

Refuting Sunday-Keeping VIII

Fred R. Coulter—

We're going to keep on going through *Refuting Sunday-Keeping* until we're done with all the 25 reasons that are given here in this book, *Sunday Facts and Sabbath Fiction*. What we're going to see today is something I think that's very profound and important in understanding how on earth can all of these things be so turned upside down and to make the Scriptures say the exact opposite of what they really mean. Now it reminds me of a debate that I heard between Alan Keyes and Alan Dershowitz. Alan Dershowitz was asked the question, because he kept saying, 'Well, I do this because it's right, not because God says so, or because someone else says so, but because it's right.' So then he was asked the question from someone in the audience, 'How do you know what is right?' And he said, 'Well, that's very hard to tell. However, we can more easily tell what is wrong.'

Now this is classic doublespeak and the long and the short of it is, if you do not have the Word of God to tell you what is right and what is wrong, you set your own standard. When you set your own standard, you sit in the seat of God. Then you make your own laws, which you profess are better than the laws of God. Now this is exactly what Protestantism has done with Sunday-keeping vs Sabbath-keeping.

Now let's look at some Scriptures and see that Paul confronted these same things and we are warned about this. We are warned that we are not to get trapped in it. Let's first of all go to 2-Corinthians 2, and let's see even in Paul's day what they were doing with the Word of God. Now there were two things that they were doing. 2-Corinthians 2:17: "For we are not like the many, who for *their own* profit are corrupting the Word of God..." Now, 'corrupt the Word of God' means to make it say something that it does not say, or even worse like they have done with these New Age Bible versions which we have today, to remove and take away words out of the Scripture to make it say what you want.

Now several years ago I did a sermon the *Inclusive Version Bible*. Now the *Inclusive Version New Testament* is the ultimate translation, which is really not a translation, but a **corruption** of the New Testament, which those who are on the committee of the *New Revised Standard Version* want to do, which is this. They want to make it neuter gender, meaning that God is not our Father, God is 'Mother/Father.' That the Son of man is not the Son of God, but the 'Human One.' **Now that's corrupting the Word of God.**

When Paul wrote this [2-Cor.], there were the Gnostics who were coming along with their gospels, and they were corrupting the Word of God by saying that they had a better word of God than the true Word of God. We're going to see that Protestantism is kind of a combination of both of them. We're also going to see that a lot of their reasoning is just like I brought out the same kind of reasoning that Alan Dershowitz said in trying to define right and wrong.

Now but here's the way that it should be: "...but we speak with sincerity, as from God, *and* before God, *and* in Christ" (v 17). In other words he wasn't doing it with a hidden agenda. He wasn't doing it with his own ideas. He wasn't preaching the things out of his own mind, which sounded good to a rebellious carnal mind. No,

- Paul was converted.
- Paul was led of God's Spirit.
- Paul was an apostle of Jesus Christ.

So he was pointing out what these different false apostles were doing in bringing these false doctrines, they were corrupting the Word of God.

Now let's look at the second thing that they do with it. Now for anyone who does any preaching or anyone who claims to represent God, they have an extra burden placed upon them and they have an extra responsibility before God, which is this. 2-Corinthians 4:1: "Therefore, having this ministry, according as we have received mercy, we are not fainthearted. For we have personally renounced the hidden things of dishonest gain, not walking in *cunning* craftiness... [That is having an agenda different from what the Word of God is.] ...nor handling the Word of God deceitfully..." (vs 1-2).

Now today we're going to see how some people really handle the Word of God *deceitfully* and with the *sleight of hand*. Let's go to Ephesians, the fourth chapter, where Paul talks about that and where there are confusing doctrines that come along because of:

1. *corrupting* the Word of God
2. *deceitfully* using the Word of God
3. *sleight of hand* for the very purpose of establishing false doctrine in place of true doctrine

Ephesians 4:14: "So that we no longer be children, tossed and carried about with every wind of doctrine..." The wind comes and the wind goes, as Solomon said, turns to the north and turns to the south. Jesus told Nicodemus that the Spirit is much

like wind. It comes and it goes, but you don't know from where it comes or where it goes. So many of these doctrines are just like that. It's like a wind, comes whistling in. People say, 'Oh, that's interesting.' When those come in and you hear of them, first of all you're to search the Scriptures to see whether they're so or not and next you're to prove all things, rightly dividing the Word of God and see if it stacks up 'line upon line, and precept upon precept,' and it fills the whole picture as we find in the Bible. Because as we are going to see, most of these doctrines which are illegal attempts, lying attempts, corrupt attempts, sleight-of-hand attempts to establish Sunday as the day of worship instead of the Sabbath, fall into those categories. And it's just like a wind and it appeals not to the Truth of God, but it appeals to the carnal mind. We'll see what the carnal mind is and why it is so appealing to people.

"...every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men in *cunning* craftiness... [we're going to see some cunning craftiness here] ...with a view to the systematizing of the error ['they lie in wait to deceive' (KJV)]" (v 14). Let me tell you something, this book by Russell Tardo is a *systematizing of the error*.

Now let's look and see what appeals to the carnal mind. Let's look at a couple basic Scriptures, which we should have memorized when we were first converted; or if you're not yet converted, you should memorize right now so that when you are converted you won't forget it.

Romans 8:6: "For to be carnally minded is death... ['carnal mind' means just the human mind with its own ability and rationale. The way that it goes is death. What does the Bible say death is the result of? '*The wages of sin is death.*' So the carnal mind will be one to which sin will be justified, because it leads to death. We're going to see very clearly how this happens.] ...but to be spiritually minded is life and peace, because the carnal mind is enmity against God... [What does enmity mean? It means *hatred*, it means *an enemy*. As a matter of fact, enmity is spelled very similar to enemy—isn't it? *Yes, it is!*] ...for it is not subject to the law of God; neither indeed can it *be*.... [All of these things concerning Sunday-keeping are rejecting the laws of God. Now what I'm reading here is New Testament doctrine, which is very profound and important, as we'll see a little later on.] ...**But those who are in the flesh...** [or carnal minded] ...**cannot please God**" (vs 6-8).

Let's go to 1-John 3 and let's see we are to do those things that please God. But the carnal mind cannot do those things that please God. We're going to see that Sunday-keeping is not pleasing to God,

because it's all carnal rationale. 1-John 3:22: "And whatever we may ask... [in prayer] ...we receive from Him because we keep His commandments and practice those things that are pleasing in His sight." So therefore, if one has the Spirit of God and is spiritual-minded, then he will keep the commandments of God and he will do the things that please God. But the one who is carnal-minded cannot please God, because he's not subject to the law of God. What can we deduce out of this? Commandment-keeping is pleasing to God! To do it based upon the love of God and the love of Jesus Christ is pleasing. To let it become a very part of heart and mind and being is the whole goal and purpose that Christ has established for us.

Let's come to 2-Peter 3, just a couple pages over and let's see why it is that these Scriptures which they use to justify Sunday-keeping, which are no more than misinterpreted Scriptures by

1. corrupting the Word of God
2. handling the Word of God of deceitfully
3. being carnal minded

—to establish false doctrine. Now here's how it happens:

2-Peter 3:15: "And bear in mind that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation, exactly as our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him, has also written to you; As *he has* also in all *his* epistles, speaking in them concerning these things; in which are some things *that are* difficult to understand, which the ignorant... [That means they don't know the Scriptures, they use them, but they don't know them. There are a lot of people that use the Scriptures. There are a lot of ministers who use them. There are a lot of them who have memorized their favorite little pathways through the Scripture, but they don't understand it and we'll see why.] ...which are ignorant and unstable... [Meaning, they are not grounded in the Word of God. Being unstable, they're subject to every wind of doctrine and tossed to and fro, just like the wind moves the water.] ...are twisting *and distorting*, as *they* also *twist and distort* the rest of the Scriptures... [Now referring to New and Old Testament Scriptures here by the way.] ...to their own destruction" (vs 15-16).

That's what we're going to see has happened here. Now let's go back and let's review John 5, because in the book [*Sunday Facts & Sabbath Fiction*], we'll turn here and I'll read the quote concerning what he says happened in John 5. We will see that they believe in a form of lawlessness that is absolutely incredible. Now here's what he claims.

John 5:18: "So then, on account of this saying, the Jews sought all the more to kill Him, not only because He had loosed the Sabbath, but also

because He had called God His own Father, making Himself equal with God.” Now in whose eyes had He broken the Sabbath? Now it doesn’t say abolished. The Greek there is ‘luo,’ which means *loosed*. Now, then what do you use for your authority? Do you use the Word of God to go back and put it together properly, which you should. Jesus said in Matt. 5:17, He says, ‘Do not think that I have come to abolish [‘luo’] the Law or the Prophets.’ So here they accused Him of doing it, but He said, **‘Don’t think that I did.’**

Now let’s see on whose authority he [Tardo] relies on. (*Sunday Facts & Sabbath Fiction*):

Numerous Greek scholars... because he said the expression ‘Jesus had broken the Sabbath’ actually declares that Jesus had done nothing less than to cancel the Sabbath commandment.

You need to think about those words. Those are stout words against God. Remember what we’ve covered in Job 40 about Job where God says, ‘Will you disannul My judgment that you may be righteous?’ ‘Will you condemn Me,’ says the Lord? That’s what he’s saying here. Now let’s look at it carefully. *Jesus did not say*, ‘I abolish the Sabbath.’ He was accused of breaking the Sabbath and in this case we will see, it means ‘*loosing*’ a law of *Judaism*, as we pointed out very clearly. But notice how they take it.

Jesus had done nothing less than cancel the Sabbath commandment.

Now is that ‘enmity against’ God’s law? Is that not ‘subject to the law of God and neither indeed can be’? *Absolutely! Yes!* So then he quotes several Protestant authorities. Now there are others who do not agree with him, but nevertheless, he takes the ones that agree with him. So he says:

M.R. Vincent translates ‘had broken’ literally was ‘loosing’—in the imperfect tense—not broke the Sabbath in any particular case, but was annulling the law and duty of Sabbath observance.

Nothing could be further from the truth. They are

1. corrupting the Word of God
2. deceitfully handling it
3. it’s the sleight of men trying to systematize the error

This is exactly what John meant. The word translated ‘was loosing’ has profound legal significance in the meaning of its context dealing with laws and judicial decisions. The same word is used in Matthew 16:19 about loosing. ‘Whatsoever you bind on earth shall be

bound in heaven. Whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.’

But, you know, that has to show that it has to be legal. God is never going to be bound to sin. Christ is not the minister of sin.

- God is righteous
- God is holy
- God is perfect
- God is true

He’s not the minister of sin, so these explanations are just the figment of the imaginations of men. Now he quotes another one, W. E. Vine, who translates it:

“To loosen, especially by way of deliverance sometimes has the meaning of breaking destructively, of breaking commandments, not only infringing them, but losing the force of them, rendering them not binding.”

Now let’s understand something very important here. When Jesus healed the man and told him to take up his bedroll and walk, that was not a burden on the Sabbath. But He *loosed that law of Judaism*—and let’s understand again, re-emphasize. ***The Jewish code of law is not the Scriptures of God.*** This was a Jewish law where he couldn’t carry his bedroll. That’s what He loosed. He didn’t say, ‘I proclaim that you have heard it said in olden times, You shall remember the Sabbath to keep it Holy, I say to you, You remember the first day of the week, because that’s the day on which I am going to be resurrected upon.’ Now can you find that in the Scriptures anywhere? ***NO!*** And unless you find it that way, all of the twisting and turning and misrepresenting and misinterpreting the Scriptures here and actually plain lying about it, *will not make Sunday acceptable to God.*

Bullinger. Now Bullinger has done some things which are good and right. He’s done some things which are not. He defines it:

“To loosen, unbind, unfasten.” Arnt and Ginrich translates it: loose, untie, set free, release, to be set free from bond, break up, destroy, bring to an end, abolish, do away with—of commandments, laws. Statements it means: repel, annul, abolish—abolish the Sabbath.

- Now on whose authority did he establish that that’s what this Scripture meant?
- On the authority of the Word of God, or on the authority of men?
- *On the authority of men!*
- Does a man have the right to tell God what to do?

- Does a man have the right to tell God that since he doesn't like this Sabbath commandment, he's going to change it?
- Does man have the right to tell God, that if he does it God must honor it?
- *Of course not!*

Now what this means here is, it's very simple. You read it for what it is. Jesus healed him, told him to take up his bedroll and walk. The Jews wanting to get something on Him, wanting to say that He was not from God, wanting to refute that He was the Son of God, to reject Him as One Who was bringing the Truth of God, had to find something to accuse Him of. And they said He broke the Sabbath.

Let's go to John, the ninth chapter, and let's where else He did this, where he healed man that was born blind. In this case, so that he would see, He took some dirt and spit it in and made a little mud plaster and put it on his eyes. Let's pick it up here when they were questioning the man about how he was able to see.

John 9:24: "Therefore, they [the Pharisees.] called a second time *for* the man who had been born blind, and said to him, 'Give glory to God. We know that this man is a sinner.'" Now isn't that true? Isn't that the way that it always happens? When there's someone that is not liked, because they are doing the Truth and what is right, you accuse them of the exact opposite of what they really are. Jesus never sinned, so they said He's a sinner.

"Then he answered and said, 'Whether He is a sinner, I do not know. One *thing* I do know, that I was blind, and now I see.' And they said to him again, 'What did He do to you? How did He open your eyes?' He answered them, 'I have already told you, and you did not listen. Why do you want to hear it again? Do you desire to become His disciples, too?' Then they railed at him and said, 'You are His disciple, but we are Moses' disciples. We know that God spoke to Moses. As for this man, we do not know where He has come from.' The man answered and said to them, 'This is truly an amazing thing, that you do not know where He has come from, yet He opened my eyes. Now we know that God does not hear sinners. But if anyone is God-fearing and is doing His will, He hears him. From the beginning of the world it has never been heard that anyone has opened *the eyes of one* who was born blind. **If this man were not from God, He could do nothing**'" (vs 25-33).

Now this is true to the prophecy of Isaiah that 'out of the mouths of babes' comes the Truth. "They answered and said to him... [Notice the attitude of demonizing now this man.] ...'You were born wholly in sin, and you are teaching us?' And they cast him out" (v 34).

Let's come back here to John 5 and understand something now. We cannot rely upon a false accusation of the Jews to establish a new doctrinal Truth that the Sabbath has been abolished. Now that ought to be abundantly clear. This leads into the next thing. The next thing, then, really shows you the heart and core and the meaning and the whole spiritual deception behind their way of thinking, which we will see is *lawlessness*—not Truth—*lawlessness*. Now he concludes:

Thus we see that in John 5:18 Jesus is accused not merely of breaking the Sabbath, but of doing away with it.

But Jesus is only *accused* of it. Are you going to base doctrine on an accusation from your enemy? You know what the word is today—spare me!—*no way!*

While it is possible to cite other such scholarly renditions, it would only become redundant.

Now why not cite some in opposition to? You might try that.

The point is clearly made... [dogmatic statement]: ...Jesus annulled, abolished, did away with the Sabbath forever.

What does *forever* mean? **Forever!** Yet the prophecy in Isaiah 66:23 says that during the Millennium when Christ returns, that from Sabbath to Sabbath, and new moon to new moon, and year to year, 'all flesh shall come before the Lord to worship Him.'

- Will there be Sabbath-keeping in the Kingdom of God, in the Millennium? *Of course!*
- Who is going to King over the earth? *Jesus Christ!*
- Who's going to enforce Sabbath-keeping? *Jesus Christ and the saints of God!*

There won't be much problem enforcing it, because that will be the law of the world; totally different than what we have today. Now remember where we started. Jesus said He was Lord of the Sabbath day all during His ministry, and still is today as we've seen from the Scriptures. Will He still be Lord of the Sabbath in the Millennium when He's here on the earth and teaching human beings to love God and keep God's commandments? *Of course!*

...did away with the Sabbath forever.

Let's just go back to Isaiah 5. God has a special judgment coming for those people who treat the Word of God like this. Anyone who would make these claims and boast in it and remain recalcitrant, and hardhearted, and carnal-minded in it, lying in it,

deceptive in it, saying they're representing God, they better get a little fear of God.

Isaiah 5:20: "Woe to those who call evil good... [That's what they're doing. They're saying, 'Sunday-keeping is good.'] ...and good evil.... [That's what they are doing, because Sabbath-keeping is good, which they call *evil*.] ...who put darkness for light and light for darkness; who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter! Woe unto *them that are wise in their own eyes*... [And what we're reading here is a dissertation of wisdom in one's own eyes.] ...and prudent in their own sight! Woe unto *them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink; who justify the wicked for a bribe, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him!* Therefore, as the fire devours the stubble, and the flame burns up the chaff... [Now have you ever seen stubble devoured by a flame? It just explodes and it's no longer in existence. Same way with chaff.] ...their root shall be like rottenness, and their blossoms shall go up like dust because they have cast away the law of the LORD of hosts, and despised the Word of the Holy One of Israel" (vs 20-24). Have they done that? *No question about it!*

Let's see how far they carry this. Let's see the real basic, hard-rock, Protestant, lawless philosophy; which is the foundation of Sunday-keeping, and Christmas and Easter, which then also is the same foundation that the Catholics have, except they're just a little more honest about it. They say, 'We keep Sunday because the church has proclaimed it so.' While at the same time we saw that they admit what? That throughout the whole Bible, if you're going to go by the Bible and Bible alone, you better keep the Sabbath Day. So at least the Catholics are honest, but the Protestants are not. And they have deceived themselves and lied to themselves, and given themselves over to the same doctrines so much that their hatred and lawlessness is almost unbounded.

In fact, the whole Law of Moses has been rendered inoperative...

What did we just read here in Isaiah 5:24? '*Woe to them.*' The New Testament message is clear for all who have 'ears to hear.'

The whole Law of Moses has been rendered inoperative by the death of the Lord Jesus. The law in its entirety no longer has any immediate and forensic authority or jurisdiction whatsoever over anyone. This is evident in three ways.

Now we'll look at those in just a little bit here. But let's understand something right now. Let's go to Matthew 7. Now we've been to this Scripture

several times in this series, but let's again go to it so we will see now a perfect example of lawlessness using the name of Jesus, thinking that they are doing good. That's exactly what he thinks right here. Matthew 7, you probably have this all memorized.

Matthew 7:21—let's look at it, very clear: "Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,'... [or Jesus, Jesus] ...shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but the one who is doing the will of My Father, Who *is* in heaven." Now what is the will of the Father? Is it the will of the Father that you live a lawless life and He still accept you into His kingdom? Is it the will of the Father that you totally live in sin and you are exonerated from anything because of another false doctrine, 'Once saved, always saved'? You know, Martin Luther said, I'll just paraphrase it, but I've got a good quote that I put in *The Harmony of the Gospels*, which goes like this:

Since on this earth we cannot quit sin, therefore let the grace of Christ reign. If you sin, let the grace of Christ be even more. If you murder or commit adultery a thousand times a day, the grace of God is greater.

Now that's just out of one of the newly translated letters of Martin Luther. Now you know where Protestantism gets its lawlessness. He is one of the fathers of lawlessness, which is that once you're under grace regardless of what you do, you're already saved; there's nothing that can take away from your salvation, which is contradictory to what this says.

Verse 22: "Many will say to Me in that day... [the day of judgment] ...'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy through Your name?.... [Is this not prophesying, writing in Your name? Is this not in the name of God? Is this not using the name of Jesus and God the Father? *No question about it.*] ...And *did we not* cast out demons through Your name? And *did we not* perform many works of power through Your name?' And then I will confess to them, "I never knew you. Depart from Me, you who work lawlessness"" (vs 22-23). Now 'iniquity; (KJV) comes from the Greek 'anomia,' which means lawlessness. Lawlessness—when you say all the Law of Moses has been abrogated, you believe in a doctrine of lawlessness.

You cannot come back and say, 'Well, we'll recapture eight or nine of these commandments, and God will accept us for that. And if we just have love in our heart, it really doesn't matter what we do.' What they're talking about is not the love of God, they're talking about the human feeling of love, their own *feelings*, rather than facts. So they're workers of iniquity.

1-John 3:4 says, "...sin is the transgression of the law" (KJV), OR in the Greek it is '...sin is lawlessness.' So to take and abolish the laws and commandments of God, all of them, is lawlessness.

Christ is the complete end and fulfillment of the laws, 613 commandments, ending their jurisdiction over us completely. We are no longer justified through law keeping. (*Sunday Facts & Sabbath Fiction*)

Now what we're going to see is this: With their sleight of hand and their deceitfulness and their wrong thinking, they trip themselves up in their own reasonings, because they are comparing apples and oranges and do not even know it.

We are no longer justified through law keeping.

Now that sounds like a good statement and that has a grain of truth, which we will see a little bit later on, but we'll have to see there's a difference between justification and commandment-keeping.

Now let's go on here with a little more. We will come back and see some of these. We'll read some of the Scriptures that he uses. Let me get to another section here. This has to do with Christ fulfilling the law. Let's begin by going to Romans 10:4. Let's understand what this is talking about. Here's a Scripture that they use and we will see how they misapply it and twist it and turn it and use it to their own destruction, not knowing what they're even saying. It's like Paul wrote Timothy that there are many who desire to be teachers of the law, not understanding what they are saying, or what they are strongly affirming. This is the case here. Now to the carnal mind that does not want to keep the commandments of God, oh boy, does this sound like a great commandment to do away with all the laws of God.

Romans 10:4: "For Christ *is the end of works* of law for righteousness to everyone who believes." 'So therefore, brother, all you have to do is just believe and you're saved.' But remember, James said if 'you believe in one God, you do well. The demons also believe and tremble,' because they know that they have sinned unto judgment and their final eternal judgment they know is coming. Christ is the end of the law, therefore all 613 of the commandments of God have been done away. You don't have to keep the Sabbath, you can have idols, you can have other gods. You can dishonor your parents, you can murder, you can steal, you can lie, you can commit adultery, you can covet, you can do all of those things because Christ ended the law.

- *But the problem is, He didn't!*
- And the problem is they do not understand what this says.

- And the problem is they took it clear out of context!

(go to the next track)

So how do we begin to understand this? Let's first of all understand what *it does not mean*.

- It does not mean that the law has been abolished.
- It does not mean that all 613 commandments of God no longer exist and it's forever done away.

Now let's go to Romans 5:13 and let's see what it says concerning law. "For before *the* law... [Now let's understand something important. There are several ways that the word *law*—'nomos'—is used in the New Testament. Here in this case 'the law' refers to the covenant that was made with Israel. Now this is the one that Tardo says is completely abolished. There are those who say from the time of creation, up until Moses was given the law, there were no commandments.] (But let's notice how Paul answers that question): ...For before *the* law... [That is the covenant given to Israel.] ...sin was in *the* world. However, sin is not imputed when law does not exist." So he's clearly saying since there was sin, there was law and there was transgression, which is 'sin is the transgression of the law,' so therefore there was death.

Now if there is no law, God cannot impute sin to you. It's the same way in the land. Let's just use a simple example. A police officer could not arrest you for driving through a stop sign at an intersection where there was no stop sign—could he? Well, if he did, would you be convicted in court? *No*, because the law is, if there is a stop sign, you must stop. If you go through it, you transgress that law. But *if there is no stop sign, there is no law of the stop sign* at the place where there is no stop sign. So therefore, *there is no transgression* or there is no sin, and you cannot be condemned as guilty or convicted of it.

Now let's understand something concerning God's laws. They are there. They work all the time. If they weren't there and didn't work all the time, then you would not see the penalty of sin that people suffer. Most noticeably understood in the sex lives of people who, in their promiscuity, commit adultery and fornication and homosexuality and bestiality and every other sex sin under the sun and they have broken the law which says, 'You shall not commit adultery,' therefore the penalty of the law in their bodies is:

1. their thinking ends up messed up
2. their emotions are ruined
3. they come down with venereal diseases

—which you need to understand that when a man and woman marry and remain faithful to each other throughout their lives, there has never been one recorded incident of venereal disease, because they are living within the law. Now that ought to be abundantly clear.

Now let's go to Romans 4:15: "For the law works out wrath... [That is, if you break it. The law does not work wrath if you don't break it; it works blessings. Wrath is a curse. Now we'll also understand, as we go through this series, that the law is not the curse, but there is a curse *of* the law for sin. There are the blessings *of* the law for obedience.] ...because **where no law is, there is no transgression.**" So if there's no law, there can't be sin. And if there's no sin, then you don't need a Savior. And if you don't need a Savior, it was completely unnecessary for Christ to come.

Now let's carry this one step further. Let's go to Romans 7:7: "What then shall we say? *Is* the law sin? MAY IT NEVER BE!.... [Men say, 'Yes, the law is sin. Do away with it!'] ..But I had not known sin, except through the law...." How can you repent, if you don't know what sin is? *Sin is the transgression of the law. Whoso sins transgresses the law, for sin is the transgression of the law.* And when you become a Christian, you do what? *You repent of your sins*, which are law-breakings and transgressions, and you look to Christ to forgive you for your sins—don't you? *Yes! That is justification!*

But we will see some very important things. The man (John 5) found Him and he worshiped Him, and Jesus told him, 'Go sin no more, lest a worst thing come upon you.' Also the woman who was taken in adultery and improperly brought forth without the man (John 8). When no one condemned her, Jesus said, 'I condemn you not. Go and sin no more.' Those are very important things to understand. **Where there is no law, there is no sin!** So the carnal mind says, 'Since I don't want the law, the law is sin.' Paul says, 'No, it's not sin. It cannot be sin.'

"...Furthermore, I would not have been conscious of lust, except *that* the law said, 'You shall not covet.' But sin... [Which is in our members. All of us have it. That's why the 'carnal mind is enmity against God,' because you have the law of sin and death in you, and you do not want to admit that you're a sinful person. You only want to admit that you're righteous or that your conduct—though it may be condemned by others; though it may be condemned in the Bible—yet you have a Savior Who has done away with all the laws and commandments of God; so therefore, whatever you do is right. Oh, what a blessed conscience that you may have. **No, it's cursed!**] ...But sin, having grasped an opportunity by the commandment,

worked out within me every *kind of* lust because apart from law, sin was dead" (vs 7-8).

There could be no such thing as sin without the law.

- Therefore, you could never have a guilty conscience.
- Therefore, there's no such thing as murder.
- Therefore, there's no such thing as adultery.
- Therefore, there's no such thing as idolatry.
- Therefore, it's all right to have as many gods as you want
- or to lie and cheat and steal and covet and break all the commandments of God.

Verse 9: "For I was once alive without law; but after the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." Now what does he mean by that? How could he have died and yet write this epistle? 'When sin revived,' that means it came to his consciousness of what really sin really, really was. And he died the death of baptism, as we will see a little later.

"And the commandment, which *was meant to result in life*, was found *to be* unto death for me... [Because he broke it.] ...Because sin... [which is the transgression of the law] ...having taken opportunity by the commandment... [Because the commandment defines what sin is. Understand that! Since the commandments define what sin is, the commandments or laws cannot justify. I just want you to understand that concept.] ...sin, having taken opportunity by the commandment, deceived me, and by it killed *me*.... ['The wages of sin is death.' That's what it says over here in Rom. 6:23, 'The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.'] ...Therefore, the law *is* indeed Holy... [not a curse] ...and the commandment Holy and righteous and good" (vs 10-12). Now that's what we need to understand concerning the commandments of God.

Let's understand something: this is very profound. This is New Testament doctrine, and this shows the lying deception that all the commandments have been done away.

Verse 1 "Are you ignorant, brethren (for I am speaking to those who know law)... [Now if Christ had done away with the law, how is it that he's speaking to brethren who are Christians who know the law? *Because if it's done away, there's no need to know the law*—correct? You don't have to be bothered with any of it—do you? You see how ridiculous that thinking is?] ...(for I am speaking to those who know law), that the law rules over a man for as long a time as he live?" And then he uses the example of marriage.

Now if the marriage law has dominion over a man and a woman as long as they live, pray tell, do you not think that all the other commandments of God, which are of greater importance, has dominion over you as long as you live? *You better understand that that's true.*

Let's come back here Romans 6:1: "What then shall we say?... [That is concerning the whole thing of justification] ...What then shall we say? Shall we continue in sin, so that grace may abound? **MAY IT NEVER BE!** We who died to sin... [And you died to sin through baptism.] ...how shall we live any longer therein?" (vs 1-2).

Now this is Christian doctrine—isn't it? By the law is the knowledge of sin, if all the law has been done away, you can't have any knowledge of sin—can you? So how would you know what sin is? Paul says, 'How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer a sinful life?' Now if you're no longer living a sinful life, then you must be leading a law-obedient life—correct? Have to be.

Verse 3: "Or are you ignorant that we, as many as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into His death?... [And that's how Paul died, yet lived.] ...Therefore, we were buried with Him through the baptism into the death, so that, just as Christ was raised from *the* dead by the glory of the Father, in the same way, we also should walk in newness of life" (vs 3-4). Now if your old way of life has been sinning, if your old way of life has been commandment-breaking, what is going to be a new way of life? *Commandment-keeping!*

Verse 5: "For if we have been conjoined together in the likeness of His death, so also shall we be *in the likeness* of His resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man was co-crucified... [That's what you do with sin and carnal nature.] ...with *Him* in order that the body of sin might be destroyed... [If there is no sin, how can you destroy it? You see how contradictory that it would be if you followed this kind of thinking.] ...so that we might no longer be enslaved to sin" (vs 5-6). Now how clear is that?

Now let's look at a couple of other Scriptures. Let's come back to Romans, the third chapter, and let's understand where they get confused in this. The very first time I read this, I was confused myself, and I didn't understand it. It wasn't until sometime later that I understood that here in the *King James* there was a mistranslation. This mistranslation led to the confusion, so let's read it and let's understand what it's talking about.

The first part of it he condemns all under sin. Romans 3:19: "Now then, we know that whatever the law says, it speaks to those who are under the law... [Everybody's under the law. The law has

dominion over a man as long as he lives.] ...so that every mouth may be stopped... [That they're not going to tell God what to do.] ...and all the world may become guilty before God." And if there is no law, there is no guilt. If there is no guilt, there has been no transgression. If there is no transgression, then it doesn't need to be made right. 'Because all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.'

Now then v 20 is the difficult one, one of those that we started out that Paul wrote some things that 'are very hard to be understood, which those who are unlearned and unstable twist and wrest to their own destruction.' Here it is: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight" (*KJV*) There you got it, you don't have to keep any law. Now, let's unravel that just a little bit. Let's understand something profound here.

1. The definite article 'the,' by 'the deeds' is not there in the Greek.
2. And 'the law,' the definite article is not there either.

So this should read: "Therefore, by works of law shall no flesh be justified before Him; for through *the law is the* knowledge of sin" (*FV*). Let's stop and ask what the function of the law is.

- To give knowledge of sin. 'Where there is no law, there is no sin.'
- Sin cannot be imputed where there is no law.

Justification has nothing to do with keeping the commandments of God. ***No law can justify you.*** Why? In that they are true, and in that one statement they have a greater truth. The law can never justify you because—***the law was made to define sin, not forgive sin.*** That's the easiest way to remember. In order to be justified, you must have forgiveness. You must have payment made by Christ. That is *justification*. The reason you need justification is because you have sinned. You have broken the law. If you did not break the law, you do not need justification. ***Justification, or righteousness, achieved by that justification is to put you in right standing with God.*** The only thing that can do that is the sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

Now under the Old Covenant they had a justification to the temple. This justification in the flesh was by works of law. Now in order to be justified to God the Father in heaven above, *it is only through Christ.* That's what this is talking about.

Verse 21: "But now, *the* righteousness of God... [which gives you justification] ...*that* is separate from law... [When I read that the first time, I said, 'Without the law!' (*KJV*). *Without* in English means *the absence of*, but the Greek means 'separate from the law' and that is the key you need to

understand.] ...*the* righteousness of God *that is* separate from law...” Meaning, it’s a separate operation.

- You have the law, which defines what you are to do
- You have sin, which is the transgression of the law

Now in order to be made right, you have to have those sins forgiven. That is done by justification.

So you need to understand how that principle works. So when we get back to Rom.10:4, we’ll understand it crystal clear. There will be no doubt that the claims of this man that all 613 commandments of the laws of God have been done away forever. *That statement is complete wrong.* That is a lawless, carnal statement made to justify the sin of Sunday-keeping and the sin of twisting and turning and deceitfully handling the Word of God, to a carnal end, to a carnal purpose, to give justification to people where there is no justification through Christ in that at all.

Let’s go back and review v 20 again. “Therefore, by works of law there shall no flesh be justified before Him... [works of law cannot substitute for the sacrifice of Christ—period!] ...for through *the law is the* knowledge of sin. But now, *the* righteousness of God... [Achieved by this justification and also the righteousness of God, God’s righteousness in sending Christ to be the perfect sacrifice for the forgiveness of sin, to justify men] ...*the* righteousness of God *that is* separate from law has been revealed, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets” (vs 20-21).

Now how could you have something witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, if you had the total absence of it? That’s what really got me hung up when I first read this. It just blew me away! I couldn’t understand it. And this really means this: The Law and the Prophets told us what?

- about the coming of Christ
- the need of a Redeemer
- Isa. 53 that He died for the sins of many
- we’re healed by His stripes
- Isaiah 42 that He was so disfigured more than any man
- Psa. 22 that He would die on the cross

And all of those were witnessing of the coming of Christ.

Verse 22: “Even *the* righteousness of God... [Now this is to put you in right standing with God.] ...*that is* through the faith of Jesus Christ...” You have to believe in Him. Under the Old Covenant, if someone sinned, they could go to the temple and they could offer a sacrifice, a work of law, and they

were justified to the temple. They were forgiven to the community of Israel, but not to God the Father in heaven above until after Christ came. Now Christ came and here we have now “...*the* righteousness of God through *the* faith of Jesus Christ...”

Meaning you have to believe on Jesus Christ, you have to accept His sacrifice as the payment for the forgiveness of your sins, and that the blood of Jesus Christ has purchased you. That is the work of righteousness that God has done, which no other work can do. Do you not understand that that which Christ did is far greater than someone going to the temple to offer a bullock or a ram or a lamb or a sacrifice of a turtle dove or a meal offering or an incense offering? Is that not greater? *Yes!* Especially when you understand that Jesus Christ was God before He became a human being. How marvelous indeed that is that He did that.

“...through *the* faith of Jesus Christ, toward all and upon all those who believe; for there is no difference” (v 22). God accepts the repentance directly from heaven above through Jesus Christ and forgives your sin. No law can substitute for that. That’s where they get all mixed up. They accuse Sabbath-keepers and say, ‘Well, you keep the law to be justified.’ No, we don’t keep the law to be justified. We keep the law so we’re not living in sin. We look to Christ and the blood of Christ, and the forgiveness of God the Father, to justify us to God the Father through Jesus Christ. And in that we believe, we know, that all the Sabbath-keeping in the world in the letter of the law cannot substitute for the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. We understand that. They do not.

Here’s why: “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; but are being justified freely...” (vs 23-24). Now there’s no charge for you to get on your knees and repent to God. You don’t go before a machine and put the money in the slot. You go before a machine and it says, ‘You want to be forgiven of this sin, it’s ten dollars. You want to be forgiven of this sin, it’s twenty dollars.’ Or like the Catholics, that’s justification by works. You go confess your sins to the priest, and the priest says do 200 ‘hail Mary’s’ and 500 ‘our fathers.’ ***You’re justified freely; that is grace.***

“...being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that *is* in Christ Jesus” (v 24). Please understand, ***no law can redeem***; not possible! No law was ever created to redeem, only upon repentance and belief in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and the blood of Jesus Christ covering your sins and your life, are you justified from your past sins. That’s what it’s talking about.

“Whom God has openly manifested *to be* a propitiation through faith in His blood...” (v 25).

Now propitiation means that Christ is always there as a continual atoning mercy seat and source of forgiveness that as we walk in our Christian life—since we have sin to overcome which is in our members, and we do sin that Christ is there to forgive us—and we can continually come back to God and received forgiveness—provided that we have not committed the unpardonable sin, provided that we are not living in sin, as Paul said, ‘God forbid. How shall we who are dead, that is baptized into Christ, live in sin any longer? *No way!* If that were the case, we would make Christ the minister of sin and He’s not the minister of sin. He’s a minister of righteousness.

“Whom God has openly manifested *to be* a propitiation through faith in His blood, in order to demonstrate His righteousness... [That is being made right with God, in right standing, the act of justifying.] ...in respect to the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God... [Now that’s what justification is. That comes from the righteousness of God. We need to understand the final result of this]: ...yes, to publicly declare His righteousness... [Rather than the righteousness of men. That’s important, because we will get to the righteousness of Israel, Rom. 10:4.] ...in the present time, that He might be just, and the one Who justifies the one who is of *the* faith of Jesus. Therefore, where *is* boasting? It is excluded...” (vs 25-27).

You can’t boast. What did you do? The only thing you could do is repent and confess your sins. You cannot say we’re special and privileged. You cannot say that God is bound to do this because of who and what I am and who my parents are, and who they were, or as the Jews said to Jesus, ‘We’re of the seat of Abraham.’ No boasting!

“...Through what law?... [It’s not a law. There’s no law that you can boast in.] ...*The law of works?*... [Can you boast in your works? *No!*] ...By no means! Rather, *it is* through the law of faith” (v 27). This is the law of faith. Now there’s one for you. What is the law of faith? *It is a law that the only way you can have your sins forgiven is through repentance and the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the sacrifice in full payment for your sins.* That is the law of faith which you must believe *vs* the law of offerings *vs* the laws of works—any works, whether you use Buddhist beads, Muslim beads, Catholic beads, Orthodox beads, whatever your rosary may be—they have no standing before God. Those cannot forgive sin. Can’t be of works.

Verse 28: “Consequently, we reckon that a man is justified by faith, separate from works of law.” Now some works of law are necessary, like the Ten Commandments, like the Holy Days. But those do not perform the operation of the sacrifice of Jesus

Christ and the payment of your sins through His blood.

Verse 29: “*Is He* the God of the Jews only?... [Now they think so, even to this day, but *He’s not.*] ...*Is He* not also *the God of the Gentiles?* YES! *He is* also God of *the* Gentiles, since *it is* indeed one God Who will justify *the* circumcision by faith... [You’re going to have to do it that way, not because you’re circumcised, but because you believe in Christ.] ...and *the* uncircumcision through faith.... [The very same operation.] (Here’s the whole key, here’s the whole summary. Here is the thing that these lawless preachers do not understand.] ...Are we, then, abolishing law through faith? **MAY IT NEVER BE! Rather, we are establishing law**” (vs 29-31).

Why? Hebrews 10:16, here’s how you establish law. The laws and commandments of God are not meant to be an external thing written in tables of stone that you can go by like in a museum and look at them and they have no effect upon you. Rather the laws and commandments of God are to be part of you.

- Here’s how you establish it then.
- Here is how it is honorable.
- Here it is how it is spiritual.
- Here is how it is good and Holy and right and true.

Hebrews 10:16: “‘This *is* the covenant... [Now that’s the covenant if you accept Jesus Christ as your Savior and repent of your sins and look to His sacrifice to blot out of those sins and the blood of Jesus Christ is full payment for you to buy you back from a life of living in lawlessness, to live in righteousness.] ...This *is* the covenant that I will establish with them after those days,’ says *the* Lord: ‘I will give My laws into their hearts, and I will inscribe them in their mind; and their sins and lawlessness I will not remember ever again’” (vs 16-17). That’s how you establish the law.

Now then, we’re ready to understand Let’s look at it. It will become crystal clear. It will be like turning on a light bulb. What do you know about that! OR the old Italian saying, ‘Mama mia!’”

Romans 9:30: “What then shall we say? That *the* Gentiles, who did not follow after righteousness... [they didn’t have any of the laws of God] ...who did not follow after righteousness, have attained righteousness... [the righteousness of Christ through repentance] ...*even* the righteousness that *is* by faith.... [to be put in right standing with God] ...But Israel, although they followed after a law of righteousness... [They had the Ten Commandments and they also had all the animal sacrifices—didn’t they?] ...did not attain to a law of righteousness....

[Why? *Because they rejected Christ!*] ...Why? Because *they did not seek it* by faith, but by works of law... [They didn't want to believe in Christ, but they wanted to keep their animal sacrifices and all of their rituals, so God destroyed Jerusalem, so it would no longer be.] ...for they stumbled at the Stone of stumbling [Christ], exactly as it is written: 'Behold, I place in Sion a Stone of stumbling and a Rock of offense, but everyone who believes in Him shall not be ashamed'" (vs 30-33).

Romans 10:1: Brethren, the earnest desire of my heart and my supplication to God for Israel is for salvation. For I testify of them that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge.... [A lot of people have zeal for God, but they go about it their own way, not according to the true knowledge of God.] ...For they, being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God... [Which is what? *God's righteous method of justification for past sins.* They refused to accept it.] ...and seeking to establish their own righteousness... [Through the code of Jewish law.] ...have not submitted to the righteousness of God" (vs 1-3). But have set themselves above God to create their own laws, to make themselves right in their own eyes, which is what not only the Jews have done, but which is what the Protestants have done, and the Catholics have done, and anyone who thinks that they can create laws more righteous than God or create a method of forgiveness of sin greater than the sacrifice of Christ. You have not submitted unto the righteousness of God.

Verse 4: "For Christ *is the end of works of law for righteousness...*" Or Christ has ended the law for justification.

- No longer do you need any animal sacrifices.
- No longer do you need a temple or a priesthood.

Christ ended that! He didn't end all the commandments of God. Now the Greek word for *end* is 'telos,' which also has a secondary meaning, which means *the goal or purpose*. And the whole purpose of the law was to bring them to Christ.

So on both accounts they have missed it. Christ ended the law for righteousness in order to achieve justification by works. He ended it. He didn't do away with all the laws and commandments of God. Now He ended it why? ***Because His life, His death, His resurrection—as the Son of God—is infinitely superior to any animal sacrifice, any work of any law that any man can do, and only that justification through Christ is acceptable with God the Father and none other is.***

This is going to be more apparent as we come into the more ecumenical thing that this world is getting into, which is going to be absolutely mind

blowing. "For Christ is the end *of works of law for righteousness...* [to achieve justification] ...to everyone who believes. For Moses wrote *concerning the righteousness that comes through the law*, 'The man who has practiced those things shall live by them'" (vs 4-5). Yes, he had to keep the commandments of God. So do we. But when he sinned what did he have to do? In order to live in them he had to offer an animal sacrifice or do a work of law for justification. Christ ended that. Now then he goes on to speak of the righteousness of Christ. Christ came down and provided it. Christ gave it so that you may repent and you may be forgiven by faith. So there you have the substance and the understanding of it. This does not say by any means that He ended all the laws and commandments of God. It says, 'For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness,' which is achieved by *justification*. He ends that!

- Did He destroy the temple? *Yes!*
- Did He end the priesthood? *Yes!*
- Did He get rid of the altar? *Yes!*

That ended it!

Now there's a greater righteousness through Christ, a greater justification through Him. And that's what this means, not the doing away of the laws and commandments of God—whatsoever.

Scriptures from *The Holy Bible In Its Original Order* by Fred R. Coulter (Except where noted)

Scriptural References:

- 1) 2-Corinthians 2:17
- 2) 2-Corinthians 4:2
- 3) Ephesians 4:14
- 4) Romans 8:6-8
- 5) 1-John 3:22
- 6) 2-Peter 3:15-16
- 7) John 5:18
- 8) John 9:24-34
- 9) Isaiah 5:20-24
- 10) Matthew 7:21-23
- 11) Romans 10:4
- 12) Romans 5:13
- 13) Romans 4:15
- 14) Romans 7:7-12, 1
- 15) Romans 6:1-6
- 16) Romans 3:19-31
- 17) Hebrews 10:16-17
- 18) Romans 9:30-33
- 19) Romans 10:1-5

Scriptures referenced, not quoted:

- Matthew 5:17
- Isaiah 6:23
- Job 40
- 1-John 3:4
- John 5, 8
- Romans 6:23
- Isaiah 53, 42

- Psalm 22

Also referenced: Books:

- *Sunday Facts and Sabbath Fiction* by Dr. Russell K. Tardo
- *The Harmony of the Gospels* by Fred R. Coulter

FRC:lp Transcribed: 6-24-10 Formatted: bo—6/29/10