

# Ten Commandments, Sabbath or Ceremonial Law?

Taken from <http://www.colossians-2-16.com/index.html>

## Colossians 2:16

Colossians 2:16 would have to be the most abused and misunderstood Bible passage in regards to the ordinances of the ceremonial law. So what actually is the ceremonial law, and is it possible for this passage on Colossians 2:16 to refer to the Ten Commandments or just the Lord's Sabbath as some claim?

The ceremonial law with its sacrificial system pointed the people to the coming of Christ. Every time the blood of an animal was shed in the old Jewish temple, it was a reminder to the onlooker that One would come and die for his sin. Hence, John the Baptist pointed to our Lord and declared the significant words, "*Behold the Lamb of God.*" When Jesus died on the cross of Calvary, the veil of the great temple curtain was torn from top to bottom to signify that the entire ceremonial system was forever finished. No longer do the priests need to offer up sacrifices.

How do [the Ten Commandments](#) and this [Ceremonial law](#) relate to each other? If a man sinned, he broke LAW No. 1 - the Moral law of the Ten Commandments. So then he brought his offering, according to LAW No. 2 - the law of sacrifices, and he received forgiveness. LAW No. 1 defines sin, for sin is the transgression of the moral law. ([1 John 3:4](#)) LAW No. 2 defined sacrifices, the Ceremonial law which was the remedy for sin. When the Israelite sinned, he broke the first law. To secure forgiveness he had to obey the second law. So here are two very distinct laws.

When the One great and perfect final Sacrifice was offered that Friday afternoon and the true Passover Lamb bowed His head and died and cried out, "*It is finished*", the now obsolete ceremonial law that pointed the people to His sacrificial death was nailed to the cross. Jesus is now the permanent remedy for when we break LAW No. 1. When we now sin, we genuinely repent and ask Jesus for forgiveness.

While the word ceremonial is spoken frequently of in scripture, the term *ceremonial law* is not. In the KJV Bible, it is normally translated to ordinances which Strong's dictionary translates to as being a law of ordinances or ceremonial law. As it was a system of commandments given by God to Israel, there can be no doubt that it was a law which involved ceremonies so it will be frequently called the *ceremonial law*. Since this law ended at the cross it was *only* observed by literal Israel.

The key to understanding Colossians 2:16 is found two verses earlier in Colossians 2:14. The key phrase is, "*Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances.*" The Greek word for blotting is "exaleipho", pronounced "ex-al-i'-fo". Strong's dictionary gives the definition; "to smear out, that is, obliterate (erase tears, figuratively pardon sin): - **blot out**, wipe away." The next keyword in this verse is "*handwriting*" and the Greek word is "cheirographon", pronounced "khi-rog'-raf-on" and the definition is, "something **handwritten** ("chirograph"), that is, a manuscript (specifically a legal document or bond (figuratively)): - **handwriting**." And the last and final very important word we need to look at is "*ordinances*", Greek word is "dogma", pronounced "dog'-mah" and the Strong's definition is "**a law** (civil, **ceremonial** or ecclesiastical): - decree, **ordinance**."

Did you note the last one? It means "*a law*", but what type of law? The two words we should be very familiar with now are "*ceremonial*" i.e., "*ceremonial law*" and "*ordinances*" which comprised the things contained in the ceremonial law.

The Thayer dictionary is even clearer and you will note that it does *not* say the Ten Commandments. It directly and unmistakably says the "Law of Moses" outright.

**Thayer Definition:** "*The rules and requirements of the Law of Moses; carrying a suggestion of severity and of threatened judgment.*"

So what was nailed to the cross as Paul explains in verse 14? The “Law of Moses,” which is also called the “Mosaic Law”, the “Book of the Law” and as we have just seen by the definition given by the KJV Bible, the “Ordinances.” There should be no doubt that the ceremonial law is not the Moral law and that Paul has said that we no longer need to observe the holy feast days that were associated with the ordinances as some erroneously teach. This was the whole problem that Paul was addressing as some Jews were still doing this.

The ceremonial law was for Israel alone as the Gospel did not go to the Gentiles for 3.5 years after Jesus died on the cross. This is why there is so much confusion between the ceremonial law and the Ten Commandments. That one and final perfect sacrifice of Jesus ended this whole sacrificial system, thankfully giving us no requirement to obey this law. Since Jesus replaced this law, He has become the remedy for sin, which is the breaking of God's Ten Commandment law.

So just to make sure there can be no misunderstanding. The ceremonial law was practised when one sinned and that sin was the breaking of the Ten Commandments. So which one of these is a ceremonial law? Which one do we practise if we sinned before the cross? Do we go and commit adultery to make reconciliation for our sin? Or do we take a lamb for sacrifice to the temple priest to cover our sin such as adultery? Note also that our God is “*is not the author of confusion*” (1 Corinthians 14:33) and did not place a ceremonial, sacrificial law that was practised when we sinned, with a law that when broken was sin. We can rest easily knowing God is not some fool and *all* Ten Commandments are Moral laws.

Now that we have a clear distinction between these two laws, we can now look at all the verses that such an astonishing amount of controversy occurs over. The verses in contention are Colossians 2:16, Galatians 4:9-10 and Romans 14:5. Since Colossians 2:16 is the main area of confusion we will cover that first.

**Colossians 2:16** reads “*Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink [offerings], or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:*” And so the belief of some is the fourth Commandment was deleted from stone. What was actually done away with here was the ordinances (ceremonial law). This is clearly seen by noting what Paul said two verses earlier. Colossians 2:14 reads, “*blotting out the handwriting (has to be Moses handwriting) of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and has taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross.*” Paul then goes on to say, so “*Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:*”

Luke 1:6 KJV also demonstrates that the ordinances and the Ten Commandments are two totally different things. It states, “*And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the Commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.*” And Hebrews 9:1-2 says, “*Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. 2 For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the showbread; which is called the sanctuary.*” The first Covenant *had also* the ordinances as well as the Ten Commandments, but the New Covenant has only the Ten Commandments that God now writes in our hearts so it will be our hearts desire to obey Him. God said that the fault with the Old Covenant was the people would not obey it and nowhere does God say that His law lost any Commandments. When God said he will write *His law* on our hearts, He meant all of His Ten Commandment law.

Did you note in Hebrews 9:1-2 that these ordinances belonged to the Hebrew sanctuary sacrificial system. It was the ceremonial law that was nailed to the cross and “*not one jot or one tittle*” of any of [the Ten Commandments](#). The obvious differences between the Ten Commandments and the ordinances of the ceremonial law are that the Commandments were written by *God's finger, written in stone*, placed *inside* the Ark of the Covenant, are love, eternal, for all people and is sin to break them. The ordinances were in *Moses handwriting, written in a book*, placed in a pocket on the *outside* of the Ark of the Covenant, are not love, not eternal, were only for the Jews and were practised because of sin. When that One great and perfect and final Sacrifice was offered that Friday afternoon, when Jesus cried out, “*It is finished,*” and the true Passover Lamb bowed His head and died, that now obsolete ceremonial law that pointed people to His sacrificial death was nailed to the cross once and for all.

So is the phrase “sabbath days” in Colossians 2:16 referring to the Lord's Sabbath? Definitely not. Firstly, every Greek scholar will tell you that “sabbaths” is unquestionably plural here, which there were several in the ordinances of the ceremonial law, and secondly, everything in verse 16 belonged purely and solely to the ordinances, which Paul specifically tells us is in verse 14. Paul also exhorts that the contents of verse 16 was nailed to the cross because that is what had to be practised because of sin prior to the cross, and of course why it ended at the cross. Sin is breaking of the Ten Commandments ([1 John 3:4](#)) and the Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments. Think very carefully about what God actually calls HIS Sabbath. We find more than once the phrase, “*But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD your God:*” It is the Lord's Sabbath! The ceremonial sabbaths belonged to Israel only and were very significantly called “Her sabbaths” and are never referred to as the *Sabbath of the Lord* yet alone the *Sabbath of the Lord your God*. The *Sabbath of the Lord* was not kept for breaking the *Sabbath of our Lord* or any other Commandment for that matter. This of course makes no sense at all.

Studying the table below will give clarity between the ceremonial sabbaths mentioned in Colossians 2:16 and the fourth Commandment, the Sabbath.

Sabbath of the Lord	Ceremonial Sabbaths
Spoken by God personally ( <a href="#">Exodus 20:1, 8-11</a> )	Spoken by Moses ( <a href="#">Exodus 24:3</a> )
Written in stone by God Himself ( <a href="#">Exodus 31:18</a> )	Written by Moses hand on paper ( <a href="#">Exodus 24:4</a> )
Put inside the Ark of the Covenant ( <a href="#">Deuteronomy 10:5</a> )	Stored on the outside of the Ark ( <a href="#">Deuteronomy 31:26</a> )
Was made at creation ( <a href="#">Genesis 2:1-3</a> )	Were made after Sinai ( <a href="#">Exodus 20:24</a> )
Was established before sin ( <a href="#">Genesis 2:1-3</a> )	Were established after sin ( <a href="#">Exodus 20:24</a> )
Breaking the Sabbath is sin ( <a href="#">1 John 3:4</a> )	These were kept because of sin ( <i>See Leviticus</i> )
It is a law of love ( <a href="#">Matthew 22:35-40</a> , <a href="#">Isaiah 58:13-14</a> )	They were not love ( <a href="#">Colossians 2:14</a> , <a href="#">Galatians 4:9-10</a> )
It is a law of liberty (freedom) ( <a href="#">James 1:25</a> , <a href="#">2:10-12</a> )	They were bondage ( <a href="#">Galatians 4:9-10</a> , <a href="#">Colossians 2:14</a> )
The Sabbath is for everyone ( <a href="#">Mark 2:27</a> , <a href="#">Hebrews 4:9-10</a> )	Only for the children of Israel & Jews ( <i>Old Testament</i> )
God calls it MY Sabbath ( <a href="#">Exodus 31:13</a> , <a href="#">Ezekiel 20:20</a> )	God calls them HER sabbaths ( <a href="#">Hosea 2:11</a> , <a href="#">Lamentations 1:7</a> )
The Sabbath is eternal ( <a href="#">Exodus 31:16-17</a> , <a href="#">Isaiah 66:22-23</a> )	Were nailed to the cross ( <a href="#">Colossians 2:14</a> , <a href="#">Ephesians 2:15</a> )

**Consider the following three questions:**

- 1) Why didn't God put His Sabbath with all the ceremonial sabbaths in Moses hand writing if it was to end at the cross?
- 2) Why didn't God put His Sabbath with the Jewish ceremonial sabbaths that ended at the cross, if His Sabbath was only for the Jews?

3) Why would our omniscient (all knowing) God put His Sabbath in His eternal law of love if it is not eternal or not love?

Observe how every single part of Colossians 2:16 and associated verses do refer to the ceremonial law. Unfortunately, most modern Bible translations have translated the word meat in verse sixteen incorrectly and most non-Jews get this wrong and this includes some theologians. Ask some Jews that understand Hebrew. The King James Bible is one of the few translations that does translate these words correctly and is therefore recommended in these studies. So much gets lost when the translators do not have a good understanding of Jewish culture and terminology. To be referring to clean or unclean foods here would be totally out of context for this passage. But when kept in context, every single point here refers to the various holy feast days and the sacrificial sanctuary system. Further clarification can be found in the book of Hebrews. Note that the context of this passage is undoubtedly the sanctuary service in regards to sacrifices and offerings, of which Jesus Christ became the final perfect sacrifice for us.

Paul is possibly the author of Hebrews and we see that the meat and drink has to be meat and drink offerings by the unmistakable context of this passage in Hebrews 9:7-14 below. The author speaks of meat and drink [offerings] and carnal ordinances which were imposed until the time of reformation, being Jesus Christ who obtained eternal redemption for us and brought an end to the sacrifices prescribed by the ordinances of the ceremonial law once and for all.

This continues to illustrate the perfect context of Colossians 2:16 and as per Colossians 2:14, we see everything described is part of the ordinances of the ceremonial law, which Paul said in this verse was against us and contrary to us, and it was taken out the way and nailed to the cross by Jesus' perfect sacrifice.

Hebrews 9:7-14 *“But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?”*

As you can plainly see, like Colossians 2:16, nowhere in this passage are clean and unclean foods referred to and nowhere in the Bible where clean and unclean foods are discussed, are there issues of unclean drinks. In fact there is no mention of unclean drinks anywhere in the Bible as they do not exist. What is spoken of in Colossians and Hebrews are references to *meat and drink offerings* that were part of the sanctuary service and were in the ordinances of the ceremonial law. This is all that can be referred to and when done so fits the context perfectly of both passages as it remains harmoniously in context with the sanctuary service.

Since many Bibles have failed in the translation of *meat and drink* [offerings] in Colossians 2:16, some try and make *meat and drink* about dietary laws etc, so let's clarify further. When Paul says *“therefore,”* he is referring to what he just spoke of in Colossians 2:14 that was nailed to the cross. So why did Jesus die on the cross? Did He die for the food we eat? Did Jesus die for any type of religious practise that involved eating and drinking? Of course not! Jesus died on the cross for one thing only and that was our SIN. Is this really so hard to understand? It is *meat and drink offerings* that were practised because of sin. So simple and perfectly in context.

So let's re-examine Colossians 2:14 and Colossians 2:16-17 again to see if everything does actually refer to the ceremonial law by the fact that the context of the passage remains the same throughout. *“Blotting out the handwriting”*, the ceremonial law was written in Moses handwriting. *“Ordinances”*, Strong's dictionary also directly translates this word to ceremonial law, *“that was against us, which was contrary*

to us, and took it out of the way”, the ceremonial law is now against us and contrary to us, as Christ has become that One and perfect sacrifice for us. “Nailing it to his cross”, and of course now that Christ has become that perfect sacrifice for us, no longer are meat and drink offerings and animal sacrifices and all associated holy days necessary, so the ceremonial law was *nailed to the cross*. Moving onto verse sixteen, “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink”, and as we have now seen were part of the ceremonial law. “Or in respect of an holyday”, these holy days included such days as Passover, Feast of Weeks and many others. “Or of the new moon”, new moon celebrations were also part of the ordinances. “Or of the sabbath days”, Passover, Feast of Unleavened Bread, First Fruits, Feast of Weeks, Day of Atonement, Feast of Tabernacles and many others were all sabbath days.

When referred to in plural and the context of the passage is the ceremonial law, then the sabbaths referred to can be nothing else but ceremonial sabbaths. Verse seventeen goes on to say, “Which are a shadow of things to come.” These sabbaths were called a shadow because Passover was a shadow of the crucifixion and Feast of Weeks was a shadow of Pentecost etc. These Old Testament holy day feasts were shadows of what was to come and once those things had come and gone then the shadows also disappeared. Here is one verse from Leviticus that refers to such feast holy days, which involves meat and drink, that is, meat and drink offerings that Paul also refers to in Colossians 2:16. Leviticus 23:37 “*These are the feasts of the LORD, which you shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, every thing upon his day*”

Some who would like us to believe it is only nine Commandments have claimed that the Sabbath of the Lord was a shadow as referred to in [Colossians 2:17](#). Is this true? We have seen that this Hebrew sanctuary system had many feast days that were ceremonial sabbaths and these were all shadows of something. What was Passover a shadow of? Who became our Passover Lamb? On what day was Jesus crucified? What was about to be sacrificed in the temple when Jesus died and an unseen hand ripped the temple curtain from top to bottom? Jesus of course became our Passover Lamb and died at the exact same time that they were about to sacrifice the Passover lamb in the temple. So was Passover a shadow of something? Most definitely! It was a shadow of the true Passover lamb dying on the cross for our sins. Since some are calling the Seventh day Sabbath a shadow, perhaps they would like to tell me what it was a shadow of. Happy hunting because the Sabbath is not a shadow of anything! All these feasts ended at the cross because they were practised because of sin and why they ended with the sacrifice of Jesus. They came about as a result of sin. So when was the Sabbath created?

Genesis 2:2-3 “*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. 3 And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.*” Most Christians do not know that the word translated “rested” in our English Bibles in [Genesis 2:3](#) is actually “shabath” in the Hebrew and means Sabbath. God said the Sabbath “*is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever...*” Why did God say it was a sign? Because “*...in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.*” Exodus 31:17 There can be no doubt that the Sabbath was made at creation and was before sin. This is just one of many reasons that it cannot be a ceremonial law as some have erroneously stated and cannot be a shadow of anything as it was instituted before sin and so can have nothing to do with the ordinances of the ceremonial law. The Lord's Sabbath has *never* been associated with sacrifices, and we are told that is a sign that it is God we love and worship and that it is God that sanctifies us and makes us Holy when we keep His day Holy.

Some will argue this sign and *perpetual* covenant that was to last *forever* was only made with Israel, but note that we are *children of Israel* as is Abraham. Galatians 3:29 “*And if you be Christ's, then are you Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*” We are and have to be children of Israel as both covenants were only made with the house of Israel. Hebrews 8:10, “*For this is the covenant that I will make with the **house of Israel**...says the Lord: I will put My Laws into their mind and write them in their hearts, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.*” See also [Romans 2:28-29](#), [Romans 9:6-8](#), [1 Corinthians 10:18](#) and [Galatians 6:16](#).

## The final proof and Perfect Parallel that can leave no doubt

Note below the perfect parallel between Colossians 2:16 and Ezekiel 45:17 and that this was a *sin offering, to make reconciliation for the house of Israel* for breaking God's Moral law (Ten Commandments) as prescribed by the ceremonial law until such time that Jesus nailed this law to the cross. This is what Israel had to do to make atonement for sin, which is the breaking of the Ten Commandments which of course includes the fourth Commandment, the Seventh Day Sabbath. It clearly demonstrates the issue and leaves no doubt as to what Paul was explaining to the Colossians. A comparison is also given in table format for those who prefer that. Note first Strong's dictionary definition for holyday in Colossians 2:16 and that festivals, feasts and holydays are synonymous. Parentheses are added.

**G1859** *heorte*, Of uncertain affinity; a festival: - feast, holyday.

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; [sin] 16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink [offerings], or in respect of an holyday [feast], or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:”*

Ezekiel 45:17 *“And it shall be the prince's part to give burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and drink offerings, in the feasts [holyday], and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, in all solemnities of the house of Israel: he shall prepare the sin offering, and the meat offering, and the burnt offering, and the peace offerings, to make reconciliation for the house of Israel.”*

Colossians 2:16	Ezekiel 45:17
<i>meat, or in drink, [offerings]</i>	<i>meat offerings, and drink offerings,</i>
<i>KJV of an holyday, NKJV regarding a festival</i>	<i>in the feasts,</i>
<i>or of the new moon</i>	<i>and in the new moons,</i>
<i>or of the sabbath days:</i>	<i>and in the sabbaths,</i>

Here is another verse confirming the ordinances were part of the “*Law of Moses*” as the Thayer dictionary states, which had holyday *feasts, new moons* and ceremonial *sabbaths* as just described in Ezekiel 45:17 and Colossians 2:16 that were practised because of sin until Christ became our one and final perfect sacrifice.

2 Chronicles 8:13 *“Even after a certain rate every day, offering according to the **commandment of Moses**, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the solemn feasts, three times in the year, even in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles.”*

The following verse also confirms that the ordinances were by the hand of Moses and are separate from the whole law despite those who would try and tell you that the Law of Moses and the Ten Commandments are the same thing. How anyone could believe this or not understand the difference is beyond me!

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

Two erroneous web sites claim *sabbath days* in Colossians 2:16 is referring to the Lord's Sabbath because they insist that feast days can only be annual ceremonial sabbath days and thus claim Paul would effectively be saying, “*don't let anyone judge you on sabbath days, new moons and sabbath days*” if *sabbath days* was not the Lord's Sabbath. So the facts are ignored in favour of second guessing what they think Paul is saying. Colossians 2:14 states that the contents of Colossians 2:16 are the ordinances. (Mosaic Law, Ceremonial law). Strong's dictionary states the ordinances are the ceremonial law and the Thayer dictionary states the same in that these ordinances are the Mosaic Law. So the two main and most reputable dictionaries agree that all of Colossians 2:16 refers to the sacrificial law of Moses as you would

expect. The sacrificial law of Moses is NOT the Ten Commandments! The Law of Moses is what was practiced for sin until Christ replaced this law and why Colossians 2:14 says it was nailed to the cross. The Lord's Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments and was never practised because of sin but the Law of Moses was practised when the Lord's Sabbath was broken! And of course not forgetting the *meat and drink offerings, feasts days, new moons and sabbath days* are also exactly what was part of the Mosaic law and fits perfectly as already seen.

There were in fact many feast days that were not ceremonial sabbaths! The feast of unleavened bread is a week long festival (feast) and only the first and last days were ceremonial sabbaths. So not all feast days are ceremonial sabbaths as these web sites claim! So when Paul said, "*don't let anyone judge you in holy feast days, new moons and sabbath days,*" that is exactly what he meant! So there goes another pitiful excuse at avoiding loving obedience to our heavenly Father.

These same people while trying to give credibility to their fallacy, also try and turn *sabbath days* in Colossians 2:16 into the singular, when the original Greek records "sabbath" as been plural here. The Mosaic law had several ceremonial sabbaths and so "sabbaths" or "sabbath days" is correct and fits. Sabbath day does not fit in any way at all. So what was inspired by God? The original Greek and Hebrew text etc, or the multitude of Bible translations? Obviously the original Greek text was. Many Bibles have wrongly translated "sabbaths" in two places in the singular as *sabbath* sounded right. But was it? The argument is that since some translations translated "sabbaths" as "sabbath" when the Greek text showed they should have been plural, then "sabbaths" in Colossians 2:16 must also be "sabbath." This of course is dreadful logic and another woeful attempt at attacking the truth of the Lord's Sabbath. The original Greek text is inspired and is always correct regardless of what some Bible translations may have wrong. Below are two translations that did correctly translate "sabbath" in the plural as the original Greek text was written in regards to the two verses the proponents use for their fallacy. John 19:31 informs us that the crucifixion Passover was a high day meaning that the Passover sabbath fell on the Lord's Sabbath. This is why Matthew 28:1 is in fact correctly sabbaths!

Matthew 28:1 YLT "*And on the eve of the sabbaths, at the dawn, toward the first of the sabbaths, came Mary the Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre,*"

Matthew 28:1 ALT "*Now after [the] Sabbaths, at the dawning into [the] first [day] of the week [i.e. early Sunday morning], Mary the Magdalene and the other Mary went to see the grave.*"

Luke 4:16 ALT "*And He came to Nazareth, where He had been brought up. And He entered, according to His custom, on the day of the Sabbaths into the synagogue, and He stood up to read aloud [the Scriptures].*"

Since Colossians 2:14 says "*handwriting of ordinances*" which Moses wrote in a book. It should be clear to all that if God intended for His Sabbath to be temporary, He would have had Moses put it in his own handwriting along with the rest of the ordinances that included all the other temporary Sabbaths that were nailed to the cross. However, the fact is, God did not include the Sabbath that He blessed and sanctified in the beginning at creation, and wrote in stone with *His own finger* along with the other nine Commandments, and placed inside the Ark of the Covenant of which the original is in heaven right now and will be for all time. This leaves us with only two options. Either God is not omniscience (all knowing) as the Bible tells us and our perfect God made a mistake, or the only other possible answer there can be — God never did have any intentions on changing or abolishing it and it is to *last as long as Heaven and Earth* just as Jesus told us. [Matthew 5:18](#) Perhaps Jesus actually meant what He said!

Below are two Bible Commentaries from famous theologians and as you would expect had no trouble in understanding the truth on Colossians 2:16.

#### **Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, LL.D., F.S.A., (1715-1832)**

***“Colossians 2:14 - Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances - By the hand-writing of ordinances the apostle most evidently means the ceremonial law: this was against them, for they were bound to fulfill it; and it was contrary to them, as condemning them for their neglect and transgression of it. This law God himself has blotted out.***

*Nailing it to his cross - When Christ was nailed to the cross, our obligation to fulfill these ordinances was done away.”*

*Colossians 2:16 - Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink - The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the hand-writing of ordinances, which had been taken away, and the necessity of observing certain holydays or festivals, such as the new moons and particular sabbaths, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity; all these had been taken out of the way and nailed to the cross, and were no longer of moral obligation. There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that, Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy, is a command of perpetual obligation, and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time. As it is a type of that rest which remains for the people of God, of an eternity of bliss, it must continue in full force till that eternity arrives; for no type ever ceases till the antitype be come. Besides, it is not clear that the apostle refers at all to the Sabbath in this place, whether Jewish or Christian; his σαββατων, of sabbaths or weeks, most probably refers to their feasts of weeks, of which much has been said in the notes on the Pentateuch.”*

#### **Albert Barnes' Notes on the Bible (1798-1870)**

*“Colossians 2:14 - Blotting out the handwriting - The word rendered handwriting means something written by the hand, a manuscript; and here, probably, the writings of the Mosaic law, or the law appointing many ordinances or observances in religion. The allusion is probably to a written contract, in which we bind ourselves to do any work, or to make a payment, and which remains in force against us until the bond is cancelled. That might be done, either by blotting out the names, or by drawing lines through it, or, as appears to have been practiced in the East, by driving a nail through it. The Jewish ceremonial law is here represented as such a contract, binding those under it to its observance, until it was nailed to the cross. The meaning here is, that the burdensome requirements of the Mosaic law are abolished, and that its necessity is superseded by the death of Christ.*

*Of ordinances - Prescribing the numerous rites and ceremonies of the Jewish religion. Which was contrary to us - Operated as a hindrance, or obstruction, in the matter of religion. The ordinances of the Mosaic law were necessary, in order to introduce the gospel; but they were always burdensome.*

*Nailing it to his cross - As if he had nailed it to his cross, so that it would be entirely removed out of our way. The death of Jesus had the same effect, in regard to the rites and institutions of the Mosaic religion, as if they had been affixed to his cross.*

*Colossians 2:16 - Or in respect of a holy day - Margin, part. The meaning is, “in the part, or the particular of a holy day; that is, in respect to it” The word rendered “holy-day” - εορτη heorte - means properly a “feast” or “festival;” and the allusion here is to the festivals of the Jews. The sense is, that no one had a right to impose their observance on Christians, or to condemn them if they did not keep them. They had been delivered from that obligation by the death of Christ; Colossians 2:14.*

*Or of the new moon - On the appearance of the new moon, among the Hebrews, in addition to the daily sacrifices, two bullocks, a ram, and seven sheep, with a meat offering, were required to be presented to God; Num 10:10; Num 28:11-14. The new moon in the beginning of the month Tisri (October) was the beginning of their civil year, and was commanded to be observed as a festival; Lev 23:24, Lev 23:25.*

*Or of the Sabbath days - Greek, “of the Sabbaths.” The word Sabbath in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, since the word is used in the plural number, and the apostle does not refer particularly to the Sabbath properly so called. There is no evidence from this passage that he would teach that there was no obligation to observe any holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to teach that one of the Ten Commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number - “the Sabbath,” it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to teach that that Commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and*

*typical law, and not to the moral law, or the Ten Commandments. No part of the moral law - not one of the Ten Commandments could be spoken of as "a shadow of good things to come." These Commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation."*

Sadly, there is no shortage of Christians that have not understood Colossians 2:16 or the other passages. They often call the Sabbath a shadow which as we have seen is impossible, and some have gone to extreme lengths to even try and prove the "*Sabbath Of The LORD*" is a ceremonial law, which is what did have the shadows. The Fourth Commandment was *never* practised because of sin. The ceremonial law was written in a book and why it was also called the "*Book of the Covenant*." This is where God would have written it if it was for Israel only but God wrote it in stone with the other nine Commandments. This one demonstrates ignorance that leaves me lost for words. These people are leading many astray with their ignorance. The "*Law of Moses*" (ceremonial law) is not the Ten Commandments as the Ten Commandments were not practised because of sin. It is sin to break them. We have also seen how God differentiates between the ceremonial sabbaths and His Sabbath by calling His Sabbath, "My Sabbath" and calling the ceremonial sabbaths that were only for Israel, "Her Sabbaths." Others have even attacked certain denominations and said that they are at a loss to explain how Colossians 2:16 says the Ten Commandments were nailed to the cross, and that only the blind and deceived could miss the simple truth of Colossians 2:16. I could not agree with them more in that they are very blind and deceived, and I for one have had no trouble proving they are wrong, and that their statement is foolishness! They even expressed their statements with animated graphics of one Christian punching another one's lights out! What spirit is behind this? These same people claimed that antichrist is Grandma in a rocking chair because she does not believe in Jesus Christ. What can anyone possibly say to that? They also denied that the word sabbaths in Colossians 2:16 is plural, because they say other places where the Greek is plural for Sabbath, it has been translated in the singular. I wonder if they know that other Bible translations did translate those verses in the plural and that it is the translators that were in error, and not the ORIGINAL Greek text, which is intact and definitely not in error. These have to be deliberate attacks as I do not believe that anyone could really be that deceived. The extreme lengths that these people go to just to avoid one Commandment of God absolutely saddens me. Do they truly love God or not? Many of these people also say that the early Church habitually worshipped on Sunday and that is an outright lie. Habitually? Not even close! There are two scriptures, and the one most typically used is actually a Saturday night meeting and if these irresponsible Christians teaching this heresy actually knew their Bibles, they would know this. One site called got questions pushes this point, and so I sent them an email showing them beyond all doubt that they had it wrong, and they did not even have the courtesy to respond. Why not? See [what day is the Sabbath](#) or [who changed the Sabbath to Sunday](#) for the real truth.

Select [Colossians 2:16](#) for more on the issue of plurality on the word Sabbaths in this verse or [Colossians 2:16](#) for public opinions and to submit your own article. And some say that the feast days must still be observed. Read [Colossians 2:16 and the ordinances](#) or [Colossians 2:16 and the feasts](#) for the real truth.

## Galatians 4:9-10

All the various holy day festivals in Colossians 2:16 involved *days* that took place at various *times* of the year as well as *yearly* holy days such as the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) and *monthly* such as the New Moon celebrations already discussed. As these were all a shadow of things to come and those things have past and the shadows are now gone, to still observe these days would be putting us back into unnecessary *bondage*. This is what Paul is speaking of in Galatians 4:9-10 which says, "*But now, after that you have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn you again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto you desire again to be in bondage? 10 You observe days, and months, and times, and years.*"

Note that the Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments of God that defines what sin is and the Commandments of God are *never* spoken of flippantly such as referring to the fourth Commandment as a day. It is *always* called "the Sabbath" or "Sabbath day" but it is never referred to superficially as just a day. Paul is not exhorting you can simply ignore anything that is a day, month or year in the Bible such as the *Sabbath of the Lord* as some have wrongly concluded. He is referring to something that includes all of

these things, which is and only can be the ordinances of the ceremonial law. [Galatians 4:9-10](#) is talking about *bondage* and servitude and the ordinances of the ceremonial law were exactly that, which Paul also states in [Colossians 2:14](#) and throughout the book of Galatians. Note that the ordinances Paul speaks of in Colossians 2:14 are described in [Colossians 2:16](#) and of course did have days [*holy days*], months [*new moon*] and years [*sabbath days*], which were yearly sabbaths. Compare the following two passages.

Galatians 4:9-10 *“But now, after that you have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn you again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto you desire again to be in bondage? 10 You observe days, and months, and times, and years.”*

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; ... 16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink [offerings], or in respect of an holy day [holy day], or of the new moon [months], or of the Sabbath days: [years eg; Passover, Unleavened Bread, Day of Atonement, Pentecost and three others, which are all yearly sabbaths].”* Parenthesis are added.

Galatians 4:9-10 is just another one of many passages our adversary abuses to keep us from one of God's Commandments and he has also added further confusion by raising a minority group who insist we must still keep the sacrificial feast days that *actually* were nailed to the cross. They very conveniently exhort that these were pagan days, months and years, which unless God made a Covenant with Moses on Pagan days (would be blasphemous) is impossible. They also attempt to support this heretical teaching by saying that nowhere in the Bible are months mentioned and therefore must be pagan. Perhaps they do not know what the *New Moon festival* was and that these were in fact Monthly!

The Galatians had wandered from the truth that Paul had first taught them and began to follow some judaizing teachers from Jerusalem who insisted that they should still be observing all the *rites of the Jewish religion* such as circumcision etc. These teachers taught that Paul was inferior and insisted that the *Law of Moses* was still binding and was necessary for justification. This is where most of the confusion originates between the [Galatians and the Law](#). Galatians chapter 4 is not referring to Pagan days as some believe as they were not part of the Mosaic Law and would be totally out of context with what Paul was explaining to the Galatians.

Please read Albert Barnes Commentary on the *entire* book of Galatians that is broken into the following three pages because of tool tip size. Page [one](#), [two](#), [three](#).

The Mosaic Law was indeed bondage but the Ten Commandments on the other hand are a law of liberty. James 1:25 *“But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.”* And for further clarity James 2:11-12 reads, *“For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if you commit no adultery, yet if you kill, you are become a transgressor of the law. 12 So speak you, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.”* If we keep these points in mind when studying the Bible it will help us see more clearly what law is being spoken of. We should also check the context of the entire chapter. See also confusion between the [ceremonial law and the Ten Commandments](#).

Below are three Bible Commentaries from famous theologians that had no trouble in understanding what Galatians 4:9-10 is referring to as you would expect.

#### **The People's New Testament (1891) by B. W. Johnson**

*“Galatians 4:10 Ye observe days. These are specifications of how they were “turning back” to the Jewish law. Compare Col\_2:16. The days are the Jewish Sabbaths. The months are the new moons; the times are the Jewish festivals; the years are the Sabbatical years. In observing these there was legal bondage to an obsolete system.”*

#### **Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, LL.D., F.S.A., (1715-1832)**

*“Galatians 4:9 Now, after that ye have known God - After having been brought to the knowledge of God as your Savior.*

*Or rather are known of God - Are approved of him, having received the adoption of sons. To the weak and beggarly elements - After receiving all this, will ye turn again to the ineffectual rites*

*and ceremonies of the Mosaic law - rites too weak to counteract your sinful habits, and too poor to purchase pardon and eternal life for you? If the Galatians were turning again to them, it is evident that they had been once addicted to them. And this they might have been, allowing that they had become converts from heathenism to Judaism, and from Judaism to Christianity. This makes the sense consistent between the 8th and 9th verses."*

*"Galatians 4:10 Ye observe days - Ye superstitiously regard the [ceremonial] sabbaths and particular days of your own appointment;*

*And months - New moons; times - festivals, such as those of tabernacles, dedication, passover, etc. Years - Annual atonements, sabbatical years, and jubilees."*

#### **Albert Barnes' Notes on the Bible (1798-1870)**

*"Galatians 4:10 Ye observe - The object of this verse is to specify some of the things to which they had become enslaved.*

*Days - The days here referred to are doubtless the days of the Jewish festivals. They had numerous days of such observances, and in addition to those specified in the Old Testament, the Jews had added many others as days commemorative of the destruction and rebuilding of the temple, and of other important events in their history. It is not a fair interpretation of this to suppose that the apostle refers to the Sabbath, properly so called, for this was a part of the Decalogue; and was observed by the Saviour himself, and by the apostles also. It is a fair interpretation to apply it to all those days which are not commanded to be kept holy in the Scriptures; and hence, the passage is as applicable to the observance of saints' days, and days in honor of particular events in sacred history, as to the days observed by the Galatians. There is as real servitude in the observance of the numerous festivals, and fasts in the papal communion and in some Protestant churches, as there was in the observance of the days in the Jewish ecclesiastical calendar, and for anything that I can see, such observances are as inconsistent now with the freedom of the gospel as they were in the time of Paul. We should observe as seasons of holy time what it can be proved God has commanded us, and no more.*

*And months - The festivals of the new moon, kept by the Jews. Num\_10:10; Num\_28:11-14. On this festival, in addition to the daily sacrifice, two bullocks, a ram, and seven sheep of a year old were offered in sacrifice. The appearance of the new-moon was announced by the sound of trumpets. See Jahn, Archae. 352.*

*And times - Stated times; festivals returning periodically, as the Passover, the Feast of Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles. See Jahn, Archae. Chap. 3. 346-360.*

*And years - The sabbatical year, or the year of jubilee. See Jahn as above."*

## **Romans 14:5**

As with Colossians 2:16 and Galatians 4:9-10, there are also those who believe that Romans 14:5 refers to the Sabbath of the Lord. Could this be true or is this also just another misunderstanding as are the other two passages?

Colossians 2:16, Galatians 4:9-10 and Romans 14:5 are in fact all related and all very misunderstood as so often seems to be the case when it comes to God's Moral law, His Sabbath and the temporary ceremonial law which pointed to Christ. Five very respected Bible Commentaries have also been chosen to cover Romans 14:5 as they give very thorough and professional explanations on this verse.

The scripture in contention is Romans 14:5 but other verses are also given so the context of the passage can be seen. Parenthesis are added.

Romans 14:1-6, *"Him that is weak in the faith receive you, but not to doubtful disputations. 2 For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. 3 Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God has received him. 4 Who are you that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yes, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand. 5 One man esteemeth one [feast] day above another:*

*another esteemeth every [feast] day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. 6 He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he does not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.”*

To begin with, it must be admitted that the word “Sabbath” is not found in the entire chapter. People assume Paul is talking about the Sabbath. But is he really? The chapter begins, “*Him that is weak in the faith receive you, but not to doubtful disputations.*” Romans 14:1. The NKJV reads, “*disputes over doubtful things.*” This chapter concerns “doubtful things” and is not a discussion of the Ten Commandments. God's “Big Ten” are not “doubtful,” but exceedingly dear and written personally with the finger of God on two tables of stone.

The Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments that defines what sin is and the Commandments of God are *never* spoken of flippantly such as referring to the fourth Commandment as a day. It is *always* called “the Sabbath” or “Sabbath day” but it is *never* referred to superficially as just a day. Also very significant is that the word “alike” in verse 5 does not exist in the Greek and is an added word, which tends to convey an idea which the apostle never designed or intended.

It becomes clear from Romans 14 and 15 chapters, that many misunderstandings existed between Jewish and Gentile Christians in relation to certain customs which were sacredly observed by one but disregarded by the other. The main subject of dispute was concerning meats and days. The converted Jew retaining respect for the Law of Moses abstained from certain meats and observed ceremonial days while the converted Gentile understood that Christianity put him under no such obligation or regard to ceremonial points. It also appears that mutual and heartless judgments existed among them and that brotherly love and reciprocal tolerance did not always prevail. Paul exhorts that in such things no longer essential to Christianity, that even though both parties had a different way of thinking they might and probably do still have an honest and serious regard for God. Paul further explains they should not therefore let different sentiments hinder Christian fellowship and love, but they should mutually refrain and withhold and make allowance for each other and especially not carry their Gospel liberty so far as to prejudice a weak brother or a Jewish Christian.

The “weak” brother “eats” some things and “esteems one day above another” while the strong brother believes that he may “eat all things” and “esteems every day” Romans 14:2, 5. The early Church was made up of Jewish believers and Gentile converts. Although Paul did not specify what “days” he was referring to, he could only be talking about the “esteeming” or “not esteeming” of certain Jewish fast or feast days and certain pagan feast days when people were especially “*eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols.*” 1 Corinthians 8:4.

A “strong” Jew who knew that “an idol is nothing” would have no scruples about eating “meat in an idols temple” on a pagan feast day. 1 Corinthians 8-4, 10. Paul warned these “strong” Jewish believers, “*But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to them that are weak. [the Gentile convert from idolatry]. For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple [on a pagan feast day], shall not the conscience of him that is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols; and through your knowledge shall the weak brother perish [if he is drawn back to idolatry], for whom Christ died? But when you sin against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, you sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth.*” 1 Corinthians 8:9-13.

There is NO evidence that the discussion about “the weak and the strong” in Romans 14 and 1 Corinthians 8 has anything to do with the Sabbath. God has never said “one man may choose to esteem MY Sabbath, while another man may choose to esteem Sunday.” Remember that the word *alike* does not exist and is an added word. God has NOT left it up to us to “pick a day.” Rather, God has commanded, “*Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy ... the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God.*” Exodus 20:8-10. The book of Romans is very clear, “by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Romans 3:20; 7:7, 12.

When the passage is about a law of bondage as referred to in Galatians 4 or foods and days as in Colossians 2:16 and Romans 14:5, especially when associated with the sanctuary service, then we must realize that the Ten Commandments are not being referred to. When the Ten Commandments are being

referenced, you will always know as the context of the passage will always be centred around love, as that is what the Ten Commandments are. The Bible tells us in 1 John 4:8 "*He that loves not, knows not God; for God Is Love.*" As God is eternal, then Love also must be eternal. 1 John 4:16 says, "*And we have known and believed the love that God has to us. God is love; and he that dwells in love dwells in God, and God in him.*" Love is inseparable from God and the true Christian, as God is *love* and *love* is God. We were created in *love* and for *love* and no other reason. This is why the Ten Commandments are eternal and unchanging, as God changes not, and *love* changes not, and the guidelines on loving God and man also changes not. Jesus said in Matthew 5:17 that He did not come to destroy the law and that till heaven and earth pass, not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law. See also misunderstandings in [fulfilling the law](#). He also warned against not teaching the law and said great is he that does teach and uphold the law. Jesus then raises the bar even higher and tells us that if we think the crime we have done the crime as verse 27 goes on to say. Jesus is in no way implying the Ten Commandments are going to be abolished or change, but to the contrary Jesus shows they will become even stricter. To imply that Colossians 2:16, Galatians 4:10 or Romans 14:5 refer to the Ten Commandments is to take them seriously out of context and also have them fail to line up with other scripture throughout the Bible as well as being in serious and obvious contradiction to many other scriptures.

The remainder of this topic on Romans 14:5 will now be left to some of the world's past but best theologians. By doing this, you can see that what has currently been taught is also backed up by some highly respected and famous theologians.

### **John Wesley's Explanatory Notes on the Whole Bible**

**Romans 14:5 - One day above another** - As new moons, and other Jewish festivals. Let every man be fully persuaded - That a thing is lawful, before he does it.

Notice how the Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge, which primarily references other verses that are referring to the same topic, has referenced the passages that Paul discussed with the Romans, Galatians and Colossians regarding the ceremonial law also. This as we have now seen is because all these verses are referring to the ceremonial law.

### **Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge by Canne, Browne, Blayney, Scott**

**Romans 14:5 - esteemeth:** Galatians 4:9, Galatians 4:10; Colossians 2:16, Colossians 2:17

### **Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, LL.D., F.S.A., (1715-1832)**

**Romans 14:5 - One man esteemeth one day above another** - Perhaps the word day, is here taken for time, festival, and such like, in which sense it is frequently used. Reference is made here to the Jewish institutions, and especially their festivals; such as the Passover, Pentecost, feast of tabernacles, new moons, jubilee, etc. The converted Jew still thought these of moral obligation; the Gentile Christian not having been bred up in this way had no such prejudices. And as those who were the instruments of bringing him to the knowledge of God gave him no such injunctions, consequently he paid to these no religious regard.

**Another** - The converted Gentile esteemeth every day - considers that all time is the Lord's, and that each day should be devoted to the glory of God; and that those festivals are not binding on him. We add here alike, and make the text say what I am sure was never intended, viz. that there is no distinction of days, not even of the Sabbath: and that every Christian is at liberty to consider even this day to be holy or not holy, as he happens to be persuaded in his own mind. That the Sabbath is of lasting obligation may be reasonably concluded from its institution (see the note on Genesis 2:3) and from its typical reference. All allow that the Sabbath is a type of that rest in glory which remains for the people of God. Now, all types are intended to continue in full force till the antitype, or thing signified, take place; consequently, the Sabbath will continue in force till the consummation of all things. The word alike should not be added; nor is it acknowledged by any MS. or ancient version.

**Let every man be fully persuaded** - With respect to the propriety or non-propriety of keeping the above festivals, let every man act from the plenary conviction of his own mind; there is a sufficient latitude allowed.

## **Albert Barnes' Notes on the Bible (1798-1870)**

**Romans 14:5 - One man esteemeth** - Greek “judgeth” krinei. The word is here properly translated “esteemeth;” compare Act 13:46; Act 16:15. The word originally has the idea of “separating,” and then “discerning,” in the act of judging. The expression means that one would set a higher value on one day than on another, or would regard it as more sacred than others. This was the case with the “Jews” uniformly, who regarded the days of their festivals, and fasts, and Sabbaths (*i.e. ceremonial Sabbaths*) as especially sacred, and who would retain, to no inconsiderable degree, their former views, even after they became converted to Christianity.

**Another “esteemeth** - That is, the “Gentile” Christian. Not having been brought up amidst the Jewish customs, and not having imbibed their opinions and prejudices, they would not regard these days as having any special sacredness. The appointment of those days had a special reference “to the Jews.” They were designed to keep them as a separate people, and to prepare the nation for the “reality,” of which their rites were but the shadow. When the Messiah came, the Passover, the feast of tabernacles, and the other special festivals of the Jews, of course vanished, and it is perfectly clear that the apostles never intended to inculcate their observance on the Gentile converts. See this subject discussed in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians.

**Every day alike** - The word “alike” is not in the original, and it may convey an idea which the apostle did not design. The passage means that he regards “every day” as consecrated to the Lord; Romans 14:6. The question has been agitated whether the apostle intends in this to include the Christian Sabbath. Does he mean to say that it is a matter of “indifference” whether this day be observed, or whether it be devoted to ordinary business or amusements? This is a very important question in regard to the Lord's day. That the apostle did not mean to say that it was a matter of indifference whether it should be kept as holy, or devoted to business or amusement, is plain from the following considerations.

(1) the discussion had reference only to the special customs of the “Jews,” to the rites and practices which “they” would attempt to impose on the Gentiles, and not to any questions which might arise among Christians as “Christians.” The inquiry pertained to “meats,” and festival observances among the Jews, and to their scruples about partaking of the food offered to idols, etc.; and there is no more propriety in supposing that the subject of the Lord's day is introduced here than that he advances principles respecting “baptism” and “the Lord's supper.”

(2) the “Lord's day” was doubtless observed by “all” Christians, whether converted from Jews or Gentiles; see 1Corinthians 16:2; Acts 20:7; Revelation 1:10; compare the notes at John 20:26. The propriety of observing “that day” does not appear to have been a matter of controversy. The only inquiry was, whether it was proper to add to that the observance of the Jewish Sabbaths, and days of festivals and fasts.

(3) it is expressly said that those who did not regard the day regarded it as not to God, or to honor God; Romans 14:6. They did it as a matter of respect to him and his institutions, to promote his glory, and to advance his kingdom. Was this ever done by those who disregard the Christian Sabbath? Is their design ever to promote his honor, and to advance in the knowledge of him, by “neglecting” his holy day? Who knows not that the Christian Sabbath has never been neglected or profaned by any design to glorify the Lord Jesus, or to promote his kingdom? It is for purposes of business, gain, war, amusement, dissipation, visiting, crime. Let the heart be filled with a sincere desire to “honor the Lord Jesus,” and the Christian Sabbath will be revered, and devoted to the purposes of piety. And if any man is disposed to plead “this passage” as an excuse for violating the Sabbath, and devoting it to pleasure or gain, let him quote it “just as it is,” that is, let “him neglect the Sabbath from a conscientious desire to honor Jesus Christ.” Unless this is his motive, the passage cannot avail him. But this motive never yet influenced a Sabbath-breaker.

**Let every man...** - That is, subjects of this kind are not to be pressed as matters of conscience. Every man is to examine them for himself, and act accordingly. This direction pertains to the subject under discussion, and not to any other. It does not refer to subjects that were “morally” wrong, but to ceremonial observances. If the “Jew” esteemed it wrong to eat meat, he was to abstain from it; if the Gentile

esteemed it right, he was to act accordingly. The word “be fully persuaded” denotes the highest conviction, not a matter of opinion or prejudice, but a matter on which the mind is made up by examination; see Romans 4:21; 2 Timothy 4:5. This is the general principle on which Christians are called to act in relation to festival days and fasts in the church. If some Christians deem them to be for edification, and suppose that their piety will be promoted by observing the days which commemorate the birth, and death, and temptations of the Lord Jesus, they are not to be reproached or opposed in their celebration. Nor are they to attempt to impose them on others as a matter of conscience, or to reproach others because they do not observe them.

### **The People's New Testament (1891) by B. W. Johnson**

**Romans 14:5-9 - One man esteemeth one day above another.** A second difference of opinion is now cited. Some, Jewish converts or Gentiles who did not understand that the old covenant was ended, believed that the Jewish sabbaths and new moons should be kept sacred. Compare Colossians 2:16, and Galatians 4:10.

This ends the Commentaries on Romans 14:5. You will note that the Peoples New Testament commentary above also references Colossians 2:16 and Galatians 4:10. It should now be clear that the context and the meaning of all these three passages is the ceremonial law with all its various holy day festivals, new moons and ceremonial sabbaths. Below are some tables that give some more insight.

### **Do we still have to keep the feast days?**

There is no doubt about the Sabbath and the other nine Commandments being eternal but the feasts had a purpose. The Bible tells us that they were our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ but then were no longer necessary. What was it that these feasts also had? They had sacrificial offerings to make reconciliation for our sin. When Jesus said “*it is finished,*” had he done the job or not? There was certainly something nailed to the cross. So what was nailed to the cross? It was whatever it was that was practised to make reconciliation for sin before Christ. These feasts had burnt offerings etc. If one insists they must keep these feasts then they have to do it properly according to how the Bible instructs that they are to be kept. You cannot just decide what part of them you want to do. You do it all or you don't do it at all. Here is just one example for Passover. If one insists on keeping these feasts, then this is what you have to do for Passover just to begin with!

*Ezekiel 45:21-25 “In the first month, in the fourteenth day of the month, you shall have the passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten. 22 And upon that day shall the prince prepare for himself and for all the people of the land a bullock for a sin offering. 23 And seven days of the feast he shall prepare a burnt offering to the LORD, seven bullocks and seven rams without blemish daily the seven days; and a kid of the goats daily for a sin offering. 24 And he shall prepare a meat offering of an ephah for a bullock, and an ephah for a ram, and an hin of oil for an ephah. 25 In the seventh month, in the fifteenth day of the month, shall he do the like in the feast of the seven days, according to the sin offering, according to the burnt offering, and according to the meat offering, and according to the oil.”*

Now here is the problem. If you start doing burnt offerings to make reconciliation for sin then you say to Jesus, “*Hey Jesus! When you said it was finished, it was not finished at all...You did not finish the job on the cross at all so I still have to follow these feasts and the burnt offerings etc to cover my sins...*”

Does one really want to deny the work of Jesus on the cross? I hope no one would ever do that! This is why they were nailed to the cross, because Jesus fulfilled this sacrificial system that these feast days belonged to. I know what the COG teaches and all the other offshoots of the WWCG, which Herbert Armstrong taught who, yes, were proven to be wrong on many things including the feasts etc and he was a proven cult leader and why the Church collapsed. The problem is that the enemy is recruiting more and more people into this system he started. Those teaching observance of the feasts typically use underhanded techniques like painting a real ugly picture for Easter and Christmas to try and turn people from them and then to their Church for the answer to escape this. Yes, there is paganism involved in the origin of these things, but do not forget that Satan wants this to happen and for these two events to be lost as much as possible because they DO result in MANY people coming to Christ. If the world followed Armstrong's teaching then the world would never here about Christ and that is exactly what Satan wants. Jesus out of the picture! He also wants to add confusion here to keep as many as possible from the

Sabbath of the Lord that really is important. It is sin not to keep the Commandments but this feast system was to make reconciliation for sin (*breaking the Ten Commandments*) and pointed forward to Christ. Big difference! We need to understand this. And yes, there are some verses that can be cleverly used and misunderstood to make a convincing argument but there are clear answers to these scriptures if one wants them that also prevents all the contradiction with other scripture that you would otherwise have.

We must not deny the work of Jesus on the cross and in turn add to the confusion that will keep more people from the Sabbath truth and entering the kingdom. The following web site on [Colossians 2:16](#) covers this topic in more detail.

There are some who have recently been trying to make an argument for abolishing the Sabbath based on Hosea 2:11. This one is so obviously and seriously wrong that it is not necessary to read the next page unless you find it of interest.

## Hosea 2:11

It grieves me deeply that some are so desperate to prove that the Lord's Sabbath is abolished, that they search for any scripture they can abuse for their argument. This has recently become the case with Hosea 2:11 with a handful of people. As Satan loves to perpetuate false doctrine, I am revealing the truth on this verse before our adversary gets a chance to spread this heresy as he did with Colossians 2:16.

Note first the similarities in context between Hosea 2:11 and Colossians 2:16 in regards to the mention of feast days, new moons and ceremonial sabbath days.

Hosea 2:11 *"I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts."*

Colossians 2:16 *"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink [offerings], or in respect of an holyday [feast], or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:"*

The reason for the similarities is simply because Hosea 2:11 also refers to the Mosaic Law and its sacrificial system that had meat and drink offerings, feast days, new moons and ceremonial sabbath days.

There is also another very significant fact that proves this. Symbolically, the Bible refers to a Church as a *woman* as the Church is the bride of Christ. There is much more that could be explained here but I do not think it is necessary to go into further detail to see this. See [Mystery Babylon](#) for more information if required.

Israel was God's Old Testament Church and why you will frequently find God referring to Israel in scripture as a woman and even a harlot when Israel was guilty of idolatry. You will note in Hosea 2:11 the consistent use of the word "HER" as in HER feasts, HER new moons and HER sabbaths etc. "HER" in this case is referring to Israel. These Sabbaths were *not* God's but belonged to Israel.

These sabbaths such as the Passover sabbath were part of the sacrificial sanctuary system that *only* Israel had to keep to make reconciliation for sin. Not long after Jesus died on the cross, the Gospel went to the Gentiles, and so they *never* had to keep them because Jesus replaced this sacrificial law when he became our One and final perfect sacrifice, nailing this law to the cross. This is why they were for Israel only to make reconciliation for sin until Jesus Christ came and fulfilled this sacrificial law. The fourth Commandment on the other hand is the Lord's Sabbath and belonged to Him and was for everyone to keep for all eternity.

So put very simply, God had two very significant laws. The Mosaic Law and the Ten Commandment law. The Mosaic Law was temporary, sacrificial, written on paper, only for the Jews and was nailed to the cross. The Ten Commandments were love, written in stone, eternal and for everyone. If the Lord's Sabbath was temporary and only for Israel, then why didn't God put it in the temporary Mosaic Law with all the other sabbaths that were nailed to the cross? Because it was not temporary! God placed it in His Ten Commandment law that was eternal and for everyone because that is where it belonged! So unless one thinks God is a fool and the author of confusion, (1 Corinthians 14:33) then this alone also reveals the truth.

God makes a very clear distinction between His Sabbath and the ceremonial sabbaths in [the Ten Commandments](#) by stating, *“But the seventh day is the **Sabbath of the LORD your God:**”* (Exodus 20:10, Deuteronomy 5:14). Note that this is the Lord's Sabbath and never belonged to Israel. It is God's! We find this further demonstrated in scripture by God often calling His Sabbath, *“My Sabbaths,”* as in His weekly Sabbaths, while calling the ceremonial sabbaths that were only for Israel, *“Her Sabbaths.”* This very clear distinction has been given in Hosea 2:11 that leaves no uncertainty that the sabbaths referred to are only ceremonial such as Passover and the Day of Atonement etc that were all practised because of sin. This is also seen by the context of Hosea 2:11. Remember that this sacrificial system had feast days, new moons and sabbath days as previously explained. All the following scriptures refer *only* to the sacrificial sanctuary system.

Hosea 2:11 *“I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts.”*

2 Chronicles 8:13 *“Even after a certain rate every day, offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the solemn feasts, three times in the year, even in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles.”*

Ezekiel 45:17 *“And it shall be the prince's part to give burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and drink offerings, in the feasts [holyday], and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, in all solemnities of the house of Israel: he shall prepare the sin offering, and the meat offering, and the burnt offering, and the peace offerings, to make reconciliation for the house of Israel.”*

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; [sin] ... 16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink [offerings], or in respect of an holyday [feast], or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:”*

Galatians 4:9-10 *“But now after you have known God, or rather are known by God, how is it that you turn again to the weak and beggarly elements, to which you desire again to be in **bondage**? 10 You observe days and months and seasons and years [eg; Passover, Day of Atonement and five others, which are all yearly sabbaths].”* Parenthesis are added. More can be found on [Galatians and the law](#).

Note that the following two verses refer to the *Lord's Sabbath*, as in the fourth Commandment that is eternal in nature as are the other nine Commandments.

Exodus 31:13 *“Speak you also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily **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** that does sanctify you.”*

Ezekiel 20:20 *“And hallow **MY** sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that you may know that I am the **LORD** your God.”*

The following two verses refer to Israel's ceremonial sabbaths that were practised because of sin. Remember that such sin would include breaking the fourth Commandment as sin is the breaking of God's law. ([1 John 3:4](#))

Hosea 2:11 *“I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and **HER** sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts.”*

Lamentations 1:7 *“Jerusalem remembered in the days of her affliction and of her miseries all her pleasant things that she had in the days of old, when her people fell into the hand of the enemy, and none did help her: the adversaries saw her, and did mock at **HER** sabbaths.”*

Those attempting to prove Hosea 2:11 is saying that the Sabbath of the Lord is going to cease state the fulfillment was at the cross, and I know of one shamefully arrogant and deceived Catholic who bases this on Matthew 28:1. More on this later.

Reading Hosea chapter 2 reveals that Israel had been guilty of idolatry that God really detests. Hosea 2:1-5 speaks of the idolatry of Israel while Hosea 2:6-13 speaks of God's judgments against them. The time frame here is around 700 B.C. and refers to the capture of the ten Northern tribes of Israel by the Assyrians. These ten tribes were captured, removed, and finally were all scattered.

Also significant is that the word cease in Hosea 2:11 means to stop. It does not mean to abolish. So why did these feast days and ceremonial sabbaths cease? Because Northern Israel did not repent and thus were captured, removed and scattered as God warned. As a result of this, her feast days, her new moons and her sabbaths all ceased for these Northern tribes. These feasts etc did however continue for Southern Israel such as Judah and Jerusalem.

### **John Wesley's Explanatory Notes on the Whole Bible**

*“Hosea 2:11 Her feast days - Though apostate, Israel was fallen to idolatry, yet they retained many of the Mosaic rites and ceremonies. Her solemn feasts - The three annual feasts of tabernacles, weeks, and passover, all which ceased when they were carried captive, by Salmaneser.”*

So when was the fulfillment of this prophecy, as in when did they cease for Northern Israel? Wesley's Notes on the Bible correctly states it was when they were carried captive by Salmaneser, which was around 722 B.C. This means we are still over 750 years away from the cross. To say Hosea 2:11 refers to the Sabbath of the Lord ceasing is to say that the fourth Commandment ended even before Jesus was born! This is just plain stupidity and those teaching this are clutching at straws.

The Catholic person I referred to earlier has an axe to grind with the worlds largest Sabbath keeping Church for preaching [antichrist truth](#), and so his use of this verse is a deliberate attempt at proving a lie. I do not think I will ever understand how so called Christians think they can do this and God will smile upon them. There is no doubt of the outcome of deliberate and wilful sin. See [Hebrews 10:26-29](#).

This Catholic has a text only video on You Tube and he challenges anyone to prove him wrong. But I have found that he removes any comment that does prove him wrong! I could not believe that he would do such a thing! If the comment was not to threatening for him, then he often just accused the person who gave their feedback as being ignorant and that was his only reply. This person erroneously claims that Matthew 28:1 is the so called fulfillment of Hosea 2:11. The problem is that he is over 750 years to late! Did he even bother to see what Hosea was referring to?

This person first sets out to prove that both uses of the word Sabbath in Matthew 28:1 are plural and on that much he is correct. The phrase *“first day of the week”* in the Greek actually means *“first of the Sabbath”* which means this is the first day after the Sabbath. This applies to all New Testament verses using the phrase *“first day of the week.”* See [what day is the Sabbath](#) for more detail on this phrase.

His end argument is that Matthew 28:1 says *“In the end of the Sabbaths”* and that since it is plural, that it is saying it is the end of the Lord's Sabbaths, as in it was abolished. This phrase is just simply saying at the end of this day. Since his argument is already squashed by the time period of fulfilment and that Hosea 2:11 refers to the ceremonial sabbaths only, it is not necessary to go into this further. But there is a very interesting translation issue here that many people fail to see. So here is more detail on this verse that proves this person wrong three times over!

The reason why the word Sabbath should have been translated “Sabbaths” in Matthew 28:1 is because this Sabbath was a High day or High Sabbath.

John 19:31 *“The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, (for that Sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.”*

Even though it should be pretty obvious what a high Sabbath is, there are many who disagree to achieve their own means once again so here it is by Commentary. The same is said by every well known and reputable Bible Commentary.

**The People's New Testament (1891) by B. W. Johnson** quotes:

*“John 19:31 - That sabbath was a high day. A double Sabbath, both the weekly Sabbath and a passover Sabbath. It was usual Roman custom to leave crucified bodies on the cross, but out of deference to their wishes Pilate consents that the legs of the victims should be broken in order to hasten death, so that the bodies might be taken down and buried. The legs were crushed with a hammer like a sledge and the shock would bring speedy death.”*

So the first thing to note is that the word Sabbath in the Greek is actually *Sabbaths* because it was both the Seventh day Sabbath of the Lord and the Passover sabbath. Remember that Jesus was the true Lamb of God and became our Passover Lamb and the fulfillment of Passover, and why this ceremonial sabbath did end at the cross! Jesus fulfilled the whole sacrificial system with all its ceremonial sabbath days.

Now for the interesting part. Matthew 28:1 reads, *“In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.”*

The “end of the Sabbath”, which is sunset and “dawn” are twelve hours apart, so why do we have this apparent contradiction in Matthew 28:1? The answer is found in the translation of this passage. By reorganizing the last verse of Matthew 27 and the first verse of Matthew 28, the apparent ambiguity completely disappears.

Matthew 27:62-66 *“Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, 63 Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. 64 Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. 65 Pilate said unto them, You have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as you can. 66 So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch. 28:1 In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.”*

In Matthew 27:62, a request for a guard on the tomb was made on the Sabbath (the day after the preparation) and that the request was for a guard until the third day. By simply moving the text *“in the end of the Sabbath,”* from the beginning of Matthew 28:1 to the end of the previous verse in Matthew 27:66, which is where it should have been placed when punctuation and chapters and verses were first added, we would have the following.

Matthew 27:66 *“So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch **in the end of the sabbath.**”*

Matthew 28:1 *“As it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.”*

It was the watch guarding the tomb that began *“in the end of the Sabbath.”* Since Jesus was to rise the third day, the Roman guards were put in place immediately at the end of the Sabbaths because they anticipated that the body of Jesus would be stolen by the Jews sometime that night. See also [Wednesday Crucifixion](#).

It is now even more obvious that the phrase *“in the end of the Sabbaths”* is not referring to the abolishing of the Lord's Sabbath but is just specifying the time when the guard was placed on the tomb. The guard was placed at the end of this High day that was both the Seventh day Sabbath and the Passover sabbath. Others I asked said it was already obvious this verse was just referring to the end of the day but now it is just so clear that no one can dispute the obvious.

So Hosea 2:11 refers to Israel's ceremonial sabbaths such as Passover and the Day of Atonement, which were practised because of sin, and the fulfillment of this prophecy was around 722 B.C. and not at the cross. And Matthew 28:1 was nothing more than a shameful attempt at proving a lie. I believe we can confidently state that this lame argument inspired by Satan is now a dead argument.

**See also:**

<http://www.the-ten-commandments.org/the-ten-commandments-law.html>

[http://www.the-ten-commandments.org/galatians\\_ceremoniallaw.html](http://www.the-ten-commandments.org/galatians_ceremoniallaw.html)

**Regarding which day is the Sabbath, see**

<http://www.whatdayisthesabbath.com/>

<http://www.the-ten-commandments.org/sabbathsundaychange.html>

**The New Testament does not have the Sabbath Commandment.**

<http://www.newtestamentsabbath.com/>