

THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL

AS TIME MARKERS

After

THE RESURRECTION

BY AVRAM YEHOSHUA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL AS TIME MARKERS

After THE RESURRECTION

Avram Yehoshua

The SeedofAbraham.net

Luke and the Apostle Paul speak of the Feasts of Israel nine times in the Book of Acts and First Corinthians. Eight times they use the Feasts as *time markers* to tell their perspective audience when an event happened or would happen, and the ninth 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],¹ or *Junius* [June]), nor do they speak of the first day of the week (i.e. Sunday) replacing the th day Sabbath.

Their use of the Feasts in this way is extremely significant for at least 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, though, teaches that at the death of Yeshua (Jesus), Mosaic Law, in this case, the Feasts of Israel and the seventh 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 the Apostles?

Also, nowhere in the New Testament does it speak of Sunday replacing or nullifying the seventh day Sabbath. The Sabbath is mentioned eleven times *after* the resurrection, while Sunday (which in the Greek New Testament is 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.² If Scripture determines God's will for us, and it is the only divinely inspired authoritative book that does, God never intended Christians to observe Sunday, Easter and Xmas (hereafter also known by the acronym, *illicit SEX*; Sunday, Easter and Xmas). The Church has *adulterated* God's Word concerning the Feasts of Israel and the 7th day Sabbath (and ultimately, Mosaic Law), and hence, why the phrase *illicit SEX* is not only appropriate, but very telling.

The second reason why the use of the Feasts of Israel and the 7th day Sabbath as time markers are important is because the Church teaches that the Law of Moses, except for its moral aspects, was cancelled (for Christians) when Christ was crucified. "The Law was nailed to the cross," pastors will say, erroneously citing Colossians 2:14³ and a couple of other proof texts. As will become obvious, Mosaic Law (and not

¹ "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 and also <http://www.unrv.com/culture/roman-days-of-week.php>.

² I address that under the section, *Sunday in the New Testament*, p. 18. 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>

³ 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.

just the Ten Commandments) was still God's holy standard by which Luke and Paul lived their lives, and as we'll see, what the early Gentile Christians also lived their lives by.⁴

THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL *After* THE RESURRECTION

The following are the nine places in the New Testament, *after* the resurrection, in Acts and First Corinthians, where the annual Feasts of Israel are spoken of by Luke and the Apostle Paul as time markers.

1. ACTS 2:1

The Book of Acts was written by Luke in 64 AD, but Acts 2:1, 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.⁵ Pentecost is the Greek name for the Hebrew 'Feast of Weeks.' Luke doesn't mention the Roman month Pentecost occurs in, but only presents the Holy Spirit coming upon the Apostles, etc., at this Mosaic feast. Pentecost occurs in early June, but with Luke not mentioning *when* it occurred, it 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!' We have to realize, though, 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 feast without mentioning when it is). Luke will mention the Feasts of Israel six more times, but never once does he tell Theophilus *when* they occur in the year. This means that Theophilus, a Gentile Christian like Luke,⁶ *knew* when all the Feasts of Israel were, with the reasonable implication being that he kept them. This reveals that Mosaic Law was still valid for Christians **34 years** *after* the resurrection because the Feasts of Israel are only found within the Law of Moses.

Also telling 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).⁷ There weren't any Gentiles at the Pentecost of

Dt. 4:5-8). For a greater understanding of Col. 2:14, ask for the PDF, *What was Nailed to the Cross?*

⁴ 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.

⁵ Ex. 34:22; Lev. 23:15-21; Num. 28:26; Dt. 16:9-10, 16.

⁶ For Luke being a Gentile see *Luke the Jew?* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Is-the-Gentile-Now-a-Jew.pdf>.

⁷ 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, *ekklaysia*, is first found of *Israel at Mt. Sinai*, in the Septuagint (Dt. 4:10; 9:10; 18:16; see also Acts 7:38, where *ekklaysia* is used by Stephen, of Israel, and rightly translated by the KJV as the *Church* in the Wilderness). The 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*

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 applied 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

Luke then says that after Passover⁸ (Ex. 12:1-8f.; Lev. 23:5), Herod intended to bring Peter 'before the people,' meaning that Herod was going to murder Peter as he had murdered the Apostle James (Acts 12:1-2). These verses (3-4) have confused some people because Passover is celebrated on the *first* night of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, 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.⁹ That's how Luke could say it was *during* the seven days of Unleavened Bread when Peter was arrested, but *after* Passover (literally 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

Acts 18:21 took place in 49 AD. Luke doesn't write which feast it is, and so we don't know what time of year it was, but we do know that it had to be in either the spring, summer or fall. Luke records that Paul was in Ephesus, in the synagogue of the traditional Jews, reasoning with them about Messiah Yeshua, *and that they wanted him to stay* and preach Christ to them (Acts 18:19-20), *but Paul declined*, telling them,

“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 18:21 NKJV; also in KJV)

Who would have ever thought that the Apostle Paul, given the opportunity to witness the Messiah to his fellow Jews (Rom. 9:1-3), would have declined *in order to keep a Mosaic feast in Jerusalem*? Obviously, the Feasts of Israel were still very important to the Apostle, even though they are 'only' shadows of the Messiah (Col. 2:16-17), but shadows are important, especially if we cannot see the Reality.

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.

⁸ 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 *פֶּחַשׁ peh'sach*, which in English is Passover.

⁹ Mt. 26:17-20; Mk. 14:12-18; Lk. 22:1, 7-14; Acts 12:3-4.

5. 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 *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.¹⁰ 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—they 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.¹¹

6. 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, though, 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 that allegedly writes ‘not to keep the Law,’ but who is consistently seen keeping a major part of it.

7. ACTS 27:9

Acts 27:9 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 cryptic reference to the Day of Atonement (Lev.

¹⁰ 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 Articles/The Feasts of Israel. You’ll also find a calendar for when the feasts are to be celebrated for the current year.

¹¹ 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).

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.¹²

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? Realize that Israel had been given the Feasts of Israel at Mt. Sinai, more than 14 centuries earlier. If something of this magnitude, this change in the celebration of the feasts were to occur, God would surely have it written about in His Word, and explain *why* the change had occurred. All throughout the Book of Acts we only see the Feasts of Israel being celebrated.

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* Yeshua was born in Bethlehem. Most any Google search on their origin will reveal all 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 do that or to use pagan feasts '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 your *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 within the exclusive domain of the God of Israel. Christians have noble reasons for *illicit SEX*, but God, through His Word, has not given authority to man to create holy days, especially pagan days that nullify His holy days. The Pharisees, too, had noble reasons for their traditions that 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 were kept by everyone 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 replaced, but on the contrary, with

¹² 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>.

their continual appearing in the Book of Acts, and that, as time markers, their sanctity and validity for Christians is established as a *biblical* fact.

Some have said that the reason Luke used the Feasts of Israel as time markers was because Luke was Jewish, and therefore, they were familiar to him, as if that would stop him from writing about the alleged ‘new reality,’ as Christians call *illicit SEX*. Also, Luke ‘being Jewish’ is negated by the fact that Paul classifies him as a Gentile (Col. 4:10-14).¹³

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 that 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 it’s obvious that the Feasts were not done away with.

Some theologians say that Luke was just a poor, disoriented writer, and so that one can’t take any theology from him, but most 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.*’¹⁴

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 early Spirit-filled Church. Marshall speaks of Luke’s attention to detail in the Book of Acts, stating,

‘One of the major contributions of Ramsay to Lucan study was his demonstration that on matters of detailed historical background *Luke shows remarkable accuracy.*’¹⁵

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 Marshall clearly refute anyone who claims that we ‘cannot take theology’ from Acts, no doubt because it goes against their anti-Law theology, and therefore, 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; 8:29).

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 at 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).

¹³ See the cite for *Luke the Jew?* on p. 2, note 6.

¹⁴ 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)

¹⁵ 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.

One would have to argue that Jesus didn't tell His Apostles that the Feasts (and therefore, Mosaic Law) had been done away with, and that the Holy Spirit never alerted any of them, including Paul,¹⁶ 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 Mosaic Law, 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?¹⁷ 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 *7 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 6 of them as specific 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 the Law of Moses was done away with at the death of Jesus, speaks of two feasts of Israel, and that, 11 years *before* Luke wrote Acts! In Paul's his first letter to the Corinthians he writes of two Feasts of Israel. The first time Paul speaks of a feast he admonishes the Gentile Corinthians to keep Passover/the Feast of Unleavened Bread! The second time he lets the Corinthians know of his plans to *stay* in Ephesus until the Feast of Weeks—Pentecost, and then travel towards them (west to Greece, from Ephesus in what is now western Turkey).

8. FIRST CORINTHIANS 5:8

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 seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread (which begins with Passover) because verses six through seven 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.

Paul speaks in verse seven 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.

Paul then says to the Corinthians in verse eight to '*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, who want to circumvent Paul's simple admonition to the Corinthians, say that he was only speaking metaphorically, not literally, but this admonition on the Apostle's part would seem very strange to Gentiles who knew nothing of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Paul was speaking to their hearts in *how* the Corinthians were to keep Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

Leaven (yeast) raises or puffs up bread dough. When a man is full of pride we say that he is '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

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ 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.

in this latter concept that Paul speaks of *purging out* the old leaven (sin; v. 7), and *being* an unleavened (sinless) loaf of bread, *just as Christ was*. This is why God gave the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which 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 Passover¹⁸ was *unleavened* bread, which *pictured* His *sinless* body.¹⁹ Spiritually, eating this bread (Messiah's body) in faith makes one like Christ. 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.²⁰ Yeshua couldn't do that with Italian or French bread, or any other bread that has yeast in it because leavened bread represents Him as full of sin.

God the Father gave Passover to ancient Israel so that His Son could walk into it, take the unleavened bread at the table and say that it was His (sinless) body.²¹ 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 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—holy. The full manifestation of this will happen on Judgment Day when we shall become as He is now—the God-Man.²²

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, 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 a biblical reason why Passover, *after* the resurrection, is so important to observe; much more so than before His death and resurrection. This teaching, of the unleavened bread and the lamb for Passover, 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 theological support for it. The Church projects the Father and the Son unto their feasts of *illicit SEX*, but those feasts have nothing to do with the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Inherent within the Feasts of Israel, though, is what the Father and 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.

The Apostle Paul, admonishing the Corinthians to keep Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, without 'malice and wickedness' (sin), but with 'sincerity and truth', was telling them how their hearts should be when they celebrate it. 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 keep it).

9. FIRST CORINTHIANS 16:8

The Apostle Paul begins to end his letter to the Corinthians, saying that he will come to them soon, but first he would stay in Ephesus until Pentecost:

⁵“Now I will come to you when I pass through Macedonia, for I am passing through Macedonia. ⁶And 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. ⁷For I do not wish to see you now on the

¹⁸ Not the 'Last Supper,' which is a Catholic phrase designed to strip the event from its Jewish reality.

¹⁹ Ex. 12:8, 14-15; Mt. 26:17.

²⁰ Exodus 12:15; 13:6; 34:18; Lev. 23:6; Num. 28:17.

²¹ Having communion with leavened bread pictures Christ as sinful, and the person as taking sin into himself.

²² 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).

way, but I hope to stay a while with you, if the Lord permits. ⁸I will stay *in Ephesus until Pentecost*.²³ ⁹For a great and effective door has opened to me, but there are many adversaries.” (1st Cor. 16:5-9)

Paul uses Pentecost as a time marker, letting the Corinthians know 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, it can't be dismissed so easily. That's why many theologians teach that Paul was only speaking metaphorically about the Feast, but as we've seen, the Apostle to the Gentiles really meant for them to keep the the Feast of Unleavened Bread *with* sincerity and truth. Their argument also doesn't take into account Luke's mention of seven Feasts of Israel in the Book of Acts, five of which have nothing to do with Pentecost (Acts 12:3-4; 18:21; 20:6; 27:6).

The nine Feasts of Israel in Acts and First Corinthians tear asunder the theological fabric of the Church concerning the keeping of the Feasts of Israel for all Christians. It also reveals that both Luke and Paul kept Mosaic Law. It was the lifestyle of all the Apostles (Acts 21:20-24) and all Christians as part of their faith-walk in the Messiah of Israel for at least the first **34** years *after* the resurrection,²⁴ and 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 lives of the Apostles.

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 intrinsically to do with Jesus Christ because they were taken from paganism. Jesus and His Apostles always kept the Feasts of Israel. Shouldn't we, also?

“For assuredly, I say to you, *until Heaven and Earth pass away, not one jot or one tittle* will pass from the Law until all is fulfilled.” (Matthew 5:18)²⁵

²³ 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).

²⁴ 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).

²⁵ 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. This speaks of 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 this passage (cf. Is. 66:23)

THE SABBATH DAY *After* THE RESURRECTION

God's seventh day Sabbath is mentioned *II 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 has replaced it* (Luke nine times, Paul once, and the author of Hebrews once). We'll go through all the cites that mention the term Sabbath, as they're listed in Acts, Colossians and Hebrews.

1. ACTS 1:12

Luke writes that the Apostles 'returned to Jerusalem from the mountain called Olives, which is near Jerusalem, *a Sabbath day's journey.*' After they had seen Yeshua ascend into the Heavens, the Apostles went back to Jerusalem. 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.²⁶ 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).

With Yeshua first appearing alive from the dead on the Sunday of Passover week,²⁷ and being seen by the Apostles and many others for 40 days, off and on,²⁸ 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 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 nulli-

²⁶ 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).

²⁷ 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.

²⁸ Acts 1:1-3; cf. Acts 13:26; 1st Cor. 15:6.

fies 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 five stadia,²⁹ a Roman expression for the same distance, that Theophilus would certainly have understood, most likely being a Roman himself.³⁰ 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.

2. 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)³¹ 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. Paul went to it in order to tell the 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

Paul, in his message to them, spoke of the Prophets being read on the Sabbath day. This is only a passing reference to the Sabbath on which the Prophets were read in the traditional synagogues.

4. ACTS 13:42

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 when we realize that if Sunday had become the day when Christians met, Paul would have told them that they could hear him the next day, on Sunday, but he didn’t do that. 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 following Sabbath almost the whole city 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 Sunday assembly.

6. ACTS 15:21

Acts 15:21 took place 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

²⁹ Literally, a Sabbath day’s journey is about 5 stadia (about 3,000 feet or 920 meters).

³⁰ 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.

³¹ 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.

15:1-6f.), and then speaks of the Gentiles assembling on the Sabbath day to learn Mosaic Law.³² At the end of the discussion, James, the half brother of Yeshua, gave four rules for the Gentiles (v. 20), and then said,

“For Moses has had, throughout many generations, those who preach him in every city, being read in the synagogues every *Sabbath*.” (Acts 15:21)

Of course, all the Jewish believers at the assembly in Jerusalem knew that Moses had been read ‘for many generations...in the synagogues every Sabbath,’ but what most Christians don’t realize is that the word *synagogue* also means ‘a *Christian* assembly.’³³ James is speaking of both the traditional Jewish synagogues and ‘now’ 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, made up of only believers (Jewish and Gentile), would equally be called a *synagogue*, especially with James using the same word in his letter referring to a Christian congregation (James 2:2;³⁴ cf. Acts 9:1-2; 26:11). The mention of Moses ‘being read in the *synagogues* every Sabbath,’ meant that both believing and unbelieving synagogues were places where Gentile believers could meet and learn Mosaic Law. Additionally, the word ‘church,’ as a distinct entity, separate from the Jewish people, wasn’t how the Apostles, including Paul, used it.³⁵

James was making a statement of observation, as well as one of expectation. James had already seen that the Gentiles *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; see 10:1–11:18; 38–40 AD or ten to twelve years earlier) and that the Gentiles would *continue* to go to the synagogues to learn Mosaic Law *on the Sabbath day*.³⁶

Most scholars teach that the four rules of James 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 for a number of reasons. One is that the four rules don’t tell the Gentiles *what* foods the Jew would consider unclean (Lev. 11). If this were for table fellowship the Gentiles would have to know

³² For a complete understanding of Acts 15:20-21 being the centerpiece of the New Testament, declaring Mosaic Law as the lifestyle for every Christian, see my book, *The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21* at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Lifting-of-the-Veil.pdf>.

³³ 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*.’

³⁴ 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).

³⁵ The Greek εκκλησία (*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. 2, note 7.

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.’

³⁶ Believing Gentiles wouldn’t be barred from the traditional synagogues until after 90 AD.

which foods were unclean so they wouldn't offend their Jewish brethren, the very reason the Church says for why the rules were given.

The four rules are actually a cohesive unit on sacrificial sexual idolatry, which if the Gentile didn't immediately stop, would place his very salvation in jeopardy (which is why the Council in Acts 15 met). In other words, the Gentile couldn't 'believe in Jesus' and continue to worship Diana and Zeus, etc. Adding 'one more god' to their pantheon was a normal practice for all the Gentiles, so 'adding Jesus' wouldn't have been seen as wrong, unless they were told. This is the reason for the four rules of James.

These four rules, then, weren't the 'only rules' for the Gentile, as some teach, but the most important in terms of Gentile salvation. That's why they were singled out and given first. The rest of the rules the Gentiles would learn at the synagogue, where Mosaic Law was taught, *every Sabbath day*. Obviously, the Sabbath was still in effect, and that, for the Gentile believers.

Once the Gentile was saved or justified by his faith in Christ, 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 includes any Gentile who is Born Again.³⁷ He didn't do away with Mosaic Law, which reveals God's holy lifestyle.³⁸ Mosaic 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 the Law is God's standard for determining what is sin.³⁹ 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?⁴⁰ By not keeping them Christians are sinning against Jesus, themselves and many others, including the Jewish people. Christians don't do these things that Jesus did, but rather, do things that Jesus would never do (e.g. *illicit SEX*, and the eating of pig [bacon and ham, etc.], catfish and

³⁷ 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.

³⁸ 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.

³⁹ 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 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).

⁴⁰ For why the dietary laws are still in effect for Christians, see *Law 102* on p. 7, note 17.

shrimp, etc.). Aside from Christian theology falsely representing the biblical Jesus, it's a great 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). Acts 15 took place **18** years *after* the resurrection. If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath there's no indication of it here. On the contrary, just the opposite is seen—the Gentiles are going to the synagogues on the Sabbath day to learn Mosaic Law.

7. 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 assembling there. For our purpose, of establishing Sabbath over Sunday in the early Church, 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

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

Acts 18:4 took place 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 or meeting 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,' and so its absence is very significant. All we see in Acts is the Sabbath, and so it's biblically reasonable to think that Paul taught on the Sabbath day in the home of Justus, and that he worked on the other six days of the week with Priscilla and Aquila making tents (Acts 18:1-3).

There would be about 80 Sabbaths for that year and half time period (cf. Acts 17:17). Luke never speaks of a Sunday meeting in all that time.

Acts 18:4 took place **22** years *after* the resurrection.

10. COLOSSIANS 2:16

The letter to the Colossians was written about 60 AD by the Apostle Paul. This is the fourth significant passage for the Sabbath–Sunday issue. Paul writes,

“So let no one judge you in food or in drink, or regarding a festival (Feast of Israel), or a New Moon, or Sabbaths.” (Colossians 2:16)

Many Christians use this verse 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. The key word in this verse is 'judge' (κρίνω *krino*), which Paul uses in a simple way, meaning, 'to pro-

nounce an opinion concerning right and wrong.⁴¹ Paul didn't want anyone in the group to judge the group wrongly *regarding how* they kept the Sabbath day (or the Feasts and New Moons, etc.).

The Sabbath was still the day Paul's Christians kept and assembled on. This is also seen in the very next verse, which speaks of the Feasts and Sabbaths as picturing what is 'to come' in the future when we will actually see 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 Christ." (Col. 2:17)

Both the Textus Receptus and the NU text have δὲ (*dae*), 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 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 understand Him and some of His sayings, is that inherent in the Sabbath is the theme of redemption (salvation). God made it 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. Note how Yeshua chastises those who opposed Him when He wanted to heal the Jewish woman, bent over for 18 years:

"So ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound—think of it!—for eighteen 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. The Sabbath is a perfect picture of Yeshua as the Redeemer of Israel; Sunday cannot claim that.

Paul, in Colossians, comes against the pagan Gnostic practice of fasting on the Sabbath day (Col. 2:23), and the Gnostic understanding of 'how to attain' to God (to be saved). 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 Sabbath and Mosaic Law. Interesting to note is that if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath, what is Paul doing writing of 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.

⁴¹ κρινω Joseph Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), n.p.

11. HEBREWS 4:9

Hebrews was written about 67 AD. This is the fifth significant biblical witness for the Sabbath in the New Testament *after* the resurrection. Hebrews 4:9 states, “Therefore, there remains *a Sabbath rest* for the people of God.” Every English Bible has “a Sabbath rest” except the King James and New King James, which only has ‘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.⁴² This is a glaring translation error for 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 not have been used. Hebrews, like the Book of Acts and Paul’s letters, 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 we don’t work, buy nor sell on the Sabbath, which makes it different from the other days. The Sabbath is God’s *practical* gift to us (Mark 2:27-28). On the Sabbath we cease from our physical work as a natural reminder for ceasing from our carnal anxiety 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 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 (cf. 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 Sabbath, which reveals that the Sabbath was still valid for Christians **37 years** *after* the resurrection.

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 traditional day of Jewish assembly,⁴³ and a 6th time speaks of ‘a Sabbath day’s journey,’⁴⁴ the other 5 times, written by 3 different New Testament writers,⁴⁵ 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 it was the ‘new day’ of assembly. Yeshua and His Apostles always kept the Sabbath day holy. Shouldn’t we, also? The Apostle John wrote: “He who says he abides in Him *ought himself also to walk just as He walked.*” (1st John 2:6)

⁴² σαββατισμὸς Joseph Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), n.p. “to keep the sabbath; a keeping sabbath.”

⁴³ Acts 13:14, 27, 42, 44; 16:13; 17:2.

⁴⁴ Acts 1:12.

⁴⁵ Luke three times (Acts 13:42; 15:21; 18:4); Paul once (Col. 2:16); and the author of Hebrews once (Heb. 4:9).

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. 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 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 will worship the God of Israel, not Sunday. The seventh day Sabbath has been holy and blessed since Creation, and was 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 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 He gives us (Ex. 20:8-11) and His redemption of Israel (Dt. 5:12-15; Rom. 11:11f.; Rev. 5:9). We are to rest, keep the day holy, assemble on it and minister 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. The divinely inspired Scriptures diametrically oppose Church teaching about Sunday.

SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Sunday, or rather the first day of the week as the Bible always speaks of it, is mentioned eight times in the New Testament, six of which are found in the Gospels.⁴⁶ The six Gospel citations 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 has replaced the Sabbath because of the resurrection. Also, Greek scholars know that grammatically, the verse can be equally 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. Here's the alternate translation, which may be seen as a note in some English Bibles and 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."⁴⁷

Most commentaries agree that Mark 16:9 was *not* written by Mark, but by a later Christian scribe. Be that

⁴⁶ 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).

⁴⁷ 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, see *The Resurrection and Mark 16:9* at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Resurrection-and-Mk.-16.9.pdf>

as it may, there is no authoritative Scripture that declares that Yeshua *rose* on Sunday. He 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!”⁴⁸ 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.

What this means is that *none* of the six times that ‘Sunday’ appears in the Gospels concerning the resurrection appearances of Messiah Yeshua speak of it replacing the Sabbath. Yeshua was first seen on Sunday, but no one writes that because of 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 60 years** *after* the resurrection. If Sunday had come to replace the Sabbath ‘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.

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: Peter, whom many believe was the ‘voice’ behind the Gospel of Mark, wrote two letters; Luke wrote Acts, and 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.’ It’s hard to believe that such a dramatic change as Sabbath to Sunday would not be clearly spoken of by any of the writers of the New Testament, if such a change had indeed taken place.

Even more bleak for Sunday is the fact that from Acts to 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.⁴⁹ 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 ‘Sunday’ begins. Saturday evening is when Jews get together in synagogues to say ‘farewell’ to the Sabbath and to welcome in the first day of the new week.⁵⁰ This is what happened in Troas.

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,⁵¹ as F. F. Bruce wrote. Luke mentions nothing of it being a ‘new day’ to assemble on, something we would expect if Sunday had replaced

⁴⁸ 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.)

⁴⁹ 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.”

⁵⁰ 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>.

⁵¹ 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.

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 *reason* why Luke mentions this meeting is not because Sunday 'was 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 (Acts 9:40). *That's* why Luke writes of Troas and the first day of the week; and in this case it was Saturday night when they met. 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 reveal in Acts. 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 seen encouraging 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. 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:

¹"Now concerning *the collection for the saints*, as I have given *orders* to the churches of Galatia, *so you must do also*: ²*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*. ³And 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 up 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 obvious that the person wasn't in the church, putting it in a tithes and offering basket.

This 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 the church 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 embarrassed, 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).

The Resurrection and Sunday

Many Christians argue that Christ being resurrected on Sunday⁵² warrants or justifies Sunday overturning the Sabbath and making Sunday ‘the new Sabbath,’ but there is no Scripture that supports that. In other words, they would be making up their own teaching or tradition that nullifies 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 not God’s idea (cf. 2nd Sam. 7:1-13f.).

Other Christians think they “can choose to keep any day as their Sabbath,” erroneously citing Romans 14:5-6,⁵³ where Paul speaks of one man esteeming one day above another, while another man esteems all days alike; and that one man fasts and 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 marketplace. Some Gentile Christians thought they couldn’t eat it 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 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, Paul isn’t saying that one can override God’s Sabbath for any day he chooses, but that he can choose which day he fasts on, thereby *esteeming* that day ‘above the others’ for himself.

If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath during the time 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,⁵⁴ yet there’s *nothing* written about Sunday being ‘the new day’ nor replacing the Sabbath, ‘the Lord’s Day’ notwithstanding.⁵⁵ With not one scriptural witness it’s a biblical certainty that Sunday did *not* replace the Sabbath in the time of the New Testament (i.e. 30-96 AD). Therefore, Sunday assembly, in lieu of Sabbath assembly and holiness, is a tradition of the Church that *nullifies* God’s Word and is sin. Sunday keeping churches have no authority from God to meet on Sunday⁵⁶ as an alternative to keeping God’s seventh day Sabbath holy.

⁵² Mt. 28:1, 9; Mk. 16:1-2, 9; Lk. 24:1, 30-31, 36; Jn. 20:1, 11f.

⁵³ For why Rom. 14:5-6 can’t be used to support making Sunday one’s Sabbath, see *Romans 14 and the Dietary Laws* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Romans-14-and-the-Dietary-Laws.pdf>. Also, there is no such thing as ‘the Christian Sabbath’ (i.e. Sunday). There’s only one (weekly) 7th day Sabbath in Scripture.

⁵⁴ 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.

⁵⁵ 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).

⁵⁶ It’s not a sin to meet on Sunday or Monday, etc., but it is a sin to not keep the Sabbath day 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,⁵⁷ 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. This says a lot about how the Father and the Son view the resurrection and the first resurrection appearances, and also, how wrong it is for Christians to try and justify Sunday over Sabbath because of the resurrection and those appearances.

Sunday is seen six 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 like to 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.⁵⁸ Adding to this is the fact that neither Easter, nor Christmas are even mentioned in the New Testament, and it's crystal clear that *illicit SEX* is not of God, nor what He wants His people to practice.

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 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 rightfully didn't listen to 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

Bacchiocchi presents the *Didache* and Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians* as proof that Sunday didn't arise in the days of the Apostles nor immediately thereafter. He writes:

"In the *immediate* post New Testament literature, the resurrection is...*not* cited as the primary 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.*"⁵⁹

"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 sym-

⁵⁷ 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>.

⁵⁸ 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.

⁵⁹ Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday*, pp. 78-79f. In Avram's PDF it's p. 46f.

bol: 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).”⁶⁰

“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 than 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.”⁶¹

“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.”⁶²

“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”⁶³ in support of Sunday assembly.

These two historical documents and the admission by Mosna prove that commemorating or keeping Sunday ‘because of the resurrection’ was not known in the days immediately after the Apostles. Sunday didn’t come about as the day that replaced the Sabbath in the days of the Apostles, who always kept the 7th day Sabbath holy, nor in the days immediately after them. This means that Sunday assembly over Sabbath holiness is not of the Lord Jesus. The Reformers would be pleased to know that.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 79. Clement was Bishop of Rome, a title that would soon be overshadowed by that of ‘Pope.’

⁶¹ Ibid., note 14. See K. Clark, *Worship in th Jerusalem Temple after 70 A.D.*

⁶² Ibid., p. 80.

⁶³ 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.’

⁶⁴ The 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. 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 Christian sect of the Nazarenes were the Jewish *spiritual descendants of the Apostles*.⁶⁵ 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 that it,

“consisted of converted Hebrews” and was administered by 15 bishops from the “*circumcision*”⁶⁶ and they were “*zealous to insist on the literal observance of the Law.*”⁶⁷

These Nazarenes, more than **100** 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. Also 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 they could).

Epiphanius (315-403), our second official Catholic witness, was also a bishop and church historian. He lived after Eusebius and writes of the Nazarenes in his time, more than **300** years *after* the resurrection:

“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.*”⁶⁸

Epiphanius confirms that well into the fourth century the Nazarenes continued to keep Sabbath, Feasts and Mosaic Law. Our third witness, non-Roman Catholic Samuele 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.”⁶⁹

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 third 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 and confirms Scripture from the New Testament about the Feasts of Israel, etc., being kept by the Apostles and all

⁶⁵ 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.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 152; p. 91 in Avram’s PDF. Eusebius, *HE* 4, 5, 2-11; Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 70, 10, PG 42, 355-356.

⁶⁷ 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.

⁶⁸ 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://seed-ofabraham.net/Gentile-Circumcision.pdf>.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 192; in Avram’s PDF, p. 114.

Christians in the early Church. Obviously, this means that Jesus wants Christians to keep them today.

Sunday—Pharisaic Catholicism

The Roman Catholic Church also changed God's Sabbath to Sunday in 120 AD (when it also 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 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.'⁷⁰

Gaspar de Fosso (1496-1592) the Archbishop of Reggio, our second official Catholic witness, mocked the Sunday Protestants 450 years ago, in 1562, and 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.*'⁷¹

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 Genesis to Revelation and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of*

⁷⁰ 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.

⁷¹ 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.

Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.⁷²

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 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).⁷³ Xmas is just the Catholic way of celebrating Saturn's birthday. Alexander Hislop writes of Saturnalia, how it predates Christ 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.”⁷⁴

The Roman Catholic Church used Saturnalia, changed the name to Christ's Mass, as a way to draw pagans into Catholicism, just as they had 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. The Catholic and 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.

⁷² 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>.

⁷³ For more on Christ's Mass see <http://www.angelfire.com/la2/prophet1/chrmass.html>.

⁷⁴ 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 2:130 AD. The Feast of Weeks (*Shavu’ot*—Pentecost; Ex. 34:22; Dt. 16:9-10)
 2. Acts 12:344 AD. The Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 12:8, 15f.; 23:15; 34:18; Lev. 23:6)
 3. Acts 12:444 AD. Passover (Ex. 12:11, 27; Lev. 23:5; Num. 9:5; 28:16; Dt. 16:1)
 4. Acts 18:2149 AD. This coming Feast
 5. Acts 20:657 AD. The Feast of Unleavened Bread
 6. Acts 20:1657 AD. The Feast of Weeks (*Shavu’ot*—Pentecost)
 7. Acts 27:960 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).

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. 5:853 AD. The Feast (Passover/the Feast of Unleavened Bread)
9. 1st Cor. 16:853 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. AprilPassoverTwice.....Acts 12:4; 1st Cor. 5:8
2. AprilThe Feast of Unleavened BreadTwice.....Acts 12:3; 20:6
3. JuneThe Feast of Weeks—PentecostThree times ...Acts 2:1; 20:16; 1st Cor. 16:8
4. Oct.The Fast—The Day of Atonement ...OnceActs 27:9
5. ???An unspecified Feast of IsraelOnceActs 18:21

The Feasts of Israel are mentioned **nine** times in the Book of Acts and First Corinthians. The use of these nine feast cites by Luke and Paul, eight of which are time markers, should raise bright red flags for every Christian. The Church teaches they were done away with, but Acts and First Corinthians say 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 twice, and one time it’s not Sunday at all, but actually Saturday night.

CONCLUSION

With eight Feasts of Israel being used as *time markers* by Luke and the Apostle Paul, it's clear that during the days of the Apostles all Christians kept these Feasts. This is also confirmed by the ninth feast, where Paul exhorts his Corinthians to keep Passover, and by Catholic historians. 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.

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 (Mosaic Law) to us. 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 Easter and Xmas. God has not given man the authority to create holy days. God has reserved that for Himself. This also applies to the weekly Sabbath.

The seventh day Sabbath is seen eleven times in the New Testament *after* the resurrection, with five of those times establishing that the Sabbath was being observed by Christians. Another five 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 eleven 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.

The Book of Acts is the only 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 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 used the Sabbath to underscore a theological point (Paul in Col. 2:16 and 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 by the Roman Catholic Church. The writing of the Feasts and the Sabbath by three New Testament writers, without speaking of anything contravening them, biblically validates them.

Further underscoring the biblical fact of the Sabbath is the glaring theological absence of Sunday. It's mentioned six times in the Gospels concerning Yeshua's resurrection appearances, but not one Gospel writer speaks of it replacing the Sabbath. From Acts to 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* Scripture containing Sunday cannot be used to establish that the Church was *already* having weekly Sunday meetings.

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 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. Also, this meeting was 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'd 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 the Messiah envisioned Sunday replacing the seventh day Sabbath.

If God wanted 'resurrection Sunday' to be holy He would have made the *first* day, Sunday of Creation Week, holy and not the *seventh* day Sabbath. Didn't Jesus speak of being Lord of the *Sabbath*? Isn't Jesus the *same* yesterday, *today* and forever? "What would Jesus do?," was stamped on many a Christian's wrist band years ago, so that they could look at it and 'do what Jesus did' in any situation they found themselves in. What would Jesus do? Would He keep Sunday or the Sabbath? Would He keep Easter of Passover? It's obvious from the Gospels that Jesus kept Sabbath, Passover and Mosaic Law, and He would keep it today, also, because not to do so would be sin for Him, which means it's sin for Christians who don't follow Him in these areas.

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 'we're not under the Law anymore.'⁷⁵

"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 the days of the Apostles. There would have been no need for Rome to *change* Sabbath and Passover if that change had already happened 'at the death of Jesus,' or during the time of the Apostles. This confirms what Scripture revealed: Sabbath and Feasts, and therefore Mosaic Law were being kept by all Christians for **70** years *after* the resurrection. It's still God's holy lifestyle for Christians, despite what the Christian Pharisaic Church teaches.⁷⁶

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

⁷⁵ See *No Longer Under the Law?* at <http://seedofabraham.net/No-Longer-Under-the-Law.pdf>.

⁷⁶ 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>.

God's truth in these areas will be persuaded by 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 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 Mosaic Law, 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 God's Church (Mt. 16:18; Acts 2:47; 8:1, 3; 1st Cor. 10:32), and the requisite, God-ordained lifestyle it implies. 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 determines whether we sin or not.

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* Jesus was born, through Daniel the prophet, who said:

²¹"I was watching, and the same horn (the Pope) *was making war against the holy ones, and prevailing against them,* ²²until the Ancient of Days came and a *judgment* was made in favor of the holy ones of the Most High God and *the time came for the holy ones to possess the Kingdom.* ²³Then He said: 'The fourth **Beast** shall be a *fourth kingdom* on Earth, which shall be ***different from all other kingdoms*** (the Roman Catholic Church) and it shall devour the whole Earth, trample it and break it in pieces...²⁵He (the Pope) shall speak pompous words against the Most High God. (He) ***shall persecute the holy ones of the Most High God, and (he) shall intend to change times (Sabbath and Feasts of Israel) and (Mosaic) Law.*** Then the holy ones shall be given into his hand, for a time and times and half a time.'" (Daniel 7:21-23, 25)⁷⁷

The Popes have persecuted, warred and murdered millions of true Christians for more than a thousand 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. Christian eyes are being opened to this Roman Catholic deception and war, which all Protestant churches have blindly followed, and are fleeing from it.

The fourth Beast, *unlike* all the other kingdoms of the world, is a *religious* kingdom. The Roman Catholic Church has trampled over, devoured and made war upon the whole Earth through its perversion of God's Word, pagan heretical teachings and ruthless persecutions of Christians, Jews and other peoples.

The Roman Catholic Church teaches 'salvation by infant sprinkling,' which has no biblical basis, prayers to, and worship of 'Mother Mary'⁷⁸ (a totally pagan, non-biblical 'Mary'), and that the Pope himself is

⁷⁷ 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.

‘Christ on Earth,’ which is part of the pompous (blasphemous) words against God that Daniel speaks of.⁷⁹

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 in Heaven. That is what the apostate Roman Catholic Church teaches them, but they are going to be in for the shock of their lives on Judgment Day.

The Roman Catholic Church (RCC) has persecuted God’s people, both literally and doctrinally, for 1,900 years.⁸⁰ 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). When the Protestant Reformers broke away from the RCC (in the 16th century), they didn’t realize that the teaching against Mosaic Law was heretical, and so they took it with them, and also, the RCC practice of *illicit SEX*. The Popes 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 standard for what they are to believe, and therefore, how they are to walk out their faith in Christ. Yet, they have blindly followed the RCC’s 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. Christianity causes hundreds of millions of Christians to sin against Jesus and themselves in their pride and ignorance. Great is the power of deception that honors satanic traditions and 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 these two perverse teachings of Her’s. Then Christians can learn to walk in God’s holy days and holy ways:

“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-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 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.

⁷⁸ 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*.)

⁷⁹ *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.

⁸⁰ 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.

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.

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.

Twenty-eight years ago a man by the name of Richard Davis told me how he had been challenged about Xmas thirty years earlier. 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?'⁸¹ 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's amazing to realize that Christianity is the only religion in the world that does not emulate its Founder, but the Lord 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 it! You must not add to it nor take away from it!” (Deuteronomy 12:32)⁸²

⁸¹ Read Richard Davis' journey in *Christmas—Its Origin* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Christmas-Its-Origin.pdf>.

⁸² This paper was finished on 21 December 2015 and last revised on 5 April 2017.