ALLES wat deur die profete geskrywe is, sal aan die Seun van die mens vervul word."

27) "Luk 24:44 "En Hy sê vir hulle: Dit is die woorde wat Ek met julle gespreek het toe Ek nog by julle was, dat ALLES wat oor My geskrywe is in die wet van Moses en die profete en die psalms, vervul moet word."

28) "Ef 1:22-23 "En Hy het alle dinge onder sy voete onderwerp en Hom as Hoof bo alle dinge aan die gemeente gegee, (23) wat sy liggaam is, die volheid van Hom wat ALLES in almal vervul."

Die herdenking van die Sondag kan dus nie verstaan word as 'n nuwe wet nie."

29) "deur sy eie Seun in die gelykheid van die sondige vlees te stuur, en dit ter wille van die sonde, die sonde veroordeel in die vlees, (4) sodat die reg van die wet vervul kon word in ons wat nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees." Gl 5:18 sê daarom: "Maar as julle deur die

Gees gelei word, dan is julle nie onder die wet nie."

30) "Geloof berus in alle opsigte op die verdienste van Christus. Hy het die wet kom vervul. Hy het alles gedoen wat nodig is vir ons om gered te word. Daar is geen addisionele voorwaardes en wette (insluitende Sabbatdag-onderhouding) wat as voorwaarde kan dien vir redding of 'n bydrae kan lewer tot ons saligheid nie."

31) "Alles waarvoor die Ou Testament staan; al God se wette en profesieë is vervul, nagekom, ingesluit en vervat in Jesus Christus self en die werk wat Hy op aarde gedoen het en nog gaan doen. Daarom, om Christus te ken oortref alles in waarde."

"Vervul" na aanleiding van Skrifture waarna PdT verwys

Hebreërs: "(4:8)... die rus waarvan Josua praat... is nie ... die finale vervulling van die belofte van rus nie" – **sê PdT. En wat is**, "die rus waarvan Josua praat" in 4:8? :— Dit is die '*katapausis*'-rus!

"(Heb 4:3). **Hierdie** rus noem die skrywer 'n **sabbatsrus**. Dit is **dus** die vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan", of te wel, "die **finale** vervulling van die belofte van rus".

"vers 9... Die werklike rus is **slegs** in Christus, **juis omdat** die fisiese sabbatdag daarvan 'n skaduwee was, en **daarheen** gewys het, en **daarin** (in Christus) vervul is." **Kon PdT sy weersprekend opsigteliker gemaak het?**

Want die 4:8 'rus' – die '*katapausis*'-rus –, was dié rus wat God sê in gehoorsaamheid deur die geloof in ingegaan moet word, 3:11, 18, 4:1, 3. Wat daarenteen, was die "rus (wat) die skrywer 'n **sabbatsrus** noem" in 4:9? :— Letterlik, idiomaties en etimologies: die '*sabbatismos*'-"*n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag!* **Wíé** het **wíé**, in die 4:8 'rus' – die '*katapausis*'-rus – in ingebring? Die skrywer sê, "*Jesus het aan hulle die rus verskaf*".

Vir wie "*bly dit nog geld*" om te '*sabbatismos*' in 4:9? :— Die skrywer sê: "*Daarom dan bly dit nog vir die Volk van God geld*"

Maar sien Hebreërs 4:9 hier onder nader op ingegaan.

"(Rm 13:9)... saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself".

"(Gl 5:14)... Die hele wet word vervul deur die gebod van die liefde."

Is dít, "beëindig"? Rm13:9, 'saamgevat' ... Mens breek een stokkie maklik op sy eie; mens kannie die saamgevatte bondel stokkies breek nie al probeer jy hoe. Die Wet was saamgevat en so **versterk**.

Is dít, "beëindig"? Gl5:14 'vervul' ... Dis net die teenoorgestelde: Dit beteken om te **begin in en met eerste-maal-volheid**, want voorheen was niks, al ooit, 'vervul' nie.

(Eks 20:11) **Soos PdT net dieselfde sê**: "Die nuwe vervul en gee altyd dieper betekenis aan die oue. So ook het die Sabbatsgebod **wel gebou** op die beginsel van **God** se rus op die sewende dag (Eks 20:11), maar het **eers** in die woestyn as gebod en deel van die **Ou Verbond tot stand gekom**." Waar begin? waar "tot stand gekom", "as gebod en deel van die **Ou Verbond**"? '**Eers**' in Eksodus 20! Eksodus 20 is die begin van die **Ou Verbond**, ja! **Genesis 2**, is die **Nuwe** en **Ewige** Verbond gegrond in, en gebasseer en "gebou op die beginsel van God se rus op die sewende dag" soos verse 2-3 verhaal! PdT sê so! Eksodus 20 is vir die Volk van God gegee om in geloof te gehoorsaam. **Hulle** het nouliks gesweer: "Ons sal! Ons sal!" of geortree, "omdat (die Evangelie) by die hoorders nie met die geloof verenig was nie". (Hb4:2c) Dis die Ou Verbond; hy gaan heden vandag so sterk aan as ooit tevore. As daar geskrywe staan: "Daar bly vir die Volk van God hulle onderhouding van die Sabbatdag geld", is ons nie instaat om die **Evangelie te hóór** nie, want dit gaan nie by ons met die geloof verenig nie.

'Vervul', óf, 'verval' in groter verband

Ek haal minstens een bladsy aan en **onderstreep** om 'verval' te beklemtoon, terwyl PdT reeds **beklemtoon** het waar hy 'vervul' uitgelig het:

"In Christus het enige vorm van wet verval. As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing. Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie. Die Sabbat vind vervulling in Christus in die sin dat ons in Hom rus.

.... Vanuit die regte verstaan van die posisie wat die wet moet inneem in die lewe van

die Nuwe Testamentiese Christen, spreek dit vanself dat die wet - waarvan die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag deel **was** - slegs 'n tugmeester en 'n skaduwee is van die toekomstige weldade in die evangelie van genade wat aangeneem word deur die geloof.

Heb 10:1 "Want die wet, wat 'n **skaduwee het** van die toekomstige weldade, nie die beeld self van die dinge nie, kan nooit deur dieselfde offers wat jaar na jaar gedurig gebring word, die wat toetree, tot volmaaktheid lei nie."

Deur geloof in Christus tree ons toe tot die ware **sabbatsrus** in Hom (Heb 4:9), wat spreek van die Nuwe Testament van sy bloed wat 'n volkome regverdiging en vrymaking is van die wet van die sonde en die dood. Dit spreek van die nuwe vryheid (Gl 5:1,18) en lewe in 'n persoonlike verhouding met Christus self. Dit is waarheen die Sabbatdag gewys het. Christus self kom dus **in die plek** van die Sabbatdag, nie die Sondag nie.

Ek kan die kern van die Christen se nuwe stand in Christus nie beter saamvat as in die woorde van Paulus nie:

Rm 8:1-4 "Daar is dan nou geen veroordeling vir die wat in Christus Jesus is nie, vir die wat **nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees**.

(2) Want die **wet** van die **Gees van die lewe in Christus Jesus** het my vrygemaak van die **wet van die sonde en die dood**. (3) Want God het wat vir die **wet onmoontlik was**, omdat dit kragteloos was deur die vlees deur sy eie Seun in die gelykheid van die sondige vlees te stuur, en dit ter wille van die sonde, die sonde **veroordeel in die vlees**, (4) sodat die **reg van die wet vervul kon word in ons wat nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees**."

Gl 5:18 sê daarom: "Maar as julle deur die **Gees** gelei word, dan is julle **nie onder die wet nie**."

As ons deur die **Gees** van God wandel en ons altyd aan Sy leiding oorgee, sal ons alles doen wat God van ons verlang. Dit vind praktiese uitdrukking in die liefdesgebod: vir God en die naaste. Saam met die werking van die Gees in en

deur ons lewens gaan **geloof**. Die **wet van geloof** kom **in die plek** van die wet van werke (Rm 3:27-28). Geloof berus in alle opsigte op die verdienste van Christus. Hy het die wet kom vervul. Hy het alles gedoen wat nodig is vir ons om gered te word. Daar is geen addisionele voorwaardes en wette (insluitende Sabbatdag-onderhouding) wat as voorwaarde kan dien vir redding of 'n bydrae kan lewer tot ons saligheid nie. Alles waarvoor die Ou Testament staan; al God se wette en profesieë is **vervul, nagekom, ingesluit en vervat** in Jesus Christus self en die werk wat Hy op aarde gedoen het en nog gaan doen. Daarom, om Christus te ken **oortref alles in waarde.**"

Merkwaardig is dit dat ek **nie by een** van PdT se eie benadrukte frases, onderstreping daarby kon aanbring nie. As ek soos PdT – 'vervul' wou benadruk het – sou ek seker ook min of meer soos hy benadruk het. Tog kan ek my nie 'n groter gaping as tussen ons twee se sieninge voorstel nie!

Waar het PdT benadruk? Hy het in die **Skrifture** self, woorde benadruk. Hy benadruk op ses woorde en drie frases na, **niks** van sy **eie** woorde nie. Nou kom ek en waar onderstreep ek? Ek vind geleentheid om te onderstreep **nêrens** in die **Skrifture** wat PdT aangehaal het nie! Ek vind dit nodig om te onderstreep, nêr waar dit **PdT** se woorde is!

Waarom het PdT benadruk? Om 'vervul(ing)' aan te toon – hy het die Skrif daarvoor kon vind. Waarom het ek geonderstreep? Om 'verval' en enigiets in daardie rigting uit te wys – en kon géén **Skrif** vind om te benadruk nie! Op ses woorde en drie frases van PdT se **eie** woorde na, kon ek tussen al die aangehaalde **Skrifture**, **niks** onderstreep nie!

Selfs van die ses woorde en drie uitsonderlike frases uit **PdT** se pen om 'vervul' uit te lig, van bo na onder, '**skaduwee**', '**sabbatsrus**', '**Gees**', '**geloof**', '**wet van geloof**', '**vervul**', '**nagekom**', '**ingesluit en vervat**', '**oortref alles in waarde**', sou ek nie één kon onderstreep om 'verval' mee aan te toon nie!

Watter van PdT se woorde beteken dit wat ek moes onderstreep om 'verval' uit te wys? Ek het geonderstreep, '**verval**', '**was**', '**het**', '**in die plek**', '**in die plek**'. Almal sý uitdrukkings. Hy gebruik dus **vier** begrippe **van sy eie** in die hele aangehaalde stuk waarvan meeste Skrifture is – in die 'groter verband' – om te probeer 'bewys': 'Vervul', beteken, 'verval'.

Net die woord '**verval**' van die woorde wat ek gereken het min of meer die begrip van '**verval**' kon onderskraag, bevat regtig daardie betekenis, vanselfsprekend! Maar mens moet 'n sterk verbeelding hê om die ander woorde wat ek kon onderstreep, met dieselfde betekenis te kan voorstel. Dus: Eintlik, skryf PdT 'n lang bladsy vol en druk soveel moontlik Skrifture daarin as wat hy kan om te wys hoe die Skrif aantoon die Wet van God het '**verval**', sonder een enkele woord met daardie konnotasie, behalwe sy enkele eie woord, '**verval**'.

Dit is egter so dat die uiteindelijke vervulling van God se belofte van rus plaasvind in en deur Jesus Christus, en inderdaad, Jesus Christus, Self, is. **Daardie** 'rus' is geen ander of nuwe 'wet' nie; dit is die Lewende Wet van God in Persoon: Jesus Christus. **Hy is die Wet** van die Evangelie van Christus Jesus; Hy is "alles in almal". Christus is ook die Wet van God in elkeen van Sy Eie.

Kyk nou die werklike Verskil in ons sienings; die Verskil, is Christus Jesus. Hy is die Verskil; Hy verskil nie net 'met' nie; **Hy is** die Verskil. Die Ou-Testamentiese Wet getuig van Hom; hoe kan daar teenstrydigheid tussen hierdie en die Werklikheid van die Nuwe-Testamentiese Wet wees? Christus Jesus het die Wet met sy Vinger, die Heilige Gees, op kliptafels geskrywe. In die 'Nuwe-Testament', is Christus Jesus in die vlees van sy eie verheerlikte Liggaam, vir altyd en altyd daardie Wet met sy Vinger, die Heilige Gees, op die tafels van die hart geskrywe. Op die tafels van die hart geskrywe van Nuwe- én van Ou-Testament-mense, want die Ewige Verbond van God se Genade is in die hart met die Gees gekryf, en nuut – vir altyd, nuut. Die Nuwe-Testament is die enigste Testament van God in die harte van mense op tafels van vlees geskrywe; daar is nie 'n ander Verbond nie.

Dit was die Wet op kliptafels geskrywe, ja; dit was die Wet met die Heilige Gees geskrywe op selfs harder tafels van klip as die klip van Sinaïberg— die kliptafels van die hart van mense. Wag! Nee! Eers moes God daardie Ou-Testamentiese klipharte uithaal en met Nuwe-Testamentiese harte van vlees vervang; toe eers kon Hy sy Ewige Gees-Wet mét al sy verganklike "wette", op menseharte van vlees skrywe. Dit alles verneem ons uit die Ou-Testament; dit praat van die Ewige en Nuwe Verbond van God se Genade, Jesus Christus. Selfs met sy Eie Vinger op kliptafels van die hart geskrywe, sou selfs God se Gees-Wet niks gehelp het nie, was dit net die Groot Wet of was dit met al sy ander wette op daardie tafels geskrywe. God sou net diesulke harte, verder verhard het, soos koper wat gehamer word. Nuwe-Testamentiese tyd se menseharte is maar net dieselfde as Ou-Testamentiese tyd se menseharte. God se Wet bly dieselfde. Sy Ewige Genadeverbond, bly dieselfde. **Wat afgesterf en mee weggedoen moet word, is die kliptafels van menseharte; soos toentertyd, so tans.**

Daarom, hierdie rus waarin mense ingaan as hulle glo in Christus, is volgens Heb 4:3 die "werke van God (wat) van die grondlegging van die wêreld af" (Hb4:3c) in ruimte en tyd en in hierdie en daardie mens, **waar en werklik** word in 'n verhouding met God **wat nuut deur God teweeggebring word**. Die 'rus' en die 'verskaf' van die rus, is beide die "werke van God" wat "volbring" is, en vandag nog weens die genade, deur God, "volbring" word— in, en deur, en ter wille van, Jesus Christus. Kyk hoe praat die Ou-Testament veral in Sabbatsverband, van hoe God spreek: "Maar ter wille van My Naam sal Ek!" ... "Maar ter wille van My Naam sal Ek!" Daarom, "Vandag, as jy Sy Stem hoor, moenie jou hart verhard nie!" Net so pleit Christus vandag nog: "Omdat Jesus die Sabbat in Homself vervul het, nooi Hy ook mense uit om hulleself aan Hom oor te gee, en hulle las af te lê". En "Dan daarom", verklaar Hb4:9, "by daar onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God oor."

Sabbatsonderhouding is die **gevolg** van Saligheid in en deur Jesus Christus verwerf vir die Volk; Sabbatsonderhouding **kannie, oorsaak of rede** van Saligheid in en deur Jesus Christus wees nie: Dis presies die onhoubare premisse van alle kontra-Sabbat argumente soos joune, geagte PdT, om te reken Sabbats-onderhouding word gereken oorsaak en rede van en voorwaarde vir, Saligheid in en deur Jesus Christus te wees. Natuurlik sou so-iets verwerplik wees. Presies sulke soort van 'verstaan van die wet in die lewe van die Christen' is daar ook baie van. Maar tien sulke verkeerd maak nie een regte, ook verkeerd nie!

Hoe duidelike uitkenningsmerk is die Sabbatdag tog nie— uitkenningsmerk van "uit die **genade** gered deur die **geloof** alleen", dit is, in Ou-Testamentiese taal: "Dat Ek vir julle, julle God sal wees; en julle vir My, My Volk sal wees!" Die Skrif praat mos van Genade hierso? Hoe verstaan ons mekaar dan?

Die misterie van 'Kerk-wees'

'Skaduwee' = 'verval'? (Kolossensiërs)

PdT: "Vanuit die regte verstaan van die posisie wat die wet moet inneem in die lewe van die Nuwe Testamentiese Christen, spreek dit vanself dat die wet – waarvan die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag deel was – slegs 'n tugmeester en 'n skaduwee is van die toekomstige weldade in die evangelie van genade wat aangeneem word deur die geloof."

"Heb 10:1 "Want die wet, wat 'n **skaduwee** het van die toekomstige weldade, nie die beeld self van die dinge nie, kan nooit ... die wat toetree, tot volmaaktheid lei nie."

"**Skaduwee**" beteken, "verval", "weggedoen", "alles prysgegee"? Verklaar **Kolossensiërs 2:17**, "Sabbatte" en "Sabbattefees, is skaduwee van die toekomstige, van die Liggaam van Christus se Eie" --- Vertel van glorieryker Toekoms van die Christenvolk?!

"Soos 'n slaaf wat hyg na die skaduwee het jy die Allerhoogste jou Beskutting gemaak!". "Die Here is jou skaduwee aan jou regterkant."

"Jy sal vernag in die Skaduwee van die Almagtige."

'Skaduwee x Beskutting'; 'skaduwee' x 'regterkant'; 'Skaduwee' x 'die Almagtige'. Daar's nog! Sedert wanneer beteken 'skaduwee' altyd net duistere kwaad, vlietende nietigheid? Dis nie die indruk wat die Bybel skep nie! Nee, dis sedert Sondagiste met Kol2:17 gekonfronteer was, wat 'skaduwee' nie 'beeld', 'spektrum', 'belofte', 'kenmerk', ens. kan, en nie mag, beteken nie.

Die rus waarin mense tree as hulle in Christus glo, is dus die (Goddelike) vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan en waarvan die sabbat van die skepping af 'n **skaduwee** was, en **steeds is**. Soos Kol2:16-17 uitdruklik verklaar:

"Sabbattefees wat staan vir, wat 'n skaduwee is van, die toekomstige; trouens, Sabbattefees wat staan vir, wat 'n skaduwee is, van die Liggaam van Christus se Eie" — Trouens, "Sabbattefees wat staan vir, wat 'n skaduwee is, van ... die prys (waarvan) julle julle nie moet laat beroof nie", vers 18a.

Die Gemeente van Christus is nie 'n wettelose maatskappy nie, want dan sal hy die kiem van vernietiging in homself dra. Maar nou het hy die Wet van Onvernietigbare Lewe ontvang in Christus Jesus. Nou lewe die Gemeente van Christus volgens die lewensrus en lewenslus wat Jesus aan hulle verskaf het; wat hulle saam met Hom en in Hom, ontvang het, en Sabbatsfeestend sal jy die Liggaam van Christus se Eie waarneem, aangesien daar vir die Volk van God steeds 'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag bly geld. Want hulle is maar bywoners hier, en waar twee of drie in die naam van Christus bymekaar kom, daar sal Christus in hulle midde wees—Sabbats, tydsreëlmagtig op die Sewende Dag hul Op-die-aarde-nog-Tabernakel-van-Samekoms, 'n tempel nie met hande gemaak nie, maar met die Krag wat Christus op die Sabbatdag uit die dode opgewek het. Hiermee is die ganse Skrif in ooreenstemming, Ou- en Nuwe-Testament; of liever, dit, is met die ganse Skrif, Nuwe- en Ou-Testament, in ooreenstemming; met die Wet, in ooreenstemming. Mens hoef nie 'n enkele kinkel in die kabel te knoop nie.

'Skaduwee' en 'tugmeester' van toekomstige weldade

"... die posisie wat die wet moet inneem in die lewe van die Nuwe Testamentiese Christen..." U erken dus "Die posisie wat die wet moet inneem ... in die lewe van die Nuwe Testamentiese Christen" ... "(Dit) spreek vanself ... die wet ... in die evangelie van genade ...". Is dit vervulling van die Wet waarvan u praat, of is dit wegdoening met die Wet, of dalk, 'geldig bly?', n.a.v., 'Die posisie waarin die wet in die lewe van die Nuwe Testamentiese Christen bly geld of ontvang is.'

"Want aan ons is Die Evangelie óók verkondig— nêr soos aan hulle; maar die (Evangelie-)woord van die (Evangelie-)prediking het hulle nie gebaat nie omdat dit by die hoorders nie met die geloof verenig was nie." Hb4:2. Was daar dan 'n 'ander Evangelie', 'n evangelie in stryd met die Evangelie wat (ons, Christene) ontvang het? (Gl1:9) Soek ek dan nou die guns van mense, of van God, as ek vir, en nie téén die Wet van God redeneer nie? Want ek erken, aanvaar, en gee die Wet van God die eer wat dit op bevel, dus Wet van God, toekom, dat 'die wet 'n tugmeester en 'n skaduwee is van die weldade in die evangelie van genade wat aangeneem word deur die geloof.'

Hoe sou die Evangelie van Christus nié ook so, die eertydse hoorders daarvan kon aangespreek het nie? Daar is tog die vele Godsmanne van vanouds vir wie die Evangelie van Christus so duidelik aangespreek het, en dit, deur die Woord van God se Wet,

omdat die gehoor daarvan by hulle, wél, "met die geloof (van die Evangelie) *gepaard gegaan het*"! [Maar wat dan die opstanding van Christus sou uitsluit?] Soos Ignatius so onverskrokke praat van "die destydse profete" wat "Christene" was, en "volgens Christus, sabbatslewe gelewe het" (*sabbatidzootes kata Xriston dzoontes*)! Ai, hoe vrees en haat die Sondagiste daardie uitlatings van Ignatius! Hulle gaan somer en probeer om die kernwoord 'lewe', uit te gooi, want waar is daar 'n woord met meer 'praktiese uitdrukkinge?' (Boek 5)

Nou maar net soos die Evangelie aan hulle ook verkondig was, terwyl hulle onder die Wet gelewe het, net so bly die Wet geldend oor vir die Volk van God wat onder die Evangelie van Genade lewe. En Gemeenskaplik – want dit is een Liggaam van Christus se Eie; en die Vader van hulle almal is dieselfde Vader; en dieselfde Here van hulle almal is "gister en vandag en tot in ewigheid dieselfde" – en Gemeenskaplik 'vier (almal) Sabbattefees ... en groei met Goddelike groei'. Kol2:16, 18. "Laat julle julle betreffende Sabbattefees deur niemand veroordeel nie!"

'Prakties' is 'fisies' sowel as 'geestelik'

PdT: "Dit (die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus) vind praktiese uitdrukking in die liefdesgebod van Christus: liefde vir God en die naaste."

Presies reg --- afhange van wat die "praktiese uitdrukking" in terme van "liefde vir God en die naaste" beteken. Want beide die "liefde vir God en die naaste" "vind praktiese uitdrukking" op verskillende maniere— onsigbaar-verskillend, én, sigbaar-verskillend. "Die liefde vergaan nooit." So, daar kan nie **essensiële** 'verskille' in die "praktiese uitdrukking" van die liefde wees nie, of hulle nou 'fisiese' of 'geestelike' 'praktiese uitdrukkinge' sou wees of nie. Alle 'praktiese uitdrukking' van "die wet van die Gees van lewe in Christus Jesus" verskil sonder om enige verskil aan die 'geestelike' of 'geloofs-' gehalte of egtheid daarvan te maak. As dit 'n 'fisiese' of 'praktiese uitdrukking' is, is dit nie te sê dis nie ook 'n 'geestelike' en **gelóófs-**'uitdrukking' nie. En as 'geestelik' dan moet beteken iets is geldig, dan, as dit 'n 'fisiese' en 'praktiese' dog 'geestelike' en **gelóófs-**'uitdrukking' van die 'liefdesgebod' is, behoort dit mos ook 'n geldige 'praktiese' of 'fisiese' 'uitdrukking' te wees. **Hoekom geld dit nie ook wat die Sabbat aanbetref nie?**

Sulke verskillende 'praktiese uitdrukking(e)' van die liefde, gaan meer 'uitdrukking(e)' van 'liefde vir God' wees, as van 'liefde vir die naaste'. Dit is die misterie van 'Kerk-wees' dat in 'Kerk-wees' jy 'praktiese uitdrukking(e)' van die liefde gaan kry wat sigbaar en prakties meer na 'liefde vir God' as na 'liefde vir die naaste' gaan lyk. 'Praktiese uitdrukking(e)' wat aanbidding is, sal uiteraard sigbaar en prakties meer gaan lyk na 'liefde vir God', as na 'liefde vir die naaste'. Alles omtrent Kerk-wees en Kerk-hou spreek daarvan; hoekom nie ook die Sabbatsgebod, Sabbatsgeloof en Sabbatsonderhouding nie? **Nou is dit skielik eiegeregtige wettiesheid?** Maar wat kan méér 'praktiese uitdrukking' van 'liefde vir God' wees as juis ons aanbidding van Hom op die Sabbatdag? En wat kan méér 'praktiese uitdrukking' van 'liefde vir die naaste' wees as juis die Gemeenskap van die heiliges? **Enigste voorwaarde is, dit moet "volgens die Skrifte" wees!**

Jesus het immers nie so in dieselfde asem gepraat van "liefde vir God en die naaste" nie. Hy het gepraat van die "*Eerste en Groot Gebod*" (Mk12:29a) wat die Gebod van die Liefde jeens **God alleen**, is. En die rede waarom Hy 'die tweede Gebod' "*hieraan gelyk gestel*" het, is omdat die Naasteliefde-Gebod heeltemaal van die Liefde-vir-God-Gebod, afhanklik is. "*Hiernaas / as dié, is daar geen ander gebod groter nie.*" Mk12:30c. Dus, die Liefde-vir-God-Gebod is na inherente krag sowel as 'praktiese uitdrukking', belangriker, groter en sterker as die Naasteliefde-Gebod. "*Ons moet God meer gehoorsaam wees as die mens*", is 'n ander manier van sê daarvoor. (Hierdie verklaring of belydenis van geloof soos gevind in Hd6:29, word gemaak juis na direkte aanleiding uit die Derde Gebod: "*Jy mag die Naam van die Here jou God nie ydelik gebruik nie*". Sien vers 28.)

Verder, Die 'tweede' of Naasteliefde-Gebod is gekwalifiseer: "Jy moet jou naaste liefhê ...? "... soos jouself!" Moet ons God liefhê soos ons onself liefhet? Nee! Ons moet God '*bo alles*', liefhê, sê die Woord, Mk12:30; vgl. Ef4:5-7 met Mk12:29. As dit nie vir hierdie **verskil** was nie, dan hoef ons ook nie 'Kerk' te gehad het nie. Maar nou moet ons 'Kerk' hê en Kerk hou, omdat ons **God alleen, aanbid** ... omdat ons Hom bo alles, lief het! Ons mag nie ons naaste of onself soveel lief hê dat ons hom of onself, gaan aanbid nie! Ook aanbid ons God alleen omdat ons Hom liefhet, maar liefhet "*omdat Hy ons éérste liefgehad het*". Verskillend, moet ons ons naaste liefhê ten spyte daarvan dat hy ons dalk die laaste van almal of nooit, terug sal liefhê.

Christus het nie net in sy vlees-liggaam ons mense-wêreld aangeneem nie, maar ook in sy Geestelike Liggaam, die 'fisiese' Kerk— "*Liggaam van Christus se Eie*", die Kerk as individuele gelowige sowel as Gemeenskap van die Gelowiges in 'n wêreld wat nie sonder die Wet van God kan of mag klaarkom nie! Alles omtrent die Kerk-van-Christus-wees voorveronderstel fisiese werklikheid.

"*Hy wat ontken dat die Christus in die vlees gekom het, is die antichris.*" Hy wat ontken dat Christus nie vir Sy Eie, wette 'in die vlees' gegee het nie, weet nie dat "*Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het*" in die vlees nie. Want dat "*Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het*" is die Wet van hulle bestaan en bestaansreg en bestaanswêreld en werklikheid. 'Wet' naas of as Christus Jesus self, 'vorm' die gelowige en die Gelowiges se ganse bestaans- en verwysingsraamwerk! Hb4:9 sê absoluut net dit: "*Daarom bly vir die Volk van God, hulle onderhouding van die Sabbatdag geld!*" Dis nie omdat die Sabbat nie meer daar vir die Volk van God is dat jy dit nie sien nie; dis eenvoudig jy wat die lewensgrootte werklikheid in die Skrifte daarvan miskyk.

Vir geen ander rede nie as juis die **nodigheid** van en **aangewesenheid** op **Goddelike Genadegebod**, word die **Opstanding** van Christus uit die dode van **Sabbatsbelang**. Die Sabbatdag was van altyd af— van die skepping af en vanuit die Opstanding uit, van Opstandingsbelang, daarvoor uitverkore, daartoe verordineer en daarop bestem— iets wat die Eerste Dag van die week nooit was of selfs net vaagweg in die rigting van geduie het nie. Alle verdere Sondag-argumentering word hierdeur by voorbaat as sonder fundamente beproef. Dit gaan niks help om een of twee onvanpaste teksies met die beste projektors in die teologie beskikbaar, op die witdoek te wil gooi nie. Al kan die kamera hoe goed kul dit gaan nog net beelde op doek wees, sonder substansie of duursaamheid. Ek vertel jou dit solank vooruit.

Want hoor watter Woord daar uit die Woord verneem word: "*Sewende Dag Sabbat van die HERE jou God*". Dit sê dit alles, "*Want God het op die Sewende Dag gerus*". Gaan lees hierdie Skrifwoord in Hb4:4-5! Die **uiteindelike waar-word** hiervan, soos die **allereerste begin** daarvan, **sal ons in Christus Jesus deur – ja, in – opstanding uit die dode, aanskou!** Dit is wat van Sabbatdagsonderhouding, 'Wet van Christus', maak. Ek hoef nie – trouens, ek mag nie – na die Tien Gebooie gaan om dit vir jou aan te toon nie, **behalwe**, om aan te toon hoedat die Tien Gebooie en alle ander wet en wette, presies dit aangaande Jesus Christus aangedui het en steeds aandui.

'Kerkwees' is Gebod omdat 'Kerk-wees' daar móét wees vir die aanbidding van God volgens hierdie Groot Gebod, en vir die Liefdesgemeenskap van die heiliges. En daarmee het ek alles gesê

wat ek vir die Sabbatdag sou kon sê! Die Sabbatdag – deur God se instelling daarvan, let wel, en deur geen menslike wil of goeddunke nie! – is Diensbaarheid aan die Kerk; en die Kerk weer – deur God se instelling daarvan, let wel, en deur geen menslike wil of goeddunke nie! – is Diensbaarheid aan God en medemens, veral aan medemens-**gelowiges**; om dan bo alles, die Kerk in Diensbaarheid aan **God**— eerstens en laastens, te wees.

Die Sabbat staan in Diens hiervan: van God, van God se aanbidding, en van God se Volk. **Die Sabbatsgebod is 'praktiese uitdrukking'-Gebod van "die liefdesgebod van Christus"**. Die Sabbat is 'Kerk-Dag'; die Sabbat is "Aanbiddingsdag"; die Sabbat is, "*Die Dag van die Here*" ('kuriakee heemera'). Dis hoekom die Sabbat ook Gebod van God geword het; hoekom dit Gebod van God onder Christus-Heerskappy, is. "*Niemand kom na die Vader behalwe deur My nie*", en, "*Niemand kom na die Seun, as die Vader hom nie trek nie*." Dit is 'aanbidding'; dit is Kerk-hou en Kerk-wees; Dis Hoekom "*onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God geldig is / stééds geldig is*", en, "*Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het*". Sondag mag nie hiervoor 'geinoveer' word nie— dit is oortreding van die Sabbatsgebod, en daarom, sonde. ('Geinoveer'— term by Karl Barth)

"*Wat sal ons dan sê? Is die Wet sonde? Nee, gládnie! Inteendeel, ek sou die sonde nie anders as deur die wet geken het nie.*" **En hoe sou ek God anders kon gedien het?** Ek ken dus nie net die sonde deur die Wet nie, maar ook die Geregtheid, naamlik, van God in Christus Jesus uit die genade alleen deur die geloof. Geen kennis 'sonder die Wet' omtrent die Geregtheid van God sou moontlik gewees het nie, en vir bewys van hierdie stelling, lees maar die Romeinebrief. Dit is so 'n diepe geloofsaak dat geen menslike oordenking dit regtig kan toelig nie; daarvoor is God se genade die noodsaaklike vereiste. Nogtans moet geen mens my wil wysmaak dat dit God se genade en openbaring in die kennis van die Wet vereis om duidelik te maak dat die Sabbat en Sabbatsgebod mee **weggedoen** is nie. Dit kan slegs duidelik maak watter gees besig is met sy werk van verduideliking en oortuiging: **die gees van misleiding**.

Hierdie gelóófs-redes, gronde, bestaansreg en motiewe Sabbatsviering onder die Christenvolk van God ter wille, put alle redes, gronde, bestaansreg of motiewe Sabbatsviering onder die Christenvolk van God ter wille uit; daar bly niks anders oor nie omdat dit alles, uit God en deur God in en deur Christus Jesus in en deur opstanding uit die dode, gefundeerd, staan! Omdat dit alles, "volgens die Skrifte", gesê kán word, gesê mág word, en gesê móét word; omdat dit alles, Nuwe-Testamentiese Wet vir Sabbattefees vir die Liggaam van Christus se Eie, is.

Christelike geloof wat sigself verbeel hy kan sonder die Wette van God regkom, is lankal die pad byster; het lankal van die Skrif vergeet, omdat die Skrif onder Christus Jesus, vir die Kerk die Wet van God geword het en is en altyd sal wees.

Uiteindelijke Vervulling

PdT, "Die uiteindelijke vervulling van God se belofte van rus is die rus waarin mense gaan as hulle glo in Christus en daardeur in 'n verhouding met God tree (Heb 4:3)."

Juis, dit is die Evangelie! Nou vind ons op aarde en in tyd en omstandigheid, **hierdie** "mense", "*die Volk van God*" wat "glo in Christus en daardeur in 'n verhouding met God (ge)tree (het)". Wat sê die Skrif? "**Daarom bly daar hulle onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God oor!**"

Is hulle as 'wese agtergelaat' om maar na hulleself om te sien? Natuurlik nie! Want nou het hulle, "*Liggaam / Gemeente van Christus se Eie*" (Kol2:17), geword, en as hierdie Nuutgeborene na die Gees van Christus, "*hou*" hierdie 'mense' "*vas aan die Hoof uit Wie die hele liggaam ... ontvang en saamgebind word, en word (hulle) só, met Goddelike groei groot.*" Nou het hierdie 'mense', Kerk van Christus, geword! **Wat nou?** "*Laat julle julle deur niemand veroordeel nie! ... Julle wat dood was deur die misdade ... het (God) saam met Hom (Christus) lewend (lewend "Liggaam van Christus se Eie") gemaak, deurdat Hy julle al die misdade vergewe het ... en deurdat Hy oor die owerhede en magte (van die wêreld en duisternis) getriomfeer het ... daarin dat julle ook saam met Hom opgewek is deur die geloof in die werking van God wat Hom uit die dode opgewek het.*"

Omdat hierdie 'mense' **op Christus Jesus voed** met geestelike "*spys en drank van Sabbattefees*", "*groei die Liggaam / Gemeente van Christus se Eie, met Goddelike groei*". Dit is die *Sitz im Leben*, die 'eksistensiële' van Christenmense-wees – van 'Kerk-wees' –, soos ons dit in die Nuwe-Testament oral, en hier in Kolossensiërs 2 in die besonder, aantref— met "*Sabbattefees*" as onveroordeelbare, integrale en sentrale lewensuitdrukking. **Dis hoe Nuwe-Testament 'Wet', werk; dis hoe Ou-Testament 'Wet', in Genesis 2:2-3, gewerk het.**

Kolossensiërs 2:12-19 dien vermeld en aangewend te word ter verduideliking van die vroeë **aanbevelenswaardige en onveroordeelbare** Christelike Gemeentelewe. Kolossensiërs 2:16-17 durf nie misbruik word ter bevraagtekening van die Kolossensiërs as "*Liggaam van Christus se Eie*", se aanbiddingslewe

nie! *'Die Kolossensier-Dwaling'* is 'n ernstige aantasting van die integriteit van die ware en eenvoudig werklike, vroeë Christelike aanbidding – “praktiese onderhouding” – *vis a vis* die krom en vedraaide geslag te midde van wie hulle hulleself bevind het! Geen grein waarheid steek in die sogenaamde *'Kolossensier-Dwaling'* nie, en ek verwerp die valse aantyging sondermeer met die veragting wat dit verdien. Dit is nie een sin bespreking werd nie want dit berus op die hallusinasies van bevooroordeelde Sondagfanatiste. Ten spyte daarvan dat my debatte na aanleiding van Kolossensiers 2:12-19 honderde blasye lank geword het, het my studies nogtans verrassend vertroostende, bemoedigende en opbouende resultate opgelewer. Sien Boek 4/2.

Ek het dus '(Heb 4:3)' met Kol2:12-19 beantwoord terwyl ons besig was om Hb4:9 te bespreek! Hoekom? Omdat dit wat deur jou in Hb4:9 veronderstel word, nie 'Heb 4:3' **kán toelig nie**, en Kol2:12-19 toe 'n heel toepaslike verduideliking blyk te gewees het. Waarom dan sou Hb4:9 nie ook dieselfde kon gedoen het nie? Dit kan, deur maar net te lees wat daar geskrywe staan, naamlik *'sabbatismos'*, en nié, *'katapausis'* nie. Dit sou, mits mens die gewone en “praktiese onderhouding... waarneming / onderhouding / onthou / heilighou van die **Sabbat-Dag**”, daarin sou gelees het.

PdT

“Paulus sê uitdruklik dat **al die gebooie** ("watter ander gebod ook al") saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm 13:9).”

Gladnie so maklik as wat u dit wil maak nie, geagte Philip du Toit, want dit “sê uitdruklik dat **al die gebooie** ("watter ander gebod ook al") ... in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm 13:9)”, **behoue bly!** “Die **hele wet** word vervul deur die gebod van die liefde (Gl 5:14)” beteken niks anders en niks minder nie as dat ‘die **hele wet** ... deur die gebod van die liefde (Gl 5:14)’, **bekragtig word!**

Vergeet ook nie dat hierdie ‘liefdeswet’ wat jy so kwistig uit die Nuwe-Testament aanhaal, juis die Seël van Egtheid en Gesaghebbendheid op ‘**al die gebooie** ... "watter ander gebod ook al"', van **Ou**-Testamentiese ingewing was! Met sy ‘Liefdeswet’ waarborg God ‘**al die gebooie**’. “Watter ander gebod ook al”, God is Outeur en Ingewer daarvan ... én, **Instandhouer!** Vergeet dit nie! Wat het Jesus anders gedoen toe Hy oor hierdie saak gespreek het? Het Hy na die ‘Liefdeswet’ verwys om daarmee die wette tot niet te maak wat sê, “Jy mag nie doodslaan” nie, of “watter ander gebod ook al”?

Geen Woord van God gaan tot niet nie, maar elke Woord van Hom word uitgevoer en waargemaak. En ek moes besef: God se Woord is God se Woord; daar is nie party Woorde van Hom wat verbygaan en ander wat vir ewig staan nie; party wat net tydelik geld, en ander wat langer bly geld nie. Soos God so is elke Woord van Hom: ewig!

God se Wet is een in God se Woord, Jesus Christus! Daar is geen ‘Ou-Testamentiese’ wet wat ooit nie sal geld nie of ooit sal ophou om waar te wees in Christus nie: Hulle almal het hulle waaragtigheid **eers in Hom ontvang**, en in Hom hulle geldigheid laat blyk en ten uitvoer laat bring! En toe Jesus – om so gou as moontlik by die kern van die saak te kom want dit is die lewensbelangrike kern – en toe Jesus aan die kruis genael word, Kyk! En sien! Die Wet van God, en in Hom alle wette van God, met Hom en in Hom – ja, en deur Hom – “*uit die weg geruim!*”! Want

Jesus sterwe, God se Woord, God se Wet, **Gód, se Wil!** En Die Wet van God uit eie Krag, lê sy Goddelike Lewe neer, en “*Geregtigheid en Wet*”, omhels, en “*rus mekaar*”, in die Seun van God in sterwe van die ewige dood vir sondes: “*Want die Krag van die sonde, is ... Die Wet!*”! Sodat Hy die Krag het – die Goddelike Krag – om sy Lewe te kán, neerlê, en waarsonder Hy nié die krag – die Goddelike Krag – sou gehad het waarmee en waarin Hy weer, sy Lewe sou kon opgeneem het nie! Dit, is wat Paulus genoem het, “*Die Krag van God*” wat die Krag van die “*Ewangelie van Jesus Christus*” was en is en sal wees, die Krag van die Wet van God en van ‘**al die gebooie** ... "watter ander gebod ook al"! Die Krag wat uit die dood kon opstaan was die Krag wat in die dood kon neerdaal; die Krag wat in die dood kon neerdaal, was die Krag wat uit die dood uit opgestaan het: Dit was die Wet, Jesus, “wat aan hulle rus” en lewe “verskaf het”. “Verskaf het” – voldonge, volstrek, daar’s niks meer vir jou of vir my om te doen nie; Jesus het die rus verwerf en Hy het ons deur en met Homself, daarin ingebring. Dit is om van te jubel; dit is om oor te juig! “*Daarom, Laat julle julle deur niemand (van of in die wêreld) oordeel of veroordeel insoverre dit julle ete en drinke of insoverre dit julle ete en drinke van fees of maandse feesviering van Sabbatte aangaan nie, want, dit is net maar ’n voorsmakie, net maar nog die spektrum, van toekomstige dinge, die Liggaam van Christus se Eie ... wat met Goddelike groei groot word!*” Kol2:16-17, 19. **Sabbattefees is spektrum van Kerk van Christus-wees!**

'Wet', 'verval' / 'Ontslae van die Wet'?

PdT: "In Christus het enige vorm van wet verval."

PdT: "Hoe kan ons "ontslae" wees van die wet en dit "afgestorf" het (Rm 7:6) en "nie meer onder die wet" wees nie (Rm 6:14,15), maar steeds verplig wees om die Sabbat te hou?"

Van Watter 'Wet'?

Van watter 'wet' moet ons 'ontslae' wees deur dit 'af te sterf'?

Volgens u, PdT, is dit "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien gebooie... die totale Ou Testament".

Volgens u, PdT, is daar net een 'wet', "die ganse wet (alle geskrewe wette, insluitende die tien gebooie, asook die ganse pentateug) en profete: dit wil sê die totale Ou Testament in Christus vervul. Niks is daarvan uitgesonder nie. Ook nie die sabbat nie. Die onderhouding van die sabbat is 'n Ou-Testamentiese instelling, saam met al die ander wette. Dit alles was slegs 'n skaduwee, wat op Christus gedui het en in en deur Christus vervul is." (Beklemtoning CGE)

'Vervul'

Nou bedoel u met "vervul", dit: "... dat die wet nie meer van toepassing is... om te sê alle wette is opgehef... dit (is) Ou Testamenties... die oue is verby... Daar is geen Nuwe Testamentiese nie. (Die Skrif) vereis juis nie... (Die Skrif) praat nie van ... spesifieke nie... dus nie fisiese nie...". "Is in Christus vervul... dui die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte aan... (is) hoe mens deel raak van die Nuwe Verbond. Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette. Hy het weggedoen met vlees." (Beklemtoning CGE)

Dit is wat "vervul", vir u beteken; dit is die 'afsterf' van daardie "ander wet in my lede... die wet van die sonde". Wat sou dit baat om u te wil antwoord?

Wie moet sterf?

Wie moet sterf om hierdie 'wet' 'af te sterf'? Die 'wet'? Nee, hierdie 'wet' moet deur die méns, afgestorf, **word!** Die 'wet' –

hierdie 'wet', moet sterf, ja, maar 'óns', moet dit "afsterf". Dit vertel mos al klaar watse 'wet' hierdie is. Of rêrig?

Is dit "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien gebooie... die totale Ou Testament"? As dit so was, waar gaan ons nou hierdie 'wet', "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien gebooie... die totale volle Ou Testament" in Paulus se woorde inskuif, want hierdie 'wet' is mos "die oue", en is mos "verby"?

So, wat is die 'oue', en wat is 'verby', in Paulus se uitspraak hier? **Dit:** "Die vlees" waarin en die wet van "die vlees" waaronder ons voorheen "nog was"; "die sondige hartstogte" en die wet van "die sondige hartstogte", wat nou, "aangesien ons dit afgestorf het", 'oud' geword, en "verby" gegaan het.

Watter 'wet' is dit dan waarvan Paulus praat? Hy noem dit elders "die wet van die dood". (8:2) Lyk dit hier, na "die wet van die dood"? Absoluut! Is dit die 'wet' van "die vlees" en "die sondige hartstogte", "die wet van die dood"? Hoe kan mens nog twyfel?! Dit is 'die wet' wat "in ons lede gewerk het om vir die dood vrugte te dra". Dit is "die wet waardeur ons gebonde was". Dis 'wet', waarvan Paulus hier, praat!

Is dit, "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien gebooie... die totale volle Ou Testament"? Om te sê is om teen wat vir God 'heilig en goed' is, te laster!

Is dit, die 'wet' wat "in ons lede werk om vir die dood vrugte te dra", "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien gebooie... die totale volle Ou Testament"?

Is dit, "die wet waardeur ons gebonde was", "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien gebooie... die totale volle Ou Testament"? Was u al ooit deur die Ou-Testament "gebonde", "gebonde om vir die dood vrugte te dra"? "gebonde om die vlees" en "die sondige hartstogte" te gehoorsaam? Ek was nooit nie! Ek was nog altyd juis deur "die sondige hartstogte" van myself en "innerlike mens" daartoe "gebonde" – daartoe "gebonde om vir die dood vrugte te dra"!

Noem die Woord, nie die 'Wet', "die Wet van vryheid" nie?

Maar daar is die 'wet van die dood wat in ons lede werk', wat sê, "Die siel wat sondig, moet sekerlik sterf!" **Wie** se Woord is dit? Is dit God se Woord? Is dit God se Wet? Gaan hierdie Wet onder die "wet van die verganklikheid", die dood, gebuk? Word die woord, die gesag, en die krag van hierdie Woord, ooit oud? Gaan God se Woord ooit verby? A! "Die dag as jy daarvan eet, van die boom van kennis van goed en kwaad, sal jy sekerlik sterwe..." **sê Wie?** Praat ons van dieselfde 'wet'?

"In", of "deur die oudheid van die letter", dit is, "**in**" (of "**deur**", of, "**op sterkte van die oudheid van die letter**" verklaar

Paulus, "op sterkte van die **Wet** (wat) die Krag van die sonde" is: A! hier kom dit uit: "deur" daardie 'Wet', "in die Krag" van daardie 'Wet', "op sterkte van" daardie 'Wet'— "**op sterkte van die oudheid van die letter**"— **gebeur dit**: "*Dan sal vervul word die Woord wat geskrywe is: Die dood is verslind in die Oorwinning! ... God sy dank wat ons die oorwinning gee, deur ("in die Krag / op sterkte van") onse Here Jesus Christus!" Die 'Wet' wat ons, dóód, is die Wet wat ons die oorwinning gee, **is Hy**, "Onse Here Jesus Christus", "*Wat die dood tot niet gemaak het en die lewe en onverderflikheid aan die lig gebring het*". "*Want as ons met Hom, gesterf het, sal ons ook met Hom lewe.*" "Dit is 'n betroubare woord!"*

"Deur die verskyning van ons Verlosser Jesus Christus wat die dood (in ons lede) tot niet gemaak het (word) **die lewe en onverderflikheid** ("in ons" "innerlike mens") **aan die lig gebring**! Dis hoe die saligheid werk. Trouens, "*Geseënd is die God en Vader van onse Here Jesus wat na sy grote barmhartigheid ons die wedergeboorte geskenk het tot 'n lewende hoop deur die opstanding van Jesus Christus uit die dode.*" 1Pt1:3.

Hoe deeglik het ons ons vergis, om te gereken het 'die wet' waarvan Paulus gepraat het, is "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien gebooie... die totale... volle Ou Testament"?

"Aangesien ons dit" – daardie "vlees" en "sondige hartstogte" –, "*afgesteef het, dien ons (God nou) in die nuwigheid van die Gees en nie in die oudheid van die letter nie*". Hier, weereens, is Hy daar, "*Lewendmakende Gees*"! Christus Jesus, Wet van God. En daarmee verklaar Paulus dat die 'Wet', "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien gebooie... die totale... volle Ou Testament", nié oor die mag beskik om sonde met die dood te beloon nie **óf Geregtigheid met die Lewe** nie, maar dat dit by **Hom** berus wat die sleutel van die doderyk hou. Dit is Hy wat die mag het (nie net 'gehad het' nie, maar hét) om sy Lewe neer te lê soos wat Hy die mag het om dit weer op te neem. Die krag van die sonde is die Wet; maar die Krag van die Wet is die Ingewer van die Wet. Die krag wat die Wet wil tot niet maak of van ontslae wil raak, sal eers die Gewer van die Wet tot niet moet maak alvorens hy van die Wet ontslae sal wees. Die keuse is joune om te besluit of jy dit gaan waag of nie.

Ek het 'n veel radikaler **wegdoen**-standpunt as jy ingeneem, PdT, en het moes eindig op 'n veel radikaler **behoudende** standpunt as jy, sodat die Wet na en deur en as gevolg van Jesus se 'vervulling' daarvan, éérs "*geldig oorbly vir die Volk van God*", en trouens as "die ganse wet... insluitende die tien

gebooie... die totale volle Ou Testament", insluitend veral, "*'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God*". Wat die verskil maak, is dat ek die vervulling van die Wet nie in metafisiese fantasie verstaan nie, maar in, deur, en op krag van Christus se opstanding uit die dode.

'Ontslaewe's' 'n swaarder juk

Dit is PdT se "Skriftuurlike gronde", sy "Skrif daarvoor": "(2 Kor 5:17)", "die oue is verby, kyk alles het nuut geword", dat die Christen van die Wet 'ontslae sal wees', of te wel, "moet wees" = 'Wet! Lees: "*Die oue is verby, kyk alles het nuut geword, dus, van nou af is die Wet: Die Christen moet van die Wet ontslae wees --- óf hy is 'n oortreder van die Wet*". G'n mens kan van die Wet ontslae wees nie! Beste voorbeeld: Eers was die Wet: "Onthou die Sabbatdag dat jy dit heilig hou." Nou is die Wet: "*As jy die Sabbatdag onthou en heilig, is jy oortreder, want: Jy mag nie meer die Sabbatdag onderhou nie.*" Dis die regte '*verstaan van hoe die Nuwe-Testament oor die wet praat*', hoor ek. Ek sê, hierdie '*regte verstaan*' is bo my vuurmaakplek. Om van die Wet of die Sabbat van die Wet ontslae te wees, vereis meer insig as waaroor ek kan beskik. Die wet van die logika van die veronderstelling die Christen moet van die Wet ontslae wees, is vir my, te swaar om te doen. Bowendien is God nie eers die Regter by my oortreding van hierdie wet nie, want waar geen '*fisiese*' Wet is nie – so vertel hierdie selfde 'nuwe wetteste' – net die ene waarvan ons ontslae moet wees, kan daar ook geen oortreding wees nie, en dus geen advokaat of regter met magte wat dit aanbetref nie. Ek meen, dit bestaan mos nie meer nie. Soos ek sê, hierdie 'nuwe wet' is vir my een wet te swaar.

Nou is mens op sulke 'logika' of simpelpraatjies aangewese om al die virs en teens van hierdie wet uit te maak omdat daaraangående eenvoudig net nie "*in die wet en die profete Geskrywe staan*" nie. Baie boeke maak bring verdriet; daar kom geen einde aan nie.

Wat jy verstaan as "die volle vervulling", is: "– die oue is verby, kyk alles het nuut geword" ... Op 'n ander plek verklaar jy by voorbeeld, "Omdat Jesus die Sabbat in Homself vervul het". Dit sê, Jesus is die vervulling van die Sabbat. Dit sê nie die Sabbat is "verby" nie. Dit sê die Sabbat, het nuut geword deur en in die Sabbat se vervulling deur en in Jesus Christus. Dit sê ek wel ook soos jy. Ek sê, anders as jy, Dit beteken nie die Sabbat is "verby" nie. Jy is inkonsekwent, ek is konsekwent.

Hoe ookal, 2Kor5: "*1) As ons aardse woning afgebreek word ... het ons 'n gebou van God ... 2) Ons verlang om met ons woning uit die*

hemel oorklee te word ... 4) Ons wat nog in die tent is, sug ... omdat ons oorklee wil word, sodat die sterflike deur die lewe verslind kan word. Maar Hy wat ons hiervoor toeberei het, is God, wat ons ook die Gees as onderpand gegee het. ... 5) as ons in die liggaam inwoon, woon ons van die Here uit. 6) want ons wandel deur geloof en nie deur aanskouing nie ... 9) Daarom lê ons ons ywerig daarop toe – of ons inwoon of uitwoon – om Hom welbehaaglik te wees. ... 13) Want as ons uitsinnig is, is dit tot eer van God; en as ons by ons verstand is, is dit om julle ontwil: 14) Want die liefde van Christus dring ons. ... 15) Hy het vir almal gesterwe sodat die wat lewe nie vir hulleself moet lewe nie, maar vir Hom wat vir hulle gesterf het en opgewek is. 16) Ons ken dan van nou af niemand meer na die vlees nie, en al het ons ook Christus na die vlees geken, ken ons Hom tog nou nie meer so nie. 17) Daarom, as iemand in Christus is, is hy 'n nuwe skepsel; die ou dinge het verbygegaan; Kyk, dit het alles nuut geword en dit alles is uit God wat ons met Homself versoen het deur Jesus Christus ..."

Asseblief! Ons het hier te doen met die nuwe en ewige lewe deur Jesus Christus wat ons met Homself versoen het. Laat ons ons ywerig daarop toelê om Hom welbehaaglik te wees, nie asof ons van ons sinne beroof is en heeltemal wetteloos geraak het nie, maar by ons verstand, tot eer van God, om Waarheids ontwil! Hierdie was die mees onvanpaste Skriftuur wat u vir u argumente durf aanwend het om van Die Here se Sabbatdag "ontslae (te) wees"!

Van watter 'wet' 'ontslae' wees deur dit 'af te sterf'?

PdT: "As mens verstaan hoe die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat, spreek dit eintlik vanself of dit nodig is om die Sabbat te hou of nie. Hoe kan ons "ontslae" wees van die wet en dit "afgesterf" het (Rm 7:6) en "nie meer onder die wet" wees nie (Rm 6:14,15), maar steeds verplig wees om die Sabbat te hou? Paulus sê uitdruklik dat **al die gebooie** ("watter ander gebod ook al") saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm 13:9). Die **hele wet** word vervul deur die gebod van die liefde (Gl 5:14)."

"Hoe kan ons "ontslae" wees van die wet en dit "afgesterf" het (Rm 7:6) As mens van die Wet ontslae wil wees, dan moet jy hom gehoorsaam!

Terwyl ons nou hierdie verwysings byderhand het, laat ons (een vir een) na hulle gaan kyk, of hulle sê wat u sê hulle sê.

PdT: "(Rm 7:6)": "Hoe kan ons "ontslae" wees van die wet en dit "afgesterf" het (Rm 7:6)?"

"Want toe ons **nog in die vlees** was, het die **sondige hartstogte** wat deur die wet kom, in ons **lede** gewerk om **vir die dood** vrugte te dra. Maar nou is ons ontslae van **die wet waardeur ons gebonde** was – aangesien ons **dit, afgesterf** het – sodat ons dien in die nuwigheid van die Gees en nie in die oudheid van die letter nie." Ro7:5-6.

"Ek sien 'n **ander wet** in my **lede** wat stryd voer teen die wet van my gemoed en my gevange neem onder **die wet van die sonde** wat in my **lede** (na die innerlike mens) is. **Ek, ellendige mens!** Wie sal my verlos van die **liggaam van hierdie dood**? Ek dank God deur Jesus Christus, onse Here!" Ro7:23-25.

"Maak dood dan julle **lede** wat op die **aarde** is ... waardeur die **toorn** van God oor die **kinders van die ongehoorsaamheid** kom, waarin **julle** ook vroeër gewandel het toe julle daarin geleef het. Maar **nou** moet julle **dit ook alles, aflê**, ... omdat julle die **oue mens, met sy werke afgelê** hét en julle met die nuwe mens beklee hét **wat vernuwe wórd** tot kennis na die beeld van sy Skepper!" Halleluja, prys die Here, o my siel!

"As julle dan **saam met Christus** die eerste beginsels van die **wêreld afgesterf** het ... as julle dan saam met Christus opgewek is, soek die dinge daarbo waar Christus aan die regterhand van die God sit ... **Want julle het gesterwe**, en julle lewe is saam met Christus in God verborge."

Kol3:5a, 2:20, 3:1, 3.

Ek wil hê PdT moet sien hoe hy – nie ekke of Paulus of wie ookal anders nie, maar hoe hy, hierdie vraag honderd persent **korrek** en totaal duidelik, **sêlf**, beantwoord!

PdT: "**As mens verstaan hoe** die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat, **spreek dit eintlik vanself** of dit nodig is om die Sabbat te hou of nie. Hoe kan ons "ontslae" wees van die wet en dit "afgesterf" het (Rm 7:6) en "nie meer onder die wet" wees nie (Rm 6:14,15), maar steeds verplig wees om die Sabbat te hou? **Paulus sê uitdruklik** dat **al die gebooie** ("watter ander gebod ook al") **saamgevat word in** hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm 13:9). **Die hele wet word vervul** deur die gebod van die liefde (Gl 5:14)."
(Onderstreping CGE)

Daar het jy dit. Geen twyfel nie, **As mens verstaan hoe** die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat, het jy geen probleem verder om die 'kwessie' omtrent die Wet te verstaan nie—

terloops 'n 'kwessie' wat gladnie soos wat die apologete (ek hou meer van 'apologiste' want hulle gis meer as iets anders) dit maak, in die ganse Skrif eers aan gedink word nie, én, wat die apologiste nooit ooit sê aan sou gedink het nie, was dit nie dat hulle die Dag van die Here so vrees en haat nie. Mens sou kon sê, hoe kan iemand op PdT se verduideliking wil verbeter, mits hy bereidwillig sou wees om God op sy Woord te neem en sy Wet te gehoorsaam? Beswaarlik sou iemand kon!

Waarom, van die wet "ontslae wees"?

Tog, **twee ongediertes skuil** in presies hierdie mooi en ondubbelsinnige 'verduideliking' van PdT. Waarin bestaan hulle? Soos altyd maar by enige en alle wanhopige pogings om God se Wet en die ewige geldigheid daarvan te negeer: by die Skrif! By die 'Skrif' wat so gladweg en onskuldig en gesaghebbend aangewend word— nee, wánaangewend word!

PdT: "As mens verstaan hoe die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat, spreek dit eintlik vanself of dit nodig is om die Sabbat te hou of nie. Hoe kan ons "ontslae" wees van **die wet en dit "afgesterf" het (Rm 7:6)** en "nie meer onder die wet" wees nie (Rm 6:14,15), maar steeds verplig wees om die Sabbat te hou? Paulus sê uitdruklik dat al die gebooie ("watter ander gebod ook al") saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself (Rm 13:9). Die hele wet **word vervul deur die gebod van die liefde (Gl 5:14).**"

(Onderstreping CGE)

(1) "die **wet** en **dit** "afgesterf" het **(Rm 7:6)**"

(2) "word vervul **deur** die gebod van die liefde **(Gl 5:14)**"

(1) Antwoord / Weerlegging: 'Skrif', met Skrif!: "Want toe ons in die vlees was, het die sondige hartstogte wat deur die wet kom in ons lede gewerk om vir die dood vrugte te dra; maar nou is ons ontslae van die wet waardeur ons gebonde was, aangesien ons dit, afgesterf het sodat ons dien in die nuwigheid van die Gees en nie in die oudheid van die letter nie."

"... aangesien ons dit, afgesterf het"— Waarvoor staan "**dit**"?

"For when we were dead, the motions of sins worked in our members ... but now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held, that we should serve in newness of spirit." "**Dit**" staan vir "ons lede" waar-"in die sondige hartstogte gewerk het om vir die dood vrugte te dra". Dus: Die "**dit**" wat "ons afgesterf het", is nié, "die wet" nie.

"**Dit**, waarin ons vasgevang was, ons lede (waar-) in die sondige hartstogte gewerk het om vir die dood vrugte te dra— "that wherein we were held"— "die sondige hartstogte", "**dit**, het ons afgesterf"! Soos wat ons "ons lede" en "die sondige hartstogte", "afgesterf het", só, het "ons van die wet" wat sê: "Die siel wat sondig, dié moet sekerlik sterwe!", "ontslae (ge)raak". O, die Wet "geld steeds", maar **net oor hom** wat **nié "dit**, waarin ons vasgevang was – ons lede (waar-) in die sondige hartstogte gewerk het om vir die dood vrugte te dra – afgesterf het" nie. **En wie is dit?** Dit is hy oor wie die Here Hom ontferm het. Dit is nie die goddelose nie, maar die Kind van God! Here, wees my, sondaar voor en onder u **Wet**, genadig?!

En al hierdie aanvegtinge teen die Wet van die Here, net om van die Dag van die Here, die Sabbatdag, 'ontslae te wees!' "God se Wet verklaar: Nooit!" (mee ghênoito) "That being dead wherein we were held", is nie die Wet van God nie, maar is **ons 'lede'**: "Maak dood dan julle lede wat op die aarde is, naamlik, hoerery, onreinheid, hartstog ...". Kol3:5. "Deurdat julle die Woord (van die Wet) van die Lewe vashou." Flp2:16. "Want as julle na die vlees lewe, sal julle sterwe, maar as julle deur die Gees die werke van die liggaam doodmaak, sal julle lewe." Ro8:13. "Die Woord (van die Wet) van die Lewe" is "die Gees" van God— is nie ons gees nie; ons gees moet juis doodgemaak word, want ons gees is ons "lede wat op die aarde is", wat ons "moet doodmaak!"—Wet! sodat "julle sal lewe" na "die Woord (van die Wet) van die Lewe". Mag God ons daartoe help!

(2) Antwoord / Weerlegging: 'Skrif': "word vervul **deur** die gebod van die liefde **(Gl 5:14)**", met Skrif: "Want die hele Wet, word vervul, **in**, een Woord, naamlik: "Jy moet jou naaste soos jouself, liefhê." "Vervul **deur** die gebod" versus "Vervul, **in**, een Woord".

PdT: "(H)oe die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat", is, "vervul **deur** die gebod".

Paulus: "(H)oe die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat", is, "Vervul, **in**, een Woord".

"Vervul **deur** die gebod" is 'die wet van die dood wat in my werk om vrugte vir die dood te dra— werkesaligheid, eiegeregtheid.

"Vervul, **in**, een Woord" uit die Ou-Testament oorgebring: "Jy moet jou naaste soos jouself, liefhê!"— is die Wet van die Lewe en van die Gees wat in my werk om vrugte te dra. "Die vrug van die Gees is liefde", Ef5:9; die "vrug tot heiligmaking", Ro6:22; "vrug vir die ewige

lewe", Jh4:36. *Daarom: As mens verstaan hoe die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat, spreek dit eintlik vanself hoekom dit nodig is om die Sabbat te hou. Want ons is ontslae van die wet van sonde omdat ons ons lede van sonde, afgesterf het ("Uit genade is julle gered")— om so van die wet van die dood ontslae te wees en "nie meer onder die wet" te wees nie maar Sabbattefees vierend, ons verlossing deur en in Christus te geniet. Want Paulus sê uitdruklik dat al die gebooie, "watter ander gebod ook al", saamgevat word in hierdie woord: jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself. Die hele wet word vervul deur die gebod van die liefde. As mens verstaan hoe die Nuwe Testament oor die wet praat, spreek dit vanself hoekom "onderhouding van die Sabbatdag nog vir die Volk van God standhou".*

Die wet van geloof is wet van werke

PdT: "Rm 8:1-4 "Daar is dan nou geen veroordeling vir die wat in Christus Jesus is nie, vir die wat **nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees**. (2) Want die **wet** van die **Gees van die lewe in Christus Jesus** het my vrygemaak van die **wet van die sonde en die dood**. (3) Want God het wat vir die **wet onmoontlik was**, omdat dit kragteloos was deur die vlees deur sy eie Seun in die gelykheid van die sondige vlees te stuur, en dit ter wille van die sonde, die sonde **veroordeel in die vlees**, (4) sodat die **reg van die wet vervul kon word in ons wat nie na die vlees wandel nie, maar na die Gees**."

"Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette" --- Hiermee: "sodat die **reg van die wet vervul kon word in ons**"? Was dit nie u wat benadruk het nie?! Behalwe vir die enkele leestekens wat – **oënskynlik** – in bogenoemde Skrifte skeel, wat sou dit vir u argument, – daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette – kon beteken?

PdT: "Saam met die werking van die Gees in en deur ons lewens gaan **geloof**. Die **wet van geloof** kom **in die plek** van die wet van werke (Rm 3:27-28). Geloof berus in alle opsigte op die verdienste van Christus ... al God se wette en profesieë is **vervul, nagekom, ingesluit en vervat** in Jesus Christus self ... om Christus te ken **oortref alles in waarde**."

PdT: "As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing."

'Glo!', is 'Wet!' "As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo", dan maak ons dit wat ons sê, soos, "Ons moet in Christus glo", '**wet**'— vir die mens om na te kom en te on gehoorsaam! 'Ons moet in Christus glo', is gedwonge of kan gedwonge wees, en kan dan **mensegebooie** wees. (Soos by voorbeeld hoeveel keer in die geskiedenis gebeur het dat hele volke voor die swaard se punt 'gedoop' was.) Enige 'Moet!', is 'wet'; '*Moet is gedwonge; trane, kindergesang*'. **Geen verskil met die Sabbatsgebod nie**.

Niemand kan in Christus glo deur te 'moet glo' nie; maar "*Niemand kan bely* (of 'glo' of help bely of glo) *dat Christus die Here is nie, behalwe, deur die Heilige Gees*". "*Want die liefde van Christus dring ons*." 2Kor5:14. Die gawe van Homself in die hart van sy geroepene bring die glo-daad van die **geloof** in Christus, in hom voort, en is genadegawe van God Self, sonder eie-verdienste van die mens. **Geen verskil met Sabbats-geloof nie**.

Nie die mens se doen of late nie het tot die geloof in Christus aanleiding gegee of dit geskep nie, maar Christus het in ons harte, aanleiding tot die werke van die saligheid gegee en dit in ons lewens geskep – werke wat vrug is, **vrug** in onderskeiding van die lewenssap wat die vrug voortbring. **Geen verskil met Sabbats-geloof nie**.

PdT: "... verstaan van die posisie wat die wet moet inneem in die lewe van die Nuwe Testamentiese Christen". Hier is jou eie bekentenis en erkenning, "**die wet moet** posisie inneem in die lewe van die Nuwe Testamentiese **Christen**". Want jy '**verstaan**' dit, maar gló, maar verstaan nie, "In Christus het enige vorm van wet **verval**." Soos uself uit u eie skrywe uit kan sien, sal u hierdie 'ding', 'verval' of 'weggedoen', **in geen Skrif vind** of uit geen Skrif kan wring nie. Nie eers as u in plaas van 'verval', 'in die plek van' gaan sê nie. Ook nie 'in die plek van', is, 'verval' nie.

Christus in die vlees aan die kruis genaen en daaraan ter helle neerdalende, en met en in en deur Homself en as Hyself, alle Wet en wette van God met en in en deur Homself en as Hyself! **Hierin** het Christus **getriomfeer**, en in sy triomf het sy vlees geen verderwing gesien nie, "*Want U sal My siel nie aan die doderyk oorlaat of U Heilige oorgee om verderwing te sien nie. U het My die weë van die Lewe bekend gemaak, U sal My met vreugde by U Aangesig vervul*" **in Opstanding uit die dode!** Word Hy verhef tot en verheerlik aan

die regterhand van die Almagtige: *"En kyk, met die wolke van die hemel het Een gekom soos die Seun van die Mens, en Hy het gekom tot by, die Oue van Dae, en hulle het Hom nadergebring, voor Hom, en aan Hom is gegee heerskappy en eer en Koningskap."* Medeverhef en medeverheerlik, **met en in en deur Homself en as Hyself**: Aanskou die Wet van God! Alle wet en wette – God s'n – 'verval', mee 'weggedoen' soos die verderwende vlees van 'n sterfling? *Vergewe my my God, die gedagte!*

Hier word die eintlike verskil tussen ons sieninge blootgelê— **u siening is nie radikaal genoeg nie!** U maak tóg nog plek vir 'n 'in die plek van'-teologie! Usê, "Die wet van **geloof** kom **in die plek van** die wet van werke." Sodoende maak u van 'die wet van geloof', 'n 'wet van werke': *"As jy nie glo nie, is jy verlore! Jy móét glo!"* Dis 'n ongenadiger en ongenaakbaarder 'wet' as enige 'wet van werke', want niemand kan glo tensy die geloof hom genadiglik **mét** Christus geskenk word nie. Nou wil elkeen sy vertoon van eie werke voorsit.

In die plek van die Wet ... in die plek van die Goddelike en Geskrewe Wet, die ganse Woord van God in die Skrifte van die Ou- en Nuwe-Testament-Boek, in die ganse plek dáárvan, kom die

Ewige, Lewende, Wet-in-Persoon en Persoon-in-Wet, van Christus Jesus die In Opstanding uit die dode Vleesgeworde Verrese Woord-Wet van God. Presies hieruit, kom die onlosmakelike van die 'Christus-Wet' en die Skrifte. Daar kom nooit weer iets nuuts of anders in die plek van hierdie onverdeelbare en onvervreembare eenwording nie; dit sal tot in ewigheid bly geld: "Volgens die Skrifte": Christus Jesus, Woord van God!— "Volgens die Skrifte": 'Volgens die Wet', die Evangelie-Wet! Vir nie die kortste oomblik ontbreek en geld hierdie wedersydse bestaansverhouding tussen die Evangelie en die Wet nie. Dit is oor hierdie **Skrif-Evangelie** wat Paulus uitroep, *"Want ek skaam my nie vir die Evangelie van Christus nie, want dit is 'n krag van God tot redding vir elkeen wat glo: ... Want die Geregtigheid van God naamlik, word daarin geopenbaar uit geloof tot geloof: soos geskrywe is: Maar die regverdige sal uit die geloof lewe!"*

Dit is hierdie vaste, geldende bestaansverhouding tussen die 'ou' Wet van God en die Wederopgestane Vlees-Wet van God, die Seun van God en Seun van die Mens Jesus Christus onse Here, wat alle en elke sogenaamde 'argument' teen God se Sabbatdag ontmasker en in die openbaar tentoonstel vir wat dit is: bespotlikheid. Want so waar as wat die mens leef, sal hy nie instaat kan wees om te gaan s'nder een of ander '*in-die-plek-van-teologie*' nie. Dit is teen sy natuur en teen sy grein; die mens **wil** 'onder die wet' lewe; wéier om daars'nder klaar te kom = 'Móét', **in die plek van** een wét, 'n ander wét, inbring.

Tensy genade optree en intree en "alles nuut maak" in Christus Jesus. God het 'alles nuut gemaak' eens en vir altyd en alle lokaliteite as Christus Jesus uitgesluit. God het geen werk van Hom eenkant in die geheim gedoen nie. Jesus Christus is die Openbaring van die Godsaligheid, en al die werke van God voor Christus was maar net sy uitwerk in tyd (ons tyd wat Hy sy tyd gemaak het net soos ons vlees, wat Hy sy vlees gemaak het) van "*die Vitnemende Grootheid van die Krag van sy Sterkte wat Hy gewerk het toe Hy Christus uit die dood uit opgewek het*"— daarop, daarin, "*in 'n oogwink*", "*Op die Sewende Dag, het God van al sy werke gerus*". Laat my jou daaraan herinner, PdT, hierdie laaste is 'n 'Nuwe-Testamentiese' Skrifwoord: Hebreërs 4:4-5.

God "*voltooi*": Hy "*maak klaar*", dit waarmee Hy werksaam is en was en sal wees; "*dit, is alles nuut gemaak*". **'Nuttgemaak' is nie iets anders gemaak nie.** Want dit sou moes impliseer dat dit waarmee God besig **wás** en voltooi **hét** en tot **dóél** gebring het, was nié "*goed*", nié "*baie goed*", nié nóg beter "*voltooi*", nié nóg beter "*geseën*", nié nóg beter "*geheilig*", nié nóg beter "*vernuwe*" nie ...

maar was ... 'n mislukking. Dit is wat Sondag-heiliging nie kan help om te impliseer nie. Dit is wat **Sondag**-heiliging, a priori uitskakel as Christelike Dag van Aanbidding: **hierdie** Skrifgebondenheid wat dit **behoort te gehad** het **sou** God dit vir Christelike Dag van Aanbidding **gewil en bestem** het— presies daardie Skrifgebondenheid wat Die Sewende Dag Sabbat:— "*van die HERE jou God*" — behoort te gehad het en **inderdaad ontvang het**, juis **omdat** God dit vir **Christelike** Dag van Aanbidding gewil en bestem **hét**.

Een ding is ek steeds en dag vir dag sekerder van, Dit is onse Vader en Here Jesus wat deur die Gees van God ons **by die Skrif hou** en terugbring na sy Heilige Wet. Ware 'Vrymaking' beteken: **Onder** die Wet van die Woord van God gebring en deur dieselfde Wet **gebonde**.

'n Wet by die Evangelie

PdT, "As ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, maar ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons die Sabbat 'n addisionele vereiste vir verlossing. Dan voeg ons weer 'n wet by, by die evangelie."

En wat sou daarmee verkeernd wees behalwe dat dit "ons" sou wees wat "weer 'n wet by(voeg), by die evangelie", naamlik nogal, die Sondag in die plek van die Sabbatdag? Of, dat ons pleks van met die Sabbatdag, nou met die Wet wat sê 'Óns móét' in Christus glo, **geloofsverdienslikheid** 'n *addisionele vereiste vir verlossing maak?* Dan voeg ons mos weer, 'n wet by –

by die evangelie, naamlik 'Óns móét' in Christus glo of ons word nie gered nie? Mens **kannie** één Wet van God wegvat nie, of jy sal een **van jou eie** in die plek daarvan **móét** inbring, en só daarvan werkesaligheid **móét** maak. Boonop, as ons sê 'Óns móét' in Christus glo, maar sê ons moenie en magnie die Sabbat onderhou nie, *dan voeg ons mos weer, 'n wet by – by die Evangelie*, wat sê, 'Jy **magnie** die Sabbatdag onderhou of dit heilig nie!' Dan verbeur ons mos die Sabbatdag wat deur die Hére "*vir die mens*" 'n eerste beginsel vir, en van, Gemeentelike en persoonlike aanbidding van Hóm, "*gemaak is*". Dan wil ons beter weet as die Here van die Sabbat. Dan verag ons sy goeie gawes. Dan reken ons op eie geregtigheid, want, 'Ek hou mos nié die Sabbatdag nie!' Dis dubbele huigelary.

Die Wet 'Uitgedelg' of "Grootgemaak"? (2Kor5:17)

PdT: "die Nuwe Testament die volle vervulling van die Ou Testament – die oue is verby, kyk alles het nuut geword (2 Kor 5:17). Daar is geen Nuwe Testamentiese gronde vir die onderhouding van die Sabbat nie." "... alle wette opgehef in Christus **behalwe** die sabbat?"

Alle wette, ja geen wette, is 'opgehef in Christus nie', ook nie die Sabbat as sodanig of as 'wet' nie. (Dis verskillende dinge!) Ja, die Sabbat is geen uitsondering, of maar een voël wat dink hy maak die somer nie.) Waar kom die woord 'opgehef' vandaan, buitendien? Dis weereens een van u gemaakte woorde – tensy u dit sou bedoel het as '*opgehef in Christus aan die kruis*', wat u duidelik en allermins sou wou bedoel het. Want u vrees dat as die Wet van God met Christus gekruisig moes geword het (wat dit waaragtiglik was, want hoe anders sou die Wet aan die kruis genael kon word as met en in en deur Christus?), dan kon dit ook nie met Christus, in Christus en deur Christus, ja, as Christus, weer uit die dode ópgestaan het om te lewe en te heers nie. Want u vrees die Sabbat sou ook met, in, en deur Christus teruggebring word uit die dood om vir altyd, "*geldend vir die Volk van God oor te bly*" soos die Skrif immers onteenseglik verklaar, gebeur het! Want alle wette word in Christus **vervat**, in Hom **saamgevat, bevat, bevestig** en **bewaar**— Ja, in Christus se eie woorde: "**Grootgemaak**"! Alle Goddelike Wet word in Jesus Christus se vervulling daarvan, **geldig gemaak** omdat '**vasgemaak**', en vir altyd **geldend vasgestel en verseël**. Dit is wat '*vervulling in Christus Jesus*' beteken; nie afskaffing of 'opheffing' of 'verval' nie. Slegs dáárom kan 1Tm1:18 hierbo, waaragtig wees. **Was dit nie** vir Jesus Christus nie, "het enige vorm van wet verval" en sou die hele wêreld *wetteloos* gewees het en *in stryd met sy Evangelie*. Maar "*So*

waar as God getrou is, ons woord tot julle was nie ja én nee nie ... maar was ja in Hóm!" Flp1:18,19c. "*Want in Hom hou alle dinge stand*"— bo alles, die dinge van God, die 'Wet van God'. Nie, 'wet' *per se* nie. Die Skrif ken nie 'wet' *per se* nie. Die Skrif is God se Woord— Geskrewe Woord. Maar veel groter en meer, is Christus Jesus, Die Wet van God; God se Gesproke, Vleesgeworde Woord. 'Vlees'-Woord van God, wat die Christene vanouds, nié geken of gehad het nie, anders as deur die **geloof** nie. Hoeveel te meer "bly" die Wet van God dan nie "*geldende oor vir die Volk van God*" van vandag nie! Hoe anders kan dit "*vanself spreek dat die wet – waarvan die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag deel was – slegs 'n tugmeester en 'n skaduwee is van die toekomstige weldade in die evangelie*"? "*Hoeveel swaarder straf sal hy verdien wat die Seun van God vertrap het en die bloed van die Testament waardeur hy geheilig is, onrein geag het en die Gees van Genade gesmaad het?*" Hb10:29.

Die Wet van God is nie vervang nie; die Wet word sedert Christus in Christus vervat; hoeveel gesaghebbender daarom is Die Wet van God nie juis sedertdien nie! Jy wat in Christus jou skuiling gemaak het, jy staan vandag onder Koningswet van God en jou lewe is saam met Christus in God verborge, lewende werklikheid, geskep tot sy eer – waarvoor die Sabbat se onderhouding vir sy Volk steeds geldende oorgelaat is.

"*Hoe het ek die tug gehaat!*" maar "*die Here tugtig hom wat Hy liefhet.*" "*Kom na My toe*", "*bring jou hart na die Tug!*" "*As julle sonder tugtiging is, dan is julle onegte kinders en nie seuns nie.*" "*Die 'Bewaarder' van Israel*" is jou 'Tug-' en 'Leermeester'. "*Here, leer ons bid!*" "*Dan open Hy hulle oor vir die tugtiging.*" Wie wil **nié** onder die Tugtiging en die Skaduwee van die Wet van God, Christus Jesus, lewe, en **staán** nie? 'n 'Christen'?

In Christus is enige wet of vorm of soort van wet **anders as Hyself**, of wat "*in stryd*" met Hom is, vernietig, "*uitgedelg*" – kyk **Kolossensiërs 2:12-15** by uitnemendheid! Sodat Christus meer kan word, en die mens of die wêreld met sy magte en outoriteite en heerskappye, 'n bespotting en minder as niks. Sels sou dit die Tien Gebooie wees wat "*in stryd*" met Christus kom, of wat '*meer vereer*' word as die "*Een* (wat die) *Gewer van die Wet is*", dan bring **óns** groter verering aan die Wet as wat die Wet self "*wettiglik*" **toelaat**, en bring ons onself, onder "*wetteloosheid*" en onder dit wat "*met die gesonde leer in stryd is volgens die Evangelie*".

Die Evangelie is groter as die 'Leer', is groter as die 'Wet'. Voor die Evangelie, staan die Wet as leerder, en is die Evangelie, die Meester. Vir geen oomblik hou hierdie verhouding op nie,

verdwyn die Wetsleerling, en staan die Leermeester voor 'n leë klas nie. Of het ons in hierdie opset te make met kindergarteklassies nie! (Of charismatic partying nie.) Dis Meestersklas! Die Hoërmeester, Christus, onderrig die na-graadse Meester, die Wet, sodat hy weer vir ons, voorgraadse leerlingetjies, betekenisvol en geslaagd, klas kan gee. Christus verskaf aan die Wet ware vervulling, sin, betekenis, outoriteit, gesag. Die Wet kom staan voor ons, sy leerlinge, vol wysheid wat hy by en van sy Hoërmeester geleer en ontvang het. Dit is die Evangeliese verhouding tussen Christus, Wet, en gelowige.

Met alle wet weggedoen? A nee a! Waar het jy skoolgegaan?

In die Christelike Skool word geleer dat die Tugmeester, die Opvoeder of Bewaarder, Jesus Self, die Wetsmeester is.

Want 'in Christus' was enige wet of vorm of soort van

Goddelike Wet met Homself in Homself en deur Homself "aan die kruis genaef". Aanskou die Lam van God en sien die Wet van God neerdalend ter helle uitgedelg word— en wat met Homself teenstrydig was, naamlik die wet van die sonde en die dood— uitgedelg word deur Homself én in Homself; ontslae van geraak, mee weggedoen en agtergelaat, in die verganklikheid van die dood en die graf gelaat. Met die dood en die sonde is dit verby, gans en al verval is dit! "Want julle is medegekruisig met Hom", **julle is uit die genade deur die geloof gedood om te kan lewe, om lewend gemaak, die self te kruisig en die ou mens af te sterwe.** Laat die dode hulle eie dode begrawe ... Volg julle My! Laat elkeen sy kruis opneem en My volg. Want wie sy lewe wil red, sal dit verloor; en wie sy lewe om My Ontwil verloor, sal dit vind ... het ons reeds gesê?

Christus was nooit, en Hy het nooit in Homself, enige wet **teenstrydig met Homself** (soos die wette van die wêreld) meegeneem, afgeneem, om dit weer op te neem nie. Die wet van die sonde en die dood het Christus in die graf agtergelaat en Hy is daarom weer "uit die dood uit teruggebring": Goddelike Wet, "geldende" Wet-woord van God. Eers dan en daardeur, "bly" welke 'fisiese' nakoming ter opbouing van die Gemeente daar ookal mag wees, "steeds geld". "Mag die God van vrede wat die Groot Herder van die skape, onse Here Jesus Christus, deur die bloed van die Ewige-Testament uit die dode teruggebring het, julle volmaak in elke goeie werk, om sy wil te doen, deur in julle te werk wat welbehaaglik is voor Hom." Hb13:20-21. Dit is 'Nuwe'-Testamentiese 'Wet'. Dit, het, "Sabbatsonderhouding" ingesluit, en volgens hierdie Nuwe-Testamentiese Wet, "geld Sabbatsonderhouding vir die Volk van God, steeds".

"Maar Hy wat ons saam met julle bevestig in Christus Jesus, en ons gesalf het, is God, wat ons ook verseël het en die Gees as onderpand in ons

harte gegee het." Dieselfde **gronde**, bevestig elke vorm of soort van **gelowige nakoming** van die Wet van God wat "daar vir die Volk van God oorbly"— **Volgens die Skrifte!** ... is die enigste voorwaarde!

"*Ek sal my wette in hulle verstand gee en dit op hulle hart skrywe.*" "Wette", Meervoud, dit is, "alle wette" wat u beweër, "is opgehef". Hoe sal God dit doen? Deur sy Een Wet in ons harte in te bring— deur wedergeboorte deur sy Heilige Gees, Christus, in ons harte in te bring en te verhef. Met **Christus**, bring God sy **hele** Wet en **al** sy wette, in ons hart in, en word alle wette van God in ons harte **bekragtig** in Christus Jesus, en so staan ons nie meer 'onder die wet' of "*onder die vloek van die wet*" nie, maar met die wette van God in die **Een** Wet-woord van God in ons harte, Jesus Christus.

Daarom, as ons sê ons moet in Christus glo en **sál** daarom ook die Sabbat onderhou, dan maak ons – of liever - **erken** ons die Sabbat die 'addisionele' vereiste **van** verlossing, en nie meer **vir** verlossing nie— wat die Sabbat immers **nooit maar nooit**, was nie. Ek glo nie eers die Jood roem daarop dat hy deur Sabbatsonderhouding die guns van God kan of wil verwerf nie. Ja, as ons sê ons moet in Christus glo, dan eis en maak **Verlossing**, die Sabbat 'n 'addisionele vereiste' – "*'n onderhouding wat steeds geld*"— feitlik woordeliks wat Hb4:9 letter vir letter konstateer. Die saligheid **deur en in Jesus Christus**, vra en eis van die Christenmens en Christenvolk Sabbatsonderhouding **terug**— feitlik woordeliks wat Hb4:8 verklaar die **rede en gronde** is "*Vir die Volk van God (se) onderhouding van die Sabbatdag*".

Christus Jesus is dit dan wat ons "dring" om saam met die "**Here** van die Sabbatdag", ook "die Sabbat-**Dag** van die Here jou God", te "onthou", te "eer", te "heilig"— in die hart te dra! "*Dink aan die Sabbatdag dat jy dit heilig ... Onthou die Sabbatdag, want Ek het jou uit Egipteland uigelei ... As jy die Sabbat 'n verlustiging noem ... jou in die HIERE verlustig, sal Ek jou laat ry oor die hoogtes!*"— **verklaar die Skrif van Christus**, en van Hom **in opstanding uit die dode**, voordat dit ons in gedagte gehad het.

En so word die Aanbidding van die Enige God, van en vir alle tye op dieselfde vlak geplaas: die vlak van deur die geloof uit die Genade alleen! Elke aksie het 'n reaksie, en elke aksie van God, meer as enige ander. God spreek, en dit is; Hy beveel, en dit staan; Hy verlos, en ons word verlos— met alles wat dit behels: Konstant en konsekwent: Volgens die Woord en volgens die onveranderlikheid en ewigheid van die Almagtige! Waarin ons alle aanduiding rakende die Sabbatdag vind; en waarin ons hoegenaamd geen aanduiding rakende Sondag-aanbidding vind nie.

'Fisies', én, óf, 'geestelik'?

PdT: "Dit is duidelik dat die Hebreërskrywer nie 'n spesifieke dag in gedagte het met die gebruik van die term "vandag" (semeron) nie. Hy bedoel daarmee: enige dag, nou, elke dag. Die sabbatsrus waarvan Heb 4:9 praat is dus 'n geestelike rus, nie 'n fisiese rus nie. Alle fisiese wette is in Christus vervul. Die aanbreek van die Nuwe Testament dui die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte aan. Dit is die manier hoe mens deel raak van die Nuwe Verbond. Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette."

PdT: "die term "vandag" (semeron) ... (die krywer) bedoel daarmee: enige dag, nou, elke dag."

Die skrywer praat juis **nié** van 'enige' dag nie; hy praat van die **énige** dag van "*hierdie dinge*"-'*tauta*' van die verlossing deur Jesus Christus: "*Hy sou van géén ander dag na hierdie dinge spreek nie.*"

PdT: "Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette."

Alle 'wet' of 'wette' van God is 'geestelik', en is presies daarom, sonder uitsondering, 'prakties', en boonop, 'ewig'. Dit is die "praktiese uitdrukking" – van hetsy 'fisiese (sigbare)' óf 'geestelike (onsigbare)', 'wet' – wat by die mens **eg, of vals** mag wees, **terwyl**, dit mag 'voorkom' of 'sigbaar-wees', of nié mag voorkom nie en 'in die geheim' of 'geestelik' is. Dit is die "praktiese uitdrukking" wat by die **mens, eg of vals is** **terwyl**, dit "fisiese wette" óf nie-fisiese wette, dus **terwyl** dit "'n geestelike rus, nie 'n fisiese rus nie", is; óf, **terwyl** dit "'n fisiese rus, nie 'n geestelike rus nie', is. Dan bly maar alleen God die Regter, oor. Maar op "Skriftuurlike gronde", "in Christus opgehef"? géén wet van God nie! Géén wet van God nie of u of ek nou daaronder staan of nie staan nie! Net die gedagte van '*nie (meer) onder die wet te wees nie*', bevestig die wet en beteken net die **teenoorgestelde** daarvan dat dit mee 'weggedoen' is of 'verval' het! U gebruik **valse logika, wat, Skrif**, vir alles wat u beweer, "die Hebreërskrywer ... duidelik in gedagte het". Gee ons wat hy in gedagte het deur ons die Skrif daarvan te gee!

Ons kan nooit van **die Wet van God óór ons** ontslae, of ontslae wil raak nie, want dan verbeur ons God se **genade**! Want God se Wet is God se Genade; en God se Genade, is God se Wet.

Ons as mens, onderskei die twee terwille van verstaan en lering; maar in God en van God komende, is hulle een. Ons kan nooit van die Wet van God oor ons ontslae raak nie, of ons moet van sy genade oor ons, ontslae raak. Dat ons sou kan, is 'n verbeeldingsvlug wat gou-gou ontnugter! A! die **lewe** en ons bese **ou mens** is die beste tweemanskap om jou dit te leer, vriend!

Daarom kan ons nooit van 'wet' ontslae raak nie, in elk geval nie solank daar by ons "**die oortreding**" gevind sal word nie en dis tot die dag dat ons doodgaan. Solank daar by ons "**die oortreding**" aanwesig is, só lank sal God se genade oor ons heers, of ons gaan verlore. Daarom "**Heers die wet oor die mens vir solank as hy lewe.**" Ro4: 15. Want "*Waar geen wet is nie, daar is ook geen oortreding nie*". Ro7: 1. "*As ons sê dat ons nie sonde het nie ... as ons sê dat ons nie gesondig het nie ... mislei ons onself en is die waarheid nie in ons nie ... dan maak ons Hóm 'n leuenaar en is sy Woord (Sy Wet) nie in ons nie.*" 1Jh1: 8,10.

Met die wet oor die mens vir solank as hy lewe kan hy nooit voor God **huigel** nie. Jy sê: Jy maak op die genade aanspraak, jy ontken en weier die wet daarby, want jy is nie 'n oortreder nie? Hoe gaan jy "*tot geregtigheid gestel word*"? Want: "*Die wet het daarby gekom sodat die misdad meer sou word*", **sodat** "*waar die sonde meer geword het ... die genade nóg meer oorvloedig geword het*"! Ro5: 20. **Wil jy die genade verbeur?** Kom onder die Wet van God uit! Ontken die **Wet** van God oor jou, sodat jy in jou **eie** geregtigheid voor die regterstoel van God kan verskyn; en sien hoe jy "*tot geregtigheid gestel (gaan) word*"! Vind uit hoe dit is om nié onder die **Genade** te wees nie! Want onder watter 'wet' staan jy, o mens, voor die Regterstoel? Staan **jy**, onder die doodmakende letter van 'Wettoreëls'— 'mensegeboeie' (of dit nou uit die Skrif kom of nie)? Of **staan** jy, onder die Lewendmakende Gees, Christus Jesus? In wie sien jy jou jousef, **huigelaar**, in die spieël van eiegeregtigheid en wet op wet, reël op reël? In wie sien jy jou jousef, **sondaar**, in die Son van Geregtigheid wat oor jou opgegaan het!? Sien die verlose sy sondes sien, en sien die kind van God onder die Genade ingebring. Sien die huigelaar sy sondes sien, en sien die kind van die verderf, se misrekening met homself.

Selfs met 'liefde' kan gehuigel word omdat "Jy moet liefhê", ook, 'wet' is; ja, "Wet" met 'n hoofletter omdat "Jy moet liefhê" ook 'Wet van God' is. Dit keer jou nie om huigelaar te wees, wat "Jy moet liefhê", aanbetref nie. Al gehoor van "*eiesinnige nederigheid ... behae in nederigheid en verering*"? Kol2: 23, 18. Dis nederigheid waarin mens loop roem, net soos met 'liefde': "*Wat die geregtigheid in die wet betref, onberispelik*", nie net 'seremoniële' of 'fisiese' wette nie; Met 'geestelike Wet' smous die skynheilige soveel lekkerder.

Daarom, verseker ja! die Sabbat kán wet, wettiesheid en mensegebooie wees. Maar **nét die Sabbat**— en nie Sondag óók nie— kan – of uit genade, mág – ‘Geloofswet’ in Christus Jesus (“tot goeie werke”) wees. Want ons het die Sabbat in en by beide die Skrifte en Christus ontdek, terwyl ons van Sondag-aanbidding nóg in of by die Skrifte, nóg in of by Christus, iets kon ontdek het.

Dus, ‘Die wet, alle wette, verval’? Waar is u Skrif hiervoor, vra ek maar weer. Soos ons sal sien, gee u enkele **ongespesifiseerde gladnie aangehaalde** verwysings. Is dit hoe mens die Skrif moet gebruik? U metode mag verstaanbaar en baie effektief werk vir meeste mense wat ‘n liefde vir Sondag koester. Ek vind dit egter onoortuigend, want nie eenmaal gee u die woorde van u ‘Skrifture’ in aanhalingstekens nie, maar neem maar net aan u lesers gaan buitendien te lui of te self-ingenome wees om sy Bybel oop te slaan by die plekke wat u op die beste in hakies aangee.

Veranderlik of onveranderlik?

Nou vir die vasmakende of vernietigende voorveronderstelling van alles so ver onder oorweging gebring: Hoeveel **veranderlikes** word in al ons veronderstelling gevind? Is **God** veranderlik, spat alles in stukke en is elke ander ding ‘n veranderlike, want ons het gevind die Sabbat is en word van **God** ontvang. “*Elke goeie gif en elke volmaakte gawe daal van die Vader van lig neer, by wie daar geen verandering of skaduwee van omkering is nie. Volgens sy Wil het Hy ons voortgebring deur die Woord van die Waarheid, sodat ons as eerstelinge van sy skepsele kan wees.*” Jk1:18. En deur die onveranderlikheid van God die Vader word die onveranderlikheid van elke goeie gawe van Hom verseker. Ons is **hier** aan die **begin** van die skepping van God gebonde— “Die Begin en Einde”— aan Christus, gebonde! Ons is gebonde aan die Wet van alle skepping, wat Genadewet was. Die eerste mens uit die hand van God was met die oog op hierdie Genadebetuiging van God in Christus Jesus, geskape. Die Sabbat des te meer: “*Vir die mens!*”

Het ons dan nie bevind die Sabbat sou ‘n **goeie**, en geen slegte en nadelige gawe aan die mens gewees het nie? As die Sabbat ‘n slegte gawe sou gewees het, dan maak ons mos die Here van die Sabbat die Maker en Gewer van slegte gawes, terwyl Jakobus sê, “elke **goeie** gawe”? Of ons moet gaan verklaar dat alles wat God in die begin gemaak het, nié “goed” nie, maar sleg was, en dat die Sabbatdag – **skepping van God se rus-werk op die Sewende Dag** – nié deur die heerlikheid van God **geheilig** en nié uit die genade van God **geseën** was nie; trouens, dat God maar ‘n halwe stuk werk half laat los het en nie op die Sewende Dag “**voltooi** het alles wat Hy (“goed” en “baie goed”) gemaak het deur dit te vermag het” nie. Sodat God van die begin af veranderlik was, en swakheid gevolglik **die ingeboude van die skepping** was—

swakheid die ingeboude, nie net van al die **werke** van God nie, maar van sy **Eie Wese** – wat ‘n lasterlike en verwerplike gedagte is. Want dan sou swakheid die sonde verskoon het. Maar nou is sonde, sonde, sodat “*die Wet die krag van die sonde*” kon word, en waar “*die sonde meer*”, en die “*krag van die sonde **die wet** meer en **kragtiger***, dat **dáár** juis, “*die genade nóg oorvloediger meer kon word*”. Ro5:20.

Alles sover gesê, kom eenvoudig op een ding neer, dat ons die **Skrif**— soos Jk1:18, Gn1-3, Mk2:27, verwerp totdat dit die hele Skrifwoord van God insluit— **óf** dat ons die Skrif aanneem; dat ons Hb4:9 aanneem totdat dit die hele Skrifwoord van God insluit. Sodat ons die konsekwentheid van die **Almagtige** verag, **óf**, eerbiedig. Maar die **goedheid** van God, **dít** is waar die Sabbatdag vandaan kom, en dit is die implikasies van aanvaarding van die Sabbatdag en van die “*geldigheid van die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag stééds vir die Volk van God*”— Hb4:9. O, “*die monsteragtige omvang van die Sabbatsgebod!*” – Karl Barth.

‘Die Nuwe Mistiek’

PdT: “Die aanbreek van die Nuwe Testament dui die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte aan. Dit is die manier hoe mens deel raak van die Nuwe Verbond. Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette.”

PdT, “Die manier hoe mens toetree tot hierdie rus is deur die geloof (4:3).”

“Die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte ... daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette”. “Hierdie rus” is hierdie “totale geestelike wedergeboorte ... (w)aarmee Christus met alle vorme van fisiese wette weggedoen het”, hierso na verwys met, “(4:3)”. Sou “Die manier hoe mens toetree tot hierdie rus”, “...deur die geloof” kon wees, ‘n ‘geloof’ wat moet glo dat “Christus daarmee (met “hierdie rus”) weggedoen het met alle vorme van fisiese wette”? Dit gaan my verstand te bowe. Dit gaan my verstand te bowe omdat ‘die geloof’ in die **konkreetheid** of ‘fisiesheid’ van ‘hierdie ‘katapausis’-rus’ en die gebasseerdheid daarvan op die **Opstanding van Jesus**, deur hierdie “totale geestelike wedergeboorte” ontken en misken word! Word dit nou **ongeloof** om die Woord, “*Daarom, bly Sabbats-onderhoudingsgeloof behoue*”, te **glo**? Is dit nie ‘deur die geloof’ dat **geglo** word Sabbats-**geloof** is **Opstandings-geloof**

en "bly daarom steeds geld" nie? Is die 'Ewangelie' dan nie sy eie Wet nie? Leef ons 'onder die Ewangelie' in 'n onwerklike religieuse wêreld van gewaande **'Wet van wetteloosheid'** – 'wette' van "totale geestelike wedergeboorte" wat enige "vorme van fisiese wette" uitsluit? 'Die Nuwe Mistiek' – is dit jou Christelike "in die wêreld maar nie van die wêreld nie"-realiteit, jou realiteit van Christelike Geloof?

Hebreërs 4

Flater!: "Die **konteks** maak dit duidelik dat die term "sabbatismos" hier **figuurlik** gebruik word. Dit word **in verband gebring** met die ewige rus (katapausis). Dit word verder versterk deur vers 10. Vers 10 is kardinaal: "**want** (gar) wie in sy rus (katapausis = ewige rus) ingegaan het, rus ook self van sy werke soos God van syne (sabbatsrus)." Vers 10 sê dus in soveel woorde, dat hulle wat in die katapausis ingegaan het, die ewige rus in Christus (waarvan die fisiese sabbatsgebod slegs 'n skaduwee was), "rus ook self van sy werke soos God van syne." "

"Vers 10 is kardinaal: "want wie in sy rus (katapausis = ewige rus) ingegaan het, rus ook self **van sy werke soos God van syne (sabbatsrus)**." " "**syne (sabbatsrus)**": 'Sabbatismos' sou dan "hier"— dit is, "Vers 10"— "Vers 10 is kardinaal"— "**figuurlik** gebruik word". 'Sabbatismos' wórd nie vers 10 gebruik nie! Wys jou net die verwarring. Lees weer my opmerkings oor Hebreërs 4, bladsy 57:

'Hebreërs: "(4:8)... die rus waarvan Josua praat... **is nie** ... die finale vervulling van die belofte van rus nie" – sê PdT. **En wat is**, "die rus waarvan Josua praat" in 4:8? :— Dit is die 'katapausis'-rus! "(Heb 4:3). **Hierdie** rus noem die skrywer 'n **sabbatsrus**. Dit is **dus** die vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan", of te wel, "die **finale** vervulling van die belofte van rus".

"vers 9... Die **werklike rus** is **slegs** in Christus, **juis omdat** die fisiese sabbatdag daarvan 'n **skaduwee** was, en **daarheen** gewys het, en **daarin** (in Christus) **vervul** is." **Kon PdT sy weerspreking opsigteliker maak het?**

Want die 4:8 'rus' – die 'katapausis'-rus –, was dié rus wat God sê in gehoorsaamheid deur die geloof in ingegaan moet word, 3:11, 18, 4:1, 3. Wat daarenteen, was die "rus (wat) die skrywer 'n **sabbatsrus** noem" in 4:9? :— Letterlik, idiomaties en etimologies: die 'sabbatismos'-" 'n *onderhouding van die Sabbatdag*"! **Wíe** het **wíe**, in die 4:8 'rus' – die 'katapausis'-rus – in ingebring? Die skrywer sê, "*Jesus het aan hulle die rus verskaf*".

Vir wie "bly dit nog geld" om te 'sabbatismos' in 4:9? :— Die skrywer sê: "*Daarom dan bly dit nog vir die Volk van God geld!*" "

Slotsom van agter af hiernatoe gebring – Dit blyk jou basiese dilemma te gewees het, PdT:

Daar bly dus geen manier oor, waarop die 'rus'-'katapausis', en die 'Sabbatsrus'-'sabbatismos' van die "*onderhouding van die Sabbatdag (wat) vir die Volk oorbly*", met mekaar **gelykgemaak**, of met mekaar **verwar**, kan of mag word nie. **En daarom**, bly daar ook geen manier oor hoe die 'Vandag'-'seameron' van die **Ewangelie-Wekroep** van die dag van Goddelike Genadebetoning in en deur Jesus Christus, met die 'Sabbatsrus'-'sabbatismos' van die "*onderhouding van die Sabbatdag (wat) vir die Volk oorbly*", **gelykgemaak**, of daarmee **verwar**, kan of mag word nie.

Die 'rus'-'katapausis' en die 'Vandag'-'seameron'-**Ewangelie-Wekroep**, is dieselfde; nie die 'rus'-'katapausis' en die 'Sabbatsrus'-'sabbatismos' nie. Die 'Sabbatsrus'-'sabbatismos' en "*die Sewende Dag aangaande waarvan God aldus gespreek het*", is min of meer ekwivalente.

'Die Rus' én 'die Sabbat', vind in Christus vervulling

PdT: "Soos ek dit verstaan is die Nuwe Testament die volle vervulling van die Ou Testament – die oue is verby, kyk alles het nuut geword (2 Kor 5:17)."

PdT, "Die Sabbat vind vervulling in Christus in die sin dat ons in Hom rus."

Die vervulling in en deur Christus van alle Ewangelie-beloftes waarin "*God aldus aangaande die Sewende Dag Gespreek het*", vorm die "*Daarom*" daarvan en daarvoor dat " 'n *onderhouding van die Sabbatdag* (d.i., die 'sabbatismos') *vir die Volk van God* (d.i., 'ons') *bly geld* (d.i., bly geld as 'Sabbatswet'). Hb4:9. Dit is a priori ontoelaatbaar dat 'katapausis' en 'sabbatismos' verwar of geïdentifiseer word! Anders kon die skrywer maar net aangehou het om 'katapausis' te sê.

Daarom: Nee, dit is nie so dat "Die Sabbat in Christus in die sin dat ons in Hom rus, vervulling vind" nie! 'Die Rus' vind in die Sabbat 'n komplement en vrug, nie 'n antagonist of wurm wat verderf nie; die Sabbat vind in 'Die Rus' (die Evangelie) sy oorsprong en dryfveer, sy wortels en lewenssap, nie dryfsand waarin dit wegsink en verdwyn nie.

Die Sabbat vind nie vervulling "in ons in Hom" nie, maar in Hóm alleen, ten volle en alles-anders uitsluitend! Dit is ook nie so dat 'vervulling' deur of in 'die Sabbat', 'gevind' word nie, selfs al sou met "die sabbat" bedoel word 'die (geestelike) rus'. Want 'die rus' vind nie vervulling in 'die rus' nie, as **Christus** nie **sélf** 'Die Rus' is nie.

'Die Rus' vind in **Christus** vervulling, en **is**, Christus. "*Hoeveel beloftes daar van God ookal mag wees*" – almal vind in Christus vervulling 'in die sin dat ons **in Hóm** rus en vervulling vind', "*in Hóm is hulle Ja, en in Hóm, Amen!*", "*hoeveel beloftes daar van God ookal mag wees!*" 2Kor1:20. "*Laat ons dan vrees dat terwyl die belofte om in sy rus in te gaan, nog standhou, dit miskien sal blyk dat iemand van julle agtergebly het nie.*" Hb4:1.

"*Hoeveel beloftes van God daar ook mag wees, in Hóm*" is hulle nie mee "weggedoen" nie – in watter "vorm" ookal, 'fisies' of 'geestelik' – ook nie in die vorm daarvan dat "*daar vir die Volk van God hulle onderhouding van die sabbat oorbly nie.*" Want "*Geen jota of tittel van die Woord van God sal ooit verbygaan gaan nie.*"

Dit is dan weens en op grond van hierdie **absolute sekerheid** "dat ons **in Hóm** rus en vervulling vind", dat die skrywer – ja, die Woord van God – in 4:9 verklaar: "**Daarom dan** blyk daar vir die Volk van God hulle onderhouding van die Sabbatdag oor."

'Die Rus' vind in Christus vervulling, "in die sin",

(1), "dat ons in **Hom** rus" en

(2), dat die 'vervulling' van die Rus van **Gód, in Hóm**

'gevind' word, en

(3), dat Hy, "*aan die Volk van God.... die **rus** verskaf het*", 4:8, en **Self, in Homself**, die Volk in die magtige, **verlossende**, "*Rus*"-'katapausis', ingebring **het**, sodat,

(4) "**daárom**, *daar vir die Volk van God, hul onderhouding van die Sabbatdag, steeds oorbly*". Dit is heeltemal iets anders, maar alhoewel 'fisies', tog 'geestelik' en 'goddellik'. Want hier is die fisiese ingaan in die onderhouding van die Sabbat as Dag van en deur God uitverkore, naamlik, "*Die Sewende Dag aangaande waarvan God aldus gespreek het: En God het op die Sewende Dag van al sy werke gerus.*" Dis

"omrede" hierdie **voltooide werke van rus van God in Christus**, dat die 'ingaan in die onderhouding van die Sabbat as Dag', "*geld / oorbly / standhou*".

Ek negeer van alle 'vervulling' in en deur Christus bewerk, niks nie, maar u, PdT, negeer die **Sabbats**-rus wat Christus ook '*aan die Volk verskaf het*', want vir u, is dit "Die Sabbat", waarmee "weggedoen" was. Aan die ander kant maak u van die 'Sabbatsrus' self, die 'vervullings'-'rus'-'katapausis'. Vir u maak dit nie saak dat "*hul*" ('fisiese') *onderhouding van die Sabbatdag* (wat daar) *steeds vir die Volk van God oorbly*', 'geestelike', 'rus' beteken nie al is dit 'fisies'. U negeer en werk dit teen as sou dit 'n '*vleeslike verordening*' wees. Hoe het u dit (oënskynlik) reggekry? ...

Net Wettesiste Vra vir 'Wet'

PdT: "Dit is duidelik dat die Hebreërskrywer nie 'n spesifieke dag in gedagte het met die gebruik van die term "vandag" (semeron) nie. Hy bedoel daarmee: enige dag, nou, elke dag. Die sabbatsrus waarvan Heb 4:9 praat is dus 'n geestelike rus, nie 'n fisiese rus nie. Alle fisiese wette is in Christus vervul. Die aanbreek van die Nuwe Testament dui die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte aan. Dit is die manier hoe mens deel raak van die Nuwe Verbond. Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette."

Volgens Hebreërs 4, letterlik en essensieel, na inhoud en na vorm, "*Bly daar 'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag, geld*", of "oor". Wat wil die **wettesiste** nou meer?! Dis mos 'gebod' / 'wet' hier soos wat jy maar selde in die Ou-Testament sal kry— soos by voorbeeld in Genesis 2:2-3— sônder moets en moenies; slegs uit innerlike aard en krag geldend— óók vir die skepsel en nie net vir die Skepper nie. Enigste verskil is, hier vind mens die Wet soos dit as gevolg van **Christus** se **Verlossingswerk** vir die **Christen** van **krag** geword het. Soos wat vir die Volk **Israel** hulle verlossing uit Egipte vir hulle betekenis aan die Vierde- of Sabbatsgebod en die onderhouding daarvan gegee het, net so ontvang Sabbats-onderhouding vir die **Christenvolk** van God betekenis in die **Verlossingswerk** van die **Evangelie**.

Dit is 'n arrogante onwaarheid dat "Volgens Heb4 daar 'n sabbatsrus oorbly" wat "*onderhouding*" van die Sabbat as "Die Sewende **Dag**", uitsluit. Al wat die 'sabbatsrus'-'argument'

reggekry het, was om die volstrekke betekenis van die woord 'apoleipetai'-'oorbly / geld steeds / maak nog saak', te bevestig het. Nou kan Sondagargumente nie omdraai wanneer hulle in die hoek gedryf word as gevolg daarvan dat hulle 'geestelike' 'sabbatsrus' storie onbehoudbaar geword het nie, en wil beweer die woord 'apoleipetai' bevat nie hierdie 'wetskonnotasie' nie. Hulle het die 'wet' net so nodig vir hulle 'geestelike wet' of 'praktiese onderhouding'-ideologie as wat Sabbatdagsonderhouding 'wet' benodig.

Nie 'n 'fisiese wet' nie, maar 'n 'geestelike'

PdT: "Volgens Heb 4 bly daar 'n sabbatsrus oor. Die manier hoe mens toetree tot hierdie rus is deur die geloof (4:3). God het eens die sabbat bepaal as rusdag (4:10), en Hy bepaal nou weer 'n sekere dag in die plek van die Sabbatdag, naamlik vandag (4:7)."

PdT: "Die sabbatsrus waarvan Heb 4:9 praat is dus 'n geestelike rus, nie 'n fisiese rus nie. Alle fisiese wette is in Christus vervul. Die aanbreek van die Nuwe Testament dui die aanbreek van totale geestelike wedergeboorte aan. Dit is die manier hoe mens deel raak van die Nuwe Verbond. Daarmee het Christus weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette."

Die Sabbat en Sabbatsgebod vind vervulling in Christus, wat beteken dat Christus alle betekenis geword het wat die Sabbat aangaande Hom ingehou het, en dus steeds inhou. Dit is wél so dat die Evangeliebeloftes, ook dié van die Sabbat, vervulling vind in Christus in die sin dat **ons, in Hom**, die rus, gevind het. D.w.s., die Sabbat vertel en 'leer' ons dat die mens verlossing in en deur Christus ontvang. "*Want as Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het*", is Hy die "Rus van God", en het Hy ons in die Rus van God "ingebring".

Juis hieruit, dat "*Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het*" (8), **volg**, die skrywer se "*Daarom*" – 'ara' – vers 9: "*Daarom – bly daar dan vir die Volk van God 'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag oor*". ("n *Onderhouding van die Sabbatdag*" is die presiese en uitsluitlik toegepaste gebruik en betekenis van die woord 'sabbatismos' in enige Griekse literatuur waarin die woord voorkom. Dit is 'n etimologiese onderwerp wat ter geleger tyd aandag gegee kan word – of, lees waar dit reeds aandag gegee was.) Ewentwel, 'Sabbatismos' is **nooit** die sinoniem of naastenby ekwivalent van, of, vir, '*katapausis*' nie. 'Sabbatismos' impliseer "onderhouding" deur die "Volk"; '*katapausis*' impliseer die poging en sukses (Eng.,

'feat') van "*Jesus (wat) aan hulle rus verskaf het*". In Kolossensiërs noem Paulus dit Jesus se "triomf".

Om in 4:9 te praat van 'net' 'n 'sabbatsrus' as sou dit **nié** 'n "*onderhouding van die Sabbatdag*" gewees het nie, "dus 'net' 'n geestelike rus, nie 'n fisiese rus nie", is 'n fout. Of as dit nie 'n fout is nie, dan moet dit 'n Skrifverdraaiing wees. Dit sou tog onsinnig gewees het om te sê, '*Omdat Hy aan hulle rus verskaf het bly dit nog oor dat aan hulle rus verskaf word*.' Want dit negeer die waarheid van die voldonge, vervulde, feit dat "*Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het*" – tog deur sy Opstanding!

Die Sabbat die Rus van God in 4:10?

PdT, "God het eens die sabbat bepaal as rusdag (4:10), en Hy bepaal nou weer 'n sekere dag in die plek van die Sabbatdag, naamlik vandag (4:7)..."

Nee wag! dis nie wat daar in "4:10", staan nie, maar ... **PdT:** "Volgens Heb 4 bly daar 'n sabbatsrus oor..."— dit kan net "Heb 4", **vers 9**, wees!

PdT: "...hierdie rus... (4:3) ...die sabbat bepaal as rusdag (4:10) ...'n sekere dag in die plek van die Sabbatdag, naamlik vandag (4:7)". (Onderstreping CGE.) In aldie verse, "(4:3)...(4:10)...(4:7)", praat **PdT** van "hierdie rus... die sabbat...as rusdag...'n sekere dag...die Sabbatdag...vandag"; hy vind geen onderskeid of verskil nie maar inteendeel volle eendersheid in elke frasering. Maar die werklikheid lyk anders.

Eerstens, 'hierdie rus' ... voor enigiets moet ons na die Skrif gaan kyk! '**Die Rus**' Merk hulle in rooi, want hulle is nie dieselfde nie. As jy klaar is, gly jou oog oor hulle, en jy word die verskille en die ware betekenis, meteens, gewaar.

Hb3:11— "*Soos Ek in my toorn gesweer het, hulle sal in my rus, nié ingaan nie*". **Rooi**; want vers 10 vertel watter rus hierdie is: "*My weë*": "*Ek het vertoorn geword ... maar hulle het My Weë nie leer ken nie*". Dit is, hulle het in **my** rus, nié ingegaan nie. "*Ek is die Weg, die Waarheid en die Lewe!*" "*Want ons het deelgenote van Christus geword as ons net die Begin van ons Vertroue tot die einde toe onwrikbaar vashou*." "*Ons Vertroue*" en "*die Begin van ons Vertroue*", is "Christus", vers 14.

Hb3:11— "*Aan wie het Hy gesweer dat hulle in sy rus nie sal ingaan nie?*" **Rooi**; want "*Ons sien dat hulle deur ongeloof, nie kon*

ingaan nie", 3:19. Deur ongelooft het hulle **Christus** nie aangeneem nie. "Want aan ons is die **Ewangelie** (van Christus – daar is net een Evangelie, Christus s'n –) ook verkondig net soos aan hulle." 4:2.

Hb4:1— "Ons behoort op ons hoede te wees dat, terwyl die **belofte om sy rus** in te gaan nog standhou, dit nie miskien gaan blyk dat iemand van julle agtergebly het nie!" **Rooi**; want dieselfde 'Evangelie-Belofte-Rus' van 3:18-4:1 is nog ter sprake.

Hb4:3— "Want ons wat geglo het, gaan **die rus** in, soos Hy gesê het: Daarom het Ek in my toorn gesweer, hulle sal in **my rus** nie ingaan nie, alhoewel sy Werke van die grondlegging van die wêreld af volbring is." **Rooi**; "Want ons wat geglo het, gaan die rus in", dié 'rus', wat "daardie geslag (wat) altyd met die hart dwaal", 3:10, nie ingegaan het nie, 3:11. Want hierdie 'rus' stem met die **volbragte werke** van God ooreen, wat weer met die '**Evangelie**' en met '**Christus**', ooreenstem. "... ons gaan **die rus** in" wat "my rus" is, wat "hulle, deur **ongelooft**, nie kon ingaan nie", 3:19. Een en dieselfde 'rus'; verskillende ontvangers.

Hb4:5— "En nou weer hier / soos volgens hierdie Skrif in huidige omstandigheid toegepas: "Hulle sal in **my rus** nie ingaan nie!" Die skrywer skryf ter herbevestiging van dit wat hy reeds bevind het na aanleiding van wat die Skrifte verklaar het. Hy skrywe steeds, "My Rus", na aanleiding van God wat by die "grondlegging van die wêreld", 4:3, "op die Sewende Dag van al sy werke, gerus het". Gód, het "gerus"; daarom praat die skrywer al die tyd nog van "sy rus", "my rus" – dit is, God, se rus en rus-daad; nie van die mens s'n nie.

Rooi.

Hb4:6— Van hierdie selfde 'Rus van God', verklaar die skrywer: "Aangesien dit dan so is dat party mense daarin ingaan." "Daarin" Voornaamwoord vir "My Rus" van vers 5 net tevore. **Rooi!**

Hb4:8— Die skrywer praat van dieselfde Rus van Gód waar hy vermeld dat "Jesus hulle" – dit is, die "party mense (wat) wel in die rus ingaan", "laat rus" het, of, dat "Jesus aan hulle rus gegee het" – waarmee hy deur middel van die Werkwoord, uitdruklik verduidelik watter 'rus' hy dan nou eintlik met sy Selfstandige- en Voornaamwoorde bedoel: Eenvoudig, dié 'rus', wat, "Jesus", vir "sommige mense" beteken – wat, **Hy**, vir daardie mense **is** – vir daardie mense wat wél in "Sy Rus", "My Rus", "Die Rus", "ingaan". Wat "Jesus" vir daardie mense wat "daarin ingaan" as voldonge '**Rus**' geword het, naamlik "die Evangelie" en "Krag van God tot redding". **Rooi!**

Hb4:11— "Laat ons ons dan beywer om in te gaan in **Dié Rus**" wat "Jesus aan hulle gegee het", Christus Jesus Self. Kleur 'Dié Rus' in vers 11 **rooi**, want dit is dieselfde as die "laat rus" van vers 8!

Hb4:10— "Want Hy-(Jesus)-in-Sy-Rus-inganende, het inderdaad van sy eie werke gerus— soos God van sy werke." Dit kan van geen mens ooit verklaar word nie, omdat verklaar van Jesus **Synde** Die Rus van God, Self. Deur **opstanding** uit die dood het "**Hy-(Jesus)-in-Sy-Rus-inganende**" 'Die Rus' van "God van sy werke" geword— het die Seun "die werke van My Vader", "klaargemaak". **Rooi!**

'Die Rus' wat die skrywer aan Hebreërs voorop stel as uitsluitlik God se rus in Christus,

(1) dui hy telkens aan met die woord, '**My** Rus', of '**sy** Rus', die Rus '**van**' God, en '**van**' Jesus.

(2) En meer as eenkeer 'bepaal' die skrywer dat hierdie rus, as dit deur die ongehoorsames en ongelowiges met geweld ingeneem wil word, '**nie** ingegaan **sal** word **nie**'.

(3) Of dat hierdie rus, as dit deur die geloof is, **wel** deur hulle wat glo, ingegaan **word**, maar, dat hulle 'ingaan', eintlik 'n 'inbring' is, want "**Jesus** het aan hulle rus verskaf"; hulle het dit nie self verwerf of in eie krag ingegaan nie.

(4) En deurgans gebruik die skrywer die woord '**katapausis**' vir hierdie 'Rus'. Hierdie redes verseker dat dit onmoontlik is dat hierdie 'Rus' met enige ander 'rus', verwar of vereenselwig kan word, want:

- (1) dit is God se vermagting deur Christus;
- (2) Hy is die Inbringer in dié Rus;
- (3) Hy is die Inganeer in dié Rus en
- (4) "dié wat daarin ingaan", gaan
- (5) deur die geloof
- (6) in en deur Hóm,
- (7) daarin in,
- (8) of gladnie: by eed van God, nié!

Na aanleiding van hierdie, enigsoortige 'Rus van God', staan daar geskrywe:

8, "**Jeens die feit dat** (n.a.v. die verse so pas na verwys), *Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het*",

9 "**Daarom dan** (n.a.v. vers **8** so pas), *bly daar vir die Volk van God 'n (of 'hulle') onderhouding van die Sabbatdag geld*

10 **omdat** Hy (n.a.v. vers **9 én 8** so pas), *synde ingegaan in sy eie rus, inderdaad self van sy eie werke soos God rus van syne.*"

Ons ontvang hier die **dubbele** rede en motief "**(W)aarom** daar dan vir die Volk van God 'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag geldig bly", naamlik: (1), vers 8: "**Omdat** Hy aan **hulle rus verskaf het**"; en, (2),

vers 10: "omdat Hy, synde ingegaan in sy eie rus, inderdaad sélf van sy eie werke soos God, rus." Die "rus"-'katapausis' is **tweemaal** die gronde, vóór (v8), **én**, agterná (v10). Die 'sabbatismos' – vers 9 – is wat **midde daarin**, uitspruit.

Die "rus"-'katapausis' is tweemaal die gronde **van en vir** die 'sabbatismos'-'Sabbatsonderhouding (wat) vir die Volk oorby':

Eerstens "Jesus", wat "aan hulle (die Volk), rus verskaf het", vers 8; en Tweedens, "Jesus", wat van **God** se werke van eie rus, vers 10, na die Innigste Gemeenskaps-Syn van God Drie-Enig, sy eie rus, "ingegaan het".

Hb4:8-10 is mees gepaste 'kommentaar' op Mk2:27-28, "Hy verklaar vir hulle: Die Sabbat is gemaak vir die mens; nie die mens vir die Sabbat nie. Daarom is die Seun van die Mens, Here inderdaad van die Sabbat". Wat sê dit anders as Hb4:8-10?

'n Sekere Dag, Vandag!

PdT

"Sê gerus of ek jou reg verstaan. 1. Soos ek jou verstaan bou jy die argument vir die onderhouding van die sabbat hoofsaaklik op Genesis wat sê dat God gerus het van sy werk."

PdT, "... en Hy bepaal nou weer 'n sekere dag in die plek van die Sabbatdag, naamlik vandag (4:7)"

Dit, staan nié daar geskrywe nie! Daar staan niks "van" of omtrent "die Sabbatdag" in "(4:7)" nie; nie in skrif nie en ook nie by implikasie nie. Wat daar wel **geskrywe** staan en wat daar wel "Geskrywe **Staan**", d.w.s., **bedoel** word, is dat God nádat Hy in Christus Jesus en deur Christus Jesus aan sy "Volk... rus verskaf het", "spreek van geen ander dag na hierdie dinge nie". "Hierdie dinge" ('meta tauta') van "hierdie dag" ('semeron') van Goddelike besoeking in Christus Jesus waarin God die mens in genade besoek of versoek om hom te bekeer, te glo, en die 'rus' in te gaan. Christus was en is God se laaste Woord aan 'n verlore gaande wêreld tot redding. Verbeur die mens die 'kans' van "Vandag" van Evangeliese Oproep en Opwekking, verbeur hy die saligheid, want hierdie 'Vandag' is Christus se "Vandag!" "Vandag!" **is dit**, "Wanneer jy sy Stem hoor!"

Verder behoort 'n mens uit vers 7-8 ontwyfelbaar te kan verstaan dat Jesus die rus (van Homself) aan sy Volk verskaf **hét**, eens vir altyd, onherhaalbaar en ten volle. Daar is geen ander Naam onder die hemele gegee waardeur die mens verlos kan of sal word

nie. Hd4:12. Dit is deur God se "Spreke", 1:2b, (of "Woord van God", vers 12a), "in hierdie laaste dae", 1:2a, "in / deur die Seun", 1:2c, **of nooit!** Dit is deur God se "Spreke" (of "Prediking" van die "Evangelie", 4:2a, et al) dat "Hy 'n sekere dag (van verlossing) vasstel ... naamlik: Vandag-wat-julle-Sy-Stem-hoor— Hier is die onvergisbare definisie van "Vandag" in "4:7". "Vandag-wat-julle-Sy-Stem-hoor, verhard nie julle harte nie! Want as Jesus aan hulle (sy Volk) (eers) rus verskaf het (Indikatief) dan sou Hy tog nie (veronderstellend, Subjunktief) hierna ("na hierdie dinge" van Jesus se rusverskaffing— nié "in die plek van die Sabbatdag" nie!) van (nog) 'n ander dag (van geleentheid) gespreek het nie." "Hy sal Hom (nie) weer oor ons ontferm, ons ongeregthede (nie) weer vertree (nie); ja, U sal hulle sondes (nie weer) in die dieptes van die see werp (nie). (Maar) U sal (het) trou bewys aan Jakob, goedertierenheid aan Abraham wat U aan ons Vaders beloof het sedert die dae van die voortyd." Miga 7:19-20, soos vervuld in en deur Christus Jesus in en deur Opstanding uit die dode.

Daarna gevolgtrekking: "Daarom dan bly daar vir die Volk van God onderhouding van die Sabbatdag geldig." Dit is die boodskap van Hebreërs 4:9 tussen verse 7-10. "God vra dat ons nie ons harte verhard nie, maar dat ons in geloof ons harte oorgee aan Hom. Dit is die ware betekenis van die sabbat"— dit is die boodskap van Hebreërs 4 tussen verse 7-10. Amen, Ja kom, Here Jesus!

Josua of Jesus?

PdT, "Die skrywer van die Hebreërbrief wys daarop dat die rus waarvan Josua praat (4:8) nie die finale vervulling van die belofte van rus is nie (sien bv. Jos 1:15; 22:4; 23:1)."

Jammer, maar ek lees nie in Hebreërs 4 van "Josua" nie, en ook nie u nie. In Josua 1:15 lees u en ek van die Israeliete se 'broers' wat nog in die rus van die Beloofde Land, Kanaan, moes ingaan; In 22:4 lees u en ek van hoedat Josua wel die Israeliete in die rus van die Beloofde Land ingebring het; En in 23:1 lees u en ek van 'n geruime tyd nadat, die Here, en nie Josua nie, "aan Israel rus gegee het." Maar in Hebreërs 4, lees ons altwee, van hoedat

"**Jesus**" – nie "Josua" nie –, aan "hulle", dit is, aan "**ons**", "rus verskaf het":—

vers 1a, aan "ons";

vers 2a, "aan wie die Evangelie (van Jesus Christus) verkondig is **net soos** aan hulle (wat) in die verbittering (hulle) hart verhard het" (**3:15b**);

aan "ons", **4:3a**, "wat **geglo het** (en) die rus **ingaan**";

vers 6a: "Terwyl dit dan **so is** dat **sommige** (vers 9, "die (Christen-)Volk van God") **daar** (d.i., die 'rus' van die Evangelie van Christus Jesus) ingaan";

vers 7, "terwyl dit dan so is dat ... Hy **wéér**, dit is, 'n sekere dag, **naamlik vandag** (in Christus Jesus) bepaal";

"Wéér bepaal / vasstel" (omdat ná "die verbittering" en **in**, die 'Vandag' van die Evangelie van Christus);

"Wéér bepaal / vasstel", omdat: (**vers 8b**), "**na hierdie**

dinge" van die Vandag van die Evangelie van Christus,

"Hy **nié** van (nog, of van 'n tweede) dag (van geleentheid) daarná sou spreek nie". (*'ei gar .. ouk an'*)

U het gelees van "*Jesus, wat inderdaad aan hulle rus verskaf*

het"— oor en oor, sonder om te gesien het. Dit is baie jammer.

Want daarmee het u gemis om te sien wat u moes gesien het, naamlik, dat "**Daarom**, vir die Volk van God hulle hou van die

Sabbatdag geldende oorbly." Dit is jammer, want u kon nie sien watter goeie gevolge die vermagtinge van Christus vir sy Volk beteken het nie, ook nie watter goeie gevolge die vermagtinge van Christus vir die Dag van die Here, sy Sabbatdag, ingehou het en "*steeds geldende bly inhou*" nie.

Waarom moet ons – asof in strenge nakoming van een of ander ongenaakbare ongeskrewe wet – waarom moet ons van die "Sabbat van die Here jou God", ontslae raak? Asof deur 'n vuur verteer, dryf ons onself daartoe. Wat regeer ons harte en ons begeertes? Is óns, by magte om "die Sabbat van die HERE jou God", te **nullifieer**? Op gesag van die Wet van die Evangelie van Christus? Maar dit is dan tog een en dieselfde HERE van die Sabbat?

Waarvoor verwurg ons die **Skrif** so? Ons moet tog die stoeiwedstryd met die Woord van God verloor? Ons sal nie 'n medalje kry omdat ons Hebreërs 4 'ondergesit' het nie. Maar neem liever **teregwysing** ter harte; hoe gouer, hoe gouer sal ons smaak wat vryheid en vreugde in die Here Jesus is. Of ons gehoorsaamheid goed genoeg gaan wees, kom nie daarop aan nie; wat daarop aankom is om **vry te wees** en voor die Aangesig van die Here te speel, want óns gehoorsaamheid, word voor God, nié in onself nie, maar in Christus Jesus, oorweeg, geweeg en getoets en geskat en uiteindelik, beloon! O verseker, Ons sal Hóm in beloning ontvang; ons sal Hóm ons toekenning, kleinood en sieraad as hooftoisel dra, en ons sal Hóm op ons voorkoppe en op ons hande as teken dat ons aan die Here behoort en Hy aan ons, ontvang, en ons sal Hóm op ons skouer ons rang laat ken, ons sal Hóm voor die bors ons roem

laat bewonder.

Een van daardie kentekens dat ons vir God en Christus afgesonderd is, is – uit die mond van die Allerhoogste self – Sý, Sabbatdag. Of ons nou voor of na Christus gebore was, dis die Waarheid waarna die Sabbat heenwys.

Waarheid of verwarring?

PdT, "Hierdie rus (van "Heb 4:3" hierbo) noem die skrywer 'n sabbatsrus."

PdT **identifiseer** '*sabbatismos*' en '*katapausis*': "Die sabbatsrus waarvan Heb 4:9 praat is dus 'n geestelike rus, nie 'n fisiese rus nie."

Let op die konteks van PdT se plasing van "Heb 4:3": "... die rus waarin mense gaan as hulle glo in Christus en daardeur in 'n verhouding met God tree (Heb 4:3). Hierdie rus noem die skrywer 'n sabbatsrus. Dit is dus die vervulling van dit waarvoor die sabbat staan..." Weereens **identifiseer** PdT '*sabbatismos*' en '*katapausis*'.

Nêrens anders as in vers **9**, praat die skrywer van '*sabbatismos*' nie. Hy gebruik '*katapausis*' al die tyd voor en na vers 9. Hy gebruik '*katapausis*' in "Heb 4:3". Duidelik sou "die skrywer" '*katapausis*', in vers **9** geskrywe het **as**, let wel, '**as**', hy in vers **9** die reddende, **Sabbat-lose**, geloofsrus in Christus, die '*katapausis*' **soos** in "Heb 4:3", in gedagte gehad het. Die '*sabbatismos*' is egter nié hierdie reddende, **Sabbat-lose** geloofsrus in Christus, nie; dit is net maar die Sabbatdag-bevattende **maar nietemin** gelóofs-onderhouding van die Christen-mens!

Let op die konteks van PdT se plasing van "4:10": "... hoe mens toetree tot hierdie rus is deur die geloof (4:3). God het eens die sabbat bepaal as rusdag (4:10), en Hy bepaal nou weer 'n sekere dag in die plek van die Sabbatdag, naamlik vandag (4:7)." PdT **misgis** '*katapausis*' vir '*sabbatismos*'.

PdT lees "die sabbat" elke keer waar "die sabbat" nié is of veronderstel word nie: "... hoe mens toetree tot hierdie rus is deur die geloof (4:3). God het eens die sabbat bepaal as rusdag (4:10), en Hy bepaal nou weer 'n sekere dag in die plek van die Sabbatdag, naamlik vandag (4:7)."

Want PdT **verwar** "... die rus waarin mense gaan as hulle glo in Christus en daardeur in 'n verhouding met God tree (Heb 4:3)", met "Hierdie rus (wat) die skrywer 'n sabbatsrus noem"— **in 4:9!**

Van identifisering tot misgissing tot verwarring tot **wegdoening** deur 'vergeesteliking': "Hierdie rus noem die skrywer 'n sabbatsrus." ... "Hierdie rus" (bedoel PdT, is die rus) "in Christus". ... "Christus het weggedoen met alle vorme van fisiese wette ... In Christus het enige vorm van wet verval", waarmee PdT eintlik bedoel, "praktiese onderhouding" van die Sabbatdag-'sabbatisme' verval, gestop, verdwyn het. Op grond waarvan? ... enkel alleen PdT se eie 'mentale projeksies'. ('Mentale projeksies' is 'n term uit die 'Nuwe Hervorming').

Wel, só wil my 'mentale projeksies' na vele herooring, lyk: In Hebreërs 4:9 en die res van die hoofstuk het ons duidelik met **verskillende** 'rus', en 'dae', te doen:

(1b) "Daar **bly** dus **oor** (*kataleipetai*),

(2b) " 'n onderhouding van die **Sabbatdag**" (*sabbatisme*)

(3b) "**vir die Volk van God**"—

'**Bly oor**' om wat mee te doen? Om: **nádat**

(1a) "ons" in die 'geestelike' "rus" van "die **Evangelie**" (4:2,6,10),

(2a) 'geestelik', "deur die geloof" (4:3,11,16; 3:14, x3:19)

(3a) "ingegaan **hét**" – soos in verse 3 en 6 gestel en in vers 11: "Laat ons (Nuwe-Testamentiese gelowiges), "ons *dan beywer om in te gaan in dié rus*"— vers 8: "*aangesien Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het*" —

om **daarná**,

(1c) die "**Sabbatdag**" (*sabbatisme*)

(2c) 'fisies' en na 'Wet' "**geldend-blywend**" (apoleipetai)

(3c) uit 'geloof' en 'geestelik' as "**Volk van God**",

"prakties" te "onderhou".

Ja, die 'rus' – '*katapausis*', is iets wat 'geestelik' ingegaan word, maar nóg die 'rus' nóg die 'ingaan', kan van die 'fisiese', in eenheidsfront van 'Volk-van-God-deur-onderhouding-van-die-Sabbatdag-wees' – '*sabbatisme*', geskei word. Want dit is hier die **Kerk**, wat optree en "vir" wie die Gebod om "**in te gaan**", "nog geld"— "prakties" sowel as "geestelik".

"Prakties" en "geestelik" is dan in die Christelike geloof, gladnie uitsluitlike begrippe nie; inteeendeel! Nou, dit sê ons terwyl ons 'n 'geestelike' wet, 'geestelik' én, 'fisies', gehoorsaam, naamlik, deur die "praktiese" dog 'geestelike' "onderhouding" van die 'geestelike' dog 'fisiese' en "praktiese", "Sabbatdag": Vandaar: "*sabbatisme*"!

'n Groter en 'n mindere 'rus'

Maar, veronderstel nou '*sabbatisme*' = '*katapausis*'— **dan** ... Wat maak van die **groter** 'Rus', die '*Katapausis*', **minder** 'Wet' of minder 'wettesisme' maar die **méns** "**moet ywer om daarin in te gaan**"? Wat maak dit **minder** 'Wet' as die **kleiner** 'rus', wat tog maar net "*vir en ter wille van die Volk, geldend nagelaat (is om te onderhou)*"? Dan maak die skrywer mos die rus of redding die **mens** se eie prestasie? Dan sou hy mos geskrywe het: "Want as die **Volk** hulle rus **verwerf** het"? Want nou is dit mos die Volk se werk en is dit uit die Volk se krag! Terwyl God juis geswéer het, "*Hulle* (dit is die mens van verharde hart – alle mense; enige mens nie uit die ontferminge van God begenadig nie), *sal in my rus, nie ingaan nie!*"? Want was dit nie juis "*Jesus*, (wat) *aan hulle* (daardie 'groter' en 'geestelike') *rus verskaf het*" nie?

Hoe kon die skrywer van die suiwer 'geestelike gebod' van die 'geestelike ingaan' in die 'geestelike rus' van God (wat die geloof in Christus Jesus is), **in 4:9** gepraat het **terwyl** hy juis argumenteer dat die reddende geloofsrus in Christus, in Christus, en déur Christus **alléén**, gevind en vermag word? As dit is omdat "**Jésus, aan**, hulle, rus verskaf **het**", **hoe** kon die skrywer sê, dat dit "**vir** die **Volk** van God, oorbly of geld"? -- om deur **hulle**, gedoen te word? **Hoe** kon die skrywer sê dat die **Volk**, die doener moet wees, die **vermagter** van 'die rus van **God**', nie, 'Jesus', nie? Ten spyte daarvan dat God gesweer het, "**Hulle**, sal in **My** rus, nie ingaan nie"? Sou dit verskil gemaak het of dit 'n 'geestelike rus' of 'n 'fisiese rus' was behalwe dat die 'geestelike rus' soveel **moeliker** is en soveel verder **weg** van die menslike vemoë af? Maar die Skrif sê hierdie 'rus' "bly vir die **Volk** oor" -- om mee te **slaag**? Sou **dit, genade** wees, "Sodat Ek in my toorn gesweer het: Hulle sal in My Rus, **nié** ingaan nie"? Genade ja, as "die Rus (wat) **Jesus, aan** hulle verskaf **het**" en hulle in en deur **Hóm** daarin ingeneem is; Maar vergeefse moeite, as dit "vir die **Volk** (sou) oorbly" om te verkry! Want wat die Volk self moet doen, dit is 'wet', en deur die Wet word niemand geregverdig nie! Deur die Wet, **kan niemand** – nie Ou- of Nuwe-Testament nie – in die rus ingaan nie. Wat **net** Jesus kan doen, **dit** is die bron van **alle** rus. Daarom moet dit die **Sabbat** wees waar die skrywer sê daar het " 'n *onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk oorgebly*" — dit is 'wet', en deur die Wet word niemand geregverdig nie!

Daarom moet dit in 4:9 hulle **onderhouding** wees wat **uit** die genade-rus van verse 7 en 8 "**vir** die Volk **oorgebly** het". Sêlf ingaan, dit, is verdienste! Minder self-verdienslik sou gewees het as dit tog maar die Sabbatdag was wat "*vir die Volk oorgebly het om*

te onderhou", nié die rus wat die gronde van die saligheid, ja, wat die Saligheid Self is nie, wat net deur Jesus vermag, waarin net Hy mens kan inlei, en inbring; wat daardie 'rus' is wat **Jesus** aan die Volk **verskaf het!** 4:9 se 'sabbatisme' is volgens die eerste beginsels van die Evangelie van Christus onmoontlik daardie 'katapausis'!

"Want as Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het, praat Hy ná hierdie dinge nie weer van 'n ander dag daarna nie; daarom bly daar 'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag staande vir die Volk van God." Dit, is wat verse **7 en 8**, presies en letterlik sê; hierdie verse bevat gladnie die gedagte of woorde van 'n "sabbats-rus" nie. Die sekondêre gedagte en beginsel van die Evangelie van "Sabbatsrus" in die **letterlike**, "fisiese", dog volkome 'geestelike' en geloöfs-"**onderhouding van die Sabbatdag**", word **slegs in vers 9** gekry.

Die argument van die 'sabbatisme' as 'dié', en suiwer 'geestelik rus', is teen-produktief. Dat niks 'fisies' in die 'sabbatisme' gesien mag word nie, kan nie verduidelik wat dit beteken dat hier iets 'oorgebly' het nie. Dan maak dit geen sin dat dit "vir die Volk oorbly" nie. Die idee is self-weersprekend. Hoeveel meer as dit 'n 'Sabbats'-rus is maar dit mag nie 'fisies' en "fisiese wet" wees nie!

Nie dat die 'kleiner' 'rus' die 'Sabbatsrus' van " 'n onderhouding van die Sabbatdag", nie óók Genadewet en Genadegawe is nie! Nee, **al** wat "vir die Volk van God" – as die Volk van GóD, dit wil sê, as 'mense' aan wie "Jesus" **rééds**, die ewige saligheids-"**rus verskaf hét**". **Al** wat "vir" hulle – sonder enige verdienstelike-waarde of selfs net verdienstelike-motief –, "**nog geldend oorbly**", en uit die Bron van alle goeie gawes "**nog geldend oorbly**", is die "**onderhouding van die** (fisiese) **Sabbatdag**": As gééstelike en 'Christelike nalatenskap' uit die fontein van die rus wat Jesus aan hulle verskaf het, juis **omdat** dit as 'Wet' en verpligting 'opgelé' word en "**geldig bly vir die Volk van God**". Moenie vergeet nie, dit is "**die Volk van God**", en Hy is die Behoeder van Israel, en hulle is sy erfgename. "**Erfgename van God**", is hulle ander naam. Dis waar hulle hulle Sabbatdag en hulle behouding en onderhouding van hulle Sabbatdag vandaan ontvang het. Uit die skatkamers van sy rykdomme en kleinnode van die Koninkryk van die hemele. **Juis** daarom, is dit en kán dit en mág dit— hierdie "**onderhouding van die** (fisiese) **Sabbatdag**" wat "**nog geldend oorbly vir die Volk van God**", **nié**, verdienstelike wees of gemaak word nie, maar "**bly (dit) oor**" behoefte, nodigheid en noodsaaklikheid, vir die lewende en

groeïende "**Liggaam van Christus se Eie**" ... om ... "**Saam met Christus die eerste beginsels van die wêreld af te sterf**" en deur "**goddelike groei**", te óntgroeï. Dis waarvoor '**Sabbattefees**' aan die Volk van God "**nagelaat is**" of "**vir die Volk van God oorgebly het**", naamlik:

Om **op Christus** te "**fees**"

met "**ete en drink**" van

die **Brood** en **Water van die Lewe**, en om

"**ondersteuning van die hele liggaam**" te verkry

en deur "**verbindings**" en "**bande van die liefde**",

"**saamgebind**" te word.

'Katapausis'-'rus' en 'sabbatisme'-'Sabbatsrus' dieselfde

PdT, "Volgens Heb 4 bly daar 'n sabbatsrus oor..."— dit kan net "Heb 4", **vers 9**, wees! "...**hierdie rus**... (**4:3**) ...die **sabbat** bepaal as rusdag (**4:10**) ...'n sekere dag in die plek van die **Sabbatdag**, naamlik vandag (**4:7**)". Onderstreping CGE.

Dit blyk jou basiese dilemma te gewees het, PdT:

Daar bly dus geen manier oor, waarop die '**rus**'-'**katapausis**', en die '**Sabbatsrus**'-'**sabbatisme**' van die "**onderhouding van die Sabbatdag (wat) vir die Volk oorbly**", met mekaar **gelykgemaak**, of met mekaar **verwar**, kan of mag word nie. **En daarom**, bly daar ook geen manier oor hoe die '**Vandag**'-'**seemeron**' van die **Evangelie-Wekroep** van die dag van Goddelike Genadebetoning in en deur Jesus Christus, met die '**Sabbatsrus**'-'**sabbatisme**' van die "**onderhouding van die Sabbatdag (wat) vir die Volk oorbly**", **gelykgemaak**, of daarmee **verwar**, kan of mag word nie.

Die '**rus**'-'**katapausis**' en die '**Vandag**'-'**seemeron**'-**Evangelie-Wekroep**, is dieselfde; nié die '**rus**'-'**katapausis**' en die '**Sabbatsrus**'-'**sabbatisme**' nie. Die '**Sabbatsrus**'-'**sabbatisme**' en "**die Sewende Dag** aangaande waarvan God aldus gespreek het", is min of meer ekwivalente.

Die Sabbatrus wat Oorgebly het vir die Volk van God – ‘sabbatismós’

Hebreërs 4:9 bevat die **‘gebod’** vir **‘die heidene’**, waarop die wettisiste onophoudelik aandring.

Hoof-tema

‘Die Rus’ in Hebreërs 3 en 4

(1:1) *“(God het) ... in hierdie laaste dae tot ons gespreek deur die Seun (2) wat Hy as Erfgenaam van alles aangestel het, deur Wie Hy ook die wêreld gemaak het. (3) Hy – wat die afskynsel van sy heerlikheid en die afdruksel van sy wese is, wat alle dinge deur die Woord van sy Krag dra – het, nadat Hy deur Homself die reiniging van ons sondes bewerk het, gaan sit aan die Regterhand van die Majesteit in die hoogte, (4) terwyl Hy soveel uitnemender geword het as die engele namate Hy ’n voortrefliker Naam as hulle geërf het....”*

Die Opstanding van Jesus Christus

Die skrywer van die Brief noem Jesus se opstanding maar eenkeer, met dié woorde, *“Die God van vrede wat die Groot Herder van die skape, onse Here Jesus Christus, uit die dode terugbring het.”* Vrede, kuddelewe – die Kerk, en rus, word onmiddellik met Jesus se opstanding vereenselwig.

Hierdie vers staan egter vér agter in die Brief, in 13:20! Tog wil ek dit stel dat Christus se opstanding van die begin van die brief af, elke gedagte van die skrywer regdeur, solied onderlê.

Reg van die begin af, hoofstuk 1, word Christus se opstanding reeds vir geen korte oomblik nié geïmpliseer en nié heel eerste, vóórveronderstel, en, vooropgestel, nie.

Want, in ag genome die eerste verse van hoofstuk een :

Is dit nie so dat “God in hierdie laaste dae”, deur sy opstanding uit die dode, *“tot ons deur die Seun gespreek het”* nie? (1b)

Is dit nie so dat God, deur die opwekking van die Seun uit die dood, Hom *“as Erfgenaam van alles aangestel het”* nie? (2a)

Is dit nie so dat Hy in en deur Christus se opstanding uit die dood, *“ook die wêreld gemaak het”* (2b) nie? Want God het trouens *“die wêreld”* *“deur Hom”* – *“die Seun”* in opstanding uit die dode juis-núút, *“gemaak”*. *“Die Seun”* in opstanding uit die dode, Want: *“Hierdie wet (entolee) het Ek van My Vader ontvang”* – hierdie **“mag (eksoesia) om my lewe weer op te neem”**, Jh10:18. *“Wek U Mag op, en*

kom ons te hulp ... o Herder van Israel!” Ps80:2-3

Is dit nie so dat hierdie *Erfgenaam* nie ook nog *“alle dinge deur die Woord van sy Krag (‘dunamies’) dra”* nie? (3b) –deur *“die Krag (‘dunamies’) van sy opstanding”* naamlik! (Fil3:10)

Want, *“Sondereiniging bewerkstelligende dra Hy alle dinge”* - *‘katharismón poi-eesamenos’*, staan dit daar! Sonder Jesus se versoeningsbewerkstelling deur opstanding uit die dode, gaan alles verlore en tot niet.

[Volgens die OAB: *“Hy dra alle dinge nadat Hy die reiniging bewerk het”*. Die Grieks: *“Hy dra alle dinge déúrdat Hy, reiniging van sonde bewerk het”*, Deelwoord: *“bewerkstelligende”*.] Christus het *“alle dinge”* *“deur Homself”*, sáám met Hom en in Homself, weer ópgerig *“út die dood”*, weer *“terugbring”*, en vóórt, *“gedra”*, *“sondereiniging bewerkende”*!

“Sodat Hy deur die dood (die dood tot ópstanding uit die dood – “the death of death in the death of Christ”, John Owen) hom wat mag oor die dood gehad het, die duiwel, tot niet kon maak, en almal kon bevry wat hulle hiele lewe lank uit vrees vir die dood aan slawerny onderworpe was.” (Hb2:14c-15)

“O, dat Ek Hom mag ken en die krag van sy opstanding!” *“Sy Seun Jesus Christus, na die Gees van Heiligheid met krag verklaar as die Seun van God deur die opstanding uit die dode!”* (Ro1:4) *“Aan My is gegee alle mag in hemel en op aarde ... Kyk, Ek is met julle al die dae tot aan die voleinding van die wêreld”* : die Opgestane Heiland troos en gee krag!

“Deur Homself”, *“het Hy die wêreld gemaak”*, en *“dra Hy alle dinge”*, dáárdeur, dat *“die Seun”*, *“deur Homself, reiniging van sonde bewerk het”*. (1:3c)

“Ek maak julle die Evangelie bekend ... dat Christus vir ons sondes gesterf het ... dat Christus vir ons sondes begrawe is ... en dat Christus vir ons sondes opgewek is. ... En as Christus nie opgewek is nie, is julle geloof nutteloos; trouens, dan is julle nog in julle sondes. ... Maar nou, Christus is opgewek uit die dode.” (1Kor15:1-4,17,20)

Kolossensiërs 1:

“16 Want in Hom is alle dinge geskape ... alle dinge is deur Hom, en tot Hom geskape. 17 Want Hy is voor alle dinge, en in Hom hou alle dinge stand. ... 18b Hy wat die Begin is, die Eersgeborene uit die dode, sodat Hy in alles eerste kan wees. 19 Want dit het die Vader behaag dat in Hom die ganse volheid sou woon. 2:9 Want in Hom woon al die

volheid van die Godheid liggaamlik, en julle het die volheid in Hom wat die Hoof is van alle owerheid en mag."

"Hom opwekkende uit die dode het God Hom laat plaasneem aan sy regterhand in hemelse heerlikheid bo alle owerheid en mag en krag en heerskappy." Ef1:20-21

Daar is dan geen twyfel nie, dat wanneer die skrywer van Hebreërs skrywe dat, "die Seun", "deur Homself, reiniging van sonde bewerk het", hy allereers aanneem "dat Christus vir ons sondes opgewek is", want "as Christus nie opgewek is nie ... dan is julle nog in julle sondes" en 'is julle nog' nie "gereinig" nie.

Christus is die Eersgeborene uit die dode – "die dode": ons! "Hy is die Hoof van die Liggaam die Gemeente": ons! (Kol1:18a) Dit alles, gebeur en word waar, by en met, in en deur, en op grond van, die opstanding van Christus uit die dode! Soos die Hebreërbrief verklaar: "Wanneer Hy weer die Eersgeborene in die wêreld inbring ... want aan wie van sy engele het Hy ooit gesê: 'U is my Seun, Vandag het Ek U gegeneer?' (1:6)

Dit is duidelik, géén gedagte sonder Christus se opstanding uit die dode is vir hierdie skrywer moontlik nie. En sou ons nie Christus se opstanding uit die dode neem as basis en gronde en voorveronderstelling van en vir alles wat hy sê nie, moet ons maar weet, ons het nog nie eers begin om hom te verstaan nie.

Vgl. Js53:4,11,12, Mt8:17. Ook Kol2:12-13, "... julle ook saam opgewek deur die geloof in die werking van God wat Hom uit die dode opgewek het -- die werking van God wat ook julle wat dood was deur die misdade saam met Hom lewend gemaak het deurdat Hy julle al die misdade vergewe het."

"Sondevergiftigis bewerkstelligende" is Christus "opstanende uit die dode". Want, "Juis waar Hy deur Homself die reiniging van ons sondes bewerk het, het Hy gaan sit aan die Regterhand van die Majesteit in die hoogte", (3c) Let wel! ('katharison ... poi-eesamenos ... ekathisen')

Ons sê wéér: Regdeur die Brief, word Christus se opstanding vir geen korte oomblik nié geimpliseer en nié heel eerste, vóórveronderstel nie.

Want, wáár vind ons Hom, die Seun, by uitnemendheid, "die afskynsel van die heerlikheid en die afdruksel van die wese van God", (3a) as juis in sy opstanding uit die dode? Wáár, as juis "Terwyl Hy" ... deur opstanding uit die dood ... "soveel uitnemender geword het as die engele namate Hy 'n voortrefliker Naam as hulle" ... deur opstanding uit die dood ... "geërf het"! (4) Wáár was dit; en

wanneer, dat die Seun "soveel uitnemender geword het as die engele namate Hy 'n voortrefliker Naam as hulle geërf het"?

Laat Paulus ons antwoord:

"Toe Hy Hom uit die dode opgewek het / Hom uit die dode opwekkende ... en Hom laat sit het / Hom setelende aan sy regterhand in hemelse heerlikheid – bo alle owerheid en mag en krag en heerskappy en naam." Ef1:20-21 Nogmaals die Deelwoorde! Toe, en terwyl!

Laat Petrus ons verduidelik:

"... op grond van Jesus Christus wat met die regterhand van God ten hemel deurgegaan-is se engele en magte en kragte aan Hom onderwerpente opstanding." (Engels, "Who is gone"-'est in poreutheis')

Die skrywer gaan tog nie soos ek gemaak het, Jesus se opstanding elke keer noem nie – hy spel dit dan klaar uit deur een vir een die oneindige deugde daarvan aan te toon!

Die grootste deug van Christus se opstanding is, dat "Hy – Jesus – aan hulle –die Volk van God– Rus verskaf het".

Hierom gaan dit in hierdie gesprek.

Hierdie "Rus" deur Jesus verwerf en deur Hom vir sy Volk "verskaf", en aan sy Volk "gegee", is "Sy Rus", "die rus van God", "die Rus van sy eie werke", "sy Rus, soos God" – "soos God in sy eie heerlikheid van Goddelikheid". Dit gaan hierom: Hierdie "Rus" is deur Jesus verwerf: "triomfántlik verwerf" (Kol2:15c), "triomfántlik verwerf" deur opstanding uit die dode, deurdat "Hy aan hulle rus verskaf het"; deur opstanding uit die dode, deurdat "Hy self in sy rus ingegaan het" ... en dan wat daaruit voortvloei ... "vir die Volk van God".

Maar om vir uself te gaan seker maak ek praat nie my eie versinsels nie, gaan lees nou verder op enige plek in die Brief. U sal saamstem, die skrywer wil van niks anders iets weet en van niks anders iets getuig, as van Christus Jesus, en van Hom, as die Opgestane Een in opstanding uit die dode nie.

Hierdie skrywer veronderstel "volwasse" lesers (5:4); Verstaan hom soos volwassenes! Hy praat met mense wat "vanweë die tyd, leraars behoort te wees". (5:12) Moenie dat u, hierdie klare feite, soos vir 'n kind, met 'n teelepeltjie gevoer word nie.

"Die Rus", Metafoor vir die Opstanding van Christus

Nou is hierdie bevinding van ons uit gemeenskaplike vroeë na die Skrif-Woord van God, bevestig, dat die Hebreërskrywer op elke manier waarvan hy gebruik mag maak, van die opstanding van Jesus Christus praat -- dat hy menige metafoor, daarvoor toepas.

Ons kon deur **die hele Brief** aangegaan het op die wyse waarop ons hierdie enkele verse betrag het, en ons afleiding sal dieselfde bly: Dit gaan in geheel en in besonderheid vir die skrywer van Hebreërs oor die opstanding van Jesus as alles-bepalend ván, en allesbepalend vír, die Christelike geloof.

Sou 'Die Rus' dan, waarvan Hebreërs in hoofstukke 3 en 4 praat, nog 'n metafoor vir die opstanding van Christus wees?

Hoe het God *'gerus'*, en waarin?

In Christus Jesus, en in Hom in opstanding uit die dode! Inderdaad nooit anders nie! Mens kan en moet dit aanvaar en vooropstel, op grond van die skrywer se gedurige en onbevraagtekende toespeling op Jesus se opstanding. Mens kan en moet dit sê op grond van sy voorveronderstelling van Jesus se opstanding as grondslag van en rede vir – as noodwendigheid van en vóórvereiste vir – álles wat die Christelike Geloof uitmaak!

So dan het ons hierdie vooropstelling – dat Jesus se opstanding die hoof-tema van die brief is – maklikste en duidelikste kon sien deur eenvoudig die Brief te gaan lees het, en blyk dit weereens die geval te wees waar die skrywer van *'Die Rus'* van God, skrywe.

Te berde vir ons gesprek dus, is een van die skrywer se metafore vir die opstanding van Christus, *'die Rus van God'* – teenoor, en relatief tot – *"'n Sabbatsrus vir die Volk van God'*.

"Terwyl die belofte om in sy rus in te gaan, nog standhou" ... en "terwyl dit dan so is, dat sommige daar ingaan" ... "Laat óns, ons dan beywer om in te gaan, in dié rus." (4:1,6,11) "Dié Rus", waarin die Seun, *"soos Góð van sy werke"*, deur opstanding uit die dood, *"ingegaan het". (4:10) "Want ons wat geglo het, gáán die rus in." (4:3)* Sy opstanding, reinig ons van die sonde.

Baie meen ook die woord *'sabbatismos'* in Hb4:9, dui die *'Rus'* –daardie *'geestelike Rus'* waarvan ons heeltyd nog gepraat het– aan. Is *'sabbatismos'* derhalwe ekwivalent vir of selfs sinoniem van, *'katapausis'*? Duie *'sabbatismos'* –net soos *'katapausis'*– die opstanding van Christus aan?

Die vraag word dus genoodsaak: **Wat is God se 'sabbatismos' dan, in verhouding tot sy 'Rus'-'katapausis'?**

'Sabbatsrus' en 'Rus' – 'Sabbatismos' en 'Katapausis'

Die woord "katapausis"-rus' kom nege keer in die NT voor, waarvan slegs een geval, nie uit Hebreërs is nie (Hd7:49). Hierdie Selfstandige Naamwoord kom van die Werkwoord, 'katapau-oo' wat ook drie uit vier keer, uit Hebreërs kom. Die vierde geval is ook uit Handeling (14:18).

Die woord "katapausis"-rus' moes besondere betekenis vir die skrywer van hierdie Brief gehad het, soos duidelik is uit die plase van voorkoms daarvan: 3:11, 18; 4:1, 3, 3, 5, 10, 11; en 'katapau-oo', 4:4, 8, 10. Trouens, beide woorde blyk vir hierdie skrywer binne die verband van die Genadeverbond, diepe mening te gehad het OMDAT al sy toepassings daarvan tussen 3:11 en 4:11 voorkom -- waar die Genadeverbond herken word aan die volgende beskrywings van die skrywer daarvoor:

"My Rus" (3:11); "Deelgenote van Christus"; "Sy Stem"; **"Sy Rus"** (3:18); "Die Belofte" (4:1a) **"Sy Rus"** 4:1b); "Die Evangelie" (4:2a); "Die Prediking" (4:2b) "Die Geloof" (4:2c); **"Die Rus"** (4:3a); **"My Rus"** (4:3b); "Sy werke Volbring" (4:3c); **"My Rus"** (4:5); "Die Evangelie" (4:5b); "Sy Stem" (4:7); **"Rus gegee"** (4:8); **"Rus ingegaan"** (4:10a); **"God rus van sy werke"** (4:10b); **"Dié Rus"** (4:11).

Die ekwivalente betekenis, bedoeling, en gebruik, van die verskillende woorde en beskrywings vir dieselfde ding, is onmiskenbaar en duidelik, duidende op die Genadeverbonds-Rus van God; op die Rus van God van sy werke van voltooiing, heiliging, seëning en opwekking in, deur, en van, Jesus Christus.

Al die skrywer se beskrywings vir die 'Rus', kan saamgevat en opgesom word in, God se Ewige Evangelie-Rus, ingegaan déúr (in die eerste plek), Christus Jesus self, en, ín (in die tweede plek), Christus Jesus, deur sy Volk!

Duidelik is God se 'katapausis'-"Rus", nié sy 'Sabbatismos'-"Sabbatsrus", "vir die Volk van God", nie.

God se 'Sabbatismos'-"Sabbatsrus" "vir die Volk van God" vólg op, en is die vrug ván, God se 'katapausis'-"Rus": "Want as Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het en Hy daarna van geen ander dag (van verlossing) sou spreek nie, BLY DAAR DAAROM, onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God oor; bly dit oor OMDAT HY WAT in sy rus ingegaan het Self ook van sy eie werke as God in sy eie, gerus het." (4:8-10)

'Sabbatismos'-'Sabbatsrus'

"Daar bly dus 'n sabbatsrus oor vir die volk van God." As 'sabbatismos', 'katapausis' beteken het, waarom sou die skrywer nie 'sabbatismos' gesê, het nie? Of, eerder, waarom sou hy nie ook waar hy 'sabbatismos' gesê het, 'katapausis' gesê het nie? Want hy gebruik tog as die reël, 'katapausis' vir 'rus'? Hy weet mos waarvan

hy praat; dis feitlik net hy, altans, wat hierdie woord en woorde in die Skrifte gebruik!

Maar nee! As daar 'n 'gebod' wat sabbatsonderhouding "vir die Volk van God" aanbetref, 'oorgebly' het, dan 'vertaal' ons dit net eenvoudig uit en weg, want daar kannie, "n Sabbatsrus vir die Volk van God oorbly", waarmee Sondagsheiliging moet saamleef nie. Want daar is nie vir altwee – "onderhouding van die Sabbat", én, "Sondagwaarneming" – ruimte in die lewe van die Kerk nie.

Nóg die '*Goddelike vryheid*'*, nóg die '*menslike vryheid*'*, laat dit toe. (* Karl Barth se frases.)

Maar ons moet tog eers wéét waaroor dit nou eintlik gaan? Wat is dit wat uiteindelik, 'geldend', sou 'oorbly', of sou 'wag'? Is dit iets van belang vir die geloof en vir die geloofslewe van Christene? Of is ons moeite verniet – soek ons vir iets wat nie saak maak nie? Of soek ons nou vir iets wat vér voor ons lê en nie tans vir die Kerk of op die individuele gelowige, betrekking het nie?

Daarom eerstens, moet ons weet waarvan die ware Woord in die oorspronklike taal praat as dit van die '**sabbatismos**' praat wat (altoos) "vir die Volk van God **oorbly**".

Uit die staanspoor kry ons te make met korrupsie van God se Woord, reg in hierdie teks, waar kwasie-vertalings praat van 'n 'rus', en nie van 'n 'Sabbats-rus', nie.

Ek weet van geen Vertaling wat die Griekse teks, se woord, 'sabbatismos', letterlik – en daarom heeltemal reg – vertaal nie. Selfs die AV het net 'rest'. (Die AV gee wel die kantlesing, "a keeping of a Sabbath".)

Nou as dit maar net 'n 'rus' sou gewees het wat vir die Volk 'oorgebly' het' (of wat vir die Volk 'voorlê'), kan mens mos nie wil voorgee dat "n onderhouding van die Sabbat-dág, (nog) vir die Volk van God, geld" nie? Dit sou tog leuenagtig gewees het, en veroordelend oor hulle wat opreg glo dat hier van 'n geestelike 'rus' (wat Jesus Christus is), gepraat word.

Ons moet daarom seker maak wat die woord 'sabbatismos', presies, beteken, sodat ons kan weet waaroor dit essensieel, in hierdie Skrif gaan.

'Sabbatismos' kom net eenkeer, in Hb4:9, in die Nuwe Testament voor. Dit is afgelei van die soortgelyke, 'kognetiewe', werkwoordsvorm, 'sabbatidzoo' – "om Sabbatdag te hou". Vgl. die Septuaginta, Ex16:30, Lv23:32, 26:34-35, 2Kron36:21. Al hierdie teksplase verwys na onderhouding of waarneming van een of ander spesifieke 'dag', as 'Sábbat-dag'.

'Sabbatismos' word saamgestel uit die wortel of stam, 'sabbatidz--' (van die Werkwoordsvorm, 'sabbatidz-oo'), en die Selfstandige Naamwoord-vormende uitgang of agtervoegsel, '-mos'. In die samesmelting van die twee woord-dele, verander die '-dz-' in '-s-' om 'Sabbatismos' te vorm. 'Sabbatismos' word heeltemal reg deur geleerdes as 'n 'tegniese benaming' vir onderhouding van die

Sabbatdag, beskrywe.

Voorbeelde van ander sulke saamgestelde Selfstandige Naamwoorde as 'tegniese benaming' vir iets, is die 'Piëtisme' (die beoefening van piëteit); 'Gnostisisme' (die kultuur van kennis), e.d.m.

Skryf Samuele Bacchiocchi, 'The Sabbath in the New Testament', bls. 82/83, 'Literal Sabbathkeeping'. "*Verdere steun vir letterlike Sabbathouding word gehaal vanuit die historiese gebruik van die term 'Sabbatismos' soos in Hb4:9 aangetref. Hierdie term word ... meermalig in na-kanoniese literatuur as 'n tegniese term vir Sabbatsonderhouding aangetref in Plutarg (De Superstitione 3, Moralia 1660), Justinus (Dialog met Trifoo 23, 3), Epifanius (Adversus Haereses 30, 2, 2), Die Apostoliese Konstitusies (2, 36) en die Martelaarskap van Petrus en Paulus.*

A. T. Lincoln ('Sabbath, Rest, and Eschatology in the New Testament', in 'From Sabbath to Lord's Day', ed. Donald A Carson, Grand Rapids, 1982 --n. 61, p. 213) *erken dat in elk van bogenoemde gevalle die term die onderhouding of viering van die Sabbat(dag) aandui. Hierdie gebruik kom ooreen met die Septuaginta se gebruik van die kognetiewe Werkwoord 'sabbatidzoo' ...*.

Walter Bauer: "*'Sabbatismos'*, vertaal Hb4:9, die Sabbatruhe, die Sabbatfeier – Sabbat zu katapausis."

Die Authorised Version (KJV, kantlesing) gee "*a keeping of a Sabbath*" aan.

"*A keeping of the Sabbath*" – Liddell en Scott, 'Leksikon' Schrevelius, 'Leksikon', "*Onderhouding van die Sabbat(dag)*"

Karl Barth, "*Vanuit die skepping heen – enige menslike beslissing as gehoorsaamheid of ongehoorsaamheid voorafgaande sowel as oorheengaande – bly daar ('apoleipetai') vir die Volk van God die Sabbatsrus ('sabbatismos'), bly daar die deur God gewilde en beveelde Gemeenskap, Verhouding, en Ooreenstemming tussen sy eie en die menslike vryheid as Doel en Bestemming van die Weg, waarna hierdie Volk immer weer terug te roep is, waarna God nie moeg word om hulle terug te roep nie, en waarna Hy dit eindelijk en op die hoogtepunt van hierdie Omgang in sy Seun, beslissend en finaal, teruggeroep hét. (Hb4:9).*"

'Sabbatismos' : 'Die deur God gewilde en beveelde Gemeenskap, Verhouding, en Ooreenstemming tussen sy eie en die menslike vryheid'... nié sonder die deur God gewilde en beveelde dág van Gemeenskap, dág van Verhouding, en dág van Ooreenstemming tussen God se "eie en menslike vryheid" nie!

Nié sonder die dág van 'sabbatismos' "vir die Volk van God" nie! Nié sonder die dág van 'sabbatismos' "deur God gewil en beveel" nie; nié sonder die dág van 'sabbatismos' "vir Gemeenskap, vir Verhouding, en vir Ooreenstemming" nie -- nié sonder die dág van 'sabbatismos' wat "op die hoogtepunt van hierdie Omgang in sy

Seun, beslissend en finaal, teruggeroep" word, en in sy opstanding uit die dode, teruggeroep wás, nie!

"Sabbatisme", is "onderhouding van die Sabbat", "Sewendedag(-Sabbat) aangaande waarvan God aldus, gespreek het, en God het op die Sewendedag(-Sabbat) van al sy werke gerus." Hb4:4. (Let op die NAB se korrupsie wat die waarheid probeer omseil dat die Derde Persoon as Gód, "Hy", die Een is wat hier "gespreek het" – Aktief – nie maar net dat "*Daar êrens in die Skrif gesê word*" nie!)

Ons weet dus nou waarvan ons praat as ons van die "**Sabbatsrus**" in Hb4:9 praat. En ons weet nou waarvan die skrywer praat, as hy 'sabbatisme', skrywe.

'Apoleipoo' – "Bly geld"

Die skrywer plaas die woord "oorbly"-'apoleipoo', vóór in die sin, "daarom dan nou BLY, vir die Volk van God, onderhouding van die Sabbatdag oor", en hy gebruik die woord in sy Teenwoordige Tyds-vorm ('apoleipetai'), om met hierdie twee sintaktiese vaardighede, nóg sterker klem te plaas op die voldonge waaragtigheid daarvan dat onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God, "bly geld". Hierdie 'Sabbatsrus'-'sabbatisme', dan, "**sál geld**", vir solank as wat "*daar die deur God gewilde en beveelde Gemeenskap, Verhouding, en Ooreenstemming tussen sy eie en menslike vryheid as Doel en Bestemming van die Weg waarna hierdie Volk immer weer terug te roep is*"*, "**bly geld**"! (* Karl Barth)

Let op 'Die Nuwe Afrikaanse Bybel' se korrupsie van die Woord van God: "Daar **wag** dus nog steeds 'n sabbatsrus vir die volk van God." Dit bly nie geldig nie; dit moet nog kom.

"Wag", sê die 'Nuwe Bybel'; "bly oor", sê die 'Oue'. Watter een moet ons glo?

Hoekom maak dit saak dat die woord 'wag' verkeerd is, maar die woord 'oorbly', reg? Omdat die woord 'oorbly', die konnotasie inhou van 'oorbly as geldende ingewing van God', terwyl 'wag', hierdie betekenis uitkanseleer en daarvan 'n antroposentriese toekoms-skim maak. Dit maak die wêreld se verskil vir die lewe van die Kerk en aan sy gehoorsaamheid. Ons wil mos weet of daar regtig, "'n sabbatsrus vir die volk van God oorbly", en of dit waar is dat hierdie vers maar net vertel van 'n toekomstige, 'hemelse' staat van 'rus', waarin die gelowige hoop om eendag in te gaan, of waarin hy hom mag waan, hy reeds ingegaan het.

Die 'Classic Dictionary' van die Grieks (Universiteit van Chicago) gee tien basiese moontlikhede met kombinasies en variante, vir die Engelse woord, 'wait' (Afr. 'wag'). 'Apoleipoo' is nêrens te siene vir 'wag' in hierdie woordeboek nie. Dit kan nie uit dogmatiese bevooroordeeldheid wees nie, want hierdie is 'n 'sekulêre' woordeboek.

Die AV vertaal geen vorm van die woord 'wait' / 'wag', uit 'apoleipoo' nie, maar wel uit vyf heeltemal ander, basiese samestellings. Daarteenoor vertaal die AV 'apoleipoo' ses keer met "remain" of "left" – 'oorbly'. Al drie kere wat met "remain" vertaal word, kom uit Hebreërs, en aldrie kere is die betekenis ondubbelsinnig 'geldend oorbly'.

Word Hb4:9 se woord, 'apoleipoo', tog elders in die Skrif verskuild, met die betekenis van 'wag', gebruik? Nee; nêrens en duidelik, nêrens. Hier volg die gevalle – almal van hulle – van die voorkoms van 'apoleipoo' in Hebreërs:

4:6 "Omdat dit daarom 'n vereiste bly dat sommige nog in die rus (van God) **móét**, ingaan ..." (*'epei oun apoleipetai tinas eiselthein eis autehn tehn katapausin mou*)

Niemand bevroegteken dit ooit, dat die woord 'apoleipoo'-'oorbly', hierso, waar dit van die Gelowiges die eerste en mees logiese veronderstelling is dat hulle die GEBOD om die 'katapausis'-'Rus' van God in te gaan, móét, en sál "ingaan", nie! Hierso is 'apoleipoo'-'oorbly', Gebod; Geloofsgebod; Christelike a priori.

Ewe skielik egter, wanneer dit op die 'sabbatisme'-'Sabbatsrus' aankom ... wel, dan ... dan 'wág' ons eerder – tot in die ewigheid – eerder as om in gehoorsaamheid te wil glo, hier bevéél God sy Volk, "om Sabbat te hou".

Laat ons 4:9, ('ara apoleipetai sabbatisme tooi laoui tou theou ho gar eiselthoon') vir eers dan nou maar daarlaat, sodat ons eers nog verder kan gaan seker maak of hier regtig van Goddelike Gebod vir die Gemeente van Christus, gepraat word al dan nie.

Hb10:26, "Geen offer bly meer oor vir sonde nie!" ('peri hamartioon ouketi apoleipetai peri hamartioon thusia')

Niemand – geen Christen in elk geval – gaan beswaar maak dat slagoffers nog gemaak moet word nie. Almal stem saam, dit mág nie meer gedoen word nie, of ons is aan die Evangelie van Christus, ongehoorsaam!

Hier, in Hb10:26, sien ons dus die duidelike en onvergisbare GEBOD, TEEN, slagoffers. Die begrip, 'téén' kry ons van die woorde, "nie meer nie"-'ouketi'; en die begrip 'Gebod', kom van die woord 'apoleipetai' – van niks anders nie!

Nou as 4:9 sou beteken het – soos baie aanvoer – dat "onderhouding van die Sabbat" (sabbatisme) nié meer geldig is nie – dat daarvan niks meer 'oorgebly het' vir die Volk van God nie – dan sou hierdie skrywer (moet mens uit bogenoemde aflei), dit, gesê het: "Ouketi ('nie meer nie') apoleipetai ('bly oor') sabbatisme" – 'Onderhouding van die Sabbatdag geld nie meer nie'! En daarmee sou al die Sabbat-haters van harte saamgestem het. So is dit dan ook, dat hulle almal van harte daarteen saamgesweer het, ongelukkig niteenstaande die feit – dwars teen die naakte waaragtigheid daarvan in – dat daar geen so 'n woord in 4:9 as 'nie meer nie', te vinde is nie!

Die teendeel is egter in 4:9 waar – “Onderhouding van die Sabbat, bly oor”; en dit “bly óór, vir die Volk van God”, vir die Nuwe Testamentiese Gemeente van Christus – “apoleipetai Sabbatismos tooi Laooi toe Theoe” as suiwere en sekere geloofsverpligting! Want die woord ‘staan daar geskrywe’: “Apoleipetai sabbatismos tohi Laooi Theou” = “bly geld as plig en gebod onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God”.

“Maar (3:8-9) hulle het die hart verhard net soos in die verbittering, in die dag van versoeking, waar hulle My versoek het, My beproef het, terwyl hulle my Werke gesien het ...”, drie en dertig jaar lank, Sabbat na Sabbat, tot “op dié Sabbatdag”, “toe Hy Hom, na die uiterste van die grootheid van die krag van sy sterkte wat Hy gewerk het in Christus, uit die dood opgewek het”. (Ef1:19 en Mt28:1)

In 10:26 sê die skrywer, “oukети” – ‘nie meer nie’. In vers 9 sê hy dit nie. Net die Bevelswoord, “bly oor / bly geldig” word in 4:9 deur hom toegepas. Hy praat dus positief bevestigend van beide die Sabbatdag en die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag in 4:9. Hy ontken geen aspek van enigiets nie – nie van “Sabbats”-geldigheid nie; ook nie van “onderhouding” (van die Sabbatdag) nie. En hy ontken niks daarvan dat “Sabbatonderhouding”, “vir die Volk van God” is nie; en ook nie dat Sabbatsonderhouding “nog”, vir die Volk van God, “geldig is” nie. Inteendeel, die skrywer bevestig dit alles sowel as alle geldigheid daarvan.

“Daarom, soos die Heilige Gees spreek” (3:7), gebruik die skrywer van Hebreërs hierdie woord “apoleipetai”-‘bly’ / ‘bly óór’ / ‘geld’, juis vir die noue verband wat daar heers tussen die “katapausis”-‘Rus’ van God se Verbonds-Rus, of “die Evangelie”, en “die Volk van God”, die Nuwe-Testamentiese Gemeente van Christus, se plig en verpligting van “Sabbatsonderhouding”-‘sabbatismos’. Hierdie woord “apoleipetai”-‘bly’ / ‘bly óór’ / ‘geld’, is Gebods-Woord van God vir die Christen-Volk van die Ewige Onveranderlike God en Vader van onse Here Jesus Christus.

Wie nog vra na die ‘Gebod’ in die Nuwe-Testament vir ‘die heidene’, ‘om die Sabbat te hou’, vra dit uit pure, wel ingeligte, ongehoorsaamheid en onwilligheid.

Kom ons ontleed ons terme verder.

‘apoleipetai’, uit ‘apo’ – “weg van”, en, ‘leipoo’ – ‘geld / bly / nodig wees’.

“Abraham het ‘n tiende van (apo), alles, gegee.” (7:13)

“Onbevlek, afgesonder van (apo), sondaars.” (7:26)

“Reinig julle gewete van (apo), dooie werke.” (9:14)

Dit mag mens verbaas, maar hierdie voorsetsel, “apo” – ‘weg van’, kom maar selde só selfstandig aangewend, voor. En geen twyfel nie, dit is die geskikste term om die gedagte van ‘om te heilig’, mee te help uitdruk.

Nou die tweede helfte van ‘apo-leipetai’, komende van ‘leipoo’.

“Daar is ‘n oorblyfsel ooreenkomstig die uitverkiesing van die genade.” (Ro11:5) (‘leimma’ – uit ‘leipoo’) Daar “is”, of “bly”, ‘n heilige Volk, ‘n ‘oorblyfsel’, “oor”.

“Jy kom een ding kort (leipoo).” (Lk18:22)

Jy moet nog een ding doen voordat jy rêrig heilig sal wees. (Titus 1:5, 3:13)

“Sodat julle volmaak en sonder gebrek kan wees en in niks kortkom (leipoo) nie.” (Jk1:4)

“As enigeen van julle wysheid kortkom.” (Jk1:5)

“As ‘n broeder aan daaglikse voedsel gebrek het (leipoo) ... net so ook die geloof ...” (Jk2:15v)

Die ‘heiligheid’ en ‘volkomenheid’, waarop hierdie woord ‘leipoo’ toespeel, kom duidelik uit die enkele toepassings daarvan in die Nuwe Testament – in Hebreërs spesifiek –, na vore.

Voeg hierdie twee in die NT uitsonderlike woorde en begrippe, ‘apo’ en ‘leipoo’, saam, om ‘apoleipoo’ te kry, en die gevolglike betekenis is een van ‘heilige afsondering en toewyding’, ja, eintlik van **‘heilige plig en verpligting’**. “En daarom dan bly (**die wet van**) die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag, vir die Volk van God, geldig.”

“Hierdie **wet** (entolee) het Ek van My Vader ontvang” – hierdie **“mag** (eksoesia) om my lewe weer op te neem”, Jh10:18.

Só, lyk die Nuwe Testamentiese en Evangeliese, Wet, of Woord, van God. Vergelyk hoe Jesus sy ‘Wet’-‘entoleen’ van sy Vader ontvang het, Jh10:18 hierbo na verwys! Dis hoe ook Christene van hulle Meester, hulle ‘Gebod’, ontvang! (Vers 19 vertel onmiddellik dat daar verdeeldheid as gevolg hiervan ontstaan het. Dis vandag niks anders nie.)

So spreek die Here. Wie ookal kom beweer die Here God het ons as sy eie uitverkore Geliefde – die Gemeente van Christus – ten opsigte van sy Sabbatdag en óns beskikte aanbiddings-vergunning, aanbiddings-geleentheid, en aanbiddings-VRYHEID, soos wese agtergelaat, misken die Here God se Vaderlike sorgsaamheid in hierdie opsig, juis in en deur Christus Jesus onse Here.

Waarvandaan, bly die ‘Gebod’ – die ‘Heilige Plig’ – van “onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God”, dan “óór”? ‘Bly’, dit ‘oor’, vanuit die Ou-Testamentiese Wet van Tien Gebooue?

Nee; én, Ja!

Want as die Sabbat geldig was vir en tydens die vorige bedeling, en “nog steeds geldig bly” –soos die woord ‘apoleipetai’ trouens aandui– dan het dit mos vanselfsprekend, ín, tót in, en “vir”, die nuwe bedeling-Volk van God, “gêldend, oorgebly”!

Maar ook as die Sabbat vir en tydens die Ou bedeling van die Nuwe getuig, en daarop gedui het, sal die verwesenliking en vervulling van hierdie vooruitduidende, profetiese en eskatologiese

eienskaplikheid van die Sabbatdag, vir en tydens die Nuwe Verbond, van krag geword hét – as God sy Woord waar sou gemaak het; wat Hy sekerlik en ontwyfelbaar ook waargemaak hét.

Nogtans is nie een van hierdie twee verduidelikings of redes, die ware en direk-toepaslike rede vir die geldigheid wat volgens hierdie teks en woord, “oorgebly het”, nie.

Want daar is hiérdie gronde en hiérdie rede vir en van die Nuwe-Testamentiese geldigheid van die Sabbatdag se onderhouding deur die Nuwe-Testamentiese Volk van God, naamlik,

“DAAROM DAN NOU (ARA) bly daar vir die Volk hulle onderhouding van die Sabbatdag geld”

Waarna word hier met die Redegewende Verwysings- en Aanduidingswoord, ‘ara’, “daarom dan verseker”, verwys?

Na nóg die Ou-Testamentiese waaragtigheid van God se Sabbatdag; na nóg die ewigdurende Goddelike gegewenheid van die Vierde Gebod; na nóg die vooruitwysende en vooruitgetuigende essensie van die Sabbatdag.

Maar, na die oorspronklike, waaragtige en ewige fundering van die Sabbatdag, word verwys; na Jesus Christus, na sy Volk “in Hóm”, en daarna, dat Hy inderdaád, “aan hulle (sy Volk) rus verskaf hét” –vers 8– welke rede en gronde, die skrywer bevestigend en versterkend herháál in die tiende vers: “Omdat Hy (Jesus) dan in sy eie rus as God in sy ware Self ingegaan het --- DAAROM DAN NOU (ARA) bly hulle onderhouding van die Sabbatdag vir die Volk van God geldend staande!”

Presies dieselfde funksie en betekenis wat deur die woord ‘ara’-“daarom dan nou”, verrig en vervul word, word deur die woord, ‘eiselthoon’-“omdat Hy ingegaan het”, verrig en vervul. Want hierdie woord, ‘eiselthoon’, is ‘n Deelwoord, wat net soos ‘ara’ (Rede-Aanwysende woord) daarvóór (in vers 9), en, ‘ghar’-‘want’, daarná (in vers 10), redegewende en aantoonende betekenis het: “Daar bly DUS DAAROM (‘ara’), ‘n onderhouding (‘apoleipetai’) van die Sabbatdag (‘sabbatismos’) geldig vir die Volk van God, *WANT (ghar) INGANENDE (eiselthoon)* in sy rus het Hy (Jesus) inderdaad van sy eie werke as God self, gerus.”

“Die Rus Ingegaan”

Mens kannie Hb4:9 goed verstaan, sonder om dit met die tweede Tien Gebooie te vergelyk nie.

In die Vierde Gebod van die tweede ingewing van die Tien Gebooie, gee God hierdie rede aan die Israeliete, WAAROM, hulle, die Sabbat moet eerbiedig soos God dit gewil het. Dáár, ‘staan dit geskrywe’:

“Onderhou die Sabbatdag dat jy dit heilig soos die Here jou God jou beveel het: Ses dae moet jy werk en al jóú, werk doen – WANT, die Séwendedag, is die HERE jou Gód, se Rusdag (vir Sý, Werk – sy Werk van Rus-skep)! Jy mag dán (terwyl God die Rus, Sý

Rus, werk), géén werk doen nie ... MAAR, jy moet dáaraan dink: dat jy in Egipteland ‘n slááf was, maar die HERE jou God het jou daarvandaan UITGELEI, deur sy Sterke Hand en Uitgestrekte Arm (Jesus Christus); DAAROM, het die Here jou God jou beveel om die Sabbatdag te hou.”

Merk u die groot verskil op tussen die verlossing wat God vir eers, bewerk het, en die Verlossing wat Hy uiteindelik, volbring het? Sien u dat dit eers ‘n “UIT-lei” as rede vir Sabbatsonderhouding was (Eksodus); maar in Christus Jesus, het dit ‘n “IN-bring as rede vir Sabbatsonderhouding” (Hebreërs), geword – inderwaarheid, ‘n “ingebbring, hét”, ‘n “rus verskaf, hét” (vers 8)?

Die Subjunktief van vers 8 is retoriese manier vir sterkste moontlike feite-stelling: “Sóú Jesus, aan hulle rus verskaf het, sóú Hy daarna (na volbragte verlossing), van geen ander dag daarna gespreek het nie, GELD onderhouding van die Sabbatdag, dáárom, stééds, vir die Volk van God!”

Kyk net hoe meesterlik gebruik hierdie skrywer die veronderstellende ‘Subjunktief’, om die ‘Imperatief’ of Bevelsvorm mee te konstateer – beklemtonend mee aan te dui! Hierdie man het geweet hoe!

Moet u nie laat omtik deur slim manne se imponerende streke nie, want Jesus hét die rus verskaf, en God spréék eenvoudig nie weer van nog ‘n dag van verlossing nie! Ek vertaal die Subjunktief daarom altyd en sonder skroom met ‘n duidelike Indikatief, want ek argumenteer tog nie oor die volstrektheid van God se Wil en Voorneme nie. Die Jode mag dit in die skrywer se tyd gedoen het, want om Jesus as die Messias te aanvaar het, was ‘n groot ding vir hulle. Maar nou het hierdie skrywer, hulle deeglik die mond gestop. Vir hom (en so vir my) is Christus die Ja en Amen van die beloftes van God, en daarom glo ek is Hy die grondslag van ook die Sabbatdag, en is dit Hóm waardig dat met die Indikatief, op die ware manier gesê word net wat die Grieks se Subjunktief indikatief konstateer.

Merk dan nou op die fyne nuanse, die spitse toespeeling in hierdie herhaalde Vierde Gebod, op hoe God “SY EIE RUS” ‘waargeneem’ het.

In die eerste ingewing van die Sabbatsgebod van Eksodus 16, is daar ‘n duidelike ‘stop’ tussen die skeppingsaktiwiteite van God en sy rusdaad van die daaropvolgende Sewendedag-Sabbat. Maar in die tweede Vierde Gebod (as ons nou die Eksodus 31:13-18 instellings-Woord van God vir nou vir later mag hou), word sy verlossingsdaád, met God se Rús, as sodanig, feitlik vereenselwig, verenig en geïdentifiseer.

God se ‘Uitlei’-verlossingsdaad of wérk; God se ‘energie-aanwending’, (Engels, ‘energising’ – van die Grieks, energhē-oo) van op die Sewendedag-Sabbat die Israeliete uit te gelei het, word as’t ware God se Rus-dáád én Rus. Hierdie tweé aspekte –God se

Rus, én, Sabbats-Wérk– verskaf dan as één, aan die Sewendedag-Sabbat, sy aard of ‘karaktereienskap’ van “Uitlei-Dág”, én, “Rus-Dág”, van Gód, te wees.

In Christus Jésus en deur Hóm, het hierdie ‘Uitlei-en-Rus-Dag-van-God’, sy ‘INBRING-en-INGAAN-Rus-Dag’, geword.

In eenvoudige taal is die implikasie van hierdie ingewikkeldheid van die Sabbat, dat God juis óp die Sewendedag-Sabbat, Ewige Verlossing gewerk en afgehandel en volmaak het. Júis, op die Sabbatdag, en op geen ander dag van God se wil en skepping nie as “Die-Sewendedag-Sabbat-van-die-HERE-jou-God”. WANT juis, “ÓP die Sewendedag-Sabbat, HET GOD ...”, sodat die Dág en juis hiérdie Dag, “dáárom dan” (ondermeer, ‘ara’), enigsins, betekenis ontvang en verkry hét, en stééds, ontvang en verkry.

“Die Sabbatdag geld daarom”, omdat “God op die Sewendag gerus het”. Soos Karl Barth dit gestel het: “Wat van hierdie dag hierdie besondere Dag maak, is dit, wát, daaróp, en daarméé, gebéúr, het.” God se dáád, sy Verlossingswérk, sy Rus –tesame, ineen en as een–, is wat aan die Sewendedag-Sabbat betekenis en geldigheid, géé. Nié die mens of sy werke of sy rus of sy plig nie!

Daarin dat God die Verlossing gewerk en volmaak het in en deur Jesus Christus, word sy Verlossings-wérk God se Verlossings-rús. God se ‘Uitlei-Werk’ en in Christus Jesus alleenlik nog ‘Ingebring-hét-Werk’, is God se ‘katapausis’-Rus – sy **Verlossingsrus** in Jesus Christus. Daarin dan, dat God hierdie Verlossingsrus “ÓP, die Sewendag-Sabbat van die Here jou God”, gedoen en volmaak het, word die Sewendedag die ‘sabbatimos’-Sabbatsrus van God, én, van die Volk van God.

Die Sewendedag Sabbat is begenadigde- en begenadigings-Dag – Rúsdag; en daarom, is dit heilige en bepaalde Dag-van-God-se-Rus-Daad “vir die mens”-‘dia anthroopoon’. Meer korrek gestel: Die Sewendedag Sabbat is heilige en bepaalde Dag-van-en-vir-die-Rus-Daad-van-God; en dáárom, is dit Rúsdag -- Rusdag ván Gód, “vir, die Vólk van God”. Dit was altyd so en waar; maar altyd nog was dit so en waar op grond en op sterkte van die waar-wórd en die waar-wéés daarvan in Jesus Christus, en déúr Hom, eens vir altyd in die opstanding van Hom uit die dood.

Nadat God Israel “uitgelei het”, mag slegs nog tentatief – voorwaardelik, gesê word dat God Israel in die Beloofde Land ‘ingebring het’. Want nadat God Israel “op (sy) hande gedra het” oor die Rooi See, het Hy hulle nog nie oor die Jordaanrivier gelei nie, en was hulle ‘Uitlei’, maar nog net die agterdeur van die vervulde belofte. Nogtans omrede hierdie ‘uitlei’ van God, beveel Hy sy Volk om die Sabbatdag te heilig, en om daarop, en só, in die Rus van Gód – die wáre, “Geloofs-Rus”, Jesus Christus, die ‘Ingegaan-hét-Rus-van-God’ – in te gaan.

Hulle s’n was ‘n geloofsdaad nes ons s’n – wat nie baie van ons almal, werklik deelagtig geword het nie. Nee; eintlik was hulle

geloofsdaad, groter as ons s’n – ons wat aanskou het, nie net die werke van sy hande in skepping en uittog nie, maar die Werker van “Die Evangelie” Self. Hulle moes vooruit glo aan wat nog sou kom (die skrywer se veronderstellende Subjunktief in vers 8); maar ons, staan voor die geloof in wat in Christus Jesus deur God waargemaak wás. Ons geniet dus groter bewys en bevestiging, sodat ons nog groter getuienis het vir onderhouding van die Sabbatdag as wat hulle gehad het. Hoe kan mense dan sê dat die Israëliete nie deur die geloof geregverdig was nie, maar uit die werke van die wet? Hulle weet duidelik nie wat hulle praat nie, en moet in onkunde verkeer oor wat regverdiging deur die geloof regtig beteken.

“Maar nou dat Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf hét,” “en sommige daar wél ingegaan hét”, verklaar die Nuwe-Testamentiese Woord in Hb4:8-10, “nou dat Hy self van sy eie werke gerus het en in sy eie rus as God in sy ware Self ingegaan hét ... DAAROM DAN NOU, BLY onderhouding van die Sabbat-Dág, vir die (hele) Volk van God (van alle tye), geld!” “Want aan ons was die Evangelie verkondig net soos aan hulle” – dan nie?

En hierin merk u die verskil én ooreenkomst, tussen God se “Rus”-‘katapausis’, en die Volk se “Sabbatdag-onderhou”-‘sabbatimos’: Dit is nie net die Volk s’n nie, maar in die eerste plek, Gód, se ‘Sabbatimos’-“Rus”; Dit is nie net Gód se ‘katapausis’-“Rus” nie, maar óók, die Volk, se ‘katapausis’-“Rus”, waarin nie net God in die eerste plek in Jesus Christus ingegaan het nie, maar ook die Volk uitgenooi word: “Vandag, as julle Sy Stem hoor, moenie julle hart verhard nie.” “Gaan die Rus in!” “Ek is die Deur”, “en Ek sal aan julle Rus géé”. “Verniet het julle ontvang.” “Julle is dúúr, gekoop.”

Nóg die ‘katapausis’-“Rus”, nóg die ‘sabbatimos’-“Sabbatsrus”, kan sonder die geloof gaan. Hy wat die ‘katapausis-Rus’ van God deur en in Jesus Christus ingegaan het, dit sal vir hom ook “daarom bly geld”, om die ‘Sabbatimos-Sabbatsrus’ van Gód, deur die gelóóf, “in te gaan”.

Die oomblik wat oneerbiedige hande hulle vergryp aan enige van God se ‘katapausis-Rus’ en ‘sabbatimos-Rusdag’, om wat God saamgevoeg het van mekaar te skei, matig hulle hulself aan teen God die Almagtige.

Gevolgtrekking

Wat beteken dit, dat “Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het”; en, dat “soos wat Hy ingegaan het in sy rus Hy Self van sy eie werke as God gerus het”?

Dit beteken, deur sy opstanding uit die dood, “het Jesus aan hulle (Volk van God) rus verskaf”! Want Jesus het nog geen “rus verskaf” alvorens “Hyself, in sy eie rus ingegaan het” nie, en Hyself, het nog geensins “in sy eie rus ingegaan”, alvorens Hy uit die dode uit, opgestaan het nie!

Die skrywer van Hebreërs pas hierdie uitdrukkings – “Hy het rus verskaf”, “Hy het sy rus ingegaan”, toe, met net één betekenis, dat Jesus die graf, die sonde en die mag van die duisternis -- die dood, oorkom, oorwin, daaroor getriomfeer, en dit vernietig het!

Niks anders en niks minder as dit, beantwoord aan die verwagtinge geskep deur die skrywer se gebruik van juis hierdie woorde as die voorskrif, die mandaat en rigtingaanwyser vir die Volk van God in sy Sabbatsonderhouding nie.

Hierin en hierdeur alleenlik en uitsluitlik -- hierin en hierdeur, eerstens, dat “Jesus aan hulle rus verskaf het (en Hy van geen ander dag van verlossing hierna sou spreek nie)”, en tweedens, “omdat Hy ingegaan het in sy eie rus en soos God, van sy eie werke gerus het” – hierin en hierdeur alleenlik, eerstens en uitsluitlik, ontvang, en hét, die Nuwe-Testamentiese Volk van God, hulle **Imperatief**, hulle **Gebod**, hulle **Woord as Daad van Gód** Almagtige Verlosser-Skepper, vir die waarneming, onderhouding en heiliging van die Sewende Dag Sabbat. Niks kán meer gevra of verwag word nie; niks dúrf bygevoeg word nie; niks mág weggeneem word nie. “Want aldus het God van die Sewende Dag gespreek ...”, van die skepping af heen en deur die ganse geskiedenis van hemel en aarde, “van die Seun, in Wie Hy groot welbehae het”.

Ons het ontvang as rede en gronde, as belofte en vervulling, as rykwydte en vooruitsig, as hoop en vertrouwe, vir “die onderhouding van die Sabbatdag”, deur, en ás, “die Volk van God”, “Jesus”, wat aan óns, “Volk van God”, “die rus verkaf hét”, én, “sélf, as God in sy weselike eie, in sy eie rus ingegaan het”. “Daarom bly onderhouding van die Sabbatdag geld vir die Volk van God.”

Die Volk van God het vir Jésus as rede vir hulle onderhouding en heilighouding van God se Sabbatdag, en as motief, “die heerlikheid van God in die aangesig van Jesus”. Hierdie in Jesus tweevoudige rede en gronde (die ‘Inbring van die Volk’, en die ‘Ingaan van Hom’), is “in Hom en deur Hom en tot Hom”, tot ‘n eenheid saambring, en onskeibaar verening, in en deur en tydens, Jesus se opstanding uit die graf, uit die dood, en onder die dode uit, “Sabbats”! (Mt28:1)

Die Volk van God – die Nuwe Testamentiese Gemeente van en in Christus – het daarom en uiteindelik, grondig en oorspronklik, die Opstanding van Jesus Christus, vir en tot rede, gronde, motief en aansporing – ja, as Belofte én Opdrag, van en vir en tot hulle heiliging van die Sabbatdag – van en vir en tot hulle “féésviering van Sabbattefees” volgens Kolossensiërs 2:12-19!

Vir verduideliking van enige Skrifture in hierdie stuk na verwys, sien ‘The Lord’s Day in the Covenant of Grace’ – u moet maar self kyk in watter boek of boeke, asseblief. Laai af van my webtuiste hieronder aangegee.

Gerhard Ebersöhn
Suite 324
Private Bag X43
Sunninghill 2157
Johannesburg

biblestudents@imagnet.co.za
<http://www.biblestudents.co.za>

ISBN 978-0-620-41731-0; 978-0-620-41739-6