

**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
<b>1. ACTS 2:1</b> .....	2
<b>2. ACTS 12:3</b> .....	3
<b>3. ACTS 12:4</b> .....	3
<b>4. ACTS 18:21</b> .....	4
<b>5. ACTS 20:6</b> .....	4
<b>6. ACTS 20:16</b> .....	5
<b>7. ACTS 27:9</b> .....	5
<b>8. FIRST CORINTHIANS 5:8</b> .....	8
<b>9. FIRST CORINTHIANS 16:8</b> .....	10
<b>THE SABBATH DAY <i>After</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	11
<b>1. ACTS 1:12</b> .....	11
<b>2. ACTS 13:14</b> .....	12
<b>3. ACTS 13:27</b> .....	12
<b>4. ACTS 13:42</b> .....	12
<b>5. ACTS 13:44</b> .....	12
<b>6. ACTS 15:21</b> .....	13
<b>7. ACTS 16:13</b> .....	16
<b>8. ACTS 17:2</b> .....	16
<b>9. ACTS 18:4</b> .....	16
<b>10. COLOSSIANS 2:16</b> .....	17
<b>11. HEBREWS 4:9</b> .....	18
<b>TWO SABBATH SCRIPTURES <i>Before</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	19
<b>SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT</b> .....	20
<b>Sunday—Mentioned Only Once From Acts To Revelation</b> .....	22
<b>The Resurrection and Sunday</b> .....	23
<b>Sunday—No Ties to the Resurrection in the Didache and Clement</b> .....	24
<b>CHURCH HISTORY AND MOSAIC LAW</b> .....	26
<b>Sunday—Pharisaic Catholicism</b> .....	27
<b>THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL IN ACTS</b> .....	29
<b>The Feasts of Israel in First Corinthians</b> .....	29
<b>The Feasts of Israel in Acts and First Corinthians</b> .....	29
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	30



# 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 9 times in the Book of Acts and First Corinthians. 8 times they use the Feasts as *time markers* to tell their perspective audience when an event happened or would happen, and the other time Paul admonishes the 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 the first day of the week (i.e. Sunday) replacing the 7th day Sabbath.

Luke and Paul's use of the Feasts in this way is extremely significant for two reasons. One, Luke wrote Acts about 64 AD or 34 years *after* the resurrection and it's the *only* divinely inspired history of Apostolic times. The Church today 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 of anywhere in the New Testament. How, then, can they be of God?

Also, nowhere in the New Testament does it speak of Sunday replacing or nullifying the 7th day Sabbath. The Sabbath is mentioned eleven 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 actually not Sunday at all, but Saturday night.<sup>2</sup> Scripture is God's Word, which reveals God's will for us, and as God's only divinely inspired authoritative Book, God never intended 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 is important is because the Church teaches that the Law of Moses, 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 couple of 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 Luke and

---

<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 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Names\\_of\\_the\\_days\\_of\\_the\\_week](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Names_of_the_days_of_the_week) and also <http://www.unrv.com/culture/roman-days-of-week.php>.

<sup>2</sup> I address that under the section, *Sunday in the New Testament*, p. 21. 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. For why the biblical day begins at darkness, see *When Does the Sabbath Begin?* at <http://seedofabraham.net/When-Does-The-Sabbath-Begin.pdf>

<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). Obviously then, Mosaic Law is God's will for us (Rom. 3:31; 7:25; cf. Dt. 4:5-8). For a greater understanding of Col. 2:14, ask for the PDF, *What was Nailed to the Cross?*

Paul lived out their lives of faith, and taught their Gentile Christians to live by, also.<sup>4</sup>

## 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 14 *centuries* (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 9 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, 8 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 35 years of the Apostolic Church. 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)

The Book of Acts was written by Luke in 64 AD, but 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> 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.

Luke doesn’t write the Roman month Pentecost occurs in, but only presents the Holy Spirit coming upon the Apostles, etc., at this Mosaic feast of Pentecost. The day occurs in early June, but with Luke not mentioning *when* it occurred, it strongly implies that Theophilus, whom Luke wrote Acts to (Acts 1:1), already knew *when* 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 the Feasts without mentioning *when* they are). Luke will mention the Feasts of Israel six

<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> Ask for the article on what was nailed to the cross (Col. 2:14) and/or the shadow of Col. 2:16-17.

<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* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Pentecost.pdf>. For why Pentecost is always on a Sunday, unlike *Shavu’ot* (English: the Feast of Weeks) for the tradition Jewish community and the Messianic community, which blindly follows the Rabbis, see *First Sheaf* at <http://seedofabraham.net/First-Sheaf.pdf>.

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

more times, 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 obvious 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 (i.e. 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. The giving of the promised Holy Spirit to Israel (Joel 2:28-29; Ezk. 36:24-27) on Pentecost does *not* negate God's words that were given on the same day, 14 centuries earlier, but makes it possible for Christians to walk as Yeshua did—in all the words of Moses that apply to him.

## 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 Jews, he proceeded further to seize Peter also. 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 then 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

---

<sup>8</sup> For Luke being a Gentile see *Luke the Jew?* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Is-the-Gentile-Now-a-Jew.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> The Ten Commandments picture or symbolize all of God's words, which is known as Mosaic Law (basically 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* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Pentecost.pdf>. Also interesting to realize 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 made to Israel more than 600 years earlier (Ezk. 36:24-27; Joel 2:28).

Also, the Greek word for church, *eklysia*, is first found of *Israel at Mt. Sinai*, in the Septuagint (Dt. 4:10; 9:10; 18:16; see also Acts 7:38, where *eklysia* is used by Stephen, of Israel, and rightly translated by the KJV as the *Church* in the Wilderness). The 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 different, 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* through Jesus Christ, and *now* it would include the Gentiles who believed in the Jewish Messiah. In no way did 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 mistake. The Greek word is *πάσχα paska*, which is the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew *פֶּחַסָּח peh'sach*, which in English is Passover.

the Feast of Unleavened Bread, 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 easily solved by realizing that in the time of Yeshua the terms Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread had become interchangeable.<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. Passover is another name for 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 *when* 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 it is, and so we don't know what time of year it was, but obviously, when the event happened, the Ephesians knew which Jewish Feast Paul was going to in Jerusalem. An astounding side-note is seen in Luke's recording of this: 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 ever thought that the Apostle Paul, given the opportunity to witness Messiah Yeshua to his fellow Jews (Rom. 9:1-3), would have declined to do so *in order to keep a Mosaic 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), but biblical shadows are very important, especially if one cannot literally see the Reality that casts the Shadows, for then the Shadows present a picture of the Reality.*

## 5. ACTS 20:6

“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.” (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 days 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

---

<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 that Luke records Paul as taking. 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). 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 reveals that Mosaic Law was still in effect for Christians. For more on what Paul's Nazarite Vows meant, see *Law 102*, pp. 21-23, at <http://seedofabraham.net/Law-102.pdf>.

<sup>13</sup> This Feast is written of in the KJV and the NKJV, but isn't found in the NASB, NIV and NEB, etc.



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 Gentile 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 and Luke kept the Feast at Philippi.

Also, this passage reveals that the Feasts were kept outside of Israel. Every Christian would conceptually agree with the ability to celebrate their feasts in their own lands. 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.
2. In Acts 20:16 Luke writes of Paul *sailing past Ephesus* in order to keep *Shavu'ot* (Pentecost) in Jerusalem (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 is consistently seen keeping a major part of it.

## 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.’ Luke writes of dangerous sailing weather because ‘the Fast’ had already passed. 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 it was. Instead, he speaks of *the Fast*, which is a Jewish cryptic reference to the Day of Atonement

---

<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/The Feasts of Israel. You'll also find a calendar 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).

(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 all their sins for the past year.<sup>16</sup>

If Gentile Theophilus wasn't *intimately* aware of the Feasts of Israel *and* their subtle nuances, 'the Fast' 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 was saying, 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, this change in the celebration of the Feasts were to occur, God would surely have written it in His Word and explained *why* the change occurred. Only the Feasts of Israel are mentioned *and* used 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).

Have you ever wondered how bringing a *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 domain of the God of Israel. Christians have noble reasons for *illicit SEX*, but the Pharisees, too, had noble reasons for their traditions that also nullified God's Word.

The sheer biblical force of these seven Feasts of Israel in Acts, six of which Luke uses as specific 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 the Book of 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 the Book of Acts, and them as time markers, their sanctity and validity for Christians is established as a *biblical* fact.

---

<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 of the Day of Atonement as part of what it means to afflict one's soul: fasting, humbling oneself before God and 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 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 religious holiday which was characterized by mourning, fasting, and repentance." From <https://bible.org/seriespage/10-day-atonement-leviticus-16>.

Another site has: "Jews today still celebrate the annual Day of Atonement...with a 25-hour period of fasting and intensive prayer." From <http://www.gotquestions.org/Day-Atonement-Yom-Kippur.html>.

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' resurrection...*The fast* to which Luke refers is the Day of Atonement (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)." From <http://www.cogwriter.com/atonement.htm>.

Some have said that the reason Luke used the Feasts of Israel as time markers was because Luke was Jewish, and therefore, they were familiar to him, as if that would stop him 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 classifies him with the Gentiles (Col. 4:10-14).<sup>17</sup>

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 Theophilus, and he certainly wouldn’t have known what ‘the Fast’ was nor when it was. The Book of Acts was *divinely* inspired and so it’s clear to see that the Feasts were not done away with.

Some theologians say that Luke was just a poor, disoriented writer, and so one cannot take any theology from him, but credible Christian theologians and scholars see Luke as a great communicator and extremely accurate in his details. Highly regarded 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, its accuracy and its reliability. 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>18</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>19</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 truly reveals that the Apostles kept and taught the Feasts of Israel. Bruce and Marchall 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) for the entire period of the early Church, which means they should be kept by Christians today. They are necessary for every Christian who wants to know more about his God and to walk in His Truth and obey Him, as Yeshua did (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 bypass 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 therefore, Mosaic Law)

---

<sup>17</sup> See the cite for *Luke the Jew?* on p. 3, note 8.

<sup>18</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)

<sup>19</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.

had been done away with, and also, why that the Holy Spirit never alerted any of them, including Paul,<sup>20</sup> to this ‘new reality,’ *throughout the first 34 years of the Church*, which Acts deals with. Neither of those two positions is spiritually realistic 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 the early Christians, and that the ‘new reality’ of *illicit SEX*, with its the rejection of the Law of Moses, had not yet slithered into the Church through what would become the Roman Catholic Church.

Some Christians believe 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 proves that Mosaic Law is valid for all Christians. How can it be, as the Church contends, that what was sin for Christ is *not* sin for Christians? How can it be that if Jesus failed to keep Passover He would have sinned, but Christians don’t have to keep it?<sup>21</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 his 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 towards them (going from Ephesus in what is now western Turkey).

## 8. FIRST CORINTHIANS 5:8

“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 (which begins with Passover 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 fast 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.’ Most Christians have no idea what Paul means by telling them to ‘purge out the old leaven’ and be ‘unleavened bread’ because the Church has failed the Savior and its people in the vital area of His holy days.

Leaven (yeast) raises or puffs up bread 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 Un-

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

<sup>21</sup> See *Law 102* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Law-102.pdf>. This article deals with most of the Church’s proof texts to justify the eating of unclean meats and the breaking of the Sabbath.

leavened Bread, where He commands the eating of unleavened bread for each of its seven days (Ex. 12:15). The bread that our Lord Yeshua raised and broke at His last Passover<sup>22</sup> was *unleavened* bread because it was Passover and it *pictured* His *sinless* body.<sup>23</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>24</sup> Yeshua couldn't do that with French 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 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, 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 the knew nothing of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and they weren't to celebrate it. Paul was speaking to their hearts in *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 only metaphorical substitutes for celebrating Passover anymore than a Christian 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? What would the Corinthians have known about it if it had been abolished for Christians, by Paul himself (as the Church teaches), at the death of Christ?

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*) body.<sup>25</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>26</sup>

This is why God used the blood of a lamb in Egypt to free Israel 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 slavery and eternal Darkness, and transforms us into new creatures, like He 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 because now we know the greater divine meaning of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread and why they were given to Israel.

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 is totally pagan. 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.

---

<sup>22</sup> Not the 'Last Supper,' which is a Catholic phrase designed to strip the event from its Jewish reality.

<sup>23</sup> Ex. 12:8, 14-15; Mt. 26:17.

<sup>24</sup> Exodus 12:15; 13:6; 34:18; Lev. 23:6; Num. 28:17.

<sup>25</sup> Having communion with leavened bread pictures Christ as sinful, and the person as taking sin into himself.

<sup>26</sup> Gen. 1:24-27; 2:18, 20, 21-24; 6:19-20; Psalm 17:15; Isaiah 43:7; John 1:12-13; 17:11, 22; Romans 5:1-2; 6:5; 8:15-17, 18-21, 29-30; 9:22-23; 1st Cor. 6:15; 15:48-49, 53; Eph. 1:3-5; 5:30-32; Phil. 3:20-21; Col. 1:15, 18; 3:4; 2nd Thess. 2:13-14; Heb. 2:1-3; 12:10; 2nd Peter 1:2-4; 1st John 2:25, 29; 3:2; Rev. 19:7; 21:9; 22:17 (see also Isaiah 64:4; 1st Cor. 2:9).

## 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>27</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 soon come to them, but first he would stay in Ephesus until Pentecost. Paul uses Pentecost as a time marker, letting the Corinthians know exactly how long he would be 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 9 Feasts of Israel in Acts and First Corinthians, 8 of which are used as time markers, and 1 where the Apostle Paul admonishes the Corinthians to keep Passover, reveal that all Christians kept the Feasts of Israel during the days of the Apostles. It also reveals that they kept Mosaic Law, which was the lifestyle of all the Apostles (Acts 21:20-24) and all other 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>28</sup> With the Apostle John speaking of walking *just like the Lord walked* (1st Jn. 2:6) and of keeping the *commandments of God* (Rev. 12:17; 14:12), that time period extends to the first **65** years *after* the resurrection—the entire time the Apostles were alive. This biblically historical theological understanding tears asunder 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 they have no authority from Above to do so and that it's very *displeasing* to God and sin for them. 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* for them, especially when the New Testament, *after* the resurrection, reveals that the Feasts of Israel were being kept. Easter and Xmas are traditions of the Church that have nothing to do with Jesus Christ because they were taken from paganism. Yeshua and His Apostles *always* kept the Feasts of Israel. Shouldn't we, also?<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</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>28</sup> The Church has twisted the Apostle Paul's position 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 its function because nothing can be added to the finished work of Messiah's salvation (e.g. Gal. 2-5; cf. Acts 15:1-31). When Paul speaks of Mosaic Law as the divine guideline of instruction for the Christian lifestyle, though, 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 inherently 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, just before the both of them are martyred, have spoken of Paul in such glowing terms (e.g. 'our beloved brother,' 2nd Peter 3:14-18; note well what Peter also says about those who are "untaught and unstable...[who] *twist*, to their own destruction," 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. *Five* of those times biblically support the continuance of the Sabbath day for Christians. Although the other six times are nominal, it's extremely significant that *none of the writers who speak of the Sabbath say that Sunday replaced it* (Luke nine times, Paul once, and the author of Hebrews once). The validity of the 7th day Sabbath in the New Testament reinforces the validity of the Feasts of Israel, and consequently, Mosaic Law.

## 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 where Yeshua ascended to Jerusalem was *a Sabbath day's journey*. This was 40 days *after* the resurrection or ten days before Pentecost in 30 AD.

Acts 1:12 is a nominal entry relating to the Sabbath because 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 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 when they walked back to Jerusalem, and 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>30</sup> There's no telling how many miles Israel walked that day when they left Egypt, but it was certainly 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, Israel was commanded by God to walk around it seven times (Joshua 6:1-4). Again, more than a Sabbath's day journey according to Judaism.

With Yeshua first appearing alive from the dead on the Sunday of Passover week,<sup>31</sup> and being seen by the Apostles and many others for 40 days, off and on,<sup>32</sup> it was a Thursday when the Apostles left Jerusalem with Yeshua to go to the Mt. of Olives, and then saw Him ascend into the Heavens. This was the second

---

<sup>29</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 (cf. Is. 66:23).

<sup>30</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>31</sup> On that Sunday of Passover week some barley grain, the first grain of spring, was offered up as 'first fruits' and 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>32</sup> Acts 1:1-3; cf. Acts 13:26; 1st Cor. 15:6.

ascension. The first ascension happened 40 days earlier, after Yeshua saw Mary (John 20:11-17), and before He met the Apostles that evening (John 20:19-21f.). This Sunday during Passover week is known as First Sheaf or 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 that purpose. With no Scripture speaking of keeping Sunday instead of the Sabbath ‘because of the resurrection,’ Sunday is a tradition of the Church that nullifies God’s commandments (cf. Mt. 15:1f.). Also, to show us that this day (i.e. Sunday) wasn’t to be singled out and made holy, God didn’t make it 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 is a nominal cite, it’s interesting that Luke chose to use a Jewish expression for distance. He could just as easily have told Theophilus that the distance was about five stadia,<sup>33</sup> a Roman expression for the same distance that Theophilus would certainly have understood, most likely being a Roman himself.<sup>34</sup> Or Luke could have omitted the reference to distance without taking anything away from the account, but he didn’t—he spoke of a Sabbath day’s journey. This also reveals that even a non-biblical Jewish term was understood by Roman Theophilus; something we wouldn’t expect if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath in the days of the Apostles.

## 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* nominal references to the Sabbath. Luke writes that Paul went into the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia (modern day mid-Turkey)<sup>35</sup> on the Sabbath day. This reference to the Sabbath does not, in and of itself, confirm that the Apostles still met and kept the seventh day Sabbath because it’s a traditional synagogue that normally meets 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.

## 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)

Paul, in his message to those in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, spoke of the Prophets being read on the Sabbath day. This, too, is only a passing 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)

---

<sup>33</sup> A Sabbath day’s journey (about 3,000 feet or 920 meters) is approximately 5 stadia.

<sup>34</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>35</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.



The Gentile God-fearers at the synagogue begged Paul to preach to them *on the next Sabbath*. This is the first significant mention of the Sabbath because if Sunday had become the day when Christians met, Paul would have told them that they could have heard him the next day, on Sunday, but he didn't do that. Sunday (the first day of the week), is not mentioned as a possible time to meet with those excited Gentiles. Obviously, Christians were still meeting on the Sabbath day. Acts 13 takes place about **16 years** *after* the resurrection.

## 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, too, as in v. 42, it's interesting to see that Luke doesn't speak of Paul telling the Gentiles of a weekly Sunday assembly.

## 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 believers of Jerusalem in 48 AD. This is the second of five significant passages about the Sabbath *after* the resurrection. The chapter deals with what the Gentiles needed to do in order to be saved (Acts 15:1-6f.), and then speaks of the Gentiles learning Mosaic Law every Sabbath.<sup>36</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 about Mosaic Law ('Moses').

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 believers 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. For Gentiles were welcomed, as we saw above, to come to the synagogues to learn of the God of Israel and His ways.

The word *synagogue* also means 'a *Christian* assembly'<sup>37</sup> or what might be called by Jewish believers, a (believing) synagogue. James is speaking of both the traditional non-believing synagogues and the Christian assemblies as places for the Gentiles to learn of Moses (i.e. Mosaic Law). In other words, both a synagogue of Jews that didn't believe in Jesus, as well as an assembly like Antioch on the Orontes River in modern day Syria, made up of only believers (Jewish and Gentile), would equally be called a *synagogue*.

---

<sup>36</sup> For why Acts 15:20-21 is the theological centerpiece of the New Testament that declares Mosaic Law as the lifestyle for every Christian, and why the four rules of James have nothing to do with table fellowship, see *The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21* at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Lifting-of-the-Veil.pdf>.

<sup>37</sup> Wesley J. Perschbacher, editor, *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publications, 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 meant' (James 2:2). A 'meeting for worship, of the Jews...*Transferred* to meetings of *Christian congregations*.'

This understanding is supported when we see James using the Greek word for synagogue in his letter (49 AD, or just a year after Acts 15:21 took place), referring to a Christian congregation (James 2:2;<sup>38</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 believers 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>39</sup> In other words, the ‘church’ was part of Israel (John 10:16; Rom. 11:11f.; Eph. 2:11f.).

In verse 21 James was making 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 from the days of the first Gentile believer, Cornelius, a ‘God-fearer’ (Acts 10:2; 38-40 AD or eight to ten years earlier; cf. 10:1–11:18) and that the Gentiles would *continue* to go to the synagogues to learn Mosaic Law *on the Sabbath day*.<sup>40</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 counterpart without offending him), but that’s wrong because none of the four rules tell the Gentiles *what* foods were unclean for the Jew (Lev. 11). If the four rules were for table fellowship, as the Church teaches, the Gentiles would have to know which foods were unclean so they wouldn’t offend their Jewish brethren by offering them, say, ham or shrimp. Therefore, the very reason the Church says was the purpose of the rules, for table fellowship so as not to offend the Jewish believers, falls apart upon examination. The four rules have nothing to do with table fellowship.

The four rules are actually a unit on sacrificial sexual idolatry,<sup>41</sup> which if the *Gentile* didn’t immediately stop, would place his very salvation in jeopardy (which is why the Council in Acts 15 met; i.e. what must the *Gentile* 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. *This is the reason for the four rules of James*.

These four rules, then, weren’t the ‘only rules’ for the *Gentile*, as the Church teaches, but the most important 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* would learn in the synagogue, where Mosaic Law was taught *every Sabbath day*. Obviously, the Sabbath was still in effect, and that, *for the Gentile believers*, in 48 AD or 18 years *after* the resurrection.

---

<sup>38</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 don’t carry the Jewish connotation, such as *meeting* or *assembly* (NIV and KJV respectively).

<sup>39</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*’ (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 said, ‘On this Rock I will build My Church,’ it could also be translated as, ‘On this Rock I will build my Assembly’ (Matthew 16:18). For more on *ekklaysia* see 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 were *filled* with the *promised* Holy Spirit on that day (Ezk. 36:27; 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>40</sup> Believing Gentiles wouldn’t be barred from the traditional synagogues until after 90 AD.

<sup>41</sup> See *The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21* at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Lifting-of-the-Veil.pdf> for why the four rules of James deal with sacrificial sexual idolatry and not table fellowship.

Once the Gentile was saved or justified by his faith in Messiah Yeshua, did it matter if he sinned? The Apostle Paul answers that question by saying, “How shall we who died to sin live any longer in it?” (Romans 6:2) Every true Christian would ‘amen’ that, but the question now is, what constitutes sin? In other words, what is *God’s* definition of sin? If we don’t know the *full* extent of what God considers sin, one could be sinning against Him without even realizing it. Again, the Apostle *to the Gentiles* answers it 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)

At His death Yeshua redeemed Israel, which now includes any Gentile who is Born Again.<sup>42</sup> He didn’t do away with Mosaic Law, for it reveals God’s holy lifestyle.<sup>43</sup> The Law reveals what is sin, and consequently, what is pleasing to God. Paul confirms it as God’s standard of what is right and wrong, 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)

Paul emphatically states that Mosaic Law<sup>44</sup> is God’s standard for determining what is sin. 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>45</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 of Mosaic Law (Dt. 4:6-8; Psalm 119:1-176; 2nd Tim. 3:10-17).

Christians don’t keep the Feasts that Jesus kept, nor do they keep the 7th day Sabbath or the Mosaic dietary laws, but rather, they do things that Jesus would never do because they would have been sin for Him (e.g. *illicit SEX*, and the eating of pig [bacon and ham, etc.], 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, the biblical Jesus said just that (Mt. 5:17-19; 22:35-40). How is it, then, that Christians haven’t seen this for all these centuries? (see Daniel 7:25)

If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath there’s no indication of it in Acts 15. On the contrary, just the opposite is seen—believing Gentiles were going to the synagogues on the Sabbath day to learn Mosaic Law so

---

<sup>42</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>43</sup> Yeshua redeemed us from the *curse* of the Law (Gal. 3:13), but not the Law itself; Matthew 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 may 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>44</sup> Some Christians say that the term Law means only the Ten Commandments, but this isn’t supported by either the Old or the New Testaments. Even the phrase, ‘the Law of the Lord’ means Mosaic Law (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, 39).

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).

<sup>45</sup> For why the dietary laws are still in effect for Christians, see *Law 102* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Law-102.pdf>, p. 5f.

they could know what was pleasing in God's eyes and what He considered sin. Acts 15 took place **18** years *after* the resurrection, in 48 AD.

## 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 a nominal cite 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 would come to believe in Yeshua (Acts 16:14-15).

## 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). It's a nominal passage because it reflects a traditional synagogue, but if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath, wouldn't Paul have told those Thessalonians of his Sunday meetings? Wouldn't Luke have written of it? Nowhere are either of them mentioned. 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 and said to them, ‘Your blood be upon your own heads! I am clean. 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 third of five significant biblical references to the Sabbath *after* the resurrection. 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 glaring silence for Sunday! Luke doesn't mention any Sunday teaching nor 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 call it),<sup>46</sup> and so its absence is extremely significant.

All we see in Acts is the Sabbath, and so it's biblically reasonable and scripturally sound 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. Acts 18:4 and following took place **22** and **23** years *after* the resurrection.

---

<sup>46</sup> There is no such biblical thing 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 (Sunday). The Hebrew word Sabbath means to cease or to conclude, and so it concludes a 7 day week; it can't begin a week.

## 10. COLOSSIANS 2:16

<sup>16</sup>“So let no one judge you in food or in drink, or regarding a Festival (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. This is the fourth significant passage for the issue of Sabbath or Sunday. Many Christians use verse 16 to prove that the Sabbath is gone, but Paul doesn't say that, nor does he say to keep Sunday, or that Sunday has replaced the Sabbath, either here or anywhere in any of his letters, something we would expect from the Apostle if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath.

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>47</sup> Paul didn't want anyone in the congregation to judge others wrongly *regarding how they kept the Sabbath day* (or the Feasts and New Moons, etc.). Note well: don't let anyone 'judge you,' concerning the Sabbath, etc.

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

This is also seen in the very next verse, which speaks of the Feasts and Sabbaths as pictures of what is *to come* in the future when we will actually see Messiah Yeshua. Paul doesn't want anyone judging the Colossians regarding these Mosaic 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 would better be translated as '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 is.

An example of how the Sabbath reveals Messiah Yeshua, and how without it, we're at a loss to more fully understand Him and some of His sayings, is that inherent in the Sabbath is the theme of redemption (salvation). God made the Sabbath that way; to reflect redemption (Dt. 5:12-15). That's how Yeshua could 'break the rules' of the Pharisees regarding healing on the Sabbath, which they considered forbidden work; for God commands a cessation of work and for Israel to rest. Note, though, how Yeshua chastises the president of the synagogue, who opposed Yeshua, when He healed the Jewish woman, who had suffered for so long, on the Sabbath day:

“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 *on the Sabbath day?*!” (Luke 13:16)

The Pharisees condemned the healings of Yeshua on the Sabbath because they didn't understand that the *work* of redemption 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). 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. 'In Yeshua' we rest, which is the essence of the Sabbath. Sunday cannot biblically claim any of that. It was never meant to.

Paul, in Colossians, comes against the pagan Gnostic practice of fasting on the Sabbath day (Col. 2:23),

---

<sup>47</sup> κρίνω Joseph Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), n.p.

and the Gnostic understanding of ‘how to attain’ to God (to be saved). Those new Gnostic Colossian Christians came into Christianity with a lot of baggage from their Gnostic days (Col. 2:8-10). Most likely they said that *one wasn’t saved* if he didn’t fast on the Sabbath, etc. Paul rightly comes against such a heresy and the new Christian heretics who judged 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 and Mosaic Law because they are divine instructions and rules from God. Also interesting to note is that if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath, what is Paul doing writing about the Sabbath?!

The letter to the Colossians was written by the Apostle 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 contrary, shows us that the Sabbath, the Feasts of Israel and New Moons were being kept by the Colossian Christians. This in turn reveals that Mosaic Law was still valid for 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 remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God.” (Hebrews 4:9)

The Letter to the Hebrews was written about 67 AD. This is the fifth significant biblical witness for the Sabbath in the New Testament *after* the resurrection.

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 the NKJV, has the Greek word σαββατισμὸς *sabbatismos*, which is a literal observance of the Sabbath.<sup>48</sup> This is a glaring 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 also has *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 weren’t faithful to the Textus Receptus.

The author of Hebrews literally reveals that the Sabbath was still valid, and also, points to the spiritual *rest* we experience by faith in Messiah Yeshua’s finished work of redemption. It’s very telling that he does it through the Sabbath, which if it had been replaced by Sunday would obviously not have been used. Hebrews, like the Book of Acts and Paul’s letters 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 (Ex. 20:8-11), which meant that He wanted them to have *faith* in Him that He would 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 finished work of redemption that God has given us through Yeshua (Heb. 6:1; 9:14). The Sabbath is God’s picture 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 (rest) from our strivings to earn a living and ‘to be good enough’ for God, and to enter into both physical and spiritual rest. Yes, we can enter that spiritual rest every day of the week, although the Sabbath we don’t work, buy nor sell, which makes God’s 7th day Sabbath different from every other day. The Sabbath is God’s *practical* gift to us (Mark 2:27) and Yeshua spoke of He being Lord of the Sabbath (Mk. 2:28).

On the Sabbath we cease from our physical work as a natural reminder for ceasing from our carnal anxie-

---

<sup>48</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.”

ty and doubts concerning our standing with God, and 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 Yeshua's sacrificial death.

Every Sabbath, as we learn (again and again) to trust God at this level, 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 for our souls (Mt. 11:28-30), which is the essence of the Sabbath commandment to rest. Sunday doesn't have this theological 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.

The Sabbath is mentioned **11** times in the New Testament *after* the resurrection. Although 5 of those times refer only nominally to the Sabbath as the biblical day of Jewish assembly,<sup>49</sup> and a 6th time speaks of 'a Sabbath day's journey,'<sup>50</sup> the other 5 times, written by 3 different New Testament writers,<sup>51</sup> biblically establish and confirm 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 eleven 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.

The Apostle John wrote, more than **60** years after the resurrection:

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

Yeshua and His Apostles always kept the 7th day Sabbath and Feasts of Israel. Shouldn't we, also?

## TWO SABBATH SCRIPTURES *Before* THE RESURRECTION

The next two passages of Scripture (Is. 66:23; 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 this 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 (Rev. 20:4-6; Ezk. 40:1-48:1f.). In that time the Son of David (2nd Sam. 7:8f.; Lk. 1:30f.) 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). God has never *blessed* nor made Sunday *holy* (on a weekly basis). We would expect Sunday to be given at least those two designations if it had indeed superseded the Sabbath.

The continuance of the Sabbath is also seen when Yeshua, about 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 to appreciate His creation and the rest 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 and minis-

<sup>49</sup> Acts 13:14, 27, 42, 44; 16:13; 17:2.

<sup>50</sup> Acts 1:12.

<sup>51</sup> Luke three times (Acts 13:42; 15:21; 18:4); Paul once (Col. 2:16); and the author of Hebrews once (Heb. 4:9).

ter to others, as Yeshua did (e.g. Mt. 12:10f.; Luke 4:16; John 5:1-9). Yeshua spoke of this *before* the resurrection, but Matthew wrote his Gospel 14 years *after* the resurrection, and never validated Sunday.

Neither God through Isaiah, nor Yeshua in Matthew, spoke of Sunday replacing the seventh day Sabbath, but of the Sabbath continuing *after* the resurrection; even into the days of the thousand year reign of Messiah Yeshua (Rev. 20:1-7f.). The divinely inspired Scriptures diametrically oppose Church teaching about God's 7th day Sabbath.

## SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Sunday, or rather the first day of the week as the Bible always speaks of it, is mentioned 8 times in the New Testament, 6 of which are found in the Gospels.<sup>52</sup> The 6 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 Yeshua 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 if Yeshua was raised on Sunday, no one, anywhere in Scripture, says that Sunday has replaced the 7th day Sabbath.

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 most 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>53</sup> Be that as it may, there is no authoritative, unambiguous Scripture that declares that Yeshua *rose* on Sunday, nor a second witness to it. Yeshua was first *seen* on Sunday, and He might well have risen on Sunday, but Scripture is silent as to the day and the hour. When the women get to the Tomb the angel says, “He is risen!,”<sup>54</sup> but he doesn't say how long ago it happened, nor even the day. In other words, it's possible that Yeshua rose on the Sabbath and not Sunday.

The point here is that *none* of the 6 times that 'Sunday' appears in the Gospels is it spoken of as replacing the Sabbath. It declares that Yeshua was first seen on Sunday, or even with Mark 16:9 possibly saying that He was resurrected on Sunday, but no one writes that Sunday has 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

---

<sup>52</sup> Mt. 28:1; Mk. 16:2, 9; Lk. 24:1, 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, and this seems to be Sunday night because John 'keeps time' in Roman terms).

<sup>53</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* at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Resurrection-and-Mk.-16.9.pdf>.

<sup>54</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.)



Sunday had replaced the Sabbath during the lifetime of the Apostles, ‘because of the resurrection,’ as many Christians teach, or even because Yeshua first appeared alive from the dead on Sunday, 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 didn’t replace the Sabbath because of Yeshua’s first appearances and/or resurrection.

Also interesting to realize is that three of the four authors of the Gospels wrote divinely inspired letters and a ‘book’ during the time of the early Church:

1. Peter, whom many believe was the ‘voice’ behind the Gospel of Mark, wrote two letters;
2. Luke wrote Acts, and
3. John wrote three letters, dating to 90-96 AD.

Yet *none of them, nor anyone else in the rest of the New Testament*, speak of Sunday being ‘the new day of assembly’ nor replacing the 7th day Sabbath, etc. It’s scripturally impossible to believe that such a dramatic change as Sabbath to Sunday would not have been spoken of by any of the writers of the New Testament, if indeed, such a change had taken place.

Even more bleak for 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>55</sup> Paul began to preach in the *evening* of the 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 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>56</sup> This is when the believers got together in Troas. It was Saturday evening, not Sunday morning ‘for church.’

Many Christian scholars today recognize 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>57</sup> as F. F. Bruce once wrote. Luke mentions nothing of it being a ‘new day’ to assemble on, something we would expect if Sunday had actually replaced the Sabbath. This 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, etc. With special guest Paul being there, though, and leaving Troas on Sunday morning, the Apostle preached all night long until daybreak. The *only reason* why Luke mentions this meeting is not because Sunday ‘was

---

<sup>55</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 at <http://seedofabraham.net/From-Sabbath-to-Sunday.pdf>. Some think this chapter speaks of Sunday communion with ‘the breaking of bread’ (Acts 20:7, 11), but the term only came to mean 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 are all 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 primarily implies the eating of a regular meal together, especially when it writes of *food and daily*; “So continuing *daily* with one accord in the Temple and *breaking bread from house to house*, they ate their *food* with gladness and simplicity of heart.”

<sup>56</sup> The church is patterned after the synagogue—church officials parallel synagogue officials. See *Synagogue and Church Officials* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Synagogue-and-Church-Officials.pdf>.

<sup>57</sup> Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday*, p. 101; p. 60 from Avram’s PDF. The quote is from F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts*, 1954, pp. 407-408.

already established,' as many theologians wrongly teach, but because Paul raised Eutychus from the dead! At midnight Eutychus fell down 'from the third story,' dead. Paul brought him back to life (Acts 20:9-10, 12). Luke wanted Theophilus to realize that the Holy Spirit was working as powerfully in Paul as the Holy Spirit had worked in Peter, when God used Peter to raise Tabitha from the dead (Acts 9:40). *That's* why Luke writes of Troas and the meeting that began on the first day of the week; that is to say Saturday night. It has nothing to do with Sunday being the new day of assembly.

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 weekly time when the disciples met to acknowledge the end of the Sabbath and the beginning of the new week. Luke's reason for writing about the meeting was to reveal the power of the Holy Spirit working through Paul as the Spirit did through Peter. Luke *never* mentions Sunday meetings, either here nor anywhere in Acts. For Luke, the evening of the first day of the week is Saturday night because he 'kept time' by biblical means, as his continual use of the Feasts of Israel and the Sabbath in Acts reveal. Even if one thinks, though, that it was Sunday night when the meeting began, it couldn't serve as the basis for Sunday assembly because nowhere in Acts 20, nor anywhere else in Scripture, does it state that Sunday had become 'the new day' of assembly or that it had replaced the Sabbath. Therefore, even if they met on Sunday night, there's nothing wrong with that, or meeting on Monday night, etc., but it doesn't mean that the Sabbath had been replaced. Using this passage 'to prove' weekly Sunday meetings only proves how desperate Sunday pastors are to justify their patently unscriptural position.

## 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 he came to Corinth. This mention of Sunday is not a church service, nor is there any mention of them assembling on Sunday, nor of tithes and offerings being collected in church on Sunday, as some pastors teach:

<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 believers in Jerusalem as a sign of Gentile love and unity with the Jewish Apostles and believers 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 them 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. It's fairly obvious that the person wasn't in the church, putting it in a tithes and offering basket.

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. This way, when Paul came to Corinth, everyone would bring their funds they had saved up to him at the 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. 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 embar-

passed, either, especially as he was bringing Christians from other churches with him and he had already spoken to them about how Corinth had been ready a year earlier (2nd Cor. 9:1-5).

Any use of 1st Corinthians 16:1-3 ‘to prove’ that Sunday had replaced the Sabbath in the days of the Apostles, evaporates upon a simple examination and reading of the text.

## The Resurrection and Sunday

Many Christians argue that Christ being resurrected on Sunday<sup>58</sup> warrants or justifies Sunday overturning the Sabbath and making Sunday ‘the new 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 a 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 or justification 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 (cf. 2nd Sam. 7:1-13f.).

Some Christians think they “can choose to keep any day as their Sabbath,” erroneously citing Romans 14:5-6,<sup>59</sup> where Paul speaks of one man esteeming one day above another, while another man esteems all days alike; and that one man fasts, yet another eats.

In Romans 14 Paul is dealing with the same problem he dealt with previously in 1st Cor. 10—the eating of meats from the pagan marketplace that had been sacrificed to idols, but were now for sale in the public marketplace. 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 others, but the meat eaters ate all the time and 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, but rather that he can choose which day he wants to fast on, thereby *esteeming* that day ‘above the others’ for himself.

If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath during the lives of the Apostles we would expect that somewhere in the New Testament it would have been clearly written about—at least two or three times because Scripture says that at the mouth of two or three witnesses the truth is established,<sup>60</sup> yet there’s *nothing* written about Sunday being ‘the new day’ nor replacing the Sabbath, nor it being ‘the Lord’s Day.’<sup>61</sup> With not one scriptural witness it’s a biblical certainty 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

---

<sup>58</sup> Mt. 28:1, 9; Mk. 16:1-2, 9; Lk. 24:1, 30-31, 36; Jn. 20:1, 11f.

<sup>59</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* at <http://seed-ofabraham.net/Romans-14-and-the-Dietary-Laws.pdf>.

<sup>60</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>61</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 either 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) or most likely, John is simply referring to the seventh day Sabbath as when he was ‘in the Spirit on the Lord’s day’ (Mark 2:28; cf. Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 20:8-11; 31:12-17).

the Church that *nullifies* God's Word and is sin. Sunday keeping churches have no authority from God to meet on Sunday<sup>62</sup> as an alternative to keeping God's seventh day Sabbath holy.

It's also interesting that the biblical Pentecost is always on a Sunday, 50 days from the Sunday of First Sheaf (during Passover week) and that God the Father made the Sunday of Pentecost an annual Sabbath,<sup>63</sup> but He didn't make First Sheaf an annual Sabbath, even though He knew that His Son would first be seen alive from the dead on First Sheaf, and most likely is the day when He was resurrected. This says a lot about how the Father and the Son view the resurrection and the first resurrection appearance, and also, how wrong it is for Christians to try and justify Sunday over Sabbath because of the resurrection and His first appearance on Sunday.

Sunday is seen 6 times in the Gospels in relation to the resurrection, but not once does it speak of it replacing the Sabbath nor of it being the new day of assembly. Sunday is seen only one other time in all the New Testament, and that's in First Corinthians, but that cite speaks of individuals, on Sunday, setting aside funds *in their own homes* for a future gift to the poor believers in Jerusalem. It has nothing to do with an 'established weekly Sunday service,' as some Christian theologians wrongly teach.

The Word of *God* reveals that the Sabbath was kept during the days of the Apostles, and that Sunday was not the day of Christian assembly during the time when the Apostles were alive. Therefore, it isn't God's will for Christians to keep Sunday in lieu of the Sabbath.<sup>64</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) is not of God, but of the Enemy of our souls.

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, who office today is known as the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church, orchestrated this diabolical change, which happened **90** years *after* the resurrection, but many Christians at that time, didn't obey him. The churches of the East (Israel, Lebanon, Syria and Turkey, etc.) continued to keep the Sabbath day holy and disregarded Sunday for **200** years, until the Roman Church gained political power under Constantine (323 AD). Then those who didn't bow to Rome were persecuted by the Roman Catholic Church.

## **Sunday—No Ties to 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 was not used as a reason to establish Sunday. 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>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</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.

<sup>63</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* at <http://seedofabraham.net/First-Sheaf.pdf>.

<sup>64</sup> The fashionable term 'Resurrection Day' has replaced 'Easter' in many churches, but that doesn't change its date, nor its rites. Most of the time it's not the Sunday when Yeshua was first seen because the calculation for Easter is the third Sunday after the vernal equinox; while 14 days after the new moon after the vernal equinox determines when the biblical Passover begins, and that Sunday in Passover week is First Sheaf/Fruits.

“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: the day-night cycle, the reproductive cycle of the seed (24) and the legend of the phoenix from whose corpse allegedly another bird arose (25).”<sup>66</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 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>67</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, Ignatius, ‘Barnabas’ and Justin not only have the opposite attitude toward Jewish law and sacrifice, but also offer *the first timid references to the resurrection*, which is presented as an added or secondary reason for Sunday worship.”<sup>68</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>69</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 as the days immediately after the Apostles, who always kept the 7th day Sabbath holy. This means that Sunday assembly over Sabbath holiness is not of the Lord God of Israel. The Reformers would have been pleased to know that.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday*, pp. 78-79f. In Avram’s PDF it’s p. 46f.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., p. 79. Clement was Bishop of Rome, a title that would soon be overshadowed by that of ‘Pope.’

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., note 14. See K. Clark, *Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after 70 A.D.*

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., p. 80.

<sup>69</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>70</sup> One motto of the Reformers was Sola Scriptural; *Only Scripture* is divinely authoritative for what we are to believe, and therefore, what we should put into practice. They saw many things wrong with the Roman Catholic Church and corrected 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).

# 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>71</sup> They were originally based in Jerusalem. Eusebius (260-340 AD), our first 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>72</sup> and they were “*zealous to insist on the literal observance of the Law.*”<sup>73</sup>

These Nazarenes, **105** years *after* the resurrection, were keeping Mosaic Law, which means that they celebrated the Feasts of Israel and kept the seventh 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 writes of the Nazarenes keeping (all) Mosaic Law (that applied to them).

Epiphanius (315-403), our second official Roman Catholic witness, was also a bishop and church historian. He writes 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. the 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>74</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>75</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 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 and a scholar reveal that the Nazarenes, for at least **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

---

<sup>71</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.*” These ancient Jewish Nazarenes are not to be confused with the modern Nazarene Church, which only came into existence about a hundred years ago.

<sup>72</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>73</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>74</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 part of the covenant that God made with Father Abraham (Gen. 17:10-14; Acts 21:20-24), but the Gentile believer and his son must not be physically *covenantally* circumcised because God comes against this in the New Covenant, and both Jew and Gentile come into Messiah’s Kingdom through faith in Him. For more on this, see *Gentile Circumcision?* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Gentile-Circumcision.pdf>.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., p. 192; in Avram’s PDF, p. 114.

all Christians in their day. Obviously, this means that the Lord wants all Christians to keep them today.

## Sunday—Pharisaic Catholicism

The Roman Catholic Church changed God’s Sabbath to Sunday in 120 AD (when it threw out Mosaic Law). Of course, they didn’t have the authority from God (Scripture) to do any of 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 to Sunday.

Karl Keating (born 1950), writing under the Imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Church, is our first official Catholic witness that Sunday is a Catholic institution, not ordained by God. He states that,

‘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>76</sup>

Gaspar de Fosso (1496-1592) the Archbishop of Reggio, our second official 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>77</sup>

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

Archbishop James Cardinal Gibbons (1834-1921) is our 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...? But, *you may read the Bible from*

---

<sup>76</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>77</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 Trent reconvened under the new Pope (Pius IV) on January 18, 1562.

*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>78</sup>

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 the Pope. The Pope took the pagan Roman feast of Saturnalia, where fir trees were set up in homes with silver and gold tinsel, gifts were exchanged, pigs were eaten, sports and banquets were celebrated with uproar, and parties abounded, and placed the name of *Jesus* over Saturn, and called it Christ's Mass (i.e. Christmas).<sup>79</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 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>80</sup>

The Roman Catholic Church used Saturnalia (the Roman version of the Babylonian festival), changed the name to Christ's Mass, as a way to draw 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 the feast.

The Protestant churches present the pagan traditions of the Roman Catholic Church (*illicit SEX*) above God's Word in the area of the Sabbath, the Feasts of Israel and Mosaic Law.

---

<sup>78</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* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Sunday-The-Catholic-Sabbath.pdf>.

<sup>79</sup> For more on Christ's Mass see <http://www.angelfire.com/la2/prophet1/chrmass.html>.

<sup>80</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 the Babylon of the New Testament (Rev. 14:8; 17:5; cf. 18:4). *The Two Babylons* at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Two-Babylons.pdf>, which is Avram Yehoshua's compilation of the entire book with all its illustrations (*The Full Hislop*). *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*.



# THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL IN ACTS

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

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

Next, 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. Oct. ....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, 8 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 declare otherwise.

The 7th day Sabbath is mentioned **11** times *after* the resurrection (Acts 1:12; 13:14, 27, 42, 44; 15:21; 16:13; 17:2; 18:4; Col. 2:16; Heb. 4:9). Sunday is mentioned only once, and it wasn’t a church meeting.

# CONCLUSION

With Luke and the Apostle Paul using 8 Feasts of Israel as *time markers after* the resurrection, and Paul exhorting the Corinthians to keep Passover, it's clear that in the days of the Apostles all Christians kept these Feasts. Because the Feasts of Israel are part of Mosaic Law this means that Mosaic Law was the standard and lifestyle for Christians to walk out their faith in the Jewish Messiah. This is a biblical fact that is supported into the fourth century by two Roman Catholic bishop-historians, who although they argued against it, presented the Nazarenes, the 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 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 (Deuteronomy 12:28-32). God has not given man the authority to create holy days. God has reserved that for Himself. This also applies to the weekly 7th day Sabbath.

The 7th day Sabbath is seen 11 times in the New Testament *after* the resurrection, with 5 of those times scripturally establishing that the Sabbath was being observed by Christians. Another 5 times, although only speaking of Sabbath assembly at a traditional synagogue, etc., indirectly confirm the Sabbath was still the day of Christian assembly and holiness because nowhere does Luke (nor 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 time of the Apostles.

The last of the 11 mentions of 'Sabbath' refers to 'a Sabbath day's journey,' and although it wasn't on the Sabbath that the Apostles returned to Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, it's interesting that Luke used a Jewish reference to distance which spoke of the Sabbath, and not a Roman measurement. If Sunday had come to replace the Sabbath in Luke's day, he wouldn't have written of a Jewish distance to Roman Theophilus (Acts 1:1f.).

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 seventh day Sabbath, nor does the New Testament (which spans about 4 BC–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 were only bringing them up to let us know,

1. *when* an event happened or would happen (Luke with the Feasts and the Sabbath; and Paul with the Feast of Weeks/Pentecost; 1st Cor. 16:8),
2. or to admonish Christians to keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which begins with Passover, in a holy manner (Paul in 1st Cor. 5:6-8),
3. or spoke of the Sabbath as the day of assembly (Acts 13:42; 15:21; 18:4f.),
4. or spoke of the Sabbath because it was under attack (along with the Feasts and New Moons, etc.) as to not letting someone judge you as to how to keep them (Paul in Col. 2:16),
5. or to underscore a theological point (the author of Hebrews in 4:9).

The *need* to prove that the Feasts and the Sabbath were still valid was not why they wrote of the Feasts and the Sabbath—that need is a modern Christian dilemma due to having been deceived about them by the Roman Catholic Church. 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 validates them.

Further underscoring the biblical fact of the Sabbath is the glaring theological absence of Sunday. It's mentioned 6 times in the Gospels concerning Yeshua's resurrection appearances, 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. Paul tells the Corinthians to set aside in their own homes (not the church), some of their funds they had made from working on Sunday, for a special love gift to the poor believers in Jerusalem, which the Corinthians would bring to their meeting place when Paul came. There's no mention of a Sunday church meeting. Therefore, this *lone* Sunday Scripture cannot be used to overthrow Israel walking in God's 7th day Sabbath for 1,400 years *and* establish that the Church was *already* meeting every week on Sunday.

Yet, even if one believes that 1st Corinthians 16:2 'proves' Sunday replaced the Sabbath, there isn't a clear second witness to it, Acts 20:7 notwithstanding because v. 7 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 welcome in the new week, a standard practice of the Jewish people. The reason Luke writes of it is not to present Sunday as 'the new day,' 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 doesn't prove that weekly Sunday meetings were the norm because nowhere does Luke, nor anyone else state that, something we'd expect to see, and also, this meeting was very special, out of the ordinary, since the Apostle Paul had been in Troas for a week and after the meeting he would depart at dawn (Acts 20:6, 11). For a change of this magnitude, of Sunday replacing God's Sabbath, we would certainly expect to see many crystal clear Scripture witnesses, but there isn't even one.

Also, even though Yeshua was first seen on the Sunday of Passover week (First Fruits/Sheaf), there is nothing in Scripture that presents it 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 speaks of the Sabbath being observed in a time yet to come, and Yeshua said to those in Jerusalem that they should pray that their flight, at the destruction of the city, would not be on the Sabbath. Neither Isaiah, nor Jesus envisioned or even hinted at Sunday replacing the seventh day Sabbath.

If God wanted 'resurrection Sunday' to be holy and the prototype of a weekly Sunday assembly, He 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*. Isn't Yeshua the *same* yesterday, *today* and forever? "What would Jesus do?," was a saying that was stamped on many a Christian's wrist band years ago, so that they could look at it and ask, 'What would Jesus do' in any situation they found themselves in. Would He keep Sunday or the Sabbath? 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 not to do so would be sin for Him, which means that it's sin for Christians who don't follow Him in these areas. 'Grace' is not a license to sin, but God's power from on High that helps us to overcome temptation and sin.

God did not change the Sabbath day to Sunday. God did not change His holy Feasts for pagan feasts. God did not negate Mosaic Law 'at the cross,' even though, truly, 'we're not under the Law anymore.'<sup>81</sup>

"Yeshua said to them, 'The Sabbath was *made for man*, and not man for the Sabbath. Therefore, *the Son of Man* is also *Lord of the Sabbath*.'" (Mark 2:27-28)

"Jesus Christ is the *same* yesterday, *today* and forever." (Hebrews 13:8)

With the Roman Catholic Church openly boasting of changing Sabbath to Sunday and Passover to Easter, it proves that all Gentile Christians were keeping those Jewish holy times and holy ways (Mosaic Law) in

---

<sup>81</sup> See *No Longer Under the Law?* at <http://seedofabraham.net/No-Longer-Under-the-Law.pdf>.

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 also 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 that the Christian Pharisaic Church vehemently teaches against it.<sup>82</sup>

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. They’ll see how Church history, from ancient Roman Catholic bishop–historians to modern 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. 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; not the traditions of man 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.; 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 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 should determine our lifestyle and determine what is sin or and what is pleasing to God.

God set Mosaic Law in motion at Mt. Sinai, and according to the Lord Yeshua it will continue for God’s Israel until this Earth is no more (Mt. 5:18-19). 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. 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 traditions that keep Christians from walking in God’s lifestyle for them and the tremendous blessings He intends 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:

*21*“I was watching, and the same horn (the Pope) *was making war against the saints, and prevailing against them,* *22*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...* *25*He (the Pope) shall speak blasphemous words against the Most High God. (He) *shall persecute the saints 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 7:21-22, 25)<sup>83</sup>

The Popes have persecuted, warred and murdered millions of true Christians for more than a thousand

---

<sup>82</sup> For an article on the Christian Pharisaic Church, its hypocrisy and false ways, specifically in relation to Mosaic Law, see *Grace, Holiness and the Pharisaic Church* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Grace-Holiness-and-the-Pharisaic-Church.pdf>.

<sup>83</sup> I have translated ‘saints’ as ‘holy ones’ because that’s the literal and correct meaning of ‘saint,’ in both the Old and New Testaments. ‘Saint’ comes from the Latin word *sanctus*, which means to sanctify or make holy.

years, and have twisted and perverted Scripture, but judgment is coming for those who love the Messiah of Israel because the time to possess the heavenly 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 teaches ‘salvation by infant sprinkling,’ which has no biblical basis, prayers to, and worship of ‘Mother Mary’<sup>84</sup> (a totally pagan, non-biblical ‘Mary’ whose characteristics are that of the Queen of Heaven), who ‘imparts’ grace to Catholics, and that the Pope himself is ‘Christ on Earth,’ which is part of the blasphemous words against God that Daniel spoke of.<sup>85</sup>

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 (through Purgatory, with the help of Mother Mary). That is only a part of the 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 1,900 years.<sup>86</sup> The heretical doctrine, that Mosaic Law was invalidated at the death of Jesus, began with the RCC at the same time they threw out Sabbath and Feasts, and brought in Sunday and Easter (120 AD) because even they realized they had to have some justification for getting rid of God’s Law.

When the Reformers spoke against and/or broke away from the Roman Catholic Church (beginning in the 15th century), they didn’t realize that the teaching against Mosaic Law was heretical, and so they took it with them, and also, the Roman Catholic practice of *illicit SEX*. The Bishop of Rome changed the times (the seventh day Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel) and the Law (of Moses), teaching that, except for its moral principles, the Law doesn’t apply to Christians.

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 600 years, against Mosaic Law, and teach *illicit SEX*. Christianity teaches these two heinous Catholic doctrines...in the name of Jesus! This is a great abomination. Jesus *is* the Truth, yet these two teachings have nothing to do with Him, but pervert Him and His ways. In teaching these false doctrines, Christian pastors 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 the Word of God.

God, though, 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 Her’s. Then Christians can learn to walk in God’s holy days and holy ways. The Apostle John wrote:

---

<sup>84</sup> In December 1854 the Roman Catholic Church decreed that (1) Mary was the *Mother* of God (i.e. the Holy Spirit incarnate; deity herself), that she died, and (2) *rose from the dead*, and (3) *ascended into heaven* and (4) was to be worshipped as the Immaculate Virgin, ‘*conceived and born without sin*’ (and that she died without ever sinning). Of course, this defies all Scripture about the biblical Mary, but these attributes align perfectly with the ancient pagan Queen of Heaven (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 that Alexander Hislop’s thesis, that the Roman Catholic Church is the Babylon of the New Testament (Rev. 17:5), and not a Christian church at all, is well founded. (The decree’s four points were taken from Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, 2nd American edition, p. 267; p. 209 in *The Full Hislop*.)

<sup>85</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>86</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 also <http://www.ramsheadpress.com/messiah/ch10.html> for the persecution and murder of Christians by the Roman Catholic Church.

“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 all Christians that they should not have anything to do with the Roman Catholic Church, nor any church that teaches Her anti-Mosaic Law doctrine and practices *illicit SEX*. God is very 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). 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 divine Example.

Also, anti-Mosaic Law theology is so engrained and cemented into the mindset of most Christians that they believe that keeping Mosaic Law is wrong, and that keeping illicit SEX is right, even if there is no biblical support for it. In this they disgrace the Catholic priest Reformer Jan Hus (1369-1415), who died, set on fire at the stake by the Roman Catholic Church because he saw that the buying of forgiveness (the sale of indulgence) was wrong. He saw other evils of the Roman Church and spoke out against it, only to give his life for the Light that he saw (justification by faith was seen by him more than a hundred years before Martin Luther spoke of it). These two reasons, the church being an institution that must perpetuate itself, even as the expense of God’s Truth, and satanic, Roman Catholic brainwashing, keep millions of Bible believing Christians in spiritual prison.

Abraham, the Father of our faith (Rom. 4:16), was 75 years old when God called him to leave his home, his friends and 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 and His Word.

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 an audible Voice say, ‘How can you put Christ back into something He was never a part of?’<sup>87</sup> Of course, he was shocked, but that began his journey out of the traditional church and into the 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; cf. 1st John 2:6)<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Read Richard Davis’ journey in *Christmas—Its Origin* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Christmas-Its-Origin.pdf>.

<sup>88</sup> This paper was finished on 21 December 2015 and last revised on 30 July 2017.