

**THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL**

**AS TIME MARKERS**

*After*

**THE RESURRECTION**

**BY AVRAM YEHOSHUA**

The [SeedofAbraham.net](http://SeedofAbraham.net)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL AS TIME MARKERS <i>After</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	1
<b>THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL <i>After</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	2
1. ACTS 2:1 .....	2
2. ACTS 12:3 .....	3
3. ACTS 12:4 .....	3
4. ACTS 18:21 .....	4
5. ACTS 20:6 .....	4
6. ACTS 20:16 .....	5
7. ACTS 27:9 .....	5
8. FIRST CORINTHIANS 5:8 .....	8
9. FIRST CORINTHIANS 16:8 .....	10
<b>THE SABBATH DAY <i>After</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	11
1. ACTS 1:12 .....	11
2. ACTS 13:14 .....	12
3. ACTS 13:27 .....	12
4. ACTS 13:42 .....	13
5. ACTS 13:44 .....	13
6. ACTS 15:21 .....	13
7. ACTS 16:13 .....	16
8. ACTS 17:2 .....	16
9. ACTS 18:4 .....	17
10. COLOSSIANS 2:16 .....	17
11. HEBREWS 4:9 .....	19
<b>THREE SABBATH SCRIPTURES <i>Before</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	21
<b>SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT</b> .....	22
Sunday in Troas .....	23
Sunday—Mentioned Only Once From Acts To Revelation .....	25
The Resurrection and Sunday .....	25
Sunday and the Resurrection in the Didache and Clement .....	27
<b>CHURCH HISTORY AND MOSAIC LAW</b> .....	29
Sunday—Pharisaic Catholicism .....	30
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	32
<b>APPENDIX CHARTS</b> .....	37
The Feasts of Israel in the Book of Acts .....	37
The Feasts of Israel in First Corinthians .....	37
The Feasts of Israel in Acts and First Corinthians .....	37
The Sabbath Day <i>After</i> the Resurrection .....	38



# THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL AS TIME MARKERS

## *After* THE RESURRECTION

Avram Yehoshua

The [SeedofAbraham.net](http://SeedofAbraham.net)

Luke and the Apostle Paul speak of the Feasts of Israel nine times in the Book of Acts and First Corinthians. Seven times they use the Feasts as *time markers* to tell their perspective Gentile audience when an event happened or would happen, and the other time Paul admonishes his Gentile Corinthians to keep Passover. Nowhere do either of them relate time in Roman terms (e.g. *Dies Lunae* [Day of the Moon or Moon-day; i.e. Monday],<sup>1</sup> or *Junius* [June]), nor do they speak of Sunday, the first day of the week, replacing the 7th day Sabbath, something of note since Acts is an historical account of the early Church.

Luke and Paul's use of the Feasts as time markers is extremely significant for two reasons. First, Luke wrote Acts about 64 AD or 34 years *after* the resurrection and it's the *only* divinely inspired history of Apostolic times. Today, the Church teaches that at the death of Yeshua (Jesus) the Feasts of Israel and the 7th day Sabbath gave way to Sunday, Easter and Christmas. Yet, Easter and Christmas aren't written anywhere in the New Testament. This is a strong biblical indication they are not of God nor for Christians.

Nowhere in the New Testament does it speak of Sunday replacing or nullifying the 7th day Sabbath. The Sabbath is mentioned **11** times *after* the resurrection, while Sunday (which in the Greek New Testament is always written in Hebraic terms as the first day of the week) is seen only twice, from Acts to Revelation, and one of those times it's not Sunday at all, but Saturday night.<sup>2</sup> Scripture is God's Word, which reveals His will for us. As God's only divinely inspired authoritative Book, God never intended for Christians to observe Sunday, Easter and Xmas (hereafter also known by the acronym, *illicit SEX*; i.e. Sunday, Easter and Xmas) because the Church has *adulterated* God's Word concerning the Feasts of Israel and the 7th day Sabbath and therefore, the phrase *illicit SEX* is very appropriate.

The second reason why the use of the Feasts of Israel and the 7th day Sabbath are important is because the Church teaches that Mosaic Law, except for its moral aspects, was cancelled for Christians when Christ was crucified. Pastors and theologians will say, "The Law was nailed to the cross," erroneously citing Colossians 2:14<sup>3</sup> and a few other proof texts. As will become obvious in the following pages, all of Mosaic Law (and not just the Ten Commandments) was still God's holy standard by which the Apostle Paul and Gentile Luke lived out their lives of faith, and also taught Gentile Christians to live by.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "The names of the days of the week...in many languages, including English, are derived from their being named after the...planets" of Greek astrology, which was "introduced in the Roman Empire during Late Antiquity."

The Roman days of the week correspond "to the planets as Roman gods: Diana as the moon for Monday; Mars for Tuesday; Mercury for Wednesday; Jupiter for Thursday; Venus for Friday; Saturn for Saturday, and Apollo as the sun (god) for Sunday." See [Names of the Days of the Week](#) and also [The Roman Calendar](#).

<sup>2</sup> I address that under the section, *Sunday in the New Testament*, p. 23. Many scholars believe that Paul began preaching on Saturday evening because biblically, that begins the first day of the week. In Scripture one day ends at darkness and the next day begins in darkness, so the first day of the week actually begins on Saturday night at dark. For why the biblical day begins at darkness, see [When Does The Sabbath Begin?](#)

<sup>3</sup> What was nailed to the cross was not Mosaic Law, but the χειρόγραφον *kai* "rographon, the written record of our *sin-indebtedness* to God. Paul calls Mosaic Law "holy and spiritual" (Rom. 7:12, 14) and God's standard for how to determine sin (Rom. 3:20; 7:7). Mosaic Law is God's will for how to walk out our faith in Jesus (Rom. 3:31; 7:25; cf. Dt. 4:5-8). Concerning Col. 2:14, see [Nailed to the Cross—Colossians 2:13-17](#).

# THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL *After* THE RESURRECTION

If Sunday, Easter and Xmas were given by the God of Israel we would expect to find them throughout the New Testament. After all, if the Feasts of Israel, which Israel had kept for more than 1400 years (since Mt. Sinai), had been set aside by the crucifixion of Messiah Yeshua, it would have been necessary for God to not only say so in the New Testament, but to confirm it at least two or three times (Dt. 19:15; Mt. 18:16; 2nd Cor. 13:1; 1st Tim. 5:19; Heb. 10:28), and hopefully, to explain why. We find nothing of the sort in Acts nor anywhere else in the New Testament, “*shadows notwithstanding.*”<sup>5</sup>

The following are the nine places in the New Testament, *after* the resurrection, in Acts and First Corinthians, where the annual Feasts of Israel are spoken of by Luke and the Apostle Paul, seven of which are used as *time markers*, telling us when an event happened or would happen. It will become clear that the Feasts of Israel continued to be kept by Christians for at least the first 34 years of the Apostolic Church (when Luke wrote Acts in 64 AD). Also, the keeping of the Feasts of Israel could not have been done if Mosaic Law, which the Feasts are a part of, was nullified by Yeshua’s sacrificial death.

## 1. ACTS 2:1

“When the Day of Pentecost had *fully come*,<sup>6</sup> they were all with one heart in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from Heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. Then there appeared to them divided tongues, as of fire, and one sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.” (Acts 2:1-4)

Acts 2:1f., the first Pentecost *after* the resurrection, took place in 30 AD. There were approximately 1,470 Pentecosts *before* this one, dating back to the first Pentecost in the days of Moses at Mt. Sinai<sup>7</sup> in 1440 BC. Pentecost is the Greek name for the Hebrew “Feast of Weeks.” As the Old Testament was written in Hebrew we don’t find the Greek designation for this Mosaic holy day, but the Hebrew to English phrase, the Feast of Weeks.

It’s significant that Luke doesn’t write the name of the Roman month that Pentecost occurs in, but only presents the Holy Spirit coming upon the Jewish Apostles, etc., at this Mosaic feast of Pentecost. The day occurs in early June, but with Luke not mentioning *when* it occurred, it reveals that Theophilus, whom Luke wrote Acts to (Acts 1:1), already knew *when* the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) came during the year.

Some might say, “Well of course Theophilus would know when Pentecost was because it was such a special day—the Holy Spirit was given!” As true as that is we have to realize that Pentecost is a holy day *within* Mosaic Law *and* that this, for Luke, begins a pattern which runs throughout the Book of Acts (and Paul also uses it without mentioning *when* it is). Luke will mention the Feasts of Israel five more times as time markers, but never once does he tell Theophilus *when* any of them occurred during the year. This means that Theophilus, a Gentile Christian like Luke,<sup>8</sup> *knew* when all the Feasts of Israel were, with the

<sup>4</sup> 1st Cor. 11:1; and also, Acts 15:21; 21:24; 25:8; Rom. 3:20, 31; 7:7, 12, 14, 22; 1st Cor. 7:19.

<sup>5</sup> See [Nailed to the Cross—Colossians 2:13-17](#).

<sup>6</sup> Pentecost is logistically and theologically tied into the Sunday of the seven day Feast of Unleavened. Both Passover/Feast of Unleavened Bread and Pentecost denote divine acts of freedom for Israel. To find out why this is, and why Luke writes that “the day of Pentecost had *fully come*,” see [Pentecost—Shavu’ot](#). For why Pentecost is always on a Sunday (Hebrew: *Shavu’ot*; English: the Feast of Weeks), but not for the traditional Jewish community and the Messianic community, which blindly follows the Rabbis, see [First Sheaf](#).

<sup>7</sup> Ex. 34:22; Lev. 23:15-21; Num. 28:26; Dt. 16:9-10, 16.

strong implication—being that he kept them. This also reveals that Mosaic Law was still valid for Christians 34 years *after* the resurrection because the Feasts of Israel are found *within* Mosaic Law.

Extremely significant is the realization that on the first Pentecost at Mt. Sinai all Israel *saw* and *heard* God *speak* the Ten Commandments, which symbolize all the words that God would give to Moses for Israel, known as Mosaic Law. This means that *both* the Word of God *and* the Spirit of God were given to Israel *on the same Mosaic holy day*—the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost).<sup>9</sup> Also, there weren't any Gentiles at the Pentecost of Acts Two. Gentiles wouldn't come into the Kingdom of Yeshua until approximately nine years later, with Cornelius & Co. (Acts 10:1–11:18) God giving the promised Holy Spirit to Israel (Joel 2:28-29; Ezk. 36:24-27) on Pentecost doesn't negate His words that He gave on the same day, 1,470 years earlier, but with the Spirit, Christians can walk as Yeshua did—in all Mosaic Law that applies to them.

## 2. ACTS 12:3

Acts 12:3 took place in 44 AD or 14 years *after* the resurrection. Luke writes of it being *during* the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 12:14f.; Lev. 23:6f.) that Herod arrested Peter. The next verse continues the thought.

## 3. ACTS 12:4

<sup>3</sup>“And because he saw that it pleased the Jewish religious leaders, he proceeded further to also seize Peter. Now it was *during* the days of Unleavened Bread. <sup>4</sup>So when he had arrested him, he put him in prison and delivered him to four squads of soldiers to keep him, intending to bring him before the people *after* Passover.” (Acts 12:3-4)

Luke says that *after* Passover<sup>10</sup> (Ex. 12:1-8f.; Lev. 23:5), Herod intended to bring Peter “before the people,” meaning that Herod was going to murder Peter as he had murdered the Apostle James (Acts 12:1-2). These verses (3-4) have confused some people because Passover is celebrated on the *first* night of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and so how could Luke write that it was *during* the Feast of Unleavened Bread that Peter was arrested, but that *after* Passover Herod would murder Peter? This is solved by realizing that in the days of Yeshua the terms Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread had become inter-

---

<sup>8</sup> For why Luke was a Gentile, see [Luke the Jew?](#)

<sup>9</sup> The Ten Commandments picture or symbolize all of God's words, which is known as Mosaic Law (really Genesis through Deuteronomy). For more understanding as to why both the Word of God and the Spirit of God were given to Israel on Pentecost, see [Pentecost—Shavu'ot—Learning to Walk in God's Freedom](#). Also interesting is that at the Pentecost of Acts 2 there were only Jews who received their Messiah and the Holy Spirit. The first Gentile doesn't come into Yeshua's Kingdom until Cornelius & Company in Acts 10 (see Acts 11:18, which confirms this). The point is that the first Pentecost *after* the resurrection wasn't the beginning of “a new Church,” separate from Israel, but of Israel recognizing Her Messiah and being baptized in His Spirit, a promise which God had made to Israel about 600 years earlier (Ezk. 36:24-27; Joel 2:28).

The Greek word for church, *ekklaysia*, is first found of *Israel at Mt. Sinai*, in the Septuagint (Dt. 4:10; 9:10; 18:16; see also Acts 7:38, where *ekklaysia* is used by Stephen, of Israel, and rightly translated by the KJV as the *Church* in the Wilderness). The Greek Septuagint was written 280 years before Jesus was born in Bethlehem and was the official “Old Testament Bible of the Jewish people living outside Israel, whose Greek was better than their Hebrew. The reason why Paul used “church” in his letters is not because the Church was separate and distinct from Israel, as unfortunately most think today, but on the contrary, Paul was saying that what God *had begun* at Mt. Sinai was *continuing* in Jesus Christ, and *now* it would include the Gentiles who believed in the Jewish Messiah. In no way does Paul's use of the word *church* oppose Israel, Sabbath, Feasts or Mosaic Law.

<sup>10</sup> Every English Bible, except the KJV, has Passover. The KJV has Easter instead of Passover, but this is a glaring error. The Greek word is *πάσχα paska*, which is the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew *פֶּחַסְאֵךְ peh'sach*, which in English is Passover. The “inerrant KJV,” as many call it, is errant or has errors (cf. Hebrews 4:9).

changeable.<sup>11</sup> That's how Luke could say it was *during* the seven days of Unleavened Bread when Peter was arrested, but *after* Passover (meaning the end of the Feast of Unleavened Bread) that Herod intended to murder him. The term Passover is synonymous with the Feast of Unleavened Bread and vice-versa.

Be that as it may, Luke uses two Feasts of Israel to convey to Theophilus *when* Peter was arrested and *when* Herod sought to murder him. If Theophilus wasn't aware of the two of them, their interchangeability and *when* they came during the year, he wouldn't have known *what time of year* this happened.

## 4. ACTS 18:21

<sup>18</sup>“So Paul still remained a good while” (at Corinth; Acts 18:1, 11). “Then he took leave of the brethren and sailed for Syria, and Priscilla and Aquila were with him. He had his hair cut off at Cenchrea,<sup>12</sup> for he had taken a vow. <sup>19</sup>He came to Ephesus and left them there, but he himself entered the synagogue and reasoned with the Jews. <sup>20</sup>When they asked him to stay a longer time with them, *he did not consent*, <sup>21</sup>but took leave of them, saying, “I must by all means *keep this coming Feast in Jerusalem*, but I will return again to you, God willing.” And he sailed from Ephesus.” (Acts 18:18-21)<sup>13</sup>

Acts 18:21 took place in 49 AD or 19 years *after* the resurrection. Luke doesn't write which feast of the Jews it is, and so we don't know what time of year it was, but obviously, when the Apostle Paul spoke it, the Ephesians knew which Jewish feast Paul was going to in Jerusalem. An astounding side-note is seen in Luke's recording of this in that Paul was in Ephesus, in the synagogue of the traditional non-believing Jews, reasoning with them about Messiah Yeshua, *and they wanted him to stay* and preach Yeshua to them (Acts 18:19-20), *but Paul declined!* Who would have thought that the Apostle Paul, given the opportunity to witness Jesus to his fellow Jews (Rom. 9:1-3), would have *declined* to do so *in order to keep a Mosaic Law feast in Jerusalem?* Obviously, the Feasts of Israel were still very important to Paul, even though they are “only” shadows of the Messiah (Col. 2:16-17). Biblical shadows though, are extremely important, especially if one cannot literally see the Reality that casts the Shadow, for the Shadow presents a picture of Yeshua to us that we wouldn't know of if the Shadow didn't exist.

## 5. ACTS 20:6

“But we sailed away from Philippi *after* the Days of Unleavened Bread and in five days we joined them at Troas, where we *stayed* for seven days.” (Acts 20:6)

Acts 20:6 took place in 57 AD or 27 years *after* the resurrection. Luke writes, “we sailed away from Philippi *after* the Days of Unleavened Bread.” It seems that Paul, and those with him, observed Passover and the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread at Philippi. That's the reason why they only left *after* the Feast was over. For the sake of argument though, let's say they didn't celebrate the Feast because it literally doesn't say they did. At the very least, *Luke uses the Feast as a time marker*, letting Theophilus know *when* they sailed from Philippi (in the spring), something that many Christians don't know today because of Church teaching that nullifies Mosaic Law, where the Feasts are found. As such, because Luke uses it, it strongly implies that the Feast of Unleavened Bread was seen as valid by Gentile Luke, known by Gen-

---

<sup>11</sup> Mt. 26:17-20; Mk. 14:12-18; Lk. 22:1, 7-14; Acts 12:3-4.

<sup>12</sup> This is the first Nazarite Vow that Paul took in Acts. Paul's second Nazarite Vow is seen in Acts 21:20-24f. The reason we know it's the Nazarite Vow is because it's the only vow where the hair is shaved off (Num. 6:18; Acts 18:18). It also meant that Paul would sacrifice animals—for himself and the four others who were under the Vow (Num. 6:14; Acts 21:23-24). This too reveals that Mosaic Law was still in effect for Christians. For more on what Paul's Nazarite Vows mean, see [Law 102](#), pp. 21-23.

<sup>13</sup> This Feast is written of in the KJV and the NKJV, but is skipped over in the NASB, NIV and NEB, etc.

tile Theophilus and therefore, kept by all Gentile Christians during the days of the Apostles.<sup>14</sup> In terms of the Feast's validity it would hardly seem relevant for Luke to use a *time marker* that had been relegated to the trash bin of biblical history due to Christ's death. Paul, Luke & Co., kept the Feast at Philippi.

This passage also reveals that the Feasts were kept outside of Israel. Every Christian would conceptually agree with the ability to celebrate Xmas in their own land. After all, how many pastors teach that Christians can only celebrate Xmas in Bethlehem? Christians keep their holy days wherever they are, and so do the Jewish people, and so should we. We do not have to be in Jerusalem to keep Passover or the Feast of Tabernacles, etc.<sup>15</sup>

## 6. ACTS 20:16

“For Paul had decided *to sail past Ephesus*, so that he would not have to spend time in Asia because he was hurrying to be at Jerusalem, if possible, on the Day of Pentecost.” (Acts 20:16)

Acts 20:16 also took place in 57 AD. Luke writes that Paul was “hurrying to be in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost” (the Feast of Weeks—Hebrew *Shavu'ot*). This reference in Acts 20:16 to Paul going to Jerusalem for Pentecost is not to be confused with the feast that Paul was *hurrying to be in Jerusalem* for, in Acts 18:21, because:

1. In Acts 18:21 Paul's *in* Ephesus and the Jewish people are asking him to stay, but he's hurrying to be in Jerusalem for an unspecified Feast of Israel in 49 AD, eight years earlier than Acts 20:16.
2. In Acts 20:16 Luke writes of Paul *sailing past Ephesus* in order to keep *Shavu'ot* (Pentecost) in Jerusalem in 57 AD.

Again, the Apostle Paul is seen as keeping the Feasts of Israel. By 57 AD Paul had already written Galatians (52/53 AD), and so if these Feasts had been done away with by Paul, *as the Church teaches*, we have a very strange Apostle here—one who allegedly writes “not to keep the Law,” but who consistently keeps the Laws Feasts of Israel, which are one of the five Pillars of Mosaic Law.

## 7. ACTS 27:9

<sup>9</sup>“Now when much time had been spent and *sailing was now dangerous because the Fast was already over*, Paul advised them, saying, <sup>10</sup>“Men, I perceive that this voyage will end with disaster and much loss, not only of the cargo and ship, but also our lives.”” (Acts 27:9-10)

Acts 27:9-10 took place in 60 AD or 30 years *after* the resurrection. Luke writes, “sailing was now dangerous because *the Fast* was already over.” What makes this verse significant in our quest to understand God's will in this matter of the Feasts of Israel and therefore, Mosaic Law, is that Luke doesn't even tell Theophilus *what* Feast of Israel this is. Instead, he speaks of *the Fast*, which is a cryptic Jewish reference to the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:1-34; 23:26-32). On this day all Israel fasts (goes without food and water for 24 hours) for the forgiveness of their sins for the past year.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> For how to celebrate Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, as well as all the Feasts of Israel, and why they are still valid for Christians today, see The Feasts of Israel at The [SeedofAbraham.net](http://SeedofAbraham.net) Articles/6. The Feasts of Israel. You'll also find two calendars for when the Feasts are to be celebrated for the current year.

<sup>15</sup> Only if one lives in the land of Israel must they go to Jerusalem for the Feasts (Ex. 23:14-17; 1st Kings 11:36; 14:21; 2nd Chron. 6:6; 12:13; Ezra 6:12; Jer. 3:17; cf. Dt. 16:16; 1st Kings 9:25; Luke 24:47; Rev. 3:12).

<sup>16</sup> Scripture states that one must afflict their soul on this day, and from ancient times this has been taken to mean that fasting is a part of the affliction (Lev. 16:29, 31; 23:27, 32; Num. 29:7; Ps. 58:5), as is obvious from Luke's speaking of *the Fast*. It's a term that is still used today in the Jewish community today for the Day of Atonement

If Gentile Theophilus wasn't *intimately* aware of the Feasts of Israel *and* the subtle nuance of "the Fast," it would have meant absolutely nothing to him and he would not have known *what time of year* Luke was speaking of (late autumn). Unfortunately, most Christians today have no idea what Luke meant, let alone when the Fast occurred because the Church has lied to them about Mosaic Law and has instituted a false feast lifestyle in its place. This event happened 30 years *after* the resurrection, when the Church says that *illicit SEX* had already become "the new reality." If that's so, where is it clearly stated as such in Scripture? If something of this magnitude, the change in the celebration of the Feasts of Israel were to occur, surely God would have written it in His Word and explained *why* the change occurred. Only the Feasts of Israel are mentioned *and* Luke uses them as *time markers* throughout the Book of Acts.

The Church doesn't celebrate God's Feasts, but instead the Church teaches Satan's Feasts, and yes, Sunday, Easter and Christmas are Satan's Feasts, kept by idolatrous pagans to their gods and goddesses more than a thousand years *before* Jesus was born in Bethlehem. Most any Google search on their origin will reveal that. The Church has removed the pagan names from the pagan feasts and "baptized" those feasts "in the name of Jesus," but obviously, Jesus doesn't approve of them, nor has God given the Church the authority to keep them or to use them "to glorify" His Son, especially as God gave the Feasts to Israel to do that (Dt. 12:28-32; cf. Luke 22:15; 1st Cor. 5:6-8).

Have you ever wondered how bringing a *fir tree* into a *house* for Xmas, and eating chocolate Easter *bunnies* have anything to do with the birth and resurrection of Jesus Christ? God doesn't want Christians practicing *illicit SEX* because those days have *nothing* to do with His Son. The creation of holy days remains exclusively within the authority of the God of Israel. Christians may have noble reasons for *illicit SEX*, but the Pharisees too had their noble reasons for their traditions that also nullified God's Word.

The sheer biblical force of these seven Feasts of Israel in the Book of Acts, six of which Luke uses specifically as *time markers*, reveals that the Feasts of Israel were kept by all Christians in the days of the Apostles for at least the first 34 years *after* the resurrection (which is when Acts was written). Nowhere does Luke hint at, let alone declare, that the Feasts of Israel were outdated, nullified or would be replaced, but on the contrary, with their continual use of the Feasts in Acts, and them as *time markers*, their sanctity and validity for Christians is established as a *biblical fact*.

Some have said that the reason Luke used the Feasts of Israel as *time markers* was because Luke was Jewish and therefore, the Feast of Israel were familiar to him, as if that would have stopped Luke from writing to Gentile Theophilus about the alleged "new reality," as some Christians call *illicit SEX*. Also, Luke "being Jewish" is negated by the fact that Paul places Luke with the Gentiles (Col. 4:10-14).<sup>17</sup>

---

as part of what it means to afflict one's soul: fasting and humbling oneself before God in repentance.

[Robert Deffinbaugh](#) writes: "This was a Sabbath day...which meant that no work could be done (Lev. 23:26-32). Anyone who did not observe this" annual "Sabbath was to be cut off from his people (Lev. 23:29), which is a euphemism for being put to death. Beyond this, this was a day when the people were to "humble their souls" (cf. Lev. 16:31; 23:27; Num. 29:7). This would thus be the only" biblical" religious holiday" holy day, "which was characterized by mourning, fasting, and repentance."

[Day of Atonement](#) has: "Jews today still celebrate the annual Day of Atonement...with a 25-hour period of fasting and intensive prayer." The extra hour is to make sure they don't sin by eating on the Day of Atonement.

[Bob Theil](#) writes: "Fasting is historically how the phrase "afflict your souls" has been interpreted by the Jewish" community and "(this is also verified by such passages as Psalm 35:13; 69:10 and Isaiah 58:5) to mean fasting, unless one is...ill and thus is already afflicted...In the New Testament, the Day of Atonement is referred to as "the Fast" (Acts 27:9). The fact that this day was referred to that way (or even at all) is an indication that it was observed by Christians after Christ's resurrection. The Bible clearly shows that...Jewish holy days...were observed by Christians after Jesus."

From *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*: It is reported that early Christians kept the Day of Atonement in Antioch the same time the Jews observed *Yom Kippur*" (Hebrew for the Day of Atonement) "in the third and fourth century (Ben Ezra DS, *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*, pp. 2, 261, 277)."

The idea of writing anything to anyone is so the person receiving it will understand what is written. If Theophilus didn't know about the Feasts of Israel and *when* they occurred during the year, Luke's writing of them, and them as *time markers*, whether Luke was Jewish or Gentile, would have meant absolutely nothing to Gentile Theophilus,<sup>18</sup> and he certainly wouldn't have known what "the Fast" was nor when it occurred. The Book of Acts is the only *divinely* inspired history of the Apostolic Church, and so it's clear to see that the Feasts were still being celebrated, and that by Gentile Christians. This is the early Church.

Some theologians say that Luke was just a poor, disoriented writer, and so we cannot take any theology from him, but credible Christian theologians and scholars see Luke as a great communicator and extremely accurate in his details. World renown Christian scholars F. F. Bruce and I. Howard Marshall speak of Luke's ability to communicate "in the highest terms." Neither of them uphold the Feasts of Israel or Mosaic Law, so no one can accuse them of furthering their own theological agenda when they speak of how important Acts is, Luke's accuracy and Luke's reliability. F. F. Bruce states,

"Luke has made a great, indeed, a *unique* contribution to the record of early Christian expansion. His narrative, in fact, is *a sourcebook of the highest value for the history of civilization.*"<sup>19</sup>

One reason why Bruce speaks of Acts as unique is because it's the *only* divinely inspired historical account of the *first 34 years of the Spirit-filled Church*. Marshall, speaking of Luke's attention to detail in the Book of Acts, states,

"One of the major contributions of Ramsay to Lucan study was his demonstration that on matters of detailed historical background *Luke shows remarkable accuracy.*"<sup>20</sup>

Marshall goes on to state that if Luke is so accurate in his historical references, the inference is that he's accurate in everything he writes. In other words, the Book of Acts is extremely reliable. It reveals that the Apostles actually kept and taught the Feasts of Israel. Bruce and Marshall clearly refute anyone who claims that we "cannot take theology" from Acts, no doubt because it goes against their anti-Law theology, and in this case, the Feasts of Israel. The Feasts though, were being observed by Luke, Theophilus and all the Apostles (Acts 21:20-24) and Christians., for the entire period of the early Church, which means they should be kept by Christians today. They teach Christians about their God in ways that nothing else can (Mt. 26:17; Lk. 22:8; Jn. 2:13; 1st Jn. 2:6).

Other theologians, realizing that Luke's writing is above reproach, but still wanting to derail what he wrote, say that the Jewish Apostles and Luke *just didn't realize the full ramifications of what Christ had done* by His death and resurrection, but that *eventually* they would come to understand that "Christ did away with the Law on the cross." Aside from never seeing that in Acts (nor anywhere else in Scripture), Luke writes that Yeshua was seen by the Apostles (and others) *after* His resurrection for 40 days, off and on, *and that Yeshua gave them commandments and taught them about the Kingdom of God* (Acts 1:1-3).

One would have to argue that Jesus didn't tell His Apostles that the Feasts and Mosaic Law had been done away with and also, why the Holy Spirit never alerted any of them, including Paul,<sup>21</sup> to this "new reality," *throughout the first 34 years of the Church*, which Acts deals with. Neither of those two positions is real-

---

<sup>17</sup> For why Luke was a Gentile see [Luke the Jew?](#)

<sup>18</sup> Some say that Theophilus was a Jew and that is why he knew about the Feasts, but this is nonsense. See [Theophilus—High Priest of Israel?](#)

<sup>19</sup> F. F. Bruce, author; Gordon D. Fee, general editor, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1988), p. 16. Bruce quotes Tertullian (p. 14, note 58) as having said of Acts, "Those who do not accept this volume of Scripture *can have nothing to do with the Holy Spirit*, for they cannot know if the Holy Spirit has yet been sent to the disciples." (Tertullian, *Prescription against Heretics* 23) See also [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#), pp. 188ff.

<sup>20</sup> I. Howard Marshall, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., author; Professor R.V.G. Tasker, M.A., B.D., general editor, *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Acts* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000), p. 36. *Italics* are Marshall's.

istic or biblically tenable, which means that the reason why Luke uses the Feasts of Israel as *time markers* is because they were still valid and being celebrated by all Christians, and that the “new reality” of *illicit SEX*, with its the rejection of Mosaic Law, had not yet slithered into the Church through Catholicism.

Some Christians think they should keep the Ten Commandments (minus the fourth commandment; the Sabbath day), but not Mosaic Law, yet the Feasts are found *within* Mosaic Law, not the Ten. This means that Mosaic Law is valid for Christians. How is it, as the Church contends, that what was sin for Christ is *not* sin for Christians? (Rom. 3:20) How is it that if Jesus failed to keep Passover He would have sinned, but Christians don’t have to keep it?<sup>22</sup> Isn’t Jesus *the same yesterday, today* and forever? (Heb. 13:8)

The Book of Acts is *not a teaching* on the Feasts of Israel, yet *seven times in its 28 chapters* Luke uses them. That’s an average of *one Feast every four chapters*, and they’re not only mentioned, but Luke uses six of them specifically as *time markers* to let Theophilus know *when* an event occurred during the year.

Lest it be said that the good doctor “was out of his mind” when Luke wrote the Book of Acts, his best buddy and traveling companion, the Apostle Paul, the one whom the Church runs to for proof that Mosaic Law was done away with, speaks of two Feasts of Israel and that, 11 years *before* Luke wrote Acts! In Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians he admonishes the Gentile Corinthians *to keep* Passover/the Feast of Unleavened Bread. In closing his letter he lets the Corinthians know of his plans to *stay* in Ephesus until the Feast of Weeks—Pentecost, and then travel west towards them (going from Ephesus in what is now modern day western Turkey to Corinth in northern Greece).

## 8. FIRST CORINTHIANS 5:8

<sup>6</sup>“Your glorying is not good. Do you not know that a little leaven leavens the whole lump? <sup>7</sup>Therefore, *purge out the old leaven*, that you may be a new lump, *since you truly are unleavened*. For indeed Christ, our Passover, *was* sacrificed for us. <sup>8</sup>Therefore, *let us keep the Feast*, not with old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.” (1st Corinthians 5:6-8)

First Corinthians was written about 53 AD or 23 years *after* the resurrection. In 1st Cor. 5:8 the Apostle Paul writes to the Corinthians and says, “let us keep the Feast.” The Feast is the Mosaic Law’s seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread (the Passover beginning on the first night), because vv. 6-7 speak of *unleavened bread* and Christ as the *Passover* (Lamb). In verse eight the Apostle encourages and admonishes the Corinthians to keep the Feast in holiness with the “unleavened bread” of sincerity and truth. Obviously, the Corinthians knew when Passover was and the tone of v. 8 suggests it was soon approaching.

Paul speaks in v. 7 of purging “out the old leaven” so the Corinthians could be a new loaf of bread, *unleavened*, as they “truly” were because “Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed.” Paul is telling them to “purge out the old leaven” (of sin) and be “unleavened bread” (sinless, like Christ). The modern Church has failed the Savior and its people in the vital area of teaching God’s holy days.

Leaven (yeast) raises or puffs up bread or dough. When a man is full of pride (sin) we say that he’s “all puffed up.” Leaven, which can be seen as a good thing (e.g. Mt. 13:33), is also seen as sin (Mt. 16:6; 11-12). It’s in this latter sense that Paul speaks of *purging out* the old leaven (sin; v. 7), and being or becoming an unleavened (sinless) loaf of bread, *just as Christ was*. This is why God gave the Feast of Unleavened Bread, where He commands the eating of unleavened bread on each of its seven days (Ex. 12:15). The bread that our Lord Yeshua raised and broke at His last Passover<sup>23</sup> was *unleavened* bread be-

<sup>21</sup> Paul kept Mosaic Law: Acts 21:20-24; 25:8; Rom. 3:31; 7:12, 14; 1st Cor. 5:6-8; 7:19; 11:1; cf. Jn. 8:46; 12:26.

<sup>22</sup> See [Law 102](#). The article deals with most of the Church’s proof texts to justify the eating of unclean meats and the breaking of the Sabbath. See also [Romans 14 and the Dietary Laws](#) which also deals with Rom. 14:5-6, verses that are typically used by Christians to justify their choosing of “any day of the week” to assemble on.

<sup>23</sup> It’s the Passover, not the “Last Supper,” which is a Catholic phrase designed to strip the event from its Jewish

cause it was Passover and it *pictured* His *sinless* body.<sup>24</sup> Spiritually, eating this bread (Messiah's body) in faith makes one like Yeshua. That's why He told His Apostles to eat of it and that's why we need to eat of it every day during the Feast, as God commands.<sup>25</sup> Yeshua couldn't do that with French bread or Wonder Bread, or any other bread that has yeast in it because bread with yeast represents Jesus as full of sin.

Paul then says to the Gentile Corinthians in v. 8, "*let us keep the feast*, not with old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the *unleavened* bread of sincerity and truth." Some Christians, wanting to circumvent Paul's clear exhortation to the Corinthians to keep Passover, say that he was "only speaking metaphorically, not literally," but the Apostle stating that the Corinthians were now "unleavened bread" would seem very strange to Gentile ears if they knew nothing of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and weren't to celebrate it. Paul was speaking to their hearts as to *how* they were to keep Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread—in sincerity and truth; not in "malice and wickedness" (i.e. sin). He wasn't saying that sincerity and truth were metaphorical substitutes for celebrating Passover anymore than a pastor today would tell his flock to keep Xmas with joy and thanksgiving, but to only keep it metaphorically (i.e. not to actually keep Xmas). Besides, if Paul was only speaking metaphorically, why would he even bring up Passover and unleavened bread? He could have told them to lead "godly lives" without ever mentioning Passover. No—Paul was exhorting them to keep Passover Week in sincerity and truth.

God the Father gave Passover to ancient Israel so that His Son could walk into it, take the unleavened bread at the Passover Table and say that it was His (*sinless and crucified*) body.<sup>26</sup> The eating of food nourishes our bodies and gives us life, and the spiritual eating and drinking of the Son of Man nourishes us and gives us His divine Life. In this we become like Him, for He is the (sinless, *unleavened*) Bread of Life (John 6:1f.). Truly the adage, you are what you eat, applies to the unleavened bread of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread. As we eat of our Messiah, pictured in the unleavened bread, we become more and more like He was and is—holy. The full manifestation of this will happen on Judgment Day when we shall become like He is now—the God-Man.<sup>27</sup>

This is why God used the blood of a lamb in Egypt to free Israel from Egyptian slavery and instituted unleavened bread to be eaten for Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread. It pictures His Son as the Lamb of God (John 1:29) and the Bread of Life (Jn 6:33, 35, 48), who frees us from the slavery of sin, sickness, death and eternal Darkness, and transforms us into new creatures like He was and is (2nd Cor. 3:18; 5:17). This is one biblical reason why Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, *after* the resurrection, are so important for Christians to observe; and in terms of reality, much more so than before His death and resurrection for the Jewish people because now we know the greater divine meaning of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread and why they were given to Israel in the first place.

This teaching, of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread is just the tip of the biblical and spiritual iceberg that are the Feasts of Israel and why they are so important for Christians, and why God wants us to celebrate them *especially after* the resurrection. Easter has no divine scriptural nor theological connection to Jesus. It's totally pagan and of the Devil. The Church *projects* the Father and the Son unto their *illicit SEX* feasts, but those feasts have nothing to do with Yeshua—God the Son. Inherent within the Feasts of Israel, though, is what the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit have done for us, are doing for us and will do for us, and *God* has authorized them for us. You can find them in His Word—both Old and New Testaments.

---

moorings. The term, *the Last Supper*, is never seen in the New Testament.

<sup>24</sup> Ex. 12:8, 14-15; Mt. 26:17.

<sup>25</sup> Exodus 12:15; 13:6; 34:18; Lev. 23:6; Num. 28:17.

<sup>26</sup> Having communion with leavened bread pictures Christ as sinful, and the person as taking sin into himself. See [Passover and Jesus](#) to learn why unleavened bread is a perfect picture of the sinless Jesus crucified. The matza or unleavened bread of Passover Week is a perfect picture of the crucified Christ.

<sup>27</sup> See [Salvation—The Promise!](#)

## 9. FIRST CORINTHIANS 16:8

<sup>5</sup>“Now I will come to you when I pass through Macedonia, for I am passing through Macedonia. <sup>6</sup>And it may be that I will remain or even spend the winter with you, that you may send me on my journey, wherever I go. <sup>7</sup>For I do not wish to see you now on the way, but I hope to stay a while with you, if the Lord permits. <sup>8</sup>I will stay *in Ephesus until Pentecost*.<sup>28</sup> <sup>9</sup>For a great and effective door has opened to me, but there are many adversaries.” (1st Cor. 16:5-9)

At the end of his first letter to the Corinthians the Apostle Paul states that he will come to them, but first he would go to Ephesus and stay there until Pentecost. Paul uses Pentecost as a *time marker*, letting the Corinthians know exactly how long he would stay in Ephesus. By itself, one could argue that Christians knew when Pentecost was because of its importance in the Christian calendar, but with Paul also writing of the Feast of Unleavened Bread in chapter five, it can't be so easily dismissed. That's why many theologians teach that Paul was only speaking metaphorically about Passover/Unleavened Bread, but as we've seen, the Apostle to the Gentiles really meant for them to keep the Feast *with* sincerity and truth. Their argument also doesn't take into account Luke's use of seven Feasts of Israel in the Book of Acts, five of which have nothing to do with Pentecost (Acts 12:3-4; 18:21; 20:6; 27:6).

The nine Feasts of Israel in Acts and First Corinthians, seven of which are used as *time markers*, and one where the Apostle Paul admonishes the Corinthians to keep Passover, show us that all Christians kept the Feasts of Israel during the Apostolic Age. It also reveals that Christians kept Mosaic Law, which was the lifestyle of all the Apostles (cf. Acts 21:20-24) and all Christians as part of their faith-walk in the Messiah of Israel for at least the time that Acts presents: the first 34 years *after* the resurrection.<sup>29</sup> With the Apostle John speaking of walking *just like the Lord walked* (1st Jn. 2:6) and of keeping the *commandments of God and faith in Jesus* (Rev. 12:17; 14:12), the time period extends to at least the first 65 years *after* the resurrection—until Revelation was written. This historical, scriptural-theological understanding shatters Church theology that states neither the Feasts of Israel nor Mosaic Law are valid for Christians today.

There was no keeping of Easter and Christmas in New Testament times, at least not by Christians, yet the Church is adamant that Easter and Xmas are good for Christians because they worship Jesus on them. The scriptural and spiritual reality though, is that the Church has no authority from Above to do so and that it's *very displeasing* to God, and sin for Christians. If Jesus wanted Christians to keep Easter and Xmas He would have taught His Apostles that, and they in turn would have written about it in the New Testament. Since they aren't even mentioned, Christians have no *authority from God* to observe them, especially when the New Testament, *after* the resurrection, reveals that the Feasts of Israel were being kept. Easter and Xmas are traditions of Catholicism that have nothing to do with Jesus and they were taken from paganism. Yeshua and His Apostles *always* kept the Feasts of Israel, and obviously we should too.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> This is a different reference to Pentecost than the two times that Luke writes of Paul and Ephesus (Acts 18:21; 20:16) because in First Corinthians Paul speaks of going *from* Ephesus to Corinth, Greece. In both instances of Acts, Paul is seen going *to* Jerusalem, Israel. Also, the Feasts took place in different years: Acts 18:21 (49 AD); 1st Corinthians 16:8 (53 AD); Acts 20:16 (57 AD).

<sup>29</sup> The Church has twisted the Apostle Paul's words on Mosaic Law, not realizing that there are two different streams to it. When Paul speaks of it as an *addition* to belief in Jesus for salvation (justification), he rightly negates that as *nothing* can be added to the finished redemptive work of Yeshua (e.g. Gal. 2-5; cf. Acts 15:1-31). When Paul speaks of Mosaic Law as God's divine lifestyle for Christians, he speaks of it in glorious terms (Rom. 3:31; 7:12, 14; 1st Cor. 7:19; 2nd Tim. 3:10-17).

Also, if Paul's Gospel was intrinsically different from Peter's, the Church in Jerusalem would never have given Paul "the right hand of fellowship" (Gal. 2:1-2, 6-7, 9-10). Nor would Peter, 34 years *after* the resurrection, speak of Paul in such glowing terms (e.g. "our beloved brother," 2nd Peter 3:14-18; note well what Peter says about those who are "untaught and unstable...[who] *twist*" the words of Paul, "as they do the rest of the Scriptures," v. 16).

# THE SABBATH DAY *After* THE RESURRECTION

God's 7th day Sabbath is mentioned *11 times* in the New Testament *after* the resurrection (Luke nine times, Paul once and the Author of Hebrews once).<sup>31</sup> *Eight* of those times biblically support the continuance of the Sabbath for Christians. Although the other three times are nominal it's significant that *none of the writers who speak of the Sabbath say that Sunday replaced it*. The validity of the 7th day Sabbath in the New Testament reinforces the validity of the Feasts of Israel and consequently a Mosaic Law lifestyle.

## 1. ACTS 1:12

“Then they returned to Jerusalem from the mountain called Olives, which is near Jerusalem, a Sabbath day's journey.” (Acts 1:12)

Luke writes that the distance from where Yeshua ascended, to Jerusalem, was *a Sabbath day's journey*. This was 40 days *after* the resurrection (Acts 1:3) and so ten days before Pentecost in 30 AD. Acts 1:12 is the first significant text relating to the Sabbath even though it's not speaking about the Sabbath day, but about a unit of measurement (distance) that a Pharisee could walk on the Sabbath without sinning (at least in Pharisaic eyes). It's one kilometer or about two thirds of a mile, and it's still taught in Judaism today.

Luke uses the term, *not* to suggest that we are limited in how far we can walk on the Sabbath, but to relate the distance the Apostles actually walked in returning to Jerusalem that Thursday after they had seen Yeshua ascend to Heaven. That it's only the distance he's concerned about, and not something we need to consider living by, is seen by the fact that it wasn't the Sabbath day when they walked back to Jerusalem and also, God doesn't seem to be too concerned with the distance one can walk on the Sabbath. This is seen from two biblical passages. The first is when God led Israel out of Egyptian slavery. Israel had just celebrated the First Passover the night before, and so it was still the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which is an annual holy Sabbath (Lev. 23:6-8) when they left Egypt.<sup>32</sup> There's no telling how many miles Israel walked that day when they left Egypt, but it certainly was more than a Sabbath day's journey.

The second biblical passage is when Joshua led the Army of Israel around Jericho. For six days Israel walked around Jericho once a day, but on the seventh day, which most likely was the seventh day Sabbath,<sup>33</sup> Israel was commanded by God to walk around it seven times (Joshua 6:1-4). This is more than a Sabbath's day journey according to Judaism, even if the last day wasn't a Sabbath. One of the 7 was.

With Yeshua rising from the dead on the Sunday of Passover week,<sup>34</sup> and being seen by the Apostles and

---

<sup>30</sup> See Zechariah 14:16f., which states that all the nations will come to Jerusalem to worship the God of Israel for the Feast of Tabernacles during the millennial reign of Messiah Yeshua (Rev. 20:1-6), which hasn't come to pass yet. If the Feasts of Israel were done away with at the crucifixion, God would never have inspired Zechariah to write this about the future Kingdom of the Lord (cf. Is. 66:23).

<sup>31</sup> The reason I mention “*after* the resurrection” for both the section on the Feasts of Israel and now the Sabbath is because although Sunday or the first day of the week is seen in the Gospels as the day when Yeshua rose from the dead, no Gospel declares Sunday as “the new day of worship” because of it. The four Gospels were written from 44-95 AD. Sunday is only mentioned one time *after* the resurrection and it has nothing to do with the resurrection (1st Cor. 16:2). Sunday, as “the new day of worship” is never seen in the New Testament.

<sup>32</sup> The only practical difference between an annual Sabbath and the weekly seventh day Sabbath is that God allows us to prepare and cook our food on an annual Sabbath (Ex. 12:14-16).

<sup>33</sup> The reason why it was most likely the 7th day Sabbath when the walls of Jericho miraculously fell down is because the Sabbath is a picture of redemption-salvation (Dt. 5:12-15) and as such, would be the perfect day for Israel to begin to redeem the land of Canaan that God had promised to Fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

<sup>34</sup> On that Sunday of Passover week some barley grain, the first grain of spring, was offered up as “first fruits” and

many others, off and on, for 40 days,<sup>35</sup> it was a Thursday when the Apostles saw Yeshua ascend into the Heavens. This was His Second Ascension. The First Ascension happened 40 days earlier, after Yeshua saw Mary (John 20:11-17), and before He came to the Apostles that evening (John 20:19-21f.). The Sunday during Passover week is known as First Fruits and Paul speaks of Yeshua as the First Fruits to rise from the dead (1st Cor. 15:20, 23). The point is that God had already appointed this day for the resurrection. With no Scripture speaking of keeping Sunday instead of the Sabbath “because of the resurrection,” Sunday is a false tradition of the Church that nullifies God’s Sabbath day (cf. Mt. 15:1f.; Mk. 2:27-28). To further show us that this Sunday wasn’t to be singled out and made holy for weekly Sunday assemblies God intentionally didn’t make First Fruits an annual holy day (Sabbath), unlike Pentecost 50 days later.

Luke uses “a Sabbath day’s journey” to let Theophilus know how far it was from Jerusalem to the place on the mountain where Yeshua ascended. Even though this doesn’t literally speak of the Sabbath day itself, with Luke using this “little known” *Jewish* term about the Sabbath for distance, it seems that Theophilus knew a lot about the Sabbath for him to understand the distance a Sabbath’s day journey speaks of, and consequently, he would have been keeping the Sabbath. Luke could just as easily have told Theophilus that the distance was about five stadia,<sup>36</sup> a Roman measurement for the same distance. Theophilus would certainly have understood that, most likely being a Roman citizen.<sup>37</sup> Luke speaking of a *Sabbath* day’s journey reveals that even a non-biblical Jewish term about the Sabbath was understood by Gentile Theophilus—something we wouldn’t expect if Sunday had actually replaced the Sabbath after the crucifixion of Jesus and Theo wasn’t keeping the Sabbath. Luke wrote Acts in 64 AD, 34 years *after* the resurrection. Sunday assembly over Sabbath and assembly hadn’t come into Christianity by then.

## 2. ACTS 13:14

“But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and sat down.” (Acts 13:14)

Acts 13 took place in 46 AD. This chapter has *four* references to the Sabbath. Luke writes that Paul went into the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia (modern day central Turkey)<sup>38</sup> on the Sabbath day. This reference to the Sabbath does not, in and of itself, support that the Apostles still met on and kept the seventh day Sabbath holy because it’s a traditional synagogue that normally met on the Sabbath day. Paul went to it in order to tell his Jewish people and the Gentile “God-fearers” who also assembled there (Acts 13:16; cf. 10:2; 13:26) about the Messiah of Israel. This is the first nominal “Sabbath” in Acts.

## 3. ACTS 13:27

“For those who dwell in Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they did not know Him, nor even the voices of the Prophets, which are read every Sabbath, have fulfilled them in condemning Him.” (Acts 13:27)

---

known as the *Omer*, which is the amount of grain received, about two pounds or 0.9 kilograms (Ex. 23:19; Lev. 2:14; 23:9-14; 1st Cor. 15:20, 23). Counting 40 days inclusive, from the Sunday of Passover week brings us to a Thursday when Yeshua ascended from the Mount of Olives. That means that the Apostles waited in Jerusalem for ten days, until the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) for the Holy Spirit to be poured out upon them and other Jews.

<sup>35</sup> Acts 1:1-3; cf. Acts 13:26; 1st Cor. 15:6.

<sup>36</sup> A Sabbath day’s journey (about 3,000 feet or 920 meters) is approximately 5 stadia.

<sup>37</sup> Most scholars believe that Theophilus was a Roman nobleman whom Luke wrote both his Gospel (62 AD) and Acts (64 AD) for, when Luke was in Rome with Paul.

<sup>38</sup> This reference to Antioch in Pisidia is made to contrast it with Antioch on the Orontes River, where the first believers were called Christians (Acts 11:26). Antioch Orontes is in modern day Syria, about 32 kilometers (20 miles) east of the Mediterranean Sea, just north of Lebanon.

Paul, in his message to those in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, spoke of the Prophets being read on the Sabbath day. This is the second nominal reference to the Sabbath.

#### 4. ACTS 13:42

“So when the Jews went out of the synagogue, the Gentiles begged that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath.” (Acts 13:42)

The Gentile God-fearers at the synagogue begged Paul to preach to them *on the next Sabbath*. This is the second significant use of the Sabbath in Acts because if Sunday had been the day when Christians met, Paul would have told them that they could hear him preach the next day, on Sunday, at “so and so’s house,” but he didn’t say that. Sunday (the first day of the week), is not mentioned as a possible time to meet with those excited Gentiles. Obviously, all Christians were still meeting on the Sabbath day. Acts 13 takes place about 16 years *after* the resurrection, and Luke doesn’t add a footnote in this chapter nor anywhere else saying in 64 AD, when he wrote Acts, that the day had changed to Sunday, something we’d expect if Sunday had come into Christianity during the time that Acts records; from 30 AD to 64 AD.

#### 5. ACTS 13:44

“On the next Sabbath almost the whole city came together to hear the word of God.” (Acts 13:44)

On the following Sabbath most everyone in Antioch came out to hear Paul preach about Messiah Yeshua. This is the last of the four passages in Acts 13 that refer to the Sabbath day and here, as in v. 42, it’s interesting to see that Luke doesn’t speak of Paul telling the Gentiles of any weekly Sunday assembly. This is the third significant use of the term Sabbath in the Book of Acts.

#### 6. ACTS 15:21

<sup>20</sup>“but that we write to them to abstain from things polluted by idols, from fornication, from things strangled, and from blood. <sup>21</sup>For *Moses* has had, throughout many generations, those who preach him in every city, *being read* in the synagogues *every Sabbath*.” (Acts 15:20-21)

Acts 15:21 took place among the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem in 48 AD. This is the fourth significant use of the Sabbath *after* the resurrection. The chapter deals with what the Gentiles needed to do in order to be saved (Acts 15:1ff.), and then speaks of *the Gentiles learning Mosaic Law every Sabbath*.<sup>39</sup> At the end of the discussion, James, the half brother of Yeshua, gave four rules for the Gentiles (v. 20), and then spoke of the Gentiles going to the synagogues to learn “Moses” (i.e. Mosaic Law).

Of course, all the Jewish believers at the assembly in Jerusalem knew that Moses had been taught (“read”) “for many generations...in the synagogues every Sabbath,” and James, as well as most of the Jewish believers there that day, knew that the Gentile Christians were learning who their God was and what pleased Him and didn’t please Him (i.e. sin), at those synagogues; both believing and non-believing synagogues because Gentiles were welcomed to come to them to learn of the God of Israel and His ways.

The word *synagogue* also means “a *Christian* assembly”<sup>40</sup> or what might be called by Jewish Christians a

<sup>39</sup> Acts 15:20-21 is the theological center of the New Testament concerning Mosaic Law for the Gentile. It declares Mosaic Law as the lifestyle for every Christian. To fully appreciate this and why the four rules of James have nothing to do with table fellowship, as the Church teaches, read [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#).

<sup>40</sup> Wesley J. Perschbacher, editor, *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publications,

believing synagogue. James was speaking of both the traditional non-believing synagogues and the Christian synagogues or assemblies as places for the Gentile to learn Mosaic Law. In other words, both a synagogue of Jews who didn't believe in Jesus, as well as an assembly like Antioch on the Orontes River in modern day Syria, made up of only Christians (Jewish and Gentile), would equally be called a *synagogue*. This understanding is also supported when we see James using the Greek word for synagogue in his letter (49 AD or just a year after Acts 15 took place), referring to a Christian congregation as a synagogue (James 2:2;<sup>41</sup> cf. Acts 9:1-2; 26:11). The mention of Moses "being read (i.e. taught) in the *synagogues* every Sabbath," meant that both believing and unbelieving synagogues were places where Gentile Christians could meet and learn Mosaic Law. Also of interest is the fact that the word *church*, as a *distinct and separate entity* from the Jewish people, wasn't known to the Apostles, including Paul.<sup>42</sup> In other words, the "church" was part of Israel (John 10:16; Rom. 11:11f.; Eph. 2:11f.).

In Acts 15:21 James made a statement of observation, as well as one of expectation. James had already seen that the Gentile believers *had been going* to the synagogues to learn Mosaic Law on the Sabbath from the days of the first Gentile believer, Cornelius, a "God-fearer" (Acts 10:2; 38-40 AD, which happened eight to ten years earlier; cf. 10:1–11:18). He expected that the Gentiles would *continue* to go to the synagogues to learn Mosaic Law *on the Sabbath day*.<sup>43</sup>

Most scholars teach that the four rules of James (v. 20) speak of table fellowship (i.e. what the Gentile needed to do in order to eat at the same table and fellowship with his Jewish Christian counterpart without offending him), but that's wrong because none of the four rules tell the Gentile Christian *what* animals were unclean that couldn't be brought "to the table" (Lev. 11). If the four rules were for table fellowship, as the Church teaches, the Gentiles would have had to know which animals, like the pig, were biblically unclean so they wouldn't offend their Jewish brethren by offering them ham, etc. Therefore, the very reason the Church says was the purpose of the four rules, for table fellowship so as not to offend the Jewish believers, falls apart upon simple examination. The four rules have nothing to do with table fellowship.

The four rules are actually a unit on sacrificial-sexual idolatry,<sup>44</sup> which if the *Gentile didn't immediately*

---

1990), p. 388. *Synagogue*: a "collecting, gathering; a Christian assembly or congregation, James 2:2" (where James speaks of a *believing* synagogue, "for if a man comes into your *synagogue* with a gold ring").

Walter Bauer, augmented by William F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and Frederick Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, second edition (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), pp. 782-783: a "place of assembly...a *Christian assembly-place* can also be mean't (James 2:2). A "meeting for worship, of the Jews...*Transferred* to meetings of *Christian congregations*."

<sup>41</sup> In James 2:2, the ASV correctly translates the Greek word συναγωγή (*sunagogae*) as synagogue. Most English Bibles don't have that, instead opting for words that destroy the Jewish connotation, such as *meeting* or *assembly* (NIV and KJV respectively).

<sup>42</sup> The Greek εκκλησια (*ekklaysia*), translated into English as "church," means an "assembly" or congregation, but literally speaks of those "called out." Originally it pictured the Greek "town meetings" of free men *called out* of the populace to vote on civic matters. The spiritual aspect relates to believers being "*called out* of darkness into His marvelous *Light*" (cf. 1st Pet. 2:9) and is one reason why Paul chose to use this word instead of *synagogue*. Believers are the "Called Out Ones;" the Greek equivalent of the Hebraic, "Chosen People." Where it says, "to the *church* at Corinth" it could also read, "to the assembly (or congregation) at Corinth" or "to the *called out ones* of Corinth." Where Yeshua says, "On this Rock I will build My Church," it could also be translated as, "On this Rock I will build My Assembly" or "My Called Out Ones" (Mt. 16:18). Also, see *ekklaysia*, p. 3, note 9.

The Church didn't begin in Acts 2 on Pentecost (the Mosaic holy day of *Shavu'ot*; Leviticus 23:15-21; the Feast of Weeks). Jewish believers in the Messiah of Israel were *filled* with the *promised* Holy Spirit on that day (Ezk. 36:27; Joel 2:28-29; see Acts 2:46-47; 5:11-12, 42 where "the Church" met in the Jewish Temple). Paul's "churches" were "house assemblies" (1st Cor. 16:19; Phlm. 1:2; see also Rom. 16:5, 10-11, 14-15, 23), which Jews would call "house synagogues."

<sup>43</sup> Believing Gentiles wouldn't be barred from the traditional synagogues until after 90 AD.

<sup>44</sup> See [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#) for why the four rules of James deal with sacrificial-sexual idolatry and not table fellowship, and how those verses form the theological foundation in the New Testament for Mosaic

*stop*, would place his very salvation in jeopardy (which is why the Council in Acts 15 met; i.e. to determine what the *Gentile* had to do in order to be saved; Acts 15:1-2, 5). In other words, the Gentile couldn't "believe in Jesus" and *continue to worship Diana and Zeus*, etc. Adding "another god" to their pantheon was a *normal practice* for the Gentiles, and so "adding Jesus" wouldn't have been seen as wrong by them. Sacrificial-sexual idolatry is the reason for the four rules and why they don't address table fellowship.

These four rules then, weren't the "only rules" for the Gentile, as the Church teaches, in order to avoid any more Mosaic rules for the Gentile, but these four rules were the most important Mosaic rules in terms of what the Gentile needed to do in order to remain in the Kingdom. That's why they were singled out and given first. The rest of the rules the Gentiles were to learn in the synagogue, where Mosaic Law was taught *every Sabbath day*. Obviously, not only was the Sabbath still in effect *for Gentile Christians* in 48 AD or 18 years *after* the resurrection, but they were learning to walk out their faith in the Jewish Jesus through all the other rules of Mosaic Law that applied to them.

Once the Gentile was Born Again and justified by his faith in Messiah Yeshua, did it matter if he sinned? The Apostle Paul succinctly raises that question and answers it by saying, "How shall we who died to sin live any longer in it?" (Rom. 6:2) Every true Christian would "amen" that, but the question then becomes, *what is the New Testament's specific definition of sin after the resurrection?* Christians today don't know the *full* extent of what God considers sin, and so they are sinning against Him in ignorance. The Apostle *to the Gentiles* (Rom. 11:1; cf. 1st Tim. 1:11) answers that for us, saying:

"Therefore, by the deeds of the Law, no flesh will be justified in His sight, **for by the Law is the knowledge of sin.**" (Romans 3:20)

Extremely interesting is the fact the Paul add a Greek prefix to "knowledge," to make it "full knowledge" (ἐπίγνωσις *epignosis*). The phrase should read, "for by the Law is the full knowledge of sin." Christians have the knowledge that murder and hate are sin, but not Sabbath and Passover. Only Mosaic Law can give that, and that's why God's will is for Christians to walk in all the rules of Moses that apply to them.

At His death Yeshua *redeemed* Israel, which now includes any Gentile who is Born Again.<sup>45</sup> He didn't do away with Mosaic Law because it reveals God's holy lifestyle.<sup>46</sup> The Law reveals what is sin, and consequently, what is pleasing to God. Paul distinctly confirms this as God's holy standard of what is right and wrong (i.e. sin), in his greatest theological Letter, saying,

"What shall we say then? *Is the Law sin? **Certainly not!*** On the contrary, *I would not have known sin except through the Law!* For I would not have known covetousness unless the Law had said, "You must not covet!" (Romans 7:7)

"Therefore, *the Law is holy*, and the commandment holy and just and good...For we know that *the Law is spiritual*, but I am carnal, sold under sin." (Romans 7:12, 14 NKJV)

Paul emphatically states that (Mosaic) Law<sup>47</sup> is God's holy standard for determining what is sin, and con-

---

Law as the biblical lifestyle for both the Jewish and Gentile Christians.

<sup>45</sup> Mark 10:45; John 3:1-5f.; 11:49-52; Ps. 49:15; 71:23; 130:8; Is. 35:9; 43:1; 44:23; 52:3, 9; 62:12; Jer. 63:10-12; Hosea 13:14; Luke 1:68; 2:38; Rom. 3:24; 8:23; 11:11f.; Gal. 3:13; 4:5; Eph. 1:7; Titus 2:14; Hebrews 9:12, 15; 1st Pet. 1:18; Rev. 5:9. Compare Gen. 48:16; Ex. 6:6; 15:13; Dt. 7:8; 9:6; 13:5; 15:15; 21:8; 24:18; 2nd Sam. 7:23; Ps. 25:22; 77:15; 78:42; Is. 48:20; 51:10; 63:8-9; Micah 4:10; 6:4.

<sup>46</sup> Yeshua redeemed us from the *curse* of the Law (Gal. 3:13), not the Law itself; see Mt. 5:17-19; 19:17; 22:35-40; Lk. 10:26; 16:17, 29; 1st Cor. 7:17-19; 11:1-2; Rom. 3:31; 7:7, 12, 14, 16, 22, 25; 8:1-7; 2nd Thess. 2:15 (traditions/customs equal the Law; see Acts 6:13; 15:1, 5; 26:3; 28:17); James 2:8-11; 4:11-12; 1st John 2:6; 3:4; 5:3; 2nd John 1:6; Rev. 12:17; 14:12; cf. 2nd Tim. 3:10-17.

<sup>47</sup> Some Christians say that the term Law means only the Ten Commandments, seeking to steer clear of the entire Mosaic Law, but this isn't supported by either the Old or the New Testaments. Even the phrase, "the Law of the Lord" means Mosaic Law and not the Ten (Ex. 13:9; 2nd Kings 10:31; 1st Chr. 16:40; 22:12; 2nd Chr. 12:1; 17:9; 31:3-4; 34:14; 35:26; Ezra 7:10; Neh. 9:3; Ps. 1:2; 19:7; 119:1; Is. 5:24; Jer 8:8; Amos 2:4; Luke 2:23-24,

sequently, what is pleasing to Him. Therefore, without the knowledge of Mosaic Law one's understanding of sin is biblically lacking and leads to sinning against God in ignorance. After all, how many Christians keep the Feasts of Israel, the seventh day Sabbath and the Mosaic dietary laws?<sup>48</sup> By not keeping them Christians are sinning against Jesus, themselves and many others, including the Jewish people, who see Christianity as a pagan religion, devoid of the wisdom and knowledge that God gave to Israel (i.e. Mosaic Law; Dt. 4:6-8; Psalm 119:1-176; 2nd Tim. 3:10-17).

Christians don't keep the Feasts of Israel nor do they keep the 7th day Sabbath nor the Mosaic dietary laws, all of which Jesus kept, but rather they do things that Jesus would never have done because they would have been sin for Him (e.g. *illicit SEX*, and the eating of pig [bacon and ham, etc.], as well as catfish and shrimp, etc.). Aside from Christian theology presenting a false way to live out a Christian's faith in Jesus, it's a demonic stumbling block for the Jewish people, who rightly believe that their Messiah would never negate Mosaic Law, and in fact, isn't that what Jesus expressly said (Mt. 5:17-19; 22:35-40)? How is it then, that Christians haven't seen this deception (cf. Daniel 7:25) for all these centuries?

If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath day there's no indication of it in Acts 15. On the contrary, just the opposite is seen—Christian Gentiles were going to the synagogues on the Sabbath day to learn Mosaic Law so they could know what was pleasing in God's eyes and what was sin. Acts 15 took place 18 years *after* the resurrection, in 48 AD. This is the fourth significant use of "Sabbath" *after* the resurrection in Acts.

## 7. ACTS 16:13

"And on the Sabbath day we went out of the city to the riverside, where prayer was customarily made; and we sat down and spoke to the women who met there." (Acts 16:13)

Acts 16:13 took place in 49 AD. Paul went out of the city of Philippi on the Sabbath day to the riverbank "where prayer was customarily made." Pious Jewish women were meeting there for prayer. For our purpose, of realizing that the 7th day Sabbath didn't give way to Sunday in the days of the Apostles, this is the / nominal cite in Acts because the women were obviously Jewish and Gentile God fearers, and so gathering on the Sabbath would have been normal for them. After hearing Paul preach, some like Lydia, would come to believe in Yeshua (Acts 16:14-15; the term "worshiped God" is a connotation for a God-fearer, a Gentile who had come to worship the God of Israel and had left her pagan ways, but hadn't gone through the artificial conversion of becoming a Jew).<sup>49</sup>

## 8. ACTS 17:2

"Then Paul, as his custom was, went in to them, and for three Sabbaths reasoned with them from the Scriptures." (Acts 17:2)

Acts 17:2 took place in 50 AD. Luke writes that Paul, "*for three Sabbaths...as was his custom,*" reasoned with the Thessalonian Jews (and Gentiles). This is the fifth significant passage because even though it reflects a traditional Sabbath synagogue meeting, if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath, wouldn't Paul have told those Thessalonians to come to his Sunday meetings? Wouldn't Luke have written of it? Nowhere are

---

39). To see how the Scriptures use the term *law* to refer to Mosaic Law, see [Mosaic Law and the Ten](#). Mosaic Law is biblically seen as the Word of God: Ex. 31:18; 32:15-16; Ps. 119:13, 16, 43, 57, 66-67, 88, 89-94, 97-104, 105-106, 129-131, 133-136, 138-140, 157-160, 161-165, 172; Is. 1:10; 2:3; 5:24; 42:21; 44:3; Jer. 35:13; 44:23; Dan. 9:10, 11; Mic. 4:2; Jn. 8:8-9; 9:13; Acts 7:38. Also, the biblical term *commandments* speaks of more than just the Ten Commandments (Ex. 15:26; 16:28; Lev. 22:31; Num. 15:22; Dt. 6:17; and Ex. 13:9-10, which refers to the keeping of Passover, which isn't found in the Ten Commandments).

<sup>48</sup> For why the Mosaic Dietary laws are still in effect for Christians, see [Law 102](#), p. 5ff.

<sup>49</sup> See [Is the Gentile Now a Jew?](#) for why rabbinic conversion of a Gentile to become a Jew is a rabbinic fairy tale.

either mentioned, but Luke writes that, as it was his custom, Paul spoke to them on the Sabbath day. Acts 17:2 took place 20 years *after* the resurrection.

## 9. ACTS 18:4

<sup>4</sup>“And he reasoned in the synagogue *every Sabbath*, and persuaded both Jews and Greeks.  
<sup>5</sup>When Silas and Timothy came from Macedonia, Paul was compelled by the Spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus is the Messiah, <sup>6</sup>but when they opposed him and blasphemed, he shook his garments out and said to them, “Your blood be upon your own heads! I am not accountable for your rejection of our Messiah! (cf. Ezk. 3:18-19; 33:8-9) From now on I will go to the Gentiles!”” (Acts 18:4-6)

Acts 18:4 took place in Corinth about 52 AD. This is the sixth significant biblical reference to the Sabbath *after* the resurrection in Acts. Luke writes that Paul “reasoned *every Sabbath*” in the synagogue, persuading “both Jews and Greeks,” but when the remaining Jews opposed him (v. 6), he began teaching in the home of Justus. *He taught there for a year and a half* (Acts 18:7-11). This is a most glaring silence for Sunday! Luke doesn’t mention any Sunday teachings or meetings in the home of Justus in all that time. We would certainly expect to see “Sunday” here, if in fact it had become “the Christian Sabbath” (as some Christians erroneously call it),<sup>50</sup> and so its absence is extremely significant.

All we have seen in Acts is the Sabbath. There truly is no mention of Sunday, Acts 20:7 notwithstanding.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, it’s scripturally reasonable to think that Paul taught on the Sabbath day in the home of Justus, and that he worked on the other six days of the week with Priscilla and Aquila making tents (Acts 18:1-3). There would have been about 80 weekly 7th day Sabbaths during that year and half time period (cf. Acts 17:17), and not once does Luke speak of a Sunday meeting. How very strange, if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath *after* the resurrection. Acts 18:4 and following took place about 22 and 23 years *after* the resurrection of the Lord Yeshua.

Six of the nine Sabbath cites in Acts are significant because they reveal that the Sabbath was still in effect for all Christians as the day to assemble on and keep holy (cf. Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 20:8-11; 31:12-18; Mk. 2:27-28) and that Sunday had not yet become a part of Christianity.

## 10. COLOSSIANS 2:16

<sup>16</sup>“So let no one judge you in food or in drink, or regarding a Festival (a Feast of Israel), or a New Moon, or Sabbaths, <sup>17</sup>which are a *shadow of things to come*, but the substance is of Messiah.” (Colossians 2:16-17)

The Letter to the Colossians was written about 60 AD by the Apostle Paul. Many Christians use verse 16 to prove that the Sabbath is gone, but Paul doesn’t say that. Just as significant is the fact that he doesn’t even speak of Sunday, let alone tell us that it’s the new day or that it has replaced the Sabbath, either in this passage or anywhere in any of his Letters, something we would expect from the Apostle Paul if Sunday had indeed replaced the Sabbath in his lifetime.

The key word in verse 16 is “judge” (κρίνω *krino*), which Paul uses in a simple way, meaning, “to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong.”<sup>52</sup> Paul didn’t want anyone in the congregation to judge

---

<sup>50</sup> There is no such biblical term as Sunday being the Christian Sabbath. The weekly, biblical 7th day Sabbath is always on the last day of the week, not the first day of the week (i.e. Sunday). The Hebrew word *Sabbath* means to cease or to conclude, and so the 7th day Sabbath concludes a 7 day week, which God gave us in Creation Week. The “Christian Sabbath” doesn’t conclude the week, but begins it. For more on this see [The Lord’s Day—Sunday?](#)

<sup>51</sup> Acts 20:7 is discussed on pp. 23ff.

others wrongly regarding *how they kept the Sabbath day* (or the Feasts of Israel and New Moons, etc.). Note well: don't let anyone "judge you," concerning the Sabbath, etc.; not "don't keep the Sabbath."

The Sabbath was still the day Paul's Christians kept holy and assembled on. So the verse that Christians use "to prove" that the Sabbath has been done away with, actually backfires because it supports that Gentile Christians were keeping and meeting on the 7th Sabbath day and the Feasts of Israel, etc.

This is also seen in the very next verse, which speaks of the Feasts and Sabbaths as *shadows* or pictures of *what is to come in the future* when we will actually see Messiah Yeshua in all of His Glory. Paul doesn't want anyone (most likely another Christian Colossian) judging the Christian Colossians in how they kept God's days and ways; these Mosaic Law things, "Which are a *shadow of things to come*, but the body (reality) is of Messiah" (Col. 2:17). In other words, the *shadow pictures reveal* things about Messiah's character and Person that we wouldn't know about Him if they didn't exist.

Both the Textus Receptus and the NU text have δὲ (*dae*) for v. 17, which can be translated as "but," which contrasts the two phrases, but a better translation would be "however" (NIV) because Paul *isn't* contrasting the Sabbath, etc., with Jesus—he's teaching that the Sabbath and the Feasts are "pictures" or shadows that reflect the Messiah, who was not literally present with them. As such the Sabbath and the Feasts are practical divine teaching tools about the Savior in Heaven. They instruct us as to who He really is. Is Jesus Lord of the Sabbath (Mk. 2:27-28) or is He Lord of Sunday? And if He's the Lord of Sunday, where does Scripture say that?

An example of how the Sabbath reveals Messiah Yeshua, and how without it, we'd be at a loss to more fully understand Him and some of His sayings, is that inherent in the Sabbath day is the theme of redemption (salvation). God *made* the Sabbath that way—to reflect the redemption from Egyptian slavery (Dt. 5:12-15), and to also be a reflection or a shadow of our redemption from the slavery of the Kingdom of Satan.

Because the Sabbath is divinely impregnated with the theme of redemption Yeshua could "break the rules" of the Pharisees regarding healing on the Sabbath day, which they considered forbidden work (for God does command a cessation of work and for Israel to rest). Note though, how Yeshua chastises the president of the synagogue, who opposed Him for healing the Jewish woman on the Sabbath, who had suffered for so long, healing her *especially* on the Sabbath day, as Yeshua says:

"So ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound—*think of it!—for 18 years!*, be freed from this bond (slavery) *on the Sabbath day?!*" (Luke 13:16)

The Pharisees condemned the healings of Yeshua on the Sabbath because they didn't realize that the *work* of redemption (i.e. miraculous healing) was Lawful. Yeshua, as the Redeemer of Israel, was sent by His Father to do works of redemption, *especially* on the Sabbath, that would culminate in *the Work* of Redemption (His death) on the annual Sabbath day of Passover—the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. That's why Yeshua could heal (work) on the Sabbath and it wouldn't be considered sin in His Father's eyes because inherent within the Sabbath is the theme of redemption. Therefore, the Sabbath is a perfect picture of Yeshua as the Redeemer of Israel who gives us "rest" from our sinful toil, by forgiving and cleansing us so that we can walk in "rest" (or shalom, the Hebrew word for God's peace). "In Yeshua" we find this rest or heavenly Peace, which is the essence of the Sabbath, and what the ancient Sabbath pictured or shadowed. Sunday cannot biblically claim that. It was never meant to.

Paul, in Colossians, comes against the pagan Gnostic practice of fasting on the Sabbath day (Col. 2:23), and the Gnostic understanding of "how to attain" to God (to be saved). It seems that some Gnostic Colossians became Christians and came into the Colossian congregation with a lot of Gnostic baggage (Col. 2:8-10). Most likely they said to their Colossian brothers that *one wasn't saved* if he didn't fast on the

---

<sup>52</sup> κείνω Joseph Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), n.p.

Sabbath, and didn't keep to their lifestyle. Paul comes against such heresy and the new Christian heretics who judged (condemned) their Colossian brothers. The point is that Paul is actually upholding the Sabbath by saying not to let anyone *judge* them in *how* they kept the Sabbath, etc. That Paul wasn't coming against Mosaic Law is seen in his speaking of what was wrong in Colosse, as the "doctrines of men" and "self-imposed religion" (Col. 2:22-23), something Paul never says about the Sabbath or Mosaic Law because they are *divine* instructions and rules from God; not from man. Also interesting to note is that if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath, what is Paul doing even writing about the Sabbath?!

This is the seventh significant passage on the issue of Sabbath or Sunday in the New Testament *after* the resurrection. The Colossian Letter was written by Paul, the Church's "No Law!" champion!, 30 years *after* the resurrection. It doesn't speak of Sunday assembly, nor the negation of the Sabbath, but on the *con*-trary, reveals that the Sabbath, the Feasts of Israel and her New Moons were being kept by the Colossian Christians. This in turn shows us that Mosaic Law was still being kept by Gentile Christians because the Feasts of Israel and the New Moons, unlike the 7th day Sabbath, are not found in the Ten Commandments, but in Mosaic Law.

## 11. HEBREWS 4:9

"There remains therefore a *Sabbath rest* for the people of God." (Hebrews 4:9)

The Letter to the Hebrews was written about 67 AD. Every English Bible has "a Sabbath rest" except the King James and New King James, which only have "a rest," yet the Textus Receptus, which is the basis for the KJV, and to a great extent for the NKJV, has the Greek word σαββατισμὸς *sabbatismos*, which is a literal observance of the Sabbath.<sup>53</sup> This is a most insidious translation error for both the KJV and the NKJV, with profound theological meaning for the observance of the Sabbath, 37 years *after* the resurrection. The NU Greek manuscript has the same Greek word, *sabbatismos*, which is why *every* English Bible except the KJV and the NKJV has "a *Sabbath rest*" *remains* for the people of God. The KJV and NKJV translators *were dishonest* in their translation of Hebrews 4:9 from the Textus Receptus, most likely due to their theological bias against the Sabbath and Mosaic Law.

The Author of Hebrews literally reveals that the Sabbath was still valid for Christians, and also, points to the spiritual *rest* we experience by faith in Messiah Yeshua's finished work of redemption, especially on the Sabbath day, as we strive, in the Holy Spirit, to enter into the divine presence of Messiah Yeshua, who is Shalom (God's peace and rest), on every day of the week, but especially on the Sabbath day.

It's very telling that the Author speaks of the Sabbath this way, which if it had been replaced by Sunday would obviously not have been used. The Letter to the Hebrews, like the Book of Acts and Paul's Letter to the Colossians, *never* speaks of Sunday replacing God's seventh day Sabbath.

God called Israel to cease from their work on the Sabbath day and rest from their labor to make a living, etc. (Ex. 20:8-11), which meant that He wanted them to have *faith* in Him that He would provide for all their needs. It seems obvious that if one works seven days a week instead of six that he will have more material things, like food and clothing, etc., but God wants His people to trust Him to provide for all their needs.

The Writer of Hebrews speaks of us ceasing from our dead works, of trying to earn our salvation by good or righteous deeds, and to enter into the God's finished work of redemption in Yeshua (Heb. 6:1; 9:14). The Sabbath is *God's picture or shadow of that rest*, both in the natural and in the spiritual realms.

The Sabbath day allows us, once a week, to literally and spiritually cease from our work and find Shalom from our strivings to earn a living and "to be good enough" for God, and to enter into both physical and

---

<sup>53</sup> σαββατισμὸς Joseph Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), n.p. "to keep the sabbath; a keeping sabbath."

spiritual rest. Yes, we can enter that spiritual rest every moment of every day of the week, but on the Sabbath God commands that we don't work nor buy or sell, and to keep this day holy for 24 hours, not just an hour or two for assembly, which makes God's 7th day Sabbath different from every other day. The Sabbath is God's *practical and spiritual* gift to us (Mark 2:27) and Yeshua spoke of His being Lord of the Sabbath (Mk. 2:28). He never even hinted at the Sabbath day changing, but on the contrary, spoke of it continuing into far future (cf. Mt. 24:20).

On the Sabbath day we cease from our physical work as a natural reminder to cease from our carnal anxiety and doubts concerning our standing with God. We learn to truly trust Him for all our needs, both temporal *and* eternal. In *this* we truly enter into the spiritual rest that He has provided through His Son's sacrificial death.

Every Sabbath, as we learn (over and over again) to trust God, our faith and joy deepen as we realize anew who our Savior is and that our Father is pleased with us because we are trusting in what He has done for us. This leads to divine rest and Shalom for our souls (Mt. 11:28-30), which is the essence of the Sabbath commandment to rest. Sunday doesn't have this theological foundation or meaning. This is why the Author of Hebrews used the 7th day Sabbath, which reveals that the Sabbath was still valid for Christians 37 years *after* the resurrection of Messiah Yeshua.

This is the eighth significant biblical witness for the Sabbath in the New Testament *after* the resurrection. The Sabbath is mentioned *11 times* in the New Testament *after* the resurrection and eight of those 11 times have proven significant in our quest to find God's Truth in this matter of Christian lifestyle.

Although three of those 11 times refer only nominally to the Sabbath as the biblical day of Jewish assembly,<sup>54</sup> the other eight times, *written by three different New Testament writers*,<sup>55</sup> biblically establish that the 7th day Sabbath was still the day that the New Testament Church kept holy and met on. Also interesting to realize is that not once after any of those 11 times, nor anywhere else in the entire New Testament, does anyone state that Sunday replaced the Sabbath or that Sunday was the "new day" of assembly or the "Christian Sabbath."

The Apostle John, more than 60 years *after* the resurrection, wrote, "He who says he abides in Him **ought himself also to walk just as He walked.**" (1st John 2:6)

The Apostles of Yeshua, as well as all the Jewish and Gentile Christians, kept the 7th day Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel during the time of the Apostles *after* the resurrection (30 AD to 96 AD), which reveals that they walked out their faith in Jesus through all the rules and statutes of Mosaic Law that applied to them. Shouldn't we, also?

---

<sup>54</sup> Acts 13:14, 27; 16:13.

<sup>55</sup> Luke six times (Acts 1:12; 13:42, 44; 15:21; 17:2; 18:4); Paul once (Col. 2:16); and the Author of Hebrews once (Heb. 4:9).

## THREE SABBATH SCRIPTURES *Before* THE RESURRECTION

The next three verses of Scripture (Is. 66:23; Ezk. 46:1; Mt. 24:20), although spoken *before* the resurrection, apply to times *after* the resurrection, and so they merit our consideration in searching Scripture for God's Truth in the matter of Sabbath or Sunday. The Lord speaks, through the prophet Isaiah, of a time which obviously has not yet come, when *all mankind* will worship Him on the *Sabbath day*:

““And it shall come to pass, that from one New Moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, *all flesh* shall come to worship before Me,” says Yahveh.” (Isaiah 66:23)

This was written about 720 BC. It hasn't happened yet, but it will happen during the thousand year reign of Yeshua from this earthly Jerusalem (Rev. 20:4-6). In that time the Son of David (2nd Sam. 7:8f.; Lk. 1:30-33) will reign and rule the nations from *this* earthly Jerusalem, with an iron rod (Rev. 12:5; 19:15). The point is that it speaks of the *Sabbath* being the day when *all mankind*, not just the Jews, will worship the God of Israel, and it won't be on Sunday. The seventh day Sabbath has been holy and blessed since Creation, and is for all mankind (Gen. 2:1-3; Mk. 2:27). God has never *blessed* nor made Sunday a weekly *holy* day. We would expect Sunday to be given at least those two divine designations if it had indeed superseded the Sabbath in the New Testament.

Ezekiel prophesied of what many Christians call, The Temple of Ezekiel, which they see coming about in the thousand year reign of Messiah Yeshua (Rev. 20:1-6). This passage was written about 580 BC:

“Thus says the Lord Yahveh! “The gateway of the inner court that faces toward the east shall be shut *the six working days*, but on the *Sabbath* it shall be opened, and on the day of the New Moon it shall be opened.”” (Ezekiel 46:1)

The six working days correspond to Sunday through Friday, and the gateway will be shut for those days, but on the Sabbath day it will be open. God never intended for Sunday to replace His holy Sabbath day.

The continuance of the Sabbath is also seen when Yeshua, in 30 AD, prophesied of the destruction of Jerusalem, which took place in 70 AD at the hands of the Roman Army, 40 years *after* His resurrection. Out of His concern for His Jewish people He told them to pray that their fleeing from the city wouldn't be in the winter *nor on the Sabbath* (Mt. 24:20). The Sabbath isn't a time “to run for your lives,” but to enter into God's presence and appreciate His creation and the Shalom and freedom (redemption) He gives us (Ex. 20:8-11; Dt. 5:12-15; Rom. 11:11f.; Rev. 5:9). We are to rest, keep the day holy, assemble on it if we can and minister to others as Yeshua did (e.g. Mt. 12:10f.; Luke 4:16; John 5:1-9). Yeshua spoke this *before* the resurrection, but Matthew wrote his Gospel 14 years *after* the resurrection, and never spoke of Sunday replacing the Sabbath:

“And pray that your flight may not be in winter nor on the Sabbath day.” (Mt. 24:20)

Neither God through Isaiah, Ezekiel, or Yeshua spoke of Sunday replacing the seventh day Sabbath, but on the contrary, of the Sabbath continuing *after* the resurrection—even into the days of the thousand year reign of Yeshua (Rev. 20:1-7f.). The divinely inspired Scriptures diametrically oppose Church teaching about God's 7th day Sabbath and Sunday. As Joshua might say to us today:

“And if it seems evil to you to serve Yeshua, choose for yourselves this day whom you will serve, whether the gods of Sunday, which your Fathers served in their Sunday, Easter and Xmas churches, in whose land you dwell, but as for me and my House we will serve Yeshua through His Days and His Ways!” (Joshua 24:15 my rendition)

To serve God is equal to obeying God. Choose for yourself this day whom you will serve—the Pope of Rome, who gave you Sunday, Easter and Xmas, or the God of Israel who gave you His Day and Feasts which reflect His Son.

# SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Sunday, or rather the first day of the week as the Bible always speaks of it, is mentioned eight times in the New Testament, six of which are found in the Gospels.<sup>56</sup> The six Gospel cites all speak of the first *appearances* of Yeshua, alive from the dead, on Sunday, with only Mark 16:9 seeming to say that Jesus was *resurrected* on Sunday. This Scripture though, cannot be used to support Sunday replacing the Sabbath because it does not declare that Sunday replaced the Sabbath (because of the resurrection). In other words, even though Yeshua was raised on Sunday, no one, anywhere in Scripture, says that Sunday replaced the 7th day Sabbath because of it.

Also, Greek scholars realize that grammatically, the verse (Mark 16:9) can equally be translated that Yeshua was only first *seen* on Sunday. In other words, the verse is not saying that Yeshua rose from the dead on Sunday, but only that He was first seen on Sunday, and this lines up with what the other Gospels tell us. Here's the alternate translation, which may be seen as a note in some English Bibles and many Christian commentaries:

“Now when He rose, *early on the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary Magdalene*, out of whom He had cast seven demons.”

Note the comma after *He rose*. It separates the fact of His resurrection with that of His being first seen by Mary on Sunday. Most English translations don't have the comma after *rose* and so the sentence reads that, “He rose early on the first day of the week” (i.e. Sunday).

Most commentaries agree that Mark 16:9 was *not* written by Mark, but by a later Christian scribe who compiled vv. 9-18 from the three other Gospels.<sup>57</sup> Be that as it may, Yeshua was first *seen* on Sunday, and He did rise on Sunday, but Scripture seems silent as to the hour. When the women get to the Tomb the angel says, “He is risen!,”<sup>58</sup> but he doesn't say how long ago it happened.

The point here is that *none* of the six times that “Sunday” appears in the Gospels is it spoken of as replacing the Sabbath. It declares that Yeshua was first seen on Sunday, even with Mark 16:9 possibly saying that He was resurrected on Sunday, but no one writes that Sunday replaced or even would come to replace the Sabbath. The four Gospels were written from 44 to 95 AD, and so, even though they're speaking of the crucifixion and resurrection of 30 AD, their vantage point is 14 to 65 years *after* the resurrection.

If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath during the lifetime of the Apostles, “because of the resurrection,” as many Christians falsely teach, the Gospel writers would certainly have declared such a monumental change as that in their accounts of the resurrection. After all, the Sabbath had been with Israel for more than 1,400 years. With nothing being said in any Gospel of a new day of assembly, we know that Sunday hadn't replaced the Sabbath in the days of the Apostles because of Yeshua's first appearances and resurrection on Sunday.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Mt. 28:1; Mk. 16:2, 9; Lk. 24:1; Jn. 20:1, 19; and also, Acts 20:7; 1st Cor. 16:2. (John 20:26, although not literally speaking of the first day of the week, is seen to be one week after his first appearance to the Apostles on Sunday, and this seems to be Sunday night because John “keeps time” in Roman terms).

<sup>57</sup> Most Bibles don't have the comma after *rose*, but after *week*, like the NKJV: “Now when He rose early on the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom He had cast seven demons.” (Mark 16:9) For more insight on why this verse speaks of Yeshua only appearing to Mary early on the first day of the week, and how the Christian scribe got his information from the three other Gospels, see [The Resurrection and Mark 16:9](#).

<sup>58</sup> Mt. 28:2-8; Mk. 16:5-8; Lk. 24:5-7 (John doesn't have the angel saying that; see Jn. 20:11-13.)

<sup>59</sup> Yeshua did rise on Sunday as the First Fruits of the resurrection, as Paul calls Him in 1st Cor. 15:20, 23. First Fruits (firstfruits or First Sheaf; Lev. 23:10-12f.) is the Sunday during the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread commemorating the first grain of spring that was to be lifted up and offered to God as a precondition to eating it; acknowledging Him as the One who provided all their food for them. In Paul's use of applying this term to

Also interesting to realize is that three of the four authors of the Gospels wrote divinely inspired Letters and two “Books” during the time of the early Church:

1. Peter, whom many believe was the “voice” behind the Gospel of Mark, wrote two Letters (1st and 2nd Peter), and
2. Luke wrote the Book of Acts, and
3. John wrote three Letters and the Book of Revelation, dating 90-96 AD (1st, 2nd, 3rd John and Revelation).

Yet *none of them, nor anyone else in the rest of the New Testament*, speak of Sunday being “the new day of assembly,” or of Sunday replacing the 7th day Sabbath. It’s impossible to believe that such a dramatic change as Sabbath to Sunday would not have a single Scripture by any of the writers of the New Testament, if indeed, such a change had taken place during their lives.

## Sunday in Troas

<sup>6</sup>“But we sailed away from Philippi *after the Days of Unleavened Bread*, and in five days joined them at Troas, where *we stayed seven days*. <sup>7</sup>Now on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together *to break bread*, Paul, *ready to depart the next day*, spoke to them and *continued his message until midnight*. <sup>8</sup>There were *many lamps in the upper room* where they were gathered together. <sup>9</sup>And in a window sat a certain young man named Eutychus, who was sinking into a deep sleep. He was overcome by sleep and as Paul continued speaking, *he fell down from the third story and was taken up dead*. <sup>10</sup>But Paul went down, fell on him, and embracing him said, “Do not trouble yourselves, for his life is in him!” <sup>11</sup>Now when he had come up, *had broken bread and eaten*, and talked a long while, *even until daybreak*, he departed. <sup>12</sup>And they brought the young man in alive, and they were not a little comforted. <sup>13</sup>Then we went ahead to the ship and sailed to Assos, there intending to take Paul on board, for so he had given orders, intending himself to go on foot.” (Acts 20:6-13)

Even more bleak for Sunday, or rather, the first day of the week as the Bible speaks of “Sunday,” is the fact that from Acts through Revelation it’s only mentioned twice, and one of those times isn’t Sunday at all, but Saturday night. Acts 20:7 states that it was the first day of the week when the disciples in Troas met to break bread.<sup>60</sup> Paul began to preach in the *evening* of that first day, as the lamps (v. 8), and the fact that Paul preached to midnight (v. 7) and then until daybreak (v. 11), testify to.

Biblically, the first day of the week (i.e. Sunday) *begins on Saturday night at darkness*, when the Sabbath

---

Yeshua we can know for certain that Yeshua was raised from the dead on the first day of the week. For more on this see [First Sheaf](#).

<sup>60</sup> Samuele Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday* (Rome, Italy: The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977), p. 104f. It’s p. 63f., in Avram’s PDF of the book [From Sabbath to Sunday](#). Roman Catholics teach that this chapter speaks of *Sunday communion* with “the breaking of bread” (Acts 20:7, 11), and so it justifies Sunday for them, but the term was only equated with *the Lord’s Supper after* Apostolic times. In Scripture it can mean the Lord’s Supper, or when Yeshua fed the multitude, or a fellowship meal, etc. Kirsopp Lake said v. 7 was a common meal, with the meaning, “having supper.” Verse 11, using the same term, speaks of Paul, *and only Paul*, eating food (the Greek verbs in both are in the singular). It’s not the Lord’s Supper or “Sunday communion,” an essential part of *Sunday* Catholic worship, in Acts 20:7, 11.

Acts 2:46 is often quoted as the “breaking of bread” equaling the Lord’s Supper, but it speaks of it happening in their *homes*, which implies the eating of a regular meal together, especially when it writes of *eating their food*; “So continuing *daily* with one accord in the temple, and *breaking bread* (i.e. food) from house to house, *they ate their food* with gladness and simplicity of heart” (NKJV).

ends and the first day of the biblical week (“Sunday”) begins. Saturday, late afternoon, just before the Sabbath ends, is when Jews get together in synagogues to say “farewell” to the Sabbath and to welcome in (the first day of) the new week.<sup>61</sup> This is when the Christians got together in Troas. It was Saturday evening, not Sunday morning “for church.”

Many Christian scholars today realize that Paul began preaching on Saturday night, not Sunday night, as previously had been held. Either way though, Acts 20:7 doesn’t constitute the “earliest unambiguous evidence...for Christians gathering together for worship on” Sunday,<sup>62</sup> as F. F. Bruce wrote. “*Unambiguous evidence*”? Really? How sad that such a scholar as Bruce uses the powerful adjective *unambiguous* to describe Sunday being established, when the verse is light years away from being unambiguous!

Luke mentions nothing of Sunday being a “new day” to assemble on and being holy, something we would expect if Sunday had actually replaced the Sabbath, but as we saw in Acts 20:6, in the section on the Feasts of Israel, Luke writes of Paul & Friends staying at Philippi *for the Feast of Unleavened Bread*. It would hardly seem believable that they kept the Mosaic Law Feast of Unleavened Bread, and also kept Sunday, without the least mention of why; if not here then somewhere else.

Saturday night, the first day of the week, wasn’t a “new Christian time,” but an old Jewish one (that remains to this day in the synagogues), that normally lasts less than an hour, as they bid farewell to the Sabbath and welcome in the new week. With special guest Paul being there, and needing to leave Troas on Sunday morning, the Apostle preached all night long until daybreak. The *only reason though*, why Luke even mentions this meeting in Troas is not because Sunday “was already established,” as many theologians pathetically teach in their grasping for “any straw” to justify their Sunday assembly, *but because Paul raised Eutychus from the dead!*

At midnight Eutychus fell down “from the third story,” dead and Paul brought him back to life (Acts 20:9-10, 12). Luke wants Theophilus, and us, to realize that the Holy Spirit was working as powerfully in Paul as the Holy Spirit worked in Peter, when God used Peter to raise Tabitha from the dead (Acts 9:40). ***That’s why Luke writes of this time in Troas*** and the meeting that began on the night of the first day of the week (i.e. Saturday night). It has absolutely nothing to do with Sunday being the new day of assembly despite the claim of certainty by Bruce.

Acts 20:7, which took place in 57 AD or 27 years *after* the resurrection, cannot be used “to establish” a *weekly Sunday meeting* because it was a special meeting in which the disciples of Troas were bidding farewell to Paul, who would leave at daybreak on Sunday morning (v. 11), and it was also a traditional weekly time when the disciples met to bid goodbye to the Sabbath and “hello” to the beginning of the new week. Luke’s reason for writing about the meeting was to reveal that the same power of the Holy Spirit Peter had displayed was also resident within Paul.

Luke ***never*** mentions Sunday meetings, either in Acts 20 or anywhere in Acts. For Luke, the evening of the first day of the week is Saturday night because he “kept time” biblically, as his continual use of the Feasts of Israel and the Sabbath in Acts reveal. Even if one wants to push, as some do, for it being Sunday night when the meeting began, it wouldn’t serve as the basis for Sunday assembly because it’s not a sin to meet on any day or night of the week, but it is a sin to desecrate God’s holy 7th day Sabbath by counting it as just another day of the week. Using this passage “to prove” weekly Sunday meetings that had replaced the Sabbath only reveals how desperate Sunday pastors are to justify their patently unscriptural and Roman Catholic position.

---

<sup>61</sup> The church is patterned after the synagogue—church officials parallel synagogue officials. See [Synagogue and Church Officials](#).

<sup>62</sup> Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday*, p. 101; it’s p. 60 in [From Sabbath to Sunday](#). The quote is from F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts*, 1954, pp. 407-408.

## Sunday—Mentioned Only Once From Acts To Revelation

The only time that Sunday is actually seen in Scripture, from Acts to Revelation is in First Corinthians 16:2, and it doesn't have anything to do with a weekly assembling in church. Paul is exhorting the Corinthians to set aside some funds *in their homes* every Sunday toward a special gift for the poor Jewish believers ("saints") *in Jerusalem*, to be collected when Paul came to Corinth. This mention of Sunday is not a church service, nor is there any mention of them assembling on Sunday, nor of a tithes and offerings basket being passed around in church on Sunday, as most pastors pharisaically teach; twisting and distorting God's Word to their own traditions that nullify the Word of God:

<sup>1</sup>"Now concerning *the collection for the saints*, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, so you must do also: <sup>2</sup>*On the first day of the week let each one of you lay something aside, storing up as he may prosper*, that there *be no collections when I come*. <sup>3</sup>And when I come, whomever you approve by your letters I will send to *bear your gift to Jerusalem*." (1st Corinthians 16:1-3)

Paul desired to take a special love offering from many churches for the poor saints in Jerusalem as a sign of Gentile love and unity with the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem (2nd Cor. 9:1-5; cf. Rom. 15:26; Acts 24:17). Here in 1st Cor. 16:2, Paul says to the Corinthians that every Sunday "*each of you*" was to "*lay something aside*." Each individual was to set some money *aside, storing it up*, which means that he would do it in his home, not in a Sunday church meeting. It's obvious that the person wasn't in the church.

This cite is not a church service nor even a central place in the church (e.g. a "treasury room"), where the people could come and place their funds. The individual was "storing up" his offering in his own home every Sunday, the first day of the *work* week, when he would get paid (for they paid people at the end of each work day; cf. Mt. 20:8f.). This way, when Paul came to Corinth, everyone would bring their funds they had saved up to him at the Sabbath church meeting place, to give him their gift for Jerusalem. This is what Paul means when he says at the end of v. 2, "that there *be no collections when I come*."

The first day of the week (i.e. Sunday) is the first day of the (biblical) work week. The ancients were usually paid on a daily basis, and so Paul was telling them to set some of it aside every Sunday (evening). Paul didn't want to be embarrassed if they failed to have any funds to give him, and he didn't want them to be embarrassed, either, especially as he was bringing Christians from other churches with him and he had already spoken to them about how zealous Corinth had been to do this (2nd Cor. 9:1-5). Any use of First Corinthians 16:1-3 "to prove" that Sunday had replaced the Sabbath in the days of the Apostles evaporates upon a simple reading of the text.<sup>63</sup>

## The Resurrection and Sunday

Many Christians think that Christ being resurrected on Sunday<sup>64</sup> warrants or justifies Sunday overturning the Sabbath and making Sunday "the Christian Sabbath," but the Kingdom of Heaven is not a democracy. God makes the rules. There is no Scripture that supports Sunday replacing God's 7th day Sabbath. In other words, Christians may feel very strongly about Sunday replacing "the Jewish Sabbath," but they have no biblical basis for it, including the Sunday resurrection.

The Church, teaching that Sunday has replaced the Sabbath, has nullified God's Sabbath *commandment*. If God didn't nullify or replace the Sabbath, no one has authority to replace His Sabbath with Sunday. Using the resurrection as a basis for the change is a noble Pharisaic idea, but it's obviously not God's idea

---

<sup>63</sup> For a further understanding of this text see [The Lord's Day—Sunday?](#), pp. 10-11.

<sup>64</sup> Mt. 28:1, 9; Mk. 16:1-2, 9; Lk. 24:1, 30-31, 36; Jn. 20:1, 11f.

(cf. 2nd Sam. 7:1-13f.).

Some Christians think they “can choose to keep any day as their Sabbath,” citing Romans 14:5-6:<sup>65</sup>

<sup>5</sup>“*One person esteems one day above another; another esteems every day alike.* Let each be fully convinced in his own mind. <sup>6</sup>He who observes the day, observes it to the Lord; and he who does not observe the day, to the Lord he does not observe it. He who eats, eats to the Lord, for he gives God thanks; and he who does not eat, to the Lord he does not eat, and gives God thanks.” (Romans 14:5-6 NKJV)

In Romans 14:5-6 Paul speaks of one man esteeming “one day above another,” while another man esteems all days alike and that each man should “be fully convinced.” Either way though, they observe it unto the Lord. These two verses, with context, seem to imply everyone can choose their own day to assemble on, and if the Church has chosen Sunday it’s alright. Context though, destroys that understanding.

In Romans 14 Paul is dealing with the same problem he dealt with previously in 1st Cor. 10—the eating of meat from the pagan marketplace that had been sacrificed to idols, with the leftovers sold to the public marketplace for people to buy (Rom. 14:1-3). Some Gentile Christians in Rome thought they couldn’t eat any of the meat because it was associated with idolatry. They were the “veggie only” eaters (Rom. 14:2), *who also fasted on certain days*, and hence, they *esteemed those days of fasting* above other days, but the meat eaters ate the meat and they didn’t fast, and *they esteemed each day alike* (for eating). Aside from the fact that the Sabbath isn’t even mentioned in Romans 14 (nor anywhere else in Romans), Paul *isn’t* saying that one can override God’s Sabbath for any day he chooses as “his Sabbath,” but rather he can choose which day he wants to fast on, thereby *esteeming that day* “above the others” for himself.

If Paul was allowing for Sunday or any day to replace the Sabbath, we would expect something more explicit than a nebulous reference to esteeming one day above another and be “fully convinced” in one’s own mind, and that observing “any day” one observes it to the Lord and the other doesn’t. If this is Paul’s way of telling us that Sunday or any day can replace the Sabbath, the Apostle is very scanty on the “why” of it, and also, he never mentions anything like this anywhere else in any of his other Letters. We would expect that somewhere in his Letters it would have been clearly written as such—at least two or three times, perhaps in most of his Letters, because Scripture says that at the mouth of two or three witnesses the truth is established,<sup>66</sup> yet there’s *nothing* written about Sunday being “the new day” or replacing the Sabbath, or Sunday being “the Lord’s Day.”<sup>67</sup> in any of his Letters, Romans 14:5-6 notwithstanding, nor anywhere else in the New Testament. With not one clear and plain scriptural witness it’s biblically certain that Paul isn’t speaking of one’s Christian ability to choose any days as “their Sabbath,” and that Sunday did *not* replace the Sabbath in New Testament times (i.e. 30-96 AD). Therefore, Sunday assembly, in lieu of Sabbath assembly and holiness, is a tradition of the Church that *nullifies* God’s Word and that’s sin. Sunday keeping churches have no authority from God to meet on Sunday<sup>68</sup> instead of keeping God’s 7th day Sabbath holy and meeting on it.

It’s also interesting that the biblical Pentecost is always on a Sunday, 50 days from the Sunday of First

---

<sup>65</sup> For a fuller explanation of why Rom. 14:5-6 can’t be used to support making Sunday one’s Sabbath, nor that Paul has eradicated the Mosaic dietary laws (Rom. 14:14), see [Romans 14 and the Dietary Laws](#).

<sup>66</sup> Dt. 17:6; 19:15; Mt. 18:16; 2nd Cor. 13:1; Heb. 10:28. Even though these speak of two human witnesses, it’s an axiom that also applies to Scripture, where two or three Scripture witnesses confirm a biblical truth.

<sup>67</sup> The term “the Lord’s Day” is mentioned only once in the New Testament (Rev. 1:10) and some Christians see this as Sunday, but Scripture never equates it with Sunday in either the Old or New Testaments. John is referring to the future Day of Judgment (i.e. the Day of God’s vengeance upon the wicked of mankind; cf. Is. 2:2; 13:6, 9; 34:8; Jer. 46:10; Ezk. 13:5; 30:3; Joel 1:15; 2:11, 31; 3:14; Amos 5:18, 20; Obadiah 1:15; Zephaniah 1:7-8, 14, 18; 2:2-3; Malachi 4:5; Acts 2:20; 1st Cor. 5:5; 2nd Cor. 1:14; 1st Thess. 5:2; 2nd Peter 3:10). For more on “the Lord’s Day” see [The Lord’s Day—Sunday?](#)

<sup>68</sup> It’s not a sin to meet on Sunday or Monday, etc., but it is a sin to not keep the Sabbath day holy and substitute Sunday for it.

Sheaf (during Passover week) and that God the Father made the Sunday of Pentecost an annual Sabbath,<sup>69</sup> but He didn't make First Sheaf an annual Sabbath, even though He knew that His Son would rise from the dead on First Sheaf. This says a lot about how the Father and the Son view the resurrection, and also, how wrong it is for Christians to try and justify Sunday over the Sabbath because of the resurrection on the Sunday of First Fruits.

Sunday is seen six times in the Gospels in relation to the resurrection, but not once does anyone say it replaced the Sabbath and nowhere does it speak of Sunday being the new day of assembly. Sunday is seen only one other time in all the New Testament after the resurrection, and that's in First Corinthians, but as we saw the cite speaks of individuals, on Sunday, setting aside funds *in their own homes* for a future gift to the poor Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. It has nothing to do with an "established weekly Sunday service," as some Christian pastors wrongly teach.

It isn't God's will for Christians to keep Sunday in lieu of the Sabbath.<sup>70</sup> Add to this the fact that neither Easter nor Christmas are even mentioned in the New Testament, and it's crystal clear that *illicit SEX* (the keeping of Sunday, Easter and Xmas, etc.) is not of God, but of the Enemy of our souls. If Satan cannot take us away from Jesus of Nazareth, he can and has perverted the Way Christians walk out their faith in the Jewish King of Israel.

The time span of the New Testament *after* the resurrection is 30 to 96 AD. Sunday began to replace God's seventh day Sabbath 24 years later, in 120 AD, when all the Apostles were dead. The Bishop of Rome, whose office today is known as the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church, orchestrated this diabolical change, which happened *90 years after* the resurrection. Many Christians at that time though, didn't obey him because they knew the Truth. The churches of the East (Israel, Lebanon, Syria and Turkey, etc.) continued to keep the Sabbath day holy and disregarded Sunday for *200 more years*, until the Roman Church gained political power under Constantine (320 AD). Then those who didn't bow to Rome were persecuted by the Roman Catholic Church, and yet Gentile and Jewish Christians continued to keep the Sabbath and Passover and walk in a Mosaic Law lifestyle, as we'll see in *Church History And Mosaic Law* on p. 29f.

## Sunday and the Resurrection in the Didache and Clement

Samuel Bacchiocchi presents the *Didache* and Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians*, two of the earliest Christian documents after the New Testament as proof that the resurrection, which is what Christians say today as the reason for Sunday, was *not* used to establish Sunday over the Sabbath. He writes:

"In the *immediate* post New Testament literature, the resurrection is...*not* cited as the... reason for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, *or for the observance of Sunday*. The *Didache*, regarded as the most ancient source of ecclesiastical legislation (dated between 70-150 AD), devotes three brief chapters (9, 10, 14) to the *manner* of celebrating the Lord's Supper, yet in the thanksgiving prayer, only "life, knowledge, church unity, faith, immortality, creation and food are mentioned (chaps. 9, 10). *No allusion to Christ's resurrection is seen.*"<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> For why the biblical Pentecost is anchored on Sunday, unlike Judaism's "Pentecost," which can occur on any day of the week, see [First Sheaf](#).

<sup>70</sup> The fashionable term "Resurrection Day" has replaced "Easter" in many churches, but that doesn't change its date, nor its rites. Many times it's not the Sunday when Yeshua rose from the dead because the calculation for Easter is the third Sunday after the vernal equinox; while 14 days after the new moon after the vernal (spring) equinox determines when the biblical Passover begins, and that Sunday in Passover week is First Sheaf/Fruits.

<sup>71</sup> Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday*, pp. 78-79f. In [From Sabbath to Sunday](#) it's p. 46f.

“In Clement’s *Epistle to the Corinthians* (95 AD) known as “the earliest Christian document outside of the New Testament, four chapters deal with the resurrection (24-27). Seeking to reassure the Christians of Corinth that “there is to be a resurrection, of which he made the Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits” (24:1), Clement uses three different symbols:

1. the day-night cycle,
2. the reproductive cycle of the seed (24) and
3. the legend of the phoenix from whose corpse allegedly another bird arose (25).”<sup>72</sup>

“The *omission* of the Lord’s Supper *and of Sunday worship*—allegedly the most telling symbols of all—are certainly surprising, if indeed, as some hold, the Eucharist was already (being) celebrated on Sunday and had acquired the commemorative value of the resurrection. What more effective way for the Bishop of Rome” (i.e. Clement) “to reassure the Corinthian Christians of their future resurrection then by reminding them that the Lord’s Supper, of which they (allegedly) partook every Sunday, was their most tangible assurance of their own resurrection?! On the contrary, not only is this omitted, but he specifically speaks of “the sacrifices and the services” in Jerusalem as “things the Master has commanded us to perform” (40:2-4). The reference to the sacrificial system services reflects not only the high esteem in which they were held by him, but also the continuance of the sacrifices, though in a reduced form, after 70 AD.”<sup>73</sup>

“Clement hardly allows for the radical break with the Jewish laws like the Sabbath and for the adoption of a new day of worship. On the other hand, just a few decades later ...*the first timid references to the resurrection*, which is presented as an added or secondary reason for Sunday worship.”<sup>74</sup>

“Noted Catholic scholar C. S. Mosna sees this and writes that by the fourth century, “an explicit link” was made between the *resurrection and Sunday* observance, but that “in the *first three centuries* the memory of the resurrection was hardly mentioned””<sup>75</sup> in support of Sunday replacing the Sabbath.

These two historical documents and the admission by Mosna prove that commemorating or keeping Sunday “because of the resurrection” was not known in the days immediately after the Apostles, who always kept the 7th day Sabbath holy. This confirms that Sunday assembly over Sabbath assembly and holiness is not of the Lord God of Israel. The Reformers would have been pleased to know that.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., p. 79. Clement was Bishop of Rome, a title that would soon be overshadowed by that of “Pope.”

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., note 14. See K. Clark, *Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after 70 A.D.*

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., p. 80.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid. Mosna, *Storia della domenica*, p. 357. W. Rordorf, *Sabbat* (texts), p. xvi, in spite of his endeavor to defend an opposite thesis, also admits: “we can indicate with reasons that the justification for Sunday on the basis of the resurrection of Jesus, does not appear until the second century and even then very timidly.”

<sup>76</sup> One motto of the Reformers was the Latin phrase, *Sola Scriptural*; *Only Scripture* is divine and therefore authoritative for what we are to believe, and what we should put into practice. The Reformers saw many things wrong with the Roman Catholic Church and corrected some of them, but unfortunately they didn’t see Rome’s *illicit SEX*. Christians who want to please their Lord should be keeping the same day that He kept, “as was His custom” (Luke 4:16).

For more on these ancient documents see [The Lord’s Day–Sunday?](#) beginning on p. 20, *After the Apostles*.

# CHURCH HISTORY AND MOSAIC LAW

Church history confirms that the seventh day Sabbath, the Feasts of Israel and Mosaic Law were still valid for Christians in the days of the Apostles and well into the fourth century. The ancient Jewish Christian sect of the Nazarenes were the *spiritual descendants of the Apostles*.<sup>77</sup> They were originally based in Jerusalem. Eusebius (260-340 AD), an official Roman Catholic witness, was a bishop and church historian. Writing of the Jewish leadership of the Jerusalem Church in 135 AD, Eusebius says it,

“consisted of converted Hebrews” and was administered by 15 bishops from the “*circumcision*”<sup>78</sup> and they were “*zealous to insist on the literal observance of the Law.*”<sup>79</sup>

These Nazarenes, *105 years after* the resurrection, were keeping Mosaic Law, which means that they celebrated the Feasts of Israel and kept the 7th day Sabbath holy, etc. Interesting to note is that some Christians today argue that “with no Temple,” you can’t keep (any) Mosaic Law, but obviously the Nazarenes thought otherwise. The Temple in Jerusalem had been destroyed in 70 AD, yet 65 years after that Eusebius says that the Nazarenes literally kept (all Mosaic) Law (that applied to them).

Epiphanius (315-403) is another official Roman Catholic witness. He was also a bishop and church historian. He wrote of the Nazarenes in his time, more than *300 years after* the resurrection, and says,

“The Nazarenes do not differ in any essential thing from them” (i.e. non-Christian Jews), “*since they practice the custom and doctrines prescribed by the Jewish Law, except that they believe in Christ...they fulfill until now Jewish rites as...the Sabbath and others.*”<sup>80</sup>

Epiphanius confirms that well into the fourth century the Nazarenes continued to keep Sabbath, Feasts and Mosaic Law. Bacchiocchi writes that Easter began in the *second* century with the Church of Rome, in direct opposition to God’s Passover. He states:

“Easter (was) introduced *first in Rome* in the early part of the second century to differentiate” (it from) “the...Passover...of the Jews.”<sup>81</sup>

Easter did not originate with the Apostles nor with the New Testament, but with the Roman Catholic Church in 120 AD. Before that all Christians kept Passover (and by extension, the other Feasts of Israel, the Sabbath and Mosaic Law). Easter is a pagan “holy day” and has nothing to do with Jesus, but honors the fertility goddess Ishtar, who raised her dead son on Ishtar (Easter) Sunday, as the savior of the world.

Two prominent Catholic historians reveal that the Nazarenes, for more than *300 years after* the resurrection, kept Mosaic Law, the Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel. This complements New Testament Scripture and confirms that the Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel, etc., were kept by the Apostles and all Christians in Apostolic times. The Lord wants all Christians today to keep His Days and Ways, not Rome’s.

---

<sup>77</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 156; p. 93 in Avram’s PDF: “the Nazarenes, as most scholars maintain, are indeed the “direct descendants of the primitive community of Jerusalem”...(and) retained *the original practice of Jewish Christianity.*” (Those ancient Jewish Nazarenes are not to be confused with the modern Nazarene Church, which only came into existence a little over a hundred years ago.)

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., p. 152; p. 91 in Avram’s PDF. Eusebius, *HE* 4, 5, 2-11; Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 70, 10, PG 42, 355-356.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, see also p. 92, note 398 in the PDF. Eusebius, *HE* 3, 27, 3, trans. by Kirsopp Lake; *Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History*, 1949, I, p. 263; cf. Acts 21:20-24.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., p. 156; in Avram’s PDF, p. 93. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 29, 7, PG 41, 402. Circumcision of the eight day old Jewish boy is still required by God because the Jew is literally still part of the covenant that God made with Father Abraham (Gen. 17:10-14; Acts 21:20-24), but the Gentile believer never was. He and his son must not be physically, *covenantally* circumcised because God comes against this in the New Covenant, for both Jew and Gentile come into Messiah’s Kingdom through faith in Yeshua. For more on this, see [Gentile Circumcision?](#)

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., p. 192; in Avram’s PDF, p. 114.

## Sunday—Pharisaic Catholicism

The Roman Catholic Church changed God’s Sabbath to Sunday in 120 AD (when it also threw out Mosaic Law). They didn’t have the authority from God (Scripture) to do that, but it didn’t stop them because a basic tenet of Catholicism is that the Pope and/or the teachings of the Catholic Fathers and/or the Councils override Scripture. They readily acknowledge their heretical change from Sabbath to Sunday.

Karl Keating (1950 to present), writing under the Imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Church, is an official Catholic witness that Sunday is a Catholic institution, not ordained by God. He wrote:

“fundamentalists (i.e. Protestants) meet for worship on Sunday, yet there is no evidence in the Bible that corporate worship was to be made on Sundays...It was the Catholic Church that decided Sunday should be the day of worship.”<sup>82</sup>

Gaspar de Fosso (1496-1592) the Archbishop of Reggio, another official Roman Catholic witness, mocked the Sunday Protestants who claimed that the Bible was their authority for what they believed and therefore practiced. In 1562 he said,

“The Protestants claim to stand upon the written word only. They profess to hold the Scripture alone as the standard of faith. They justify their revolt” (against the Catholic Church) “by the plea that the” Roman “Church has apostatized *from the written word and follows tradition*. Now the Protestant claim that they stand upon the written word only, *is not true*. Their profession of holding the Scripture alone as the standard of faith is false. PROOF—*The written word explicitly enjoins the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath.*”

“They do not observe the seventh day, but reject it. *If they do truly hold the Scripture alone as their standard, they would be observing the seventh day as is enjoined in the Scripture throughout*. Yet they not only reject the observance of the Sabbath enjoined in the written word, *but they have adopted and do practice the observance of Sunday, for which they have **only the tradition of the” Roman) “Church***. Consequently, the claim of “Scripture alone as the standard,” fails, and the doctrine of “Scripture *and* tradition” as essential” Catholic doctrine “is fully established; *the Protestants themselves being” practitioners and “judges.*”<sup>83</sup>

Such a powerful and clear presentation of the issue. Keating and Gaspar de Fosso are right. Protestants don’t have Scripture to justify Sunday. In changing Sabbath to Sunday the Roman Catholic Church conceptually followed their true Fathers, the Pharisees, who placed their traditions above the Word of God. Yeshua rhetorically asked the Pharisees, “Why do you *transgress* the commandment of God because of your tradition?” (Mt. 15:3) He’s also asking today that *of every Sunday keeping Christian*.

Archbishop James Cardinal Gibbons (1834-1921) is a third official Catholic witness to the change of Sabbath to Sunday by the Roman Catholic Church. In 1876 he wrote,

“is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday?...*read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday*. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.”<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Karl Keating, *Catholicism and Fundamentalism*, copyright 1988 by Ignatius Press, San Francisco, p. 38, bearing the Nihil Obstat and Imprimatur (the official sanction) of the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>83</sup> J. H. Holtzman, *Canon and Tradition*, published in Ludwigsburg, Germany, 1859, p. 263. Archbishop of Reggio’s address in the 17th session of the Council of Trent, in Mansi SC, Vol. 33, cols. 529, 530. The Archbishop of Reggio, Gaspar (Ricciulli) de Fosso made this speech at the last opening session of the Council of Trent reconvened under the new Pope (Pius IV) on January 18, 1562.

These three official Catholic witnesses testify that Sunday is not of God, but of the Roman Catholic Church. Sunday Christians are following the heretical tradition of the Roman Catholic Church that nullifies God's Word, but that's not all of Catholicism that Sunday Christians follow.

Xmas came into the Roman Catholic Church around 350 AD, again by decree of a Pope. The Pope took the pagan Roman feast of Saturnalia, where fir trees were set up in homes with silver and gold tinsel, gifts exchanged, pigs eaten, sports and banquets celebrated with uproar, and parties abounded, and placed the name of *Jesus* over Saturn, and called it Christ's Mass (i.e. Christmas).<sup>85</sup> Xmas is just the Catholic way of celebrating Saturn's birthday.

Alexander Hislop writes of Saturnalia, how it predates the Messiah of Israel and that the Catholic Church brought it into its fold to entice pagans, who loved Saturnalia and all its gala, to join the Church:

“Long before the fourth century, and long before the Christian era itself, a festival was celebrated among the *heathen* at that *precise time* of the year (25 Dec), in honour of the *birth of the son of the Babylonian queen of heaven*” (aka Ishtar/Easter) “and it may fairly be presumed that, in order to conciliate the heathen and to swell the number of the nominal adherents of Christianity, the same festival was adopted by the Roman Church, giving it only the name of Christ.”<sup>86</sup>

The Roman Catholic Church used Saturnalia (the Roman version of the Babylonian festival), and changed the name to Christ's Mass, as a way of drawing pagans into Catholicism, just as they had previously done with Sunday and Easter. Most of these new members would remain just as pagan as they had always been, seeing that the only thing that changed was the name of their feast and the name of the god of their feast.

The Protestant churches walk in the pagan traditions of the Roman Catholic Church (*illicit SEX*) and think they are of God, just as the Pharisees did their traditions. In this Christians are honorary Catholics and Pharisees and don't even realize it.

God's Word is clear—the Sabbath, the Feasts of Israel and Mosaic Law were never annulled, but intensified and amplified with the death and resurrection of the Messiah of Israel. In other words, now we know that the rules of Mosaic Law reflect God the Son; His nature and what He has done and will do for us, as well as His Father and the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>84</sup> James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, *The Faith of Our Fathers*, originally published in 1876, pp. 111-112 (63rd edition); p. 86 (76th edition); republished and copyright 1980 by TAN Books and Publishers, Inc., pages 72-73. See [Sunday—The Catholic Sabbath](#).

<sup>85</sup> See [Christ's Mass](#).

<sup>86</sup> Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, 2nd American edition (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1959), p. 92; p. 71 in *The Full Hislop*. Hislop overwhelmingly proves that the Roman Catholic Church is not a Christian church at all, but the Babylon of the New Testament (Rev. 14:8; 17:5; cf. 18:4). [The Two Babylons—The Full Hislop](#) is Avram Yehoshua's compilation of the entire book with all its illustrations. *The Two Babylons*, like Bacchiocchi's [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), are Christian classic “must reads.” One of the titles of the son of the Queen of Heaven is The Emancipator (i.e. Savior-god) p. 97, note \*; p. 74, note 361 in *The Full Hislop*. For the Xmas tree see p. 97f.; p. 74f., in *TFH*.

# CONCLUSION

With Luke and the Apostle Paul using *eight Feasts of Israel as time markers after* the resurrection and also, Paul exhorting his Gentile Corinthians to keep Passover, it's clear that in the days of the Apostles all Christians kept the Feasts of Israel. Because the Feasts are part of Mosaic Law it means that Mosaic Law was the standard and lifestyle for Christians to walk out their faith in the Jewish Messiah. This is supported into the fourth century by two Roman Catholic bishop-historians, who although they were totally against the Law, presented the Nazarenes, the literal Jewish spiritual descendants of the Apostles, as keeping Mosaic Law.

On the other hand, nowhere in the New Testament are Easter or Christmas even mentioned, let alone taught to be observed. The Scriptures are God's authoritative guideline for what we are to believe and therefore, put into practice. In other words we know God's will by His Word, and so it's certainly *not* His will for Christians to keep Easter or Xmas, especially as they nullify God's holy Feasts and are an adulteration and profanation of His holy instructions to us (i.e. Mosaic Law). God doesn't want Christians offering up to Him pagan feast days which have nothing to do with Him or His Son. According to God's Word it is sin *not* to keep the Feasts of Israel, and conversely, it is sin to keep pagan feasts like Easter and Xmas (Dt. 12:28-32). God has not given man the authority to create holy days. God has reserved that for Himself. This understanding also applies to the weekly 7th day Sabbath.

The Sabbath is seen *11 times* in the New Testament *after* the resurrection, with *eight* of them scripturally establishing the Sabbath day for Christians. Nowhere does Luke (or anyone else) add that the Church was "now" meeting on Sunday, which is the very least we would expect if the day had changed during the years of the Apostles, the Lord's Day of Rev. 1:10 notwithstanding.<sup>87</sup>

The Book of Acts is the *only* divinely inspired historical account of the Apostolic Church (30-64 AD), yet it contains nothing about Sunday replacing the 7th day Sabbath, nor is anything written about keeping Sunda in any of the New Testament, which goes to 96 AD. Also important is that neither Luke, nor any other New Testament writer, was trying to *prove* that the Feasts of Israel and the Sabbath were still valid. It was "a given." The writers who spoke of the Feasts and the Sabbath wanted us know *when* an event happened or would happen or mentioned them in a teaching:

1. Luke with the Feasts and the Sabbath and,
2. Paul with the Feast of Weeks/Pentecost (1st Cor. 16:8) and,
3. Paul to admonish the Corinthian Christians to keep the Passover/Feast of Unleavened Bread in a holy manner (1st Cor. 5:6-8), or
4. Paul when speaking of the Sabbath and Feasts in general (Col. 2:16-17) because some Gnostics had come into the congregation and they were telling the people that they were to keep them "the Gnostic Way;" not if they should be kept or that they shouldn't be kept because they were "only" shadows of Christ, and also,
5. To underscore a theological point that the Author of Hebrews in 4:9 wrote of; to strive to enter into the Sabbath rest.

In none of these cites is Sunday even mentioned, let alone held up as the new day of assembly because of the resurrection. The *need* to prove that the Feasts and the Sabbath were still valid was not why the writers of the New Testament wrote of the Feasts and the Sabbath—that need is a modern Christian dilemma due to false days being taught by Rome. The writing of the Feasts by Luke and Paul, and the Sabbath by Luke, Paul and the Author of Hebrews, without speaking of anything contravening them, certainly vali-

---

<sup>87</sup> See [The Lord's Day—Sunday?](#) for why the Lord's Day is not Sunday.

dates “the Jewish Days.”

Further underscoring the biblical fact of the Sabbath is the glaring theological near-absence of Sunday in the New Testament after the Gospel resurrection accounts. It’s mentioned six times in the Gospels concerning Yeshua’s resurrection, but not one Gospel writer speaks of it replacing the Sabbath. From Acts through Revelation, Sunday is only mentioned once, in 1st Cor. 16:2, and it has nothing to do with Sunday assembly, but with Paul telling his Corinthians to set aside in their own homes (not the church), some of their funds every week on Sunday (evening) for a special love gift to the poor Christians in Jerusalem. The Corinthians would bring their love offering to their meeting place when Paul came. There’s no mention of a weekly Sunday church meeting. Therefore, this *lone* Sunday Scripture cannot be used to overthrow God’s 7th day Sabbath that Israel had walked in for 1,400 years especially as the various New Testament cites and authors listed above confirm the continuation of the seventh day Sabbath. The Apostolic Church *never* met on Sunday in lieu of the Sabbath.

Even if a die-hard Christian believes that 1st Cor. 16:2 “proves” that Sunday replaced the Sabbath, there isn’t a second witness to support it, Acts 20:7 notwithstanding because it doesn’t speak of a Sunday meeting in Troas, but a Saturday night meeting, which is when the first day of the week biblically begins. The believers got together to say goodbye to the Sabbath (and Paul) and to welcome in the new week, a standard Jewish practice. The reason Luke writes of it is not to present Sunday as “the new day of weekly assembly,” but to reveal that by the raising of Eutychus, the Holy Spirit worked in Paul as powerfully as in Peter. Yet, even if one thinks it was a Sunday night meeting, it cannot prove that weekly Sunday night meetings were the norm because nowhere does Luke, nor anyone else state that and also, this meeting was a special one, out of the ordinary, since the Apostle Paul had been in Troas for a week and after the meeting in which he spoke all night until dawn, he departed (Acts 20:6, 11). For a change of this magnitude, of Sunday replacing God’s holy Sabbath, we would certainly expect to see many crystal clear Scripture witnesses, but there isn’t even one.

Yeshua was first seen and rose from the dead on the Sunday of Passover week (First Fruits/Sheaf), but there is nothing in Scripture that presents this as the basis for Sunday replacing the Sabbath. *There’s not one biblical witness to a change of days.* Underscoring this is the fact that Isaiah and Ezekiel speak of the Sabbath being observed in a time yet to come, and Yeshua spoke to those in Jerusalem, saying that they should pray that their flight, at the destruction of the city (in 70 AD), would not be on the Sabbath. Here are three more Scriptures that confirm the continuance of God’s holy Sabbath day. Neither Isaiah, Ezekiel or Yeshua envisioned or even hinted at Sunday replacing God’s seventh day Sabbath.

If God wanted “resurrection Sunday” to be holy and the prototype of a weekly Sunday assembly, He most likely would have made the *first* day of Creation Week (“Sunday”), holy and not the *seventh* day. Also, Yeshua spoke of being Lord of the *Sabbath*. Remember those, “What would Jesus do?,” bracelets of some years ago? Would He keep Sunday or the Sabbath today? Would He keep Easter or Passover? It’s obvious from the Gospels that Yeshua kept Sabbath, Passover and all Mosaic Law that applied to Him, and He would keep it today, also, because Yeshua is the *same* yesterday, *today* and forever (Heb. 13:8). In other words, if Yeshua didn’t keep all the rules of Mosaic Law that applied to Him it would be sin for Him, and so how can it not be sin for Christians who don’t follow Him in this area of lifestyle. “Grace” is not a license to sin, but God’s power from on High that helps us to overcome temptation and sin and to walk like Jesus walked (Rom. 6:1f.).

God did not change the Sabbath day to Sunday. God did not change His holy Feasts for pagan feasts, slapping the name of Jesus on them. God did not negate Mosaic Law “at the cross,” even though truly, “we’re not under the Law, but under Grace.”<sup>88</sup>

With the Roman Catholic Church openly boasting of changing Sabbath to Sunday and Passover to Easter, it proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that *illicit SEX* is not of God, but of Satan. All Gentile Christians

---

<sup>88</sup> See [No Longer Under the Law?](#)

were keeping God's holy times and holy ways (Mosaic Law) in the days of the Apostles. There would have been no need for Rome to *change* Sabbath and Passover if that change had already happened "at the death of Jesus," or during the time of the Apostles. This confirms what Scripture revealed: Sabbath and Feasts, and therefore Mosaic Law were being kept by all Christians for *70 years after* the resurrection. Mosaic Law is still God's holy lifestyle for Christians, despite the fact that the Pharisaic Christian Church vehemently teaches against it,<sup>89</sup> to their own shame and sin.

Many pastors have their proof texts and interpretations of Scripture that fortify them against Sabbath, Feasts and Mosaic Law, as did the Catholic Church Fathers before them, but those who are looking for God's Truth in these areas will be persuaded by Yeshua through the biblical evidence presented in this article and prayer. They'll see how Church history, from ancient Roman Catholic bishop-historians to modern Roman Catholic archbishops, etc., speaks of the Roman Catholic Church changing the days and ways of God, and that the Nazarenes, the spiritual descendants of the Apostles, kept Sabbath, Feasts of Israel and Mosaic Law for *hundreds of years after* the resurrection, as did many Gentiles. They'll realize that God is right and the Church is wrong, and they'll begin to order their lives around God's holy instructions, for that is what Mosaic Law is, and not the traditions of Rome that nullify it.

The churches teach against God's Feasts and Sabbaths because they believe that the Law of Moses "is not for Christians," but fail to see that the New Testament, many years *after* the resurrection, teaches otherwise. Also, most Christians don't realize the full implication of what it means for them to be *part* of God's *Israel* (Gal. 6:16; cf. Rom. 11:11f.; Gal. 6:16; Eph. 2:11f.), or the Lord's Church (Mt. 16:18; Acts 2:47; 8:1, 3; 1st Cor. 10:32), and the requisite, God-ordained lifestyle it implies (2nd Cor. 3:10-17). Because the Feasts of Israel are still valid it follows that Mosaic Law is also valid. Mosaic Law, and not just the Ten Commandments, because the Feasts of Israel are not part of the Ten, but as we've seen they were in full force *after* the resurrection throughout New Testament times. Mosaic Law was God's standard and guideline that ordered the life of Yeshua and determined whether He sinned or not, and it also determines our lifestyle and what is sin for us and and what is pleasing to God.

God set Mosaic Law in motion at Mt. Sinai, and according to the Lord Yeshua it will continue until this Earth is no more (Mt. 5:18-19; Luke 16:17). It doesn't mean it'll end then, but on Judgment Day its essence will be *written* on our hearts (Jer. 31:33; cf. Heb. 8:10; 10:16), because Mosaic Law is the written reflection of the heart, character and ways of Papa God, Messiah Yeshua and the Holy Spirit.

Satan loves to mesmerize his victims and he has done a stunning job of it for the last 1,900 years with the pageantry of Easter and the gifts and galore of Xmas. Without Mosaic Law as the standard of God's Truth, Christians have been deceived by Satan's counterfeits and don't even realize it. *Illicit SEX* and anti-Mosaic Law teachings are satanic doctrines that keep Christians from walking in God's lifestyle for them.

Many Christians can't believe that God would allow the Church to be so wrong for so long, but God spoke of this very thing more than 500 years *before* Yeshua was born, through Daniel, who said:

<sup>21</sup>"I was watching, and the same horn (the Pope) *was making war against the saints, and prevailing against them,* <sup>22</sup>until the Ancient of Days came and a judgment was made in favor of the saints of the Most High God and *the time came for the saints to possess the Kingdom.*" (Daniel 7:21-22)

<sup>25</sup>He (the Pope) shall speak blasphemous words against the Most High God. (He) *shall persecute the saints* (i.e. Christians) of the Most High God, *and (he) shall intend to change times* (Sabbath and Feasts of Israel) *and (Mosaic) Law.* Then the saints *shall be given into his hand,* for a time and times and half a time." (Daniel 7:25)

The Popes have persecuted, warred against and murdered millions of true Christians for more than 1500

---

<sup>89</sup> For an article on the Pharisaic Christian Church, its hypocrisy and false ways, specifically in relation to Mosaic Law, see [Grace, Holiness and the Pharisaic Church](#).

years, and have twisted and perverted Scripture, but judgment is coming for those who walk with the Devil and those who love the Messiah of Israel because the time to possess the Kingdom draws near. Many Christian eyes are being opened to this Roman Catholic deception, which all Protestant churches have blindly followed, and are fleeing from it.

The Roman Catholic Church also teaches “salvation by infant sprinkling,” which has no biblical basis, prayers to, and worship of “Mother Mary”<sup>90</sup> (a totally pagan, non-biblical “Mary” whose characteristics are that of the Queen of Heaven, not the Jewish maiden who bore the Son of God), and that the Catholic Mary “imparts” grace to Catholics. Add to this the unbiblical Purgatory, and the Pope being “Christ on Earth” and you have the blasphemous words against God that Daniel spoke of.<sup>91</sup> The Roman Catholic Church is *not* a Christian church.

There are one billion, two hundred million Catholics in the world, and the vast majority of them think that by belonging to the Catholic Church they will be saved and eventually go to Heaven (going through Purgatory first, and then with the help of Mother Mary, making it to the Pearly Gates where Saint Peter will let them in). That is only a part of the damnable heresies the apostate Roman Catholic Church teaches them, and they are going to be in for the shock of their lives on Judgment Day.

The Roman Catholic Church has persecuted God’s people, both literally and doctrinally, for 1900 years.<sup>92</sup> The heretical doctrines of *illicit SEX* and anti-Mosaic Law theology began with the Roman Catholic Church in 120 AD. When the Reformers spoke against Rome and/or broke away from the Roman Church (beginning in the 15th century), they didn’t realize that the teaching against Mosaic Law was heretical, and so in their ignorance they took *illicit SEX* with them.

Protestant Christianity believes, and rightfully so, that God’s Word is the divine standard for what they are to believe and therefore, how they are to walk out their faith in Christ. Yet they have blindly followed Catholic teachings for the last 500 years against Mosaic Law and teach *illicit SEX*. Christianity teaches these Catholic doctrines in the name of Jesus! This is a great deception. Jesus *is* the Way, the Truth and the Life (Jn. 14:6),<sup>93</sup> yet these two teachings have nothing to do with Him, but pervert Him and His ways.

---

<sup>90</sup> In December 1854 the Roman Catholic Church decreed that Mary was the *Mother* of God (i.e. the Holy Spirit incarnate; deity herself), that she died and she *rose from the dead*, and *ascended into heaven* and she was to be *worshipped* as the Immaculate *Virgin*, “*conceived and born without sin*” (and that she died without ever sinning). See Mt. 13:55; Mk. 6:3 for the brothers of Yeshua (James [Jacob or Yakov], Joses [Yosi], Simon [Shimon] and Judas [Judah or Yehudah] and the sisters of Jesus. Mary was not a virgin all her life, but that is how the Roman Catholic Church presents her.

Of course, this defies all Scripture about the biblical Mary, but these attributes align perfectly with the ancient pagan Queen of Heaven called by various names such as Diana and Ishtar (which is also a title of the Roman Catholic Mary). For an individual to espouse any of those four points about Mary, we’d say he was insane or greatly mistaken, but for a so-called church to teach these things proves beyond doubt that Alexander Hislop’s thesis is correct: the Roman Catholic Church is the Babylon of the New Testament (Rev. 17:5), and not a Christian church at all. (The decree’s four points were taken from Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, 2nd American edition, p. 267; p. 209 in [The Two Babylons—The Full Hislop](#).)

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211; p. 166 in *The Full Hislop*. One of the titles of the Pope is the *Vicar* of Christ, which means that the Pope is *the* physical representative of Christ on Earth, with all Christ’s authority concentrated in him.

<sup>92</sup> See <http://www.mtc.org/inquis.html> and <http://www.end-times-prophecy.org/secret-history-catholic-church.html> and <http://www.eaec.org/cults/romancatholic.htm>, which states, “In 431 AD Mary *worship* became an official doctrine of the (Roman Catholic) Church at the Council of Ephesus.”

See Dave Hunt’s, *A Woman Rides the Beast*, for the atrocities and murders the Roman Catholic Church did “in the name of Jesus,” and also <http://www.ramsheadpress.com/messiah/ch10.html> for the persecution and murder of Christians by the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>93</sup> Truth is Yeshua Himself, but

1. Truth is also Torah, which today constitutes Genesis through Revelation, and whose foundation is the five Books of Moses (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy).
2. The words, Way, Truth and Life are synonyms for Yeshua and Torah, which is God’s Word (Isaiah 1:10; 2:3;

In teaching these false doctrines Christian pastors, Sunday School teachers and theologians cause hundreds of millions of Christians to sin against Jesus and themselves. Great is the power of satanic deception that honors traditions and pagan feasts over God's Word.

God, through His Word and His Spirit, is calling every Christian "to come out of Her," meaning to leave the Roman Catholic Church and every church that teaches those two perverse teachings of Rome's (illicit SEX and that Mosaic Law is not God's lifestyle for them). Then Christians can learn to walk in God's holy days and holy ways. The Apostle John wrote:

"And I heard another Voice from Heaven saying, "***Come out of Her, My people!***, lest you share in her sins and receive of Her plagues!" (Rev. 18:4; cf. Jer. 51:6-10, 19, 24)

God is warning Christians that they have been "captured" by Rome's Days and Ways even if they've never set foot inside a Catholic Church. They must not have anything to do with any church that teaches Rome's anti-Mosaic Law doctrine and practices *illicit SEX*. The God of Israel is serious about keeping His Sabbath and Feasts, etc. (Ex. 31:12-17; Num. 9:13), and although Christians have sinned greatly against their Lord in these areas, there is forgiveness. As the Apostle Paul said to the sin-laden Athenians:

"Truly, these times of ignorance God overlooked, *but now commands all men everywhere to repent.*" (Acts 17:30)

God has provided the way for Christians to be forgiven for not having kept His laws, rules and ordinances until now—through the forgiveness that is in His Son (Acts 13:39). All we have to do is ask Him and order our lives aright.

Christian churches are institutions, and more times than not, the men in charge of them have vested interests in wanting their institutions *to remain the way they are*, even if it means rejecting God's Truth (cf. John 11:46-50). "Hello Christian Pharisees!" As it was in the days of Jesus, when He overturned the money changers' tables in the Temple, so it is today (Ecc. 1:9). Yeshua didn't come to start an institution that falsely presents Him and His ways, but to enable us to be like Him and to follow *Him*, for He is our Example in all matters of faith *and practice*.

Anti-Mosaic Law theology is so engrained into the mindset of most Christians that they believe that keeping Mosaic Law is wrong, and that keeping *illicit SEX* is right, even though there is no *biblical* support for it. Yes, there are "proof texts," but that's all they are, and as this article has revealed, Sabbath and Feasts

---

5:24).

- A. *The Way* is a synonym for Mosaic Law in Exodus 13:21; 18:20; 23:20; 32:8; Dt. 9:12, 16; 11:28; 13:5; 31:29; Ps. 25:8; 32:8; 119:1, 14, 27, 30, 33, 35 (path i.e. 'way'), 104-105; 139:24; Prov. 2:20; 15:10; 23:19; 29:27; Jer. 6:16; Mal. 2:8-9.
  - B. *The Truth* is a synonym for Torah in Ps. 119:43, 142, 151, 160; Mal. 2:6 (cf. John 17:7) and,
  - C. *The Life* is a synonym for Mosaic Law in Dt. 30:15, 19-20; 32:47; Ps. 16:11; Prov. 3:1-3, 13-18; 6:23; 10:17; 12:28, etc.
3. Yeshua, speaking the three words for Torah together is emphatically declaring that He is the Living Word of God; the Living Torah, the living embodiment of all the words or instructions of God (i.e. Mosaic Law, etc.), which emanate from God's very nature, and also the Living Example of what it is to be a true Israeli.
    - A. What was first spoken by God to Israel and then written down by Moses (Mosaic Law; Torah), is a written reflection of God the Son (and the Father and the Holy Spirit), for They are One.
    - B. The Hebrew word Torah, translated as "Law," actually means instruction or teaching, so Mosaic Law is the Instruction or Teaching of God concerning Himself, His Ways, His Nature, how He wants Israel to live out their lives before Him, and what He has for Israel and those who reject Him in the future.
  4. Yeshua didn't do away with the Law of Moses—He amplified it (Mt. 5:17-22; see also Acts 9:2; 18:25-26; 19:9, 23; 24:12, 14 concerning *The Way* as the name of the movement for the Jewish and Gentile people who believed in Yeshua and walked out their faith in Him through God's Torah, which now includes His words in the Gospels and the rest of the New Covenant).

of Israel are just the beginning. There's another Pillar of Moses called the Dietary laws, as well as other rules and regulations that God want's His people Israel to walk in.

Abraham, the Father of our faith (Rom. 4:16), was 75 years old when God called him to leave his home, his friends, his relatives and his country—everything he knew, loved and was familiar with, and to journey to a land he had never seen. It's never too late to start afresh if you're wanting God's Truth and His ways over man's heretical ways that nullify your Lord's days and ways.

In 1987 a man by the name of Richard Davis told me how he had been challenged about Xmas in 1957. He was driving in his car, listening to a Christian radio station and the pastor exclaimed, "Let's put Christ back into Christmas!" and Richard said, "Yes!" Then he heard a Voice say, "How can you put Christ back into something He was never a part of?"<sup>94</sup> Of course he was shocked, but that began his journey out of the Xmas and the traditional Protestant church and into the Days and Ways of the God of Israel.

It never ceases to amaze me that Christianity is the only religion in the world that does not emulate its Founder, but Yeshua is calling us to correct that. Let's walk as Yeshua did—in all areas of our life.

"Be *diligent* to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed (before God), *rightly* dividing the Word of Truth." (2nd Timothy 2:15)

"Whatever I command you, be careful to observe! You must not add to it nor take away from it!" (Deuteronomy 12:32)

"He who says he abides in Him ought himself also to walk just as He walked." (1st John 2:6 NKJV)

---

<sup>94</sup> Read Richard Davis' journey from Xmas to Truth in [Christmas—Its Origin](#).

# APPENDIX CHARTS

## The Feasts of Israel in the Book of Acts

The next three sections present the Scripture cites for the Feasts of Israel in Acts and First Corinthians in an easy to see, one page “at a glance” compilation. The following are the Feasts of Israel from the Book of Acts in their chronological order:

1. Acts 2:1 .....30 AD. The Feast of Weeks (*Shavu'ot*—Pentecost; Ex. 34:22; Dt. 16:9-10)
2. Acts 12:3 .....44 AD. The Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 12:8, 15f.; 23:15; 34:18; Lev. 23:6)
3. Acts 12:4 .....44 AD. Passover (Ex. 12:11, 27; Lev. 23:5; Num. 9:5; 28:16; Dt. 16:1)
4. Acts 18:21 ...49 AD. This coming Feast
5. Acts 20:6 .....57 AD. The Feast of Unleavened Bread
6. Acts 20:16 ...57 AD. The Feast of Weeks (*Shavu'ot*—Pentecost)
7. Acts 27:9 .....60 AD. The Fast—The Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:1f.; 23:27-28)
  - Passover is mentioned once (Acts 12:4).
  - The Feast of Unleavened Bread is mentioned twice (Acts 12:3; 20:6).
  - The Feast of Weeks (*Shavu'ot*—Pentecost) is mentioned twice (Acts 2:1; 20:16).
  - The Fast (the Day of Atonement) is mentioned once (Acts 27:9).
  - An unspecified Feast of Israel is mentioned once (Acts 18:21 KJV; NKJV).

## The Feasts of Israel in First Corinthians

The following are the Feasts of Israel in First Corinthians in their order in Paul’s letter to the Corinthians:

8. 1st Cor. 5:8 .....53 AD. The Feast (Passover/the Feast of Unleavened Bread)
9. 1st Cor. 16:8 .....53 AD. The Feast of Weeks (*Shavu'ot*—Pentecost)

## The Feasts of Israel in Acts and First Corinthians

Now, the Feasts of Israel in Acts and First Corinthians in the Gregorian month they’re celebrated in, and the number of times these “feasts that were done away with,” are found in Acts and First Corinthians:

1. April .....Passover .....Twice .....Acts 12:4; 1st Cor. 5:8
2. April .....The Feast of Unleavened Bread .....Twice .....Acts 12:3; 20:6
3. June .....The Feast of Weeks—Pentecost .....Three times ...Acts 2:1; 20:16; 1st Cor. 16:8
4. October.....The Fast—The Day of Atonement .....Once .....Acts 27:9
5. ??? .....An unspecified Feast of Israel .....Once .....Acts 18:21

The Feasts of Israel are mentioned **9** times in the Book of Acts and First Corinthians. The use of these 9 feast cites by Luke and Paul, **7** of which are *time markers* and **one** that speaks of keeping Passover/the Feast of Unleavened Bread, should raise bright red flags for every Christian. The Church teaches these Feasts were done away with, but the Book of Acts and First Corinthians proclaim otherwise.

# The Sabbath Day After the Resurrection

Here are the **11** New Testament Scripture cites for the 7th day Sabbath *after* the resurrection in a concise “one glance” picture. I’ve marked these Sabbath references are *significant* in establishing the Sabbath for Christians today or *not significant* or just passing references to the Sabbath.

Eight out of eleven New Testament cites *after* the resurrection are significant in establishing the Sabbath because it’s easy to see that they were kept by all Christians in the days of the Apostles. Taken together these eight cites form an impressive and overwhelming biblical foundation that reveals that the Sabbath continued for at least 37 years *after* the resurrection. Nowhere does it say that Sunday replaced the Sabbath. This, along with all the Feasts of Israel after the resurrection, dismantle the Church’s heretical and unbiblical position on Sunday, Easter and Xmas:

1. Acts 1:12 .....30 AD .....Significant
2. Acts 13:42 .....46 AD .....Significant
3. Acts 13:44 .....46 AD .....Significant
4. Acts 15:21 .....48 AD .....Significant
5. Acts 17:2 .....50 AD .....Significant
6. Acts 18:4 .....52 AD .....Significant
7. Colossians 2:16 .....60 AD .....Significant
8. Hebrews 4:9 .....67 AD .....Significant

The next three Sabbath cites are nominal or not significant in determining the status of the Sabbath because they’re passing references to synagogue services, etc., that would normally take place on the Sabbath day for the traditional Jewish people in the days of the Apostles:

1. Acts 13:14 .....46 AD .....Not Significant
2. Acts 13:27 .....46 AD .....Not Significant
3. Acts 16:13 .....49 AD .....Not Significant<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> This paper was finished on Dec. 21, 2015 and last revised on Sunday, December 25, 2022.