

[Col 2:16-17 ESV] 16 Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink, or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath. 17 These are a shadow of the things to come, but the substance belongs to Christ.

We are on the third sermon in our study on the Sabbath.

In the first sermon we looked at why the position that “Sunday is now the new Saturday” is **difficult**, if not **impossible**, to support biblically. But we **did** emphasize that **keeping a Sunday Sabbath** and **worshipping on Sunday** are not one and the same thing.

In the second sermon we looked at why the Seventh Day Sabbath keeping position is so compelling. The strongest argument is that the **fourth** command is part of the **10 commandments** that most Christians believe are still binding upon a Christian.

For the last couple of months I have been trying to put my finger on the main difference between the Sabbatarian position and my own. I think I might have come to understand this on Monday of this week.

It is found in Galatians.

[Gal 3:24-29 ESV] 24 So then, the law was our guardian until Christ came, in order that we might be justified by faith. 25 But now that faith has come, we are no longer under a guardian, 26 for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. 27 For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. 28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. 29 And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise.

The King James uses the word School Master where ESV says guardian.

Basically this guardian was a child's educator. This guardian walked the child through all the lessons that needed to be learned in order to prepare the person for his or her adult life. The law, according to Paul, was intended for that purpose.

Paul is telling us something about the law that Moses and Old Testament believers would not have known. He is giving us an insight into the purpose of the law that was probably hidden to the people who were keeping it over the years.

And what was the law preparing us for? What was the most fundamental purpose of the law? It was **to prepare us for responding to Christ in faith.**

The law was to **make us ready** to have faith in Christ. That was its highest purpose. It surely served other purposes. And it still does. But Paul gives us an insight into God's **ultimate** purpose of the law.

So the law was subservient to the destination that the law was to take us to. The law led us to Christ. Christ is of **most** importance. The law's importance was primarily to get us to Christ. The law was not an **end** but a **means to an end**. So now, when we read the law, one of the first questions we should ask is **how would this be used to lead us to Christ?** How would this law be used as a **schoolmaster guiding us to faith in Christ?**

When Christ spoke to the men on the road to Emmaus in Luke 24, it says, **27 And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.** In verse 33 they talked about how excited they were when Jesus "**opened to us the scriptures**". Jesus was teaching them the law from this side of the cross. And it was stuff they evidently would not have seen without Christ's help. It was stuff they did not grow up with.

Then later Jesus told his disciples-

44 "These are my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you, that everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled." 45 Then he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures,

See how he "Opened their minds to understand the scriptures." That means that some of the assumptions they held about what scripture seemed to clearly say were wrong. Some obvious things weren't obvious at all. Jesus made them see things about the law that they would not have seen without His help.

All of us are likely to choose one of the two following options.

We will either read the **New Testament** through **the eyes of the law**. Or we will **read the law** through the **eyes of the New Testament**. It is a very subtle **difference** in approach, but it leads to **very different results** in theology.

Let me put this another way. If you wanted to find out how the Old Testament law applies to a New Testament believer, who would you ask to talk to first?

Paul or **Moses**? You are going to arrive at different conclusions, I believe wrong conclusions, if you prioritize what Moses tells you over what Paul tells you about Moses. You will have the right conclusions if you prioritize what Paul tells you over what Moses tells you. Both perspectives are important, but

one is of a higher priority than the other, one is more fully informed than the other, just like the **destination** of Christ is more important than the law's function of **getting us** to Christ. When a servant guides you to a destination, the servant from that point forward will serve a different function. I am not trying to say that we no longer need to obey any of the law. Both Jesus and Paul tell us **where** and **how** we should. But I am saying that we best understand the law's **intent** from **this side of the cross**. **We** know things about the law that **Moses** would have marveled at.

This morning I seek to view the fourth commandment through the eyes of the New Testament.

I will add this as a teaser. What if God hid the fourth commandment as a gem, right inside the foundation of the law, to point us to Christ? Who here would complain if God, in His Sovereignty, chose to have His people, over time, taking one day of the week, **unknowingly preparing** their hearts for Christ? Who of us would say, no God, you cannot use that commandment for that purpose? Who would say, "You cannot create one of the 10 commandments in order to fulfill it in Christ."

In this sermon I hope to show how the position of the Sabbath being fulfilled by Christ is an easily **defendable** and extremely **faithful** application of all that scripture says about the Sabbath. I said last week that the assumption that is foundational to Seventh day Sabbath position is that the fourth commandment is the same in intent and purpose as the other 9 commandments. I will seek to show this morning that the 4th commandment was a gem hidden in the 10 commandment whose purpose was to point us to Christ.

We need to ask this question. Does scripture give us **any reason to believe** that the 4th commandment should be dealt with in a way **different** from the other 9? This is not an issue of God's character changing. It is possibly an issue of a hidden intent in the 10 commandments that is later revealed in the New Testament.

That is the million dollar question and at the heart of the Sabbath study. Is the 4th commandment different. Now scripture was not written in a way to hide truth. It was written in a way that would reveal it. We do not need to be Sherlock Holmes.

If the 4th commandment is **intended** to be **viewed differently**, we should see **clear statements** that reveal **how** it is different. So now we are going to

approach what the New Testament says about the command and **that** is what we are looking for. If there are no significant differences, we are bound to keep the command, just like we would keep the other 9. If there is a **difference**, we **define it** and **apply it** according to what the Bible reveals. We should expect that differences will not be hard to find **if** the 4th command **really is** different.

First Difference-

The 4th commandment is not repeated or enforced with Gentile believers in scripture.

We start by looking at the sin lists that the New Testament persistently presents. There are at least 12 of those lists in the New Testament. The prohibition of Idolatry covers the first 3 commandments of the 10 commandments. The prohibition of idolatry is mentioned at least 17 times. It is strictly and clearly forbidden and condemned. So the first three commandments are repeated and enforced.

All of the rest of the rest of the 6 commandments are listed in one form or another in many of the sin lists that Paul compiles. Paul has no trouble listing the sins that are reflected in the 10 commandments in his sin lists. He follows Jesus's lead in expanding the sins. Not only is adultery a sin but lust is a sin. Not only is murder a sin, but just as Jesus said, hatred is a sin. Paul is not bashful about exposing the 10 commandment sins, and even their logical extensions. But NEVER does he list a failure to keep the Sabbath as a sin. Never ever.

Logically there can only be one of **two reasons**.

First is that these gentiles are keeping the Sabbath so well that it does not need to be addressed.

Or **second**, it is not as important as the other sins he addresses.

Now the Sabbatarian position is logically forced to contend that these Gentiles **must** have been **keeping** the Sabbath, and they must have been keeping it **satisfactorily**.

There is no scripture that tells us they were. There are some **descriptive** passages where we see Christians at synagogues on the Sabbath. But scripture does not tell us that Gentiles were told to keep the Sabbath or were keeping the Sabbath. That means it is an **assumption** that the Sabbatarian position carries based on some evidence.

If scripture told us that the Gentiles were told to **keep the Sabbath** and that **they were keeping it**, this sermon would be over. We would immediately begin keeping the Sabbath and worshipping on Saturday. But because it doesn't, we need to look at this lack of any **Sabbath rebukes** closely.

Think about this. Paul is writing to new believers. I think the Corinthians give us the clearest example of the type of people he was dealing with. These were Christians who were visiting prostitutes. They were getting drunk at the Lord's supper. Some of these believers evidently did not even believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ. Look at the fundamentals to the faith that Paul had to address. What is the likelihood that these people were **satisfactorily keeping the Sabbath**? What is the likelihood that the **first thing** Paul taught and emphasized to these Gentiles for whom a Sabbath would be a completely foreign idea, was that they needed to keep the Sabbath. He would have had to tell them what that means and how they do it. And he would have had to emphasize it as being even a bigger priority than avoiding prostitutes, getting drunk, and believing Jesus raised from the dead.

Also think about this. Do you know any **fundamentals** to the Christian life that the epistle writers in the New Testament **don't cover** in their letters? I can't think of any. Instructions about the Sabbath are a notable exception. And think about this too. The Sabbath is not a simple concept. It would take at least a couple of paragraphs to explain what it means to keep the Sabbath. So what does all this mean if Sabbath keeping instructions are not covered at all?

We only have a couple of choices here.

Either the new Gentile believers were keeping the Sabbath well, even though the Sabbath would have been a completely new concept to them.

Or they were not keeping it well, but it wasn't as high a priority as the other teachings were.

Or they were not being told to keep the Sabbath at all.

Now what about the Jerusalem counsel? Paul took his issues to the apostles in Jerusalem. The **whole issue** was what should be done about Gentile converts? How should they be dealt with? What distinctly Old Testament Jewish demands should still apply and which ones should not. How **Jewish** did they need to be?

Look at the response from the Jerusalem counsel.

Acts 15:28–29 (ESV)

28 For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay on you no greater burden than these requirements: 29 that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from what has been strangled, and from sexual immorality. If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well. Farewell.”

This isn't a perfect proof, but you would think the Sabbath would be mentioned because the Sabbath would be a concept the Gentiles had no experience with. It was **only practiced** by the Hebrew people.

Just like in our culture, if you talk to the unchurched about lying, or cheating on their spouse, or greed, or coveting, those are not foreign concepts. They are not predominantly Jewish concepts. They are nearly universal. Most people recognize that those concepts might at least be a little evil. They already have an idea that they are moral issues. People might ignore them, but they understand that they exist. But the Sabbath? That would take some explaining, just like it took for the Israelites the first time it is explained in the Bible in Exodus 16. So the Sabbath command was a bit different in that it was not mentioned in the Jerusalem counsel. The Sabbatarian position requires believing that it was already so much a part of Christianity that it **did not need to be mentioned**. But that belief, again, is housed on an **assumption** with only circumstantial evidence. It is certainly never overtly stated in a teaching passage in the NT.

So that is the **first** difference. All other 9 commands were taught and reinforced. We see no evidence in the epistles of the 4th commandment being taught or reinforced.

Now what else is different about the Sabbath command?

Second Difference- The Sabbath days were included in the list of ceremonial feasts. There is no other of the 10 commandments that was lumped into the feast category in the Old Testament's descriptions.

Lev 23:1-3 Says this

Leviticus 23:1–3 (ESV)

1 The LORD spoke to Moses, saying, 2 “Speak to the people of Israel and say to them, These are the appointed feasts of the LORD that you shall proclaim as holy convocations; they are my appointed feasts. 3 “Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day is a Sabbath of solemn rest, a

holy convocation. You shall do no work. It is a Sabbath to the LORD in all your dwelling places.

The Sabbath keeping here appears to be a weekly feast. Now this is very significant. The Jewish feasts are largely understood by New Testament Christians as being something that Christians are no longer required to keep. Christ **fulfilled** them. Yet scripture **places** the Sabbath in the **list** of the feasts. This at least gives room for, but does not prove, that the fourth commandment actually **WAS** a law that was Jewish in nature. Sabbatarians argue that because the command to keep the Sabbath is based on creation, before God chose Abraham, that Sabbath keeping was not primarily a command to only the Hebrew people. I am not going to try to argue for or against that except to say that I know of **nothing** that would **keep God** from giving a law **to only the Jews** that was **based on creation**. Even the belief that the command is **for all people of all races** is arrived at through “reason **about** the scripture” and not scripture itself. It is an **assumption** from scripture, not a **quote** from scripture.

The fact that keeping the Sabbath was based on creation is also not absolute proof that this law was ever given to anyone before it was given to the Jews. I don't want to belabor this point. I just wanted to lay out that this is a clear difference to the fourth command. The Sabbath is included in the list of Jewish feasts. No other commandments are.

Third Difference-The fourth commandment is the only one that is mentioned in the New Testament as an optional conviction.

In fact we are told not to judge someone who does not keep it.

[Col 2:16-17 ESV] 16 Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink, or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath. 17 These are a shadow of the things to come, but the substance belongs to Christ.

This passage was the biggest surprise in my whole study. I expected to find reasons that made it hard to conclude that this was really about the weekly Sabbath. I expected it to be unclear. I thought there might be an easy way to confuse this with other kinds of Sabbaths. What I found surprised me.

Paul was actually quoting the Old Testament. He was using an Old Testament phrase that was used multiple times. Any Jewish person would have recognized the phrase immediately. And it always referred to the yearly festivals, the monthly feasts, and the **weekly Sabbath**.

This is just one of them. But they are all the same except sometimes they reverse the order.

1 Chron 23:31 "and whenever burnt offerings were presented to the LORD on Sabbaths and at New Moon festivals and at appointed feasts. They were to serve before the LORD regularly in the proper number and in the way prescribed for them."

2 Chron 2:4, Neh 10:33 say the same kind of thing

My point is that anyone who knew the Old Testament knew Paul was talking about a **weekly Sabbath**. Even the Seventh Day Adventist scholars are forced to admit this.

Now, there is nothing in the context of the passage that would cause us not to understand it exactly how it is written. And if it means what it most clearly says, Paul is telling Christians not to allow the keeping of the Sabbath to be a divisive thing.

I think that is exactly what it means. Paul is telling us in the **New Testament** something about how the **4th commandment** should be viewed.

Obviously that Sabbatarian position cannot accept that it means what it most clearly says. And sometimes we need to do this kind of business with scripture. Romans tells us that it is by faith we are saved. James appears to say that Abraham was justified by works. So one of those verses doesn't mean what you would think at first reading.

It is here that the Sabbatarian position carries an assumption that will not allow the Colossians verses to stand on their own. The assumption is that the 10 commandments all must be obeyed by New Testament Christians. The Colossians verses appear to say that this is **not true**. Therefore the Colossians verses **cannot mean** what they say. That is the only reason for needing a deeper explanation. There is nothing in the text itself that keeps us from understanding it **just like it is written**.

The Sabbatarian scholars I looked at say that the issue being referred to in the Colossians text is **not** about the **days** but about the **sacrifices** that were being done **on** those days. They say that **this** is what was the "shadow of things to come" was all about. I differ with them primarily for one reason. **I assume** that the **New Testament** tells us **how to interpret** the Old. I know of no passage that tells me that all 10 commandments stand or fall together. I know of no reason **not to allow this teaching** to tell me something I would not have known about the law. I know of no scripture that tells me that the fourth

commandment could not have been crafted by God for the purpose of preparing people for Christ. So when I read Colossians I let it tell me what it means.

[Col 2:16-17 ESV] 16 Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink, or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath. 17 These are a shadow of the things to come, but the substance belongs to Christ.

If I am looking at this scripture correctly, then Paul is saying that what you do with the Sabbath is up to you. It is between you and God. It is no longer a requirement for you like the rest of the 10 commandments. And this passage does us the blessing of telling us WHY.

These are a shadow of the things to come, but the substance belongs to Christ.

And that provides the fourth difference.

Fourth Difference- The Sabbath is a shadow of things to come.

You will not find in the New Testament where any of the other 10 commandments are a shadow of **anything**. The 10 commandments are not pointing to a **greater reality**. Jesus showed us in the sermon on the mount how the **spirit** of the commandments goes **deeper** than the external keeping of the commandments, but He didn't say they are pointing to some greater fulfillment.

We are told here that the Sabbath is a shadow of things to come. And the substance belongs to Christ. Christ is the Lord of the Sabbath. He owns the guts of the Sabbath. The Sabbath is His. And what is the thing to come? The book of Hebrews will tell us next week.

So if we ask the question, how is this **guardian**, how is this **schoolmaster**, how is this **command in the law**, how is this **fourth commandment** leading us to faith in Christ, the New Testament actually gives us an answer.

But think about this. If the Sabbath, like the rest of the feasts, is a shadow of things to come, doesn't that make this commandment a little prophetic?

While the other commandments don't point forward to anything, this one does. Could it be that the whole Sabbath experience was to point us forward to something better? Think about it. Prior to the curse, Adam and Eve were living in a seven day rest. If they were hungry, they picked fruit. They lived in a controlled environment needing no heating or cooling. They were naked so

clothing wasn't an issue. So providing food, clothing and shelter did not require the constant work that it does for us.

Oh yeah, they were tending a garden. But everything they fixed stayed fixed. Everything they made pretty stayed pretty. Those who love to garden have got to love that idea.

But my point is that it is possible they **lived in** the 7th day rest. That is how it would seem to us I think. But after sin, now there is a curse. We are left longing to have the rest that Adam threw away. The seventh day Sabbath is a taste of that. We want that. We want to enter that rest for all time and eternity. We don't want to just take that rest for a day a week. We want to live in it. I believe that is part of the point of the Sabbath. It is different than all of the other commandments because it **whets our lips** for an **eternity of rest**. It gives us a taste of what is to come.

Now what is another difference in the 4th commandment from the rest of the 10 commandments?

Fifth Difference- The fourth commandment is based upon a historic event.

Carla helped me see this.

God, who needs no rest, purposefully took a rest on the Sabbath day. And He wants **us to take a part** in remembering it and commemorating what **He did** by actively **resting from our labors**. Clearly God made a point of resting for man's sake. But why would a man need rest? Well, what was the curse? The ground was cursed with weeds that would lead to a man's relentless work. The Sabbath was the reprieve for a day. Would anyone conclude that taking one day a week of rest was the **ultimate of rest**? We break our backs for 6 days defeating the curse, and then we get a day free from it to devote to the Lord? I don't think anyone thinks that is **ideal**. It is a great benefit in our fallen world. But our hearts yearn for more. We want better. We want **complete** rest. We want all of our work to be productive going forward. We don't want to look back a year from now to a garden that is now a weed bed. We want free from the curse. We want to take part in the **fulfillment** of rest, not just the **memorial** looking forward to it. We want to live in a world of rest.

This leads us to another difference.

Sixth difference- The fourth commandment is built on commemorating a concept

That might not be the clearest way of stating it, but this is what I mean. We are commanded not to commit idolatry because God is the only one worthy of worship. That is the reasoning given.

Honor your father and mother because that is right and beneficial. It has beneficial results.

Don't murder because that is wrong.

Etc.

But we keep the Sabbath holy because we are **commemorating something** by doing it. We are commemorating **God's rest** by us resting. All the other commandments are right or wrong based on **who God is**. This one is based on what God **did**. At this point I am not trying to state what the difference **means**. I am just trying to point out what the difference **IS**. I think Hebrews will show us what the difference means.

Seventh Difference- The fourth commandment's concept of rest is presented as a reason to come to Christ.

There are no other appeals to **come to Christ** that are based on a **concept** from one of the 10 commandments. We worship Christ like the first three commands tell us because **He IS God**. But it is not based on a concept we are hoping **to get**.

We don't murder, don't steal etc. because it is **wrong** to do so. There is no **concept** being fulfilled. Christ does not offer to fulfill anything about the basis of those commands. He will grant **forgiveness of the sins**, but he will not fulfill those sins. He will fulfill the laws demands by keeping them. But he will not fulfill those sins.

But rest. That is different. We know that we must worship God. We know we must obey the commands. But the need for **rest** strikes a deep longing in us. We are tired of working to find favor with God. We are tired of working to beat the curse. Our souls long for rest. To which Jesus says this:

Matthew 11:28, 29 (ESV)

28 Come to me, all who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

29 Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me, for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls.

Now to be fair and forthcoming, the Greek word for rest in Matthew is different than the Greek word for rest in Hebrews when it refers to the Sabbath rest. That limits how much we can conclude from this difference. But

it is still a difference in the 4th commandment that is not true for the other 9. We are told to rest our bodies from work in Exodus. We are told to come to Christ for rest for our souls in Matthew.

Now let's look at another passage. It does not specifically mention the word Sabbath but the context is so similar to the Colossians text that I think it is safe to apply it in the same way.

[Rom 14:1-10 ESV] 1 As for the one who is weak in faith, welcome him, but not to quarrel over opinions. 2 One person believes he may eat anything, while the weak person eats only vegetables. 3 Let not the one who eats despise the one who abstains, and let not the one who abstains pass judgment on the one who eats, for God has welcomed him. 4 Who are you to pass judgment on the servant of another? It is before his own master that he stands or falls. And he will be upheld, for the Lord is able to make him stand.

The issue of eating is being **explained** here by Paul in Romans. Then he moves on to a different topic that he **does not** explain. It is quite likely he **already has** explained this topic at some other time. So he is using the second issue he presents about the specialness of days to **solidify** his point about **eating**.

5 One person esteems one day as better than another, while another esteems all days alike. Each one should be fully convinced in his own mind. 6 The one who observes the day, observes it in honor of the Lord.

How can a person be actively setting one day apart to keep a seventh day sabbath and still esteem all days alike? I think we **most easily** understand this as two believers with different views of the Sabbath. One says, I should keep this day and do no work in it to honor the Lord. The other says, I am free to do with day whatever I think the Lord would have me to do, whether it qualifies as work or not.

Note the more important principle than technically **keeping the day** or technically **not** keeping it. We need to get this. The big deal is not who has this particular theology **right** or **wrong**. The big deal is that both parties live by faith and that they do not judge each other. When people break fellowship in a church because of the Sabbath issue, they are violating the higher to uphold the lower. That is wrong. This issue is never worth breaking fellowship. Love should cover it.

It is interesting that Jesus tells us that if we love Him we will keep His commandments. If you do a study of which commandments Christ **specifically** gave, the ones He actually states, you will find the most common one was that we love one another. I am not saying that is **all** that He means, but I am saying it is the **most important thing** He means. Again, we must interpret the law through New Testament eyes and not the other way around. Here is the rest of the passage:

The one who eats, eats in honor of the Lord, since he gives thanks to God, while the one who abstains, abstains in honor of the Lord and gives thanks to God. 7 For none of us lives to himself, and none of us dies to himself. 8 For if we live, we live to the Lord, and if we die, we die to the Lord. So then, whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's. 9 For to this end Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living. 10 Why do you pass judgment on your brother? Or you, why do you despise your brother? For we will all stand before the judgment seat of God.

Can you see Paul's heart in all of this? Paul does not want **division** on the issues that he singles out. The unity and love matter more to him than if the person is technically right or technically wrong about the specific issue. What should that tell us? Despising our brothers, disfellowshipping our brothers for anything but rejection of core issues or intentional rebellion against God in one of the sins Paul specifically addresses is the bigger sin than getting a less clear issue right or wrong.

Is Christ Lord to you? Have you received Him as King of your life? Have you come to him as a guilty sinner and received His glorious grace? Have you died with Him by faith and been raised with Him by faith? Do you believe the Gospel and have you been made new in Christ? Are you His child? Are you committed to obey those things that you understand you must obey? That is what matters most. And if that is true of you, we have more in common than we have apart.

These are the conclusions I think we can come to so far.

First,

if a new Christian came to this topic of the Sabbath with no knowledge of it and read everything that the New Testament says about living the Christian life, he is not likely to think that a Christian needs to keep the Sabbath. Keep in mind that this is how many people come to Christ in various parts of the

world. The fact is that this person reading the Bible for his first time is **more likely** to believe that **whatever this Sabbath is** that the Bible talks about, it is not something he needs to be overly concerned about it. No one is saying that it is something he must do.

This does not mean he is reading the Bible correctly. But Sabbath keeping is clearly not one of the most important things in the New Testament because the most important things are mentioned **the most often** and **the most clearly**. The topic of the Sabbath, as I have shown and I believe Paul has shown, can clearly be understood biblically different ways.

If this Christian starts with the New Testament and then moves to the Old, he may have trouble understanding **how** the Sabbath fits into the New Testament. He may be confused. But he would already have gotten a clue that the Sabbath is more than a ritual. It is also a concept. And it is a concept that has some kind of fulfillment that is greater than the ritualistic keeping of it. Somehow it is a **shadow** that **points to Christ**.

Secondly,

Those who hold a Sabbatarian position in such a way that they exclude non Sabbatarians from fellowship in Christ are in a greater danger of Paul's rebuke than those who may simply be wrong about the issue. Those excluding fellowship on this issue would find themselves on the wrong side of Paul's instructions. They are passing judgment in a way that Paul prohibits. I have often said that our elders have the job of **including** those who **Christ** would include and **excluding** those who **Christ** would exclude. I believe, based on scripture, that Christ would not allow Sabbath keeping as a criteria of inclusion or exclusion in the church.

And **thirdly,**

The assumption that the fourth commandment is the same as the other 9 in form and function is **not** a safe assumption. The fourth commandment clearly has **many differences** that allow for people to interpret its obedience in different ways. To assume that the fourth commandment is required to be obeyed just like the other 9 is not as **obvious** or **logical** as it might seem at first. To think that all 10 commandments **are** alike and should **be treated** alike is to ignore many clear biblical references that draw attention to its differences. The Sabbatarian position is built on the assumption that the 10 commandments stand together and are universal. That is an assumption that

the New Testament does not **state**, and I believe it does not **support**, based on how **it** treats the 4th commandment.

Next week we will delve into 3 more ways that the 4th commandment is different than the rest. We will spend some time in Hebrews 3 and 4. And I will also give a rebuttal to some of the points I made in the second sermon on keeping the Sabbath.

I will post this whole sermon text on sermon audio, along with the sermon.

I hope that we are all studying along and glorying in how Christ is everything that the Old Testament pointed to. He truly is a wonderful Savior.