

# **THE LORD'S DAY**

# **SUNDAY?**

**by Avram Yehoshua**

**[THE SEED OF ABRAHAM](#)**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Scholarly Reasons For The Lord's Day Being Sunday</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Problems With The Lord's Day Being Sunday</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Acts And The Lord's Day</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Bullinger And The Lord's Day</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Lenski And The Lord's Day</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Acts 20:7 And Sunday</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Paul And Luke Celebrate Passover In Philippi</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Lenski And First Corinthians 16:2</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>For Argument's Sake</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Lenski And Revelation 1:10</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Lenski And The Apostolic Church</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>John 20:19 and the Lord's Day</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Moffat and The Lord's Day</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>WHY A SUNDAY RESURRECTION?</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>YAHVEH'S DAY</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>AFTER THE APOSTLES</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Clement—The Letter to the Corinthians</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Ignatius—The Letter to the Magnesians</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>The Pseudo Letter of Barnabas</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>The Didache</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>PASSOVER VS EASTER</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>Articles</b> .....	<b>44</b>



# INTRODUCTION

Revelation 1:10 is the only place in the New Testament that speaks of “the Lord’s Day.” The Apostle John writes that he was “in the Spirit on the Lord’s Day,” which most Christian theologians and pastors teach is Sunday. Ask any of them though, to show you in the New Testament where “the Lord’s Day” is equated with Sunday, or where Sunday is spoken of as “the Lord’s Day,” and they can’t give you a single Scripture, let alone two or more Scripture witnesses to verify it.<sup>1</sup> How then do they justify that the Lord’s Day in Revelation 1:10 is Sunday?

Christian theologians resort to three New Testament Scriptures that literally have “the first day of the week” in them, for that’s how the Bible speaks of “Sunday.” They interpret these to mean that Christians were keeping Sunday, and not the 7th day Sabbath, and so *Sunday must be* “the Lord’s Day.” This is false logic. Also, they fall back on the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church “Fathers,” whose tradition says, “the Lord’s Day” is Sunday. The Lord’s Day being Sunday is both unbiblical and heretical, as is Sunday being the weekly day of assembly during the days of the Apostles (30-100 AD). I will also reveal the false understanding of four of the earliest letters outside the New Testament concerning the Lord’s Day.

John wrote Revelation in 95 AD.<sup>2</sup> In Revelation 1:10 he says, “I was in the Spirit *on the Lord’s Day* and I heard behind me a loud voice as of a trumpet.” The two Greek texts from which we get our English Bibles are identical for this verse,<sup>3</sup> and so there’s no concern that one text says one thing in Greek while the other says something else. They both say, “τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ. (*Tae Kuri’ah’kay Hay’mira*, which is just one of several ways to phonetically spell it in English). English Bibles translate it as “the Lord’s Day.” It’s the only place in the New Testament (or even the Septuagint) where this Greek phrase is found.

Interesting to realize is that John doesn’t say something like, “I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s Day, *the day He rose*” or, “I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s Day, the first day of the week,” either of which would have *proven from Scripture* that it was a Sunday that John was equating *the Lord’s Day* with. This means that it can point to two other things: the 7th day Sabbath, as Jesus says He is “Lord of the Sabbath” (Mark 2:28), or the “Last Day,” where “Day” means the time or season of God’s Judgment of the Earth and End Time events culminating in the New Jerusalem, which is what the entire Book of Revelation is about.

## Scholarly Reasons For The Lord’s Day Being Sunday

Most Christians believe that the Lord’s Day is Sunday, and that Sunday is God’s New Testament day of the week for assembling and worshiping Yeshua (Hebrew for Jesus). *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, an authoritative Christian reference work, states that it’s “beyond all reasonable doubt,”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> God’s Truth is confirmed with two or three witnesses; in this case two or three Scripture cites that would uphold that “the Lord’s Day” is Sunday. Compare Dt. 17:6; 19:15; Mt. 18:16; 2nd Cor. 13:1; 1st Tim. 5:19; Heb. 10:28.

<sup>2</sup> Some think that Revelation was written about 68 AD, but this only makes the case for “the Lord’s Day” being “Sunday” that much harder to defend. John wrote his *Gospel* in 95 AD. If he was calling the Lord’s Day Sunday in 68 AD, why would he only use “Sunday” in his Gospel Resurrection accounts, written about 95 AD, but not the Lord’s Day? (John 20:1, 19, 26) Theologians generally think that the two (the Gospel of John and Revelation) were written around the same time (95 AD), but how strange would it be if in 68 AD he uses “the Lord’s Day” for Sunday in Revelation, but 27 years later, for his Gospel in 95 AD, he only speaks of “Sunday”?

<sup>3</sup> “ἐγενόμην ἐν Πνεύματι ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἤκουσα ὀπίσω μου φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος;” (Revelation 1:10 GNT-TR)

“ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἤκουσα ὀπίσω μου φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος” (Revelation 1:10 GNT-WH)

<sup>4</sup> Geoffrey W. Bromiley, General Editor, Everett F. Harrison, Roland K. Harrison and William Sanford LaSor, Associate Editors, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. one (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eer-

that “the Lord’s Day” of Revelation 1:10 is Sunday. *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, a respected Christian commentary agrees, saying there can be “little doubt”<sup>5</sup> that the Lord’s Day is Sunday.

Robert Mounce<sup>6</sup> (1921-2019), a renowned American Christian theologian, was a member of the translation teams for the New International Version, the New Living Translation, and the English Standard Version. He, as well as the *NIV Study Bible*,<sup>7</sup> say “the Lord’s Day” in Revelation 1:10 is a “technical term for Sunday,” because Jesus rose on the first day of the week.<sup>8</sup>

Richard Lenski (1864-1936) was probably the greatest Lutheran theologian since Martin Luther, which reveals the level of theologian that he was, but unfortunately both were anti-Semites, which seriously tainted their theology on Mosaic Law as God’s New Testament lifestyle, and also God’s heart for the Jewish people. Anti-Semitism also doesn’t bode well with *the Jewish King* (cf. Luke 1:30-33; Rev. 22:16).

Down through the ages anti-Semitism has been just as prevalent in the Lutheran Church, because of Martin Luther, as it has been in the Roman Catholic Church, and that’s saying a lot. In relation to Sunday, Lenski claims that Sunday assembly was of the “earliest apostolic times” and that it was “for public worship. He writes, “*Christ made the first day of the week his own,*” by rising from the dead on Sunday and by “sending the Holy Spirit” on the Sunday of Pentecost (Acts Two). The Apostolic Church, he states, *chose Sunday* as its day of weekly assembly and worship,<sup>9</sup> and therefore Sunday is the Lord’s Day.

It was Jerome (345-402 AD), who freely admitted his hatred of the Jews and their religion, and whose “caustic theological rhetoric reinforced the Roman Catholic Church’s displacement of the Jews.”<sup>10</sup> In other words, according to Catholicism, Christians replaced the Jews as God’s Chosen people. That’s called Replacement theology. Many Christians still walk in this heresy. Jerome said that John was “in the Spirit on” an *Easter Sunday*.

---

mans Publishing Company, 1979), p. 692; 52-53 AD. “The expression” (the Lord’s Day) “occurs here only in the New Testament, and *beyond all reasonable doubt* it means on Sunday. This is, therefore, the earliest use of the phrase” which “*had not yet become common in AD 57*, as is shown from St. Paul writing, “on the first of the week”” (instead of using “the Lord’s Day:” 1st Cor. 16:2; 53-57 AD, “the first day of the week” being) “the usual expression in the Gospels and Acts:” 44 AD “Matthew 28:1” (the first day of the week), 57 AD “Acts 20:7 ...comp. Mark. 16:9” (the first day of the week), 62 AD “Luke 24:1” (the first day of the week), 65 AD “Mark 16:2” (the first day of the week), 95 AD “John 21:19” (the first day of the week).

<sup>5</sup> Charles F. Pfeiffer, Old Testament; Everett F. Harrison, New Testament, *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977), p. 1,502. “*There is little doubt* that the Lord’s day here refers to the day we know as Sunday.”

<sup>6</sup> Mounce, Robert H. *The Book of Revelation, The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.; Kindle Edition, 1997), pp. 55-57. “It is more probable that this is the first mention in Christian literature of the Lord’s day as a technical term for the first day of the week...It is the Lord’s day because on the first day of the week Christ rose victorious from the grave.”

<sup>7</sup> Kenneth Barker et al., eds., the *NIV Study Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985; Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 25,635. “*the Lord’s Day is a technical term* for the first day of the week—so named because Jesus rose from the dead on that day. It was also the day on which the Christians met (see Acts 20:7) and took up collections (see 1st Cor. 16:2).”

<sup>8</sup> The biblical first day of the week begins on Saturday night at dark and ends on Sunday night at dark. This follows “the Days” in Creation Week, the First Day beginning in darkness and then going into light (i.e. morning; cf. Gen. 1:1-5f.).

<sup>9</sup> R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John’s Revelation, Lenski’s Commentary on the New Testament*; Accordance electronic ed. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), pp. 57-58. ““Since the earliest apostolic times, Sunday was the Christians’ day for assembly and public worship. Here for the first time” (speaking of Rev. 1:10), “we meet the designation *the Lord’s day*...Christ made the first day of the week peculiarly his own by rising from the dead on this day and by sending his Holy Spirit on this day of the week. Both Easter and Pentecost made Sunday “the Lord’s day.” And after the day had been thus distinguished, the apostolic church chose it as its day of public, congregational worship.”

<sup>10</sup> [Jerome and the Jews](#).

Alan Johnson<sup>11</sup> (1888-1942), a former professor of New Testament and Christian Ethics at Wheaton Graduate School, following Jerome, wrote in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, another prestigious Christian reference work, that the Apostle John may very well have been “in the Spirit” on an Easter Sunday. Leon Morris also thought that possible.<sup>12</sup>

Leon Morris (1914-2006) was an Australian New Testament Christian scholar of prominence. He said that the Lord's Day mentioned in Rev. 1:10 was the “first use of the term *for the day of worship*,” and the weekly Sunday “*commemoration of the resurrection*.”<sup>13</sup> He, like Jerome and Johnson, stated that it was on an Easter Sunday that John was “in the Spirit,” because of John 20:19 (which speaks of the first appearance of Yeshua to the Apostles after His Resurrection. Morris also brings to his position Acts 20:7 and 1st Cor. 16:2.<sup>14</sup> Most Christian scholars use the last two cites to support their theology that Sunday replaced the seventh day Sabbath and therefore, that Sunday is the Lord's Day.

Matthew Henry (1662-1714) was a famous English preacher and author. He is best known for his six volume biblical commentary, *Exposition of the Old and New Testaments*, which many still use today. Henry calls Sunday the Lord's Day and also the “Christian Sabbath.”<sup>15</sup>

James Moffat (1870-1944) was a Scottish theologian and among other things, translated the entire Bible into English, which many today use for its accuracy. He writes in his commentary on Revelation that Sunday is “specifically mentioned as the Lord's Day.”<sup>16</sup>

David Stern (1935-2022) was a scholar, author and pioneer in the Messianic Jewish movement. Stern taught that “the Lord's Day” meant *both* Sunday and Judgment Day.<sup>17</sup>

Rounding out our sampling of Christian scholars and commentaries is Alfred Plummer (1841-1926), an Anglican theologian and prolific writer. His commentaries on the New Testament, noted especially for the section dealing with Luke's Gospel, and his introductions to the books of the Old Testament, are scholarly and conservative. He has a very unusual theological explanation though, for why the Lord's Day is Sunday. He saw there were a lot of “sevens” in Revelation (e.g. the seven bowls of wrath; Rev. 16:1; 17:1; 21:9), and because of that, the sevens must mean they begin on the first day of the week, Sunday, and so Sunday must be the Lord's Day!<sup>18</sup> Mr. Plummer certainly had a vivid imagination.

---

<sup>11</sup> Alan F. Johnson, Author; Frank E. Gaebelien, General Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed., *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 12, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1990; Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 60,794. “Others find a reference...to *Easter Sunday* and base it on the” Catholic “tradition reported in Jerome's commentary on Matthew 24, that Christ would” (also) “return on Easter Eve.”

<sup>12</sup> Leon Morris, M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Revelation* (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 2000), p. 52. “Morris also says that some see it as relating to Easter, when John was in the Spirit, or Judgment Day.” It seems that Jerome saw the Lord's Day as Sunday because of the “Easter” Sunday Resurrection, and Morris is telling us it was Jerome who first came up with that idea, without citing Jerome.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Matthew Henry, *Matthew Henry's Commentary* (Condensed; Accordance Bible Software, 2012), paragraph 6,400. “The day and time when John had this vision was the Lord's day, the Christian sabbath, the first day of the week, observed in remembrance of the resurrection of Christ. Let us who call him “Our Lord,” honour him on his own day.”

<sup>16</sup> James Moffat, D.D., Author; W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, M. A., LL. D., *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. five: *Revelation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), p. 340. He writes in his commentary on Revelation that the Lord's Day is Sunday, “as the day of Christian worship is specifically mentioned.” He was most likely linking in his mind Acts 20:7 and 1st Cor. 16:2 with the Lord's Day, but as we'll see his position is untenable as neither of them mentions the Lord's Day being Sunday.

<sup>17</sup> David Stern, *Jewish New Testament Commentary* (Clarksville, MD: Jewish New Testament Pub., 1992), p. 791.

<sup>18</sup> Alfred Plummer, author, assisted by T. Randell (who also wrote the Introduction), and A.T. Bott; Henry D. M. Spence-Jones and Joseph S. Excell, Editors; *The Pulpit Commentary Series: Revelation* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 1890; Accordance Bible Software, 2017), paragraph 93,463. “Whereas seeing that the visions which

With all these *Christian authorities being absolutely certain* that “the Lord’s Day” is Sunday, and Sunday is the new day for weekly assembly or “the Christian Sabbath,” how could any “less educated” Christian think otherwise? With some common sense of the three New Testament Scriptures theologians speak of (i.e. John 20:19; Acts 20:7 and 1st Cor. 16:2) we’ll see that the Lord’s Day being Sunday is a tradition of Christianity that rests on very thin ice.

Ron Allen offers an intelligent rebuke to those who observe Sunday, whether they call it the Christian Sabbath or not. In commenting on the Israeli who picked up “sticks” (wood and/or stubble for a fire) on the Sabbath day (Num. 15:32-36), Allen says,

“we speak in an oxymoron if we describe Sunday, the Lord’s Day, as a “Christian sabbath.” If we really believed that Sunday is the “Sabbath,” then not only would we need to transform it to a day of rest (rather than the frenetic activities that mark most church-going families on this day!), but we would logically have to consider the application of the seriousness” of the punishment for breaking the Christian Sabbath. “For Sabbath breaking in this story is a blatant revolt against God that is deserving of death!”<sup>19</sup>

Allen seems to agree that Sunday is “the Lord’s Day,” but he brings up two important points: rest and punishment, for the observance of, and the breaking of the “Christian Sabbath.” Today, these two points aren’t even considered for Sunday, let alone enacted, which reveals how flimsy and unbiblical the term, “Christian Sabbath,” is.

## Problems With The Lord’s Day Being Sunday

One significant problem with the Lord’s Day being Sunday is that there isn’t a single Scripture to validate it. The three New Testament Scriptures do not speak of the first day of the week as being the Lord’s Day. The Lord’s Day isn’t even mentioned in those three Scriptures.

Leon Morris is among only a handful of Sunday theologians who use John 20:19 to support their Sunday equals the Lord’s Day theology. The reason why most scholars shy away from using John 20:19 or any other Resurrection account or first appearance of Jesus is because all the Gospels were written many years *after* the Resurrection (44-95 AD) and none of them so much as even hint at the Sabbath being replaced by Sunday, let alone clearly state that Sunday was the new day of assembly or the Lord’s Day.

As for Plummer’s “sevens” meaning the Lord’s Day is Sunday, he fails to realize that if the bowls of God’s wrath, etc., do begin on Sunday, which is not “a-given,” and daily follow one another for each day of the week thereafter, *they must end* on the 7th day Sabbath. Creation began on a Sunday and ended with the Sabbath, which God made holy and blessed (Gen. 2:1-3). Sunday being the first day in Creation didn’t overturn the Sabbath. Why would something beginning on Sunday then, be given the honor of being the Lord’s Day? God’s “sevens” would culminate on the Sabbath, not Sunday, seeming to give more honor to the Sabbath than Sunday, just as God did in Creation.

*Unger’s Bible Dictionary* is an asterisk in Christian scholarship concerning Sunday. It says it’s “scarcely biblically defensible,”<sup>20</sup> and that it’s a Christian *invention*, as is Sunday being the Christian Sabbath.<sup>21</sup>

---

follow are grouped in sevens (the seven candlesticks, seven seals, seven trumpets, seven vials), the fact that they begin on the first day of the seven” (day week) “is eminently appropriate.”

<sup>19</sup> Ronald B. Allen, Author; Gaebelien, General Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed., *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 2, *Numbers* (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1990; Accordance Bible Software, 2012), paragraph 10,527.

<sup>20</sup> Merrill F. Unger, *The New Unger’s Bible Dictionary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1988), p. 782. “The term “Christian Sabbath” is scarcely biblically defensible...It must carefully be remembered that the Lord’s Day, the term Sunday, being of pagan origin, is strictly a Christian institution.”



Matthew Henry wouldn't have been pleased and he isn't the only one, but the fact is that nowhere in Scripture does anyone mention Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday being the Lord's Day. The Pharisees though, would be pleased with these Sunday Christian theologians stating unequivocally that it's also the Lord's Day.

Anglican scholar and priest, E. W. Bullinger (1837-1913) critically challenged those who saw "the Lord's Day" as Sunday, saying,

"In the New Testament this day is *always* called "the first day of the week"...Is it not strange that in this one place" (i.e. Rev. 1:10) "a different expression is thought to refer to the same day?...so sure are the commentators that it means Sunday, that some go as far to say it was "Easter Sunday," but "There is no evidence of any kind that "the first day of the week" was ever called "the Lord's Day" before the Apocalypse"<sup>22</sup> (another name for the Book of Revelation).

In other words there isn't a single Scripture that speaks of the first day of the week as the Lord's Day. Bullinger saw that it was the Catholic Church Fathers, *made up of converted pagans*, who infused Christianity with their paganism, bringing their *sun worship* on "Sun-day," as well as other pagan rites and ceremonies, into the Church.<sup>23</sup>

Bullinger, like Unger, knew that the Lord's day being Sunday was man-made, and that scholars had no Scripture to justify it. If Yeshua had spoken to His Apostles of Sunday replacing the Sabbath, the Apostles would certainly have written about this monumental change. If Paul had this new revelation he would also have written of it, many times in his Letters. Nowhere though, in the divinely inspired and authoritative New Testament, does anyone speak of Sunday replacing the Sabbath or of Sunday being the Lord's Day.

## *Acts And The Lord's Day*

Another major problem is Acts. Luke, at the beginning of it, writes that *Yeshua taught His Apostles about the Kingdom of God during 40 days after the Resurrection*. Yet there's nothing in Acts that declares Sunday replacing the Sabbath or of it being the Lord's Day:

"The former account I made, Theophilus, of all that Yeshua began both to do and teach, until the day in which He was taken up, after He through the Holy Spirit *had given commandments to the Apostles* whom He had chosen, to whom He also presented Himself *alive after His suffering* by many infallible proofs, *being seen by them during forty days and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.*" (Acts 1:1-3)

It's not only strange, but very telling, that *after* the Resurrection Yeshua taught His Apostles "the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God," for 40 days, but He failed to tell them that Sunday had become the new day for Christians to assemble, and also, that Sunday was to be called the Lord's Day? Or did Jesus tell them, but they forgot to proclaim it and Luke forgot to record it in the *only* divinely inspired and authoritative history of the Apostolic Church (30-64 AD)?

Luke wrote Acts in 64 AD or 34 years *after* the Resurrection, which is plenty of time for him to declare any change of day there might have been in the Apostolic Church, especially as Lenski spoke of this change coming in the "earliest apostolic times" (p. 7, note 9). Nothing of the sort is found in Acts nor anywhere else in the New Testament. These are the traditions of man (i.e. Rome) *that nullify God's Word*.

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Ethelbert William Bullinger, *Commentary on Revelation or The Apocalypse* (first published in 1909 by Pantianos Classics; this 2018 edition by Lulu), p. 6. "(Mt. 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:9" [actually v. 7]; "1st Cor. 16:2)."

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 7.

## *Bullinger And The Lord's Day*

Bullinger believed that John's "Lord's Day" is the one great theme or "object of all the future events seen by John in visions and recorded in the Apocalypse."<sup>24</sup> He also states that Sunday was called by *pagans* in Rome, "the Lord Sun," and so it wasn't a difficult task for the Catholic Church to make Sunday "the Lord's Day." He also says that Tertullian (155-220 AD) wrote that Christians were "looked upon by some as a sect of sun worshippers."<sup>25</sup> That's quite a derogatory witness for the Lord Yeshua (cf. Dt. 4:19; 17:3).

Some Christians say this doesn't matter because the Church has authority "to baptize pagan things" like Sunday, and honor Christ through it, but nowhere in Scripture does God give authority to man to do that. On the contrary, God is very emphatic that we shouldn't worship Him the way the pagans worship their gods,<sup>26</sup> and Sunday was the pagan day for worshipping the sun god. The Church has no authority to make Sunday the new day of worship and assembly.

We who hold God's Truth dear must not accept pagan Easter with the name "Jesus" pasted on it and think it honors Him. Easter has absolutely nothing to do with Jesus and His Resurrection. Easter is Satan's day to honor his pagan savior. Jesus is not the Easter Bunny, which pictures the goddess of fertility, but the Lamb of God (Jn. 1:29). This holds true for Sunday. No Apostle ever chose Sunday over the Sabbath.

Also, as far as the Lord's Day being "a technical term," as Mounce, Morris and the *NIV Study Bible* state, what does that mean? It's just a gloss placed over "the Lord's Day," to persuade people, but there is no linkage between the Lord's Day and Sunday in the Word of God.

Bullinger rightly realized that the Apostle John was referring to the time of God's wrath and final Judgment, etc., not Sunday. Yet, why did Yeshua Resurrect on the first day of the week? Before I answer that I want to further dismantle some more of the theological reasons that scholars present "to prove" that the Lord's Day is Sunday *and* that Sunday is the new day of the week for Christians to assemble on.

## *Lenski And The Lord's Day*

Lenski taught that "the Lord's Day" was Sunday and that it had replaced the Sabbath as the Christian day for weekly worship. He proclaims as biblical facts a number of bold and unfounded statements, which he has no Scripture support for, even though he puts three forth (the Resurrection and Pentecost on Sunday, and 1st Cor. 16:2, which mentions Sunday, i.e. the first day of the week). Can you imagine for a moment, God overturning the Sabbath that He gave to Israel *more than 1,400 years earlier*, being negated by just one Scripture in all the New Testament? Yes, the Resurrection on Sunday is true, but there's nothing that connects it to the Lord's Day or that Sunday is now the new day to assemble on. This should be a shocking position for any thinking Christian, let alone a scholar, if they weren't so immeshed in their deception that "Jesus did away with the Law," and so they don't have to keep the Sabbath holy, "as the Jews."

This reveals the blind ignorance of Lenski and most Christians. It's appalling that Christians disregard what God gave to Israel (i.e. Mosaic Law), to walk out their faith before Him, for the heretical tradition of the Roman Catholic Church. The Law didn't save Israel in Egypt and the Law doesn't save Israel in the days of Peter and Paul—the blood/Blood of the lamb/Lamb did (see Ex. 12:1ff.) and does. Once saved though, God gave ancient Israel their "saved" lifestyle—His Law, and He wants to guide modern Israel's lifestyle through this Law, as interpreted and walked out by the Lord Yeshua and His Apostles.<sup>27</sup> After all, why reinvent the Wheel? It's Israel that has been reinvented or recreated by the Blood.

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 8. "Looked upon as sun worshippers," no doubt, because they met on Easter Sunday for their sunrise services, and Sun-day was their weekly day of assembly.

<sup>26</sup> See Dt. 12:28-32; cf. Mt. 4:4; Rev. 12:17.

Lenski states, “Since *the earliest apostolic times Sunday was the Christians’ day for assembly and public worship*,”<sup>28</sup> but he fails to establish his point with any Scripture in his comments on Rev. 1:10. How does Lenski know this? He presents 1st Cor. 16:2, which I’ll speak of in a few moments. We might reasonably understand “the earliest apostolic times” to be 30-37 AD, which covers *only* Jewish conversion to their own Messiah, as Gentiles don’t begin to come into the Kingdom until Cornelius in Acts Ten, which scholars place between 38-40 AD.<sup>29</sup> *No Jews switched from Sabbath to Sunday during those first eight years* as is evident from nothing being said about it anywhere in Scripture. On the contrary, Acts 21:20 (55-58 AD), took place at least 25 years *after* the Resurrection. It speaks of *all* the Jewish Christians keeping the Law, which certainly meant they still kept the 7th day Sabbath and not Sunday (cf. Acts 15:21 in 48 AD for the Gentiles going to the synagogue on the Sabbath day, not Sunday, to learn Mosaic Law).

Even if we extend the “earliest” possible time period to 50, 70 or 100 AD, there’s absolutely nothing in the Word of God that even hints at Sunday being the “new day” of assembly and/or replacing the seventh day Sabbath, or being the Lord’s Day. Lenski fails to prove his heretical teaching that from “the earliest apostolic times Sunday” *had become* the Christian day of assembly, superseding the Lord’s 7th day Sabbath and/or that it was “the Lord’s Day”<sup>30</sup> because of the Resurrection.

## ***Acts 20:7 And Sunday***

In a comment on Acts 20:7, Lenski rightfully comes to the conclusion, unlike many Sunday theologians and pastors, that because it was a special service due to Paul’s leaving the next day, and that it began the evening before and went until dawn, *one cannot use it to establish weekly Sunday AM church services*.<sup>31</sup> He wrongly thinks that the service began on Sunday night, with Paul leaving on Monday morning. Actually the service began on Saturday night just before dark, which is the time when Jews begin their Saturday evening service. Many theologians believe that the service began on Saturday evening,<sup>32</sup> while there are some like Lenski who think it was a Sunday evening.<sup>33</sup> *Either way though*, as Lenski realized, it’s not your typical Sunday AM hour worship service because in whatever evening it began it went well past

---

<sup>27</sup> See Romans 3:20, 31; 7:7, 12, 14; 1st Cor. 4:16-17; 11:1; Heb. 13:8; Rev. 12:17.

<sup>28</sup> See p. 2, note 9.

<sup>29</sup> See Acts 11:18 for why theologians see Cornelius & Company as the first Gentiles to come into the Kingdom.

<sup>30</sup> See also Mark 2:28; cf. Acts 13:42, 44; 15:21.

<sup>31</sup> R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of The Acts of the Apostles*, Acts 15–28, *Lenski’s Commentary on the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software), p. 825.

<sup>32</sup> See Stern, *Jewish New Testament Commentary*, pp. 297-298. Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1998), p. 606; see “Luke’s use of the Jewish phrase, “the first day of the week.”” 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* (Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000), p. 344, note 13: For the view on Saturday night see “M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Mathew* (London, 1974), p. 177, note 38.” Marshall isn’t sure what night they met, but leans towards Sunday night, but Goulder says it’s Saturday night.

<sup>33</sup> Compare the *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, the *NIV Study Bible*, *The Pulpit Commentary* and also 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. 384 and note 27. David J. Williams, Author; W. Ward Gasque, New Testament Editor, *New International Biblical Commentary: Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999), p. 347. Charles F. Pfeiffer, Old Testament; Everett F. Harrison, New Testament, *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977), p. 1,163. “We are not told *when* or *how* the practice of Sunday worship arose in the church.” Darrell L. Bock, Author; Robert Yarborough and Joshua Jipp, Editors; *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), p. 619. Bock seems to think it’s a Sunday night, but presents Polhill (1992, p. 418) and Fitzmyer (1998, p. 668) as seeing it as Saturday night.

midnight and into the dawn of the next day (Acts 20:11).

The reason why many scholars teach that the service began on Saturday night is because of Luke's Greek phrase for "Sunday." It's the first day of the week or σαββάτων (*Sabbaton*), which is the Greek plural for Sabbaths or the word used for the seven day week. In other words the service began on, or just before, the first of the seven days of the biblical week (i.e. "Sunday"). The "first day" begins on Saturday night, not Sunday night (cf. Creation Week, Genesis 1:3ff.; in which the days begin in darkness, many times translated as "evening," and so biblically, Saturday night to Sunday night is the first 24 hour day of the week).<sup>34</sup> That's why this account should be read as beginning on Saturday night and ending at dawn on Sunday morning; not beginning on Sunday night and ending on Monday morning.

Most Christian theologians use Acts 20:7 to declare that "Sunday was now the new Christian day for weekly worship." Distinguished 20th century biblical scholar F. F. Bruce claims that this is the "earliest *unambiguous* evidence...for Christians gathering together for worship on" Sunday<sup>35</sup> and subsequently, that Christians were no longer keeping the Sabbath. And I thought that the "Sevens Man," Alfred Plummer, had an imagination. Would Bruce have us to believe that this was a "typical Sunday service" in Apostolic times? Lenski saw the futility of it, and so he wouldn't use it to support Sunday over the Sabbath, or Sunday being the Lord's Day, because of it lasting all night into the dawn, and that it was a very special service with the Apostle Paul, but that isn't what made it special enough for Luke to write about it. After all, Paul preached many, many times that Luke never speaks of. Why this time?

Normally those Saturday evening meetings would last about 45 minutes. It was, and still is, among Jewish Christians and traditional Jews, a time to say "Farewell" to the Sabbath and "Hello" *to the first day of the week*. It reveals that the early Gentile Christian churches followed the rhythm of the Jewish Synagogue<sup>36</sup> and the Bible when it came to holy days like the 7th day Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel.<sup>37</sup> Luke writes of it's unusual length though, saying,

"Now *on the first day of the week*, when the disciples came together *to break bread*, Paul, *ready to depart the next day*, spoke to them and *continued his message until midnight*."  
(Acts 20:7)

Paul not only *speaks until midnight*, but preaches all the way until dawn the next day (Acts 20:11). The Jewish Apostle to the Gentiles had been in Troas exactly one week and this was his last day there before leaving in the morning (Acts 20:6). This indeed was a special meeting in just that fact, whatever evening it began on, but the real "specialness" is emphasized *by Paul raising Eutychus from the dead*. That would make it a very special service and worthy of including in Acts.

The Apostle spoke until midnight Saturday night when Eutychus fell from the balcony dead. Paul raised Eutychus from the dead (Acts 20:9-10), thereby allowing Luke, who wrote the Book of Acts, *to reveal to us that the same anointing that Peter had to raise Tabitha from the dead, which Luke also wrote about (Acts 9:36f.), also resided within Paul*.<sup>38</sup> **This is the reason** why Luke speaks of "the first day of the week" in Acts 20:7. It has absolutely nothing to do with Christians "now" meeting every week on Sunday morning "in honor of Christ's Resurrection," which is the usual reason given today, as Bruce exemplifies.

---

<sup>34</sup> [When Does The Sabbath Begin?](#)

<sup>35</sup> Samuele Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), *A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity* (Rome, Italy: The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977), p. 101; p. 60 from Avram's free online PDF. This book is the definitive work on Sabbath vs. Sunday. Bacchiocchi's quote is from F. F. Bruce is in Bruce's, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts*, 1954, pp. 407-408.

<sup>36</sup> See [Synagogue and Church Officials](#) for how the offices in the Church parallel the offices in the Synagogue.

<sup>37</sup> See [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#).

<sup>38</sup> Also compare Acts 3:1-10, where Peter heals a man lame from his mother's womb, and Acts 14:8-10, where Paul does the same thing in Lystra; and Acts 5:12-16, where the mere shadow of Peter is mentioned in relation to healing, and Acts 19:11-12, where Paul did "unusual miracles," through handkerchiefs, etc.

It *doesn't* say that Sunday had become the new day for Christians to assemble on. Such “minor points” seem to have eluded most Christian theologians in their desperate attempt “to prove Sunday.” This is nothing less than irresponsible and shoddy scholarship. Truthfully, six graders “just coming to Christ,” not raised in “Sunday,” would have gotten it better than these scholars.

## *Paul And Luke Celebrate Passover In Philippi*

Continuing with Acts 20:7 and why it doesn't prove “Sunday” or that the Lord's Day is Sunday, before Paul came to Troas Luke records in the previous verse, Acts 20:6, that they they sailed away from Philippi “*after the days of Unleavened Bread.*” This indicates that Paul, Luke and all those with them (Acts 20:13), Jews and Gentiles, kept Passover and the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread in Philippi.<sup>39</sup> Why would Luke write about them staying in Philippi if not to let us know that they kept Passover, which begins the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread? This event took place 23 years *after* the Resurrection, when the Church says that the Feasts of Israel were done away with for Christians at the Cross.

Luke, a Gentile Christian, wrote the Book of Acts to another Gentile, Theophilus (Acts 1:1) and continually used the Feasts of Israel as Time Markers. Six times in the 28 chapters of Acts, or an average of one Feast of Israel every four and a half chapters, Luke lets Theophilus *know when* an event happened or would happen with a Feast of Israel. In the case of Acts 20:6, Luke lets Theophilus know that they left Philippi *after* the Feast of Unleavened Bread, or in the spring of that year.<sup>40</sup>

It's obvious that Paul & Company kept Passover–Unleavened Bread in Philippi, not wanting to travel during the seven day Feast. Luke could just as easily have written of the Roman month and day they left Philippi or even have said that it was early spring, but he chose to designate the time they left by a Feast of Israel. In other words, Luke used the Feast of Unleavened Bread as a Time Marker, *something that is well known*, to convey in this case to Theophilus, *when* they left Philippi.

If I say to you that I'll meet you “the day after Christmas,” I won't have to tell you Dec. 26th because you know it's December 26th. I've used Christmas as a Time Marker. Luke does that with the Feasts of Israel six times in the Book of Acts, which was written in 64 AD, or 34 years *after* the Resurrection. The Church is wrong that the Feasts of Israel were “fulfilled” by Jesus on the Cross and so Christians don't have to, and shouldn't keep them. Gentile Luke though, the traveling companion of the Apostle Paul, whom the Church credits with doing away with Mosaic Law, exposes their heretical teaching.<sup>41</sup> Someone might say that Luke and/or Theophilus were Jews,<sup>42</sup> and so that's why they knew when the Feasts were. Why though, would Luke use them if, as the Church teaches, the Feasts of Israel had been done away with at the Cross 34 years earlier? Luke and Theophilus were Gentiles, which makes it certain that Gentiles were keeping the Feasts of Israel and the 7th day Sabbath in Apostolic times, and that Sunday had not become the Lord's Day. Acts 20:7 offers no solace to Christians that Sunday had become “the new day for Christian assembly” because the reason why Luke writes of “the first day of the week” is because Paul raised Eutychus from the dead.

---

<sup>39</sup> Passover and the Feasts of Unleavened Bread are used interchangeably, as Passover begins the Feast of Unleavened Bread on the first day of Unleavened Bread. See Luke 22:1, 7.

<sup>40</sup> See 1st Cor. 5:6-8 where Paul exhorts the Corinthians to not only be sinless, by referring to them *being unleavened*, a term that can only apply to the Feast of Unleavened Bread, but also for them to “keep the Feast” (of Unleavened Bread).

<sup>41</sup> Actually, Luke uses seven Feasts of Israel in Acts, which would be an average of one Feast every four chapters, but doesn't use one of them as a Time Marker. See [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#) and [The Feasts of Israel as Time Markers After the Resurrection](#) for how Luke uses the Feasts as Time Markers to let Theophilus, and us, know *when* they were, or would be, at certain places.

<sup>42</sup> Some question whether Luke and/or Theophilus were Jews, and so that's why they knew of the Feasts. See my articles that prove they were both Gentiles: [Luke the Jew?](#) and [Theophilus—High Priest of Israel?](#)

## *Lenski And First Corinthians 16:2*

Many Sunday theologians like Lenski and Morris bring up 1st Cor. 16:2 to justify a weekly Sunday service in the New Testament. Lenski teaches that it's grounds for Sunday being established in the days of the Apostles, *even though he understands* that there isn't a Sunday church service mentioned! In this passage, Sunday is the day that the Apostle Paul tells each Corinthian to lay aside, *in their own home*, their love offering for the poor Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. In other words, the tithe and offering basket are not being passed around in a weekly Sunday AM church service. It seems that just the mere mention of "Sunday" is enough for him, and too many other theologians, to teach that Sunday was "the new day" being kept by the early Christian community (1st Cor. written 52-53 AD), overriding the Lord's 7th day Sabbath. First Corinthians 16:2 says,

"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."

Lenski writes that it's,

"*a fair inference* that Sunday was the day which was *set aside for the public worship*... and that this custom was also followed in Galatia and in the other churches that had been founded by Paul."<sup>43</sup>

Despite what Lenski says, it's actually quite *an unfair inference*. There really isn't any connection between someone setting aside money in their home on Sunday, and meeting every Sunday for church. There isn't any mention of a Sunday meeting nor of Sunday replacing the Sabbath, something we would expect if the Apostle to the Gentiles, or any other New Testament writer, had made Sunday the new day. Lenski fails to prove his biased opinion, which stems from Catholic-Lutheran tradition, that Sunday was the weekly day of Christian assembly for the Corinthians and therefore, every Christian. What Paul said to the Corinthians he also said to the Galatian churches. They too were to set aside funds every Sunday in their homes, as a special love gift for the poor Jewish Christians in Jerusalem (cf. 1st Cor. 16:1).

Paul wrote *Second Corinthians* in 55 AD, about two years after *First Corinthians*, and speaks again of the Corinthians' gift to the poor Jewish Christians in Jerusalem:

"*Now concerning the ministering to the (Jerusalem) saints*. It is superfluous for me to write to you, for I know your willingness, about which I boast of you to the Macedonians, that Achaia was ready *a year ago*,<sup>44</sup> and your zeal has stirred up the majority. Yet I have sent the brethren, *lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this respect* that, as I said, *you may be ready*, lest if some Macedonians come with me *and find you unprepared*, we (not to mention you!) *should be ashamed* of this confident boasting. Therefore, I thought it necessary *to exhort the brethren to go to you ahead of time, and prepare your generous gift beforehand, which you had previously promised, that it may be ready* as a matter of generosity and not as a grudging obligation." (2nd Cor. 9:1-5; see also 8:1-11, 19-21, and Acts 24:17, where the Apostle speaks of coming to Jerusalem with a gift for his people.)

How could the Corinthians be "unprepared" with their gift if the church had been collecting it every Sunday? Obviously, these gifts hadn't been taken up in the church of Corinth because Paul is concerned that the gift even exists! Paul affirms that the "collection" of 1st Cor. 16:1-3 was not part of a weekly tithe and offering given to the church *at the church*, but on the contrary, a special love gift for the poor Jewish Christians that each Corinthian had set aside in his own home. Note how the Apostle speaks to the Corinthians, saying that their zeal "stirred up the majority" and that he didn't want the Corinthians to be

---

<sup>43</sup> R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software), p. 759.

<sup>44</sup> Corinth is in the region of Achaia, northern Greece, and Macedonia is north of Achaia.

ashamed when he came if they didn't have anything ready for him to take to Jerusalem.

First Corinthians 16:1-3 *doesn't* speak of a weekly church gathering on the first day of the week with the taking up of tithes and offerings *to establish Sunday assembly over the Sabbath*, or Sunday as the Lord's Day. The biblical text does not speak of a weekly Sunday church and Paul doesn't say that Sunday has replaced the Sabbath, even though theologians, pastors and other Christians will override the plain meaning of the Scriptures and teach that there is "church on Sunday!" How very Pharisaic of them, and I don't use that term lightly!

## *For Argument's Sake*

For argument's sake though, let's say that First Corinthians 16:1-3 is a weekly church service. **Where** in all the New Testament does anyone else speak of this for Christians? **Where** are two or three witnesses to confirm for us this monumental change?<sup>45</sup> Israel had been keeping the Sabbath day holy since the days of Moses (cf. Ex. 16:23, 25-26; 29), even before the Ten Commandments at Mt. Sinai (Ex. 20:8-11). In other words, for more than 1,400 years Israel had kept the Sabbath *day* holy and as their weekly day of assembly, and *this one verse* in First Corinthians 16 is all we get to overthrow that?

**Where** in the New Testament does anyone say that Sunday has replaced the Sabbath, or are we supposed to believe that all Apostolic Christianity started keeping Sunday at the same time and no one said anything about it? **When** did the change from Sabbath to Sunday take place in Apostolic times, and **why**? *Nothing* is written in the New Testament to answer these three simple, but extremely important questions. Also, nothing is spoken of to lead us to believe that Sunday, and not the Sabbath, is God's will for Christians today—absolutely nothing. This "Sunday" teaching from is silence! It's also a teaching that flagrantly defies the Word of God—both written and Living.

**Why** had Israel been keeping the Sabbath day holy and for weekly assembly? God told them in the Ten Commandments that they were to keep it holy because in six days He had made the Heavens and the Earth, and on the 7th day He rested, and so His people were to imitate Him (Ex. 20:8-11; Lev. 23:1-4). Also, God made the Sabbath day a symbol of Salvation, having redeemed Israel from Egyptian slavery (cf. the Second giving of the Ten Commandments; Dt. 5:12-15). The keeping of the Sabbath day holy was not just some random thought that Moses had that could be easily overturned, even with the Resurrection on Sunday. Also, there isn't a single Scripture as to **Why** Sunday had replaced God's Sabbath day.

## *Lenski And Revelation 1:10*

In commenting on "the Lord's Day" in Rev. 1:10, Lenski writes of Jesus Christ making the first day of the week His very own because of the Resurrection and the giving of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost:

"Here for the first time we meet the designation *the Lord's day*...**Christ made the first day of the week peculiarly his own** by rising from the dead on this day *and* by sending his Holy Spirit on this day of the week. Both Easter and Pentecost made Sunday "the Lord's day." And after the day had been thus distinguished, *the apostolic church chose it* as its day of public, congregational worship."<sup>46</sup>

Did Jesus make "*the first day of the week peculiarly his own* by rising from the dead on" Easter Sunday, as Lenski calls that Sunday, and by "*sending his Holy Spirit on this day of the week*," that is to say, on Pentecost Sunday? This makes every Sunday "the Lord's Day" for Lenski, but as noble as those two rea-

---

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Dt. 17:6; 19:15; Mt. 18:16; 2nd Cor. 13:1.

<sup>46</sup> Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John's Revelation*, pp. 57-58.



sons are, Lenski lacks Scripture to link or justify his idea. There isn't a single Scripture stating that Yeshua, or anyone else, declared Sunday Jesus' own day because of both or either of Lenski's two reasons (Resurrection and the giving of the Holy Spirit). Yeshua actually said that He was Lord of the Sabbath (Mt. 12:8; Mk. 2:28; Lk. 6:5), and nowhere in Scripture does anyone challenge or change that. Lenski's *interpretation* of the Sunday Resurrection and the Sunday of Pentecost is just that—Lenski's, although many Christians agree with him.

The Catholic term “Easter,” as Lenski, Jerome, Johnson, Morris and most Christians call the Sunday Resurrection, is *never* written in the Greek New Testament.<sup>47</sup> It just so happens that the Sunday Resurrection took place on the Jewish day of First Fruits—the *Sunday of the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread*. It's a special biblical Sunday within Passover Week that God set up 1,470 years earlier at Mt. Sinai *with His Son's Resurrection in mind!* (More on this in *Why A Sunday Resurrection*, p. 15f.).

The Sunday of Pentecost is actually an annual Sabbath day for Israel called the Feast of Weeks (in the Old Testament), and like First Fruits, has been around since the days of Moses and Israel at Mt. Sinai. It's known as Pentecost in the *Greek* New Testament, but *Shavu'ot* (Weeks) in the Old Testament. Two different languages describing the same Old Testament yearly holy Feast Sabbath that the Church says was done away with at the Cross. How inconvenient for the Church that Jesus would send His Spirit on the “Jewish” Feast of Weeks!<sup>48</sup>

Israel left Egyptian slavery on the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Passover having been eaten the night before. In the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread there's always a Sunday. It's from that Sunday that one counts 50 days to the seventh Sunday (Lev. 23:15-16). That was the *First Pentecost* or Feast of Weeks and God did something very special on this First Pentecost—He descends upon Mt. Sinai and speaks forth the Ten Commandments to all Israel!<sup>49</sup> That was quite an experience for Israel, for it left them “shaking in their boots” (cf. Ex. 19:16-20; 20:18-22; Dt. 5:5).

On what I call the *Second Pentecost* or Feast of Weeks, 1,470 years *after* the *First Feast of Weeks*, fifty days *after* the Sunday Resurrection in 30 AD, God pours out His *promised* Holy Spirit upon Israel, in Acts Two.<sup>50</sup> In other words, God gave both the Ten Commandments, which symbolize all His words (e.g. Mosaic Law; cf. Mt. 4:4) on how He wanted Israel to live their new life with Him *after* He had saved them from Egyptian slavery, and then 1,470 years later, *on the same Sunday of the Feast of Weeks*,<sup>51</sup> He pours out the Holy Spirit on Israel. The Holy Spirit, given at the Second Pentecost, empowers Christians to live out their Christian lives through all the rules of Mosaic Law that apply to them, the same way Yeshua, and all His Apostles, including Paul, did (cf. 1st Cor. 4:16-17; 11:1).

The Holy Spirit poured out that Sunday on the Jewish people, for only Jews were at the *Second Pentecost* in Acts Two, was prophesied by Joel (2:28-29) and Ezekiel (36:24-27), but *nothing* is said in the New Testament about this annual Sabbath Feast of Israel on Sunday replacing the Sabbath or making Sunday “the Lord's Day.” Now, Pentecost has a double meaning, which God always meant for it to have. This double meaning pertains to all the Feasts of Israel. God isn't short sighted, but most Christians are truly blind in this area. What Jesus said about the Pharisees being blind also doubly applies to most Christians.<sup>52</sup>

The Feast of Weeks, an annual Hebrew Sabbath that always falls on a Sunday, doesn't make Sunday “the

---

<sup>47</sup> Easter is seen in the King James Version of Acts 12:4, but the Greek word is *Paska*, which is English for Passover, not Easter. The inerrant KJV is errs. All other English Bibles correctly have Passover.

<sup>48</sup> Exodus 34:22; Num. 28:26; Duet. 16:10, 16.

<sup>49</sup> See [Pentecost—Shavu'ot](#). This is an annual Sabbath day that comes on Sunday.

<sup>50</sup> Many Christians say “the Church” began on the Pentecost of Acts Two, but the Church actually began at Mt. Sinai (see [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#), p. 148, last sentence in the body of the text, and note 621 on p. 149).

<sup>51</sup> See [Pentecost—Shavu'ot](#), p. 7f.

<sup>52</sup> See Mt. 15:14; 23:16, 17, 19, 24, 26.



King of the Week” because of Acts Two (or the Resurrection), nor does it make Sunday “the Lord’s Day.” If the Lord of the Scriptures doesn’t make Sunday “the Lord’s Day,” by having at least two Scripture witnesses for it somewhere in the New Testament, then there are *no biblical grounds* for equating “the Lord’s Day” with Sunday, despite the Resurrection and Pentecost being on Sunday. The Lord’s Day being Sunday is nothing less than the heretical tradition of the Roman Catholic Church, which Protestants blindly follow, that nullifies the Word of God. Using the cloak of scholarship to prove this teaching doesn’t make it any less false, foolish and sinful.

## ***Lenski And The Apostolic Church***

Lenski concludes his case for “the Lord’s Day” being Sunday by saying that after the day “*had thus been distinguished, the apostolic church chose it* as its day of public, congregational worship.” **Where** in the New Testament does anyone say that? **When did the Apostolic Church choose Sunday** for its weekly congregational worship over the Sabbath? In what Letter of Paul’s? Certainly not in 1st Cor. 16:2! Can you imagine the Apostolic Church making this monumental shift *and not writing anything about it*?

There’s nothing in the New Testament about keeping Sunday, or it replacing the Sabbath, or making Sunday the Lord’s Day. There isn’t a single Scripture that speaks of any church, let alone “the apostolic church,” meaning all the churches, choosing Sunday—not in any of the accounts of the Gospel writings about the Resurrection, or in Acts 20:7 or in 1st Cor. 16:2, etc. The Apostolic Church **never** distinguished Sunday by choosing it as its weekly “day of public, congregational worship,” but the Roman Catholic Church did, brazenly showing a contempt for God’s Word, and boasting that they have God’s authority to do it!<sup>53</sup> Here is a twisting and perversion of Scripture that the Pharisees would be proud of.

Scripture is our “North Star” or what God wants us to use to determine His will for us, just as all the Reformers said, who came against the Roman Catholic Church with its myriad of heretical doctrines and persecution of anyone who didn’t bow down to their satanic Pope and his Days and Ways. The Reformers spoke of *Sola Scriptura*, which is Latin for “*only Scripture*,” and means that *only Scripture is divinely inspired and authoritative for what we are to believe and therefore practice*. Only Scripture reveals God’s will for us and guards us against heresy. The Reformers came against the Catholic Church, which teaches that She can override and nullify the words of Jesus and Scripture with Her Church Councils, Church Fathers and/or whatever the Pope might say “speaking for Jesus Christ.” Nowhere in Scripture though, does God give authority to anyone to overturn His Word, no matter how pretty his robes are.

What Yeshua said to the Pharisees certainly applies to the Roman Church, Lenski and all those who arbitrarily rubber stamp Rome’s ancient switch of God’s Days and Ways to Satan’s Days and Ways. The Pharisees asked Yeshua:

““Why do Your disciples transgress the Tradition of the Elders?!...Hypocrites!” Yeshua said, “Well did Isaiah prophesy about you, saying, “...in vain they worship Me, *teaching as doctrines the commandments of men!*”” (Matthew 15:2, 7, 9)

Pharisaism is not just a “Jewish disease.” Christians are wallowing in Christian Pharisaism concerning their lifestyle (e.g. Sunday assembly over Sabbath assembly and holiness). This “sleight of hand” interpretation of God’s Word by Rome and Lenski and many others is *exactly* what the Pharisees did with Scripture. They too had their noble ideas and “reasons” for all their legalistic rules and less-than-worthless teachings of God’s Word,<sup>54</sup> *and so does Christianity in the area of Mosaic Law*. Are you following the Messiah of Israel and His Days and His Ways, or the Pope and His Days and his Ways? It may not

---

<sup>53</sup> See [Sunday—The Catholic Sabbath](#).

<sup>54</sup> See [Law 102](#) and [Grace, Holiness and the Pharisaic Church](#). They reveal that “Sunday” is only the Tip of the Church’s heretical Iceberg.

matter to you, but it matters to the Lord. It's a matter of obedience to the King or sinning against Him.

## ***John 20:19 and the Lord's Day***

Some, like Leon Morris, also use John 20:19 to support Sunday assembly and Sunday being the Lord's Day. The Apostle John writes:

“Then, the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when *the doors were shut* where the disciples were assembled, *for fear of the Jewish authorities*, Yeshua came and stood in the midst and said to them, “Peace be with you.”” (John 20:19)

This isn't a Sunday church service, with the doors being shut for fear of the Jewish authorities. The Apostles were afraid for their lives. This verse presents them “just now” seeing the Resurrected Savior. Why Morris uses this to try and establish Sunday seems to be that “this” is “Easter Sunday” for him, and so the Resurrection on Easter Sunday establishes Sunday as the weekly day of assembly, as it did Lenski, but Morris is reading things into this verse that just aren't there. In other words, John, who wrote this about 95 AD, or 65 years *after* the Resurrection, doesn't say anything about Sunday being or becoming the new day of assembly *because* of the Resurrection or that it's the Lord's Day. How Morris could miss these two simple points is incomprehensible for a theologian. Yeshua revealed Himself to His Apostles on the Sunday of First Fruits within Passover Week, as the *First Fruits* of God's *new* Creation to rise from the dead.

The phrase, *the first day of the week* is in John 20:19, but the verse certainly doesn't equate the first day of the week with “the Lord's Day” or even speak of a “weekly commemoration of the” Resurrection on Sunday,<sup>55</sup> even if you heretically place “Easter” next to this Sunday. The Sunday of Messiah's Resurrection is never spoken of as “Easter,” at least not in Scripture, the KJV notwithstanding, which has “Easter” in Acts 12:4. The Greek word in Acts 12:4 is *Paska*, which is Greek for Passover, not Easter. The inerrant KJV is the only English Bible that has this glaring error. All other English Bibles have Passover.

## ***Moffat and The Lord's Day***

“The Lord's Day” being Sunday is a very poor opinion from silence, despite Moffat claiming that Sunday is “specifically mentioned as the Lord's Day.” There is no Scripture that says that, and so truly, “beyond all reasonable doubt” the Lord's Day *is not* Sunday, nor is Sunday the weekly day of assembly in the days of the Apostles. There isn't a single Scripture that says something like, because Jesus rose on the first day of the week, Sunday has replaced the Sabbath and/or is the Lord's Day. Christians who keep Sunday are actually honorary Catholics, whether they've ever stepped foot inside a Catholic Church or not, because it was Pope Sixtus in 120 AD who changed Sabbath to Sunday,<sup>56</sup> not God.

Christian theologians, believing that the Lord's Day is Sunday and that Sunday is the day when the Apostles met instead of the Sabbath, then turn to four ancient documents to bolster their Sunday—Lord's Day doctrine. Before I discuss these four ancient documents (p. 19ff.), I'll present God's reason for the Sunday Resurrection. Of course, it has absolutely nothing to do with making Sunday “the Christian Sabbath” or “the Lord's Day.”

---

<sup>55</sup> The Sunday Resurrection or rather Resurrection appearances of Yeshua are mentioned six times in the Gospels (Mt. 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19). The only other mentions of the first day of the week are in Acts 20:7 and 1st Corinthians 16:2, and none of them proclaim Sunday as “the new day,” or “the new Sabbath,” or “the Lord's Day.”

<sup>56</sup> See [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#).

# WHY A SUNDAY RESURRECTION?

Lenski, as well as others, have said that Christ made Sunday “His Day” because He rose on Sunday. Therefore Sunday replaced the Sabbath and consequently became “the Lord’s Day,” even though they cannot provide any Scripture to support their positions; their use of John 20:19; Acts 20:7 and 1st Corinthians 16:2 notwithstanding. Their interpretation of those three verses is more wishful thinking than scholarly exegesis and deduction.

Why though, did Yeshua rise from the dead on Sunday? Quite simply, He did it *to parallel the first day of the Old Creation with the first day of the New Creation*. Both Creations *began* on the first day of the week. Both revealed the eternal Word of God on the first day of the week—the Old Creation as God’s Word and Light (Gen. 1:1-5); and the New Creation as the Father’s God-Man Glorified, the first of many.<sup>57</sup> God begins new things, quite appropriately, on the *first* day of the week.

Yeshua’s Resurrection on Sunday has nothing to do with invalidating the Sabbath for Sunday though, nor making Sunday “the Lord’s Day.” Yeshua’s Resurrection on Sunday proclaims Yeshua as the One who is the First to appear in both the Old and the New Creations on Day One of those Creations. He is the Pre-eminent One in whom both Creations literally dwell (cf. John 1:3; Col. 1:15-18).

Mosaic Law is the divine prototype for everything that our Lord says and does in the Gospels. By beginning the First Creation on “Sunday” God obviously didn’t negate the 7th day Sabbath *when He made the Sabbath holy and blessed* at Creation (Gen. 2:1-3), nor did He do so beginning the Second or New Creation on Sunday. If Sunday were “the Christian Sabbath,” God wouldn’t have made the 7th day Sabbath holy at the First Creation. He would have made Sunday the “Sabbath.” It’s not without Dark Irony that Satan led pagans to honor Sun-Day as their “Sabbath,” and now Christians have it too.

Yeshua appearing on Day One is the Beginning of the Old Creation—begotten from eternity past, not created, just as He is the Beginning of the New Creation—begotten, not created; fully human, fully deity and now glorified. In Genesis 1:1-3 we see God’s Word *coming forth* as the Light; *begotten*, as John also says, not created:

<sup>1</sup>“In the *Beginning* God created the Heavens and the Earth. <sup>2</sup>The Earth was without form and void and Darkness was on the face of the Deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering” (or fluttering like a bird; a Dove no doubt) “over the face of the Waters. <sup>3</sup>Then God said, “Let there be Light!,” and there was Light!” (Genesis 1:1-3)

“And the Word” (of God from Gen. 1:3) “became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His Glory, the Glory as of the *only begotten*” (Son) “of the Father, full of Grace and Truth.” (John 1:14)

This is why during the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread in 30 AD, on the *first* day of the week, “Sunday,” known as First Fruits (Lev. 23:9-14), Yeshua was raised from the dead as *the God-Man Glorified*, the *First Fruits* or First of many (Jewish and Gentile Christians) to become like Him. Yeshua is the *Beginning* of the New Creation. Christians who have been Born Again are like Him when He was a Man in Israel 2,000 years ago, and will become like He is now, on Judgment Day. The point though, is that as He was the first to appear in the Old Creation, He is also the first to appear in the New Creation, both beginning on the first day of the week, “Sunday,” but neither Creation overturning the 7th day Sabbath or making Sunday, “the Lord’s Day.”

Paul writes of Yeshua’s preeminence or “firstness,” and of His being the Firstborn and being risen from the dead on *First Fruits*, the Sunday of Passover Week, in his Letter to the Colossians and his Letter to the Corinthians, respectively:

---

<sup>57</sup> See [Salvation—The Promise!](#)

“Yeshua is the Image of the invisible God, the *Firstborn* over all Creation. *For by Him all things were created that are in the Heavens and that are on the Earth; visible and invisible, whether thrones, dominions, principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him.* And He is *before* all things, and *in Him all things consist.* He is the Head of the Body, the Church, who is the *Beginning, the Firstborn from the dead,* that in *all things He may have the preeminence.*” (Colossian 1:15-18)

“But now Messiah is risen from the dead *and has become the First Fruits* of those who *have fallen asleep...*each one in his own order—*Messiah the First Fruits,* afterward those who are Messiah’s at His coming.” (1st Corinthians 15:20, 23)

The Apostle Paul isn’t just generalizing when he speaks of Yeshua as the First Fruits to rise from the dead. Paul is also pointing to the *Day* on which Yeshua rose—the Day of *First Fruits*, which biblically is the Sunday of Passover (Feast of Unleavened Bread) Week. This is *not* Easter Sunday, although sometimes the Sundays coincide, but sometimes the two Sundays can be a week to a month apart in dating. There are two different dating methods for the Bible’s First Sheaf and Rome’s pagan Easter Sunday.

In the days of Moses at Mt. Sinai, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of all the Gentiles who love the Jewish Messiah, set up the Sunday of First Fruits in Passover Week as not only the day Israel was able to eat of the new, just-risen and harvested spring barley grain, but also the Day that Israel could eat of its new, resurrected Messiah, the Bread from Heaven (cf. John 6:32-33, 50-51, 58). *This* is the Day that God set up to honor the Resurrection of His Son as the First Fruits to come forth from the ground, that is to say, to rise from the dead.

Scripture never speaks of a change in the Feasts of Israel,<sup>58</sup> or of the 7th day Sabbath giving way to the first day of the week (Sunday) because of the Sunday Resurrection.<sup>59</sup> Now we know why. It was never God’s intent to make Sunday “the Christian Sabbath” or the Lord’s Day. Interestingly enough, God did not make First Fruits an annual Sabbath. In other words, it’s not the Resurrection, as incredible as that is, that God wants us to realize is the “Center of the Universe,” but the Day His Son, our Lord, gave His Life for us as our *Passover Lamb* (cf. Mt. 26:1-30; Jn. 1:29, 36). *This is the Day that the Lord has made! Let us rejoice in Him!* (Ps. 118:22-24)<sup>60</sup> *This* is the *Day* God wants us to hold dear.<sup>61</sup> The Day we were justified and brought out of the Kingdom of Darkness (cf. Dt. 16:1-3) through the sacrifice of God’s Lamb.

The Day Yeshua conducted the Passover Meal for His Apostles is also the Day He died, which *is* the *first* annual Sabbath, as the Passover is eaten in the evening of the first annual Sabbath day of Unleavened Bread, and later that first Day of Unleavened Bread, at 3:00 PM, Yeshua was dead. That first Day of Passover–Unleavened Bread is the first annual Sabbath of all the Feasts of Israel.<sup>62</sup> This reveals that God puts much more emphasis or value on His Son’s sacrificial Death than His Son’s Resurrection, as did the early Gentile and Jewish Christians, and as we should.<sup>63</sup> Therefore, Church teaching, that the Sabbath

---

<sup>58</sup> There are phrases that seem to “do away with Mosaic Law,” like we’re no longer “under the Law,” but once those phrases are correctly understood, the interpretation of the Church evaporates into thin air. See [No Longer Under the Law?](#), [Nailed to the Cross—Colossians 2:13-17](#), [Law 102](#), [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#) and [The Feasts of Israel as Time Markers After the Resurrection](#).

<sup>59</sup> See [Sunday—The Catholic Sabbath](#), [Why Sunday?](#) and the Christian classic, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#).

<sup>60</sup> “Him” is the better translation as the word “it” in Hebrew is either masculine or feminine, and we know that we are to rejoice in the Lord always! We are to rejoice in Yeshua for what He has done for us. *This* is our Messiah.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. 1st Cor. 11:26 where Paul speaks of taking the Body and the Blood in remembrance of His death.

<sup>62</sup> There are seven annual Sabbaths, which can fall on any day of the week. There are the first and seventh days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread; Pentecost or the Feast of Weeks (Ex. 34:22); the first day of the seventh month, the tenth day of the seventh month, and the 15th and 22nd days of the seventh month. See Leviticus 23.

<sup>63</sup> It was the death of Yeshua that the early Gentile Christians in the first three centuries primarily focused on; not His Resurrection. Bacchiocchi writes, “the two earliest documents mentioning the Passover celebration...both emphasize the commemoration of the death rather than of the resurrection of Christ.” Bacchiocchi, [From Sab-](#)

changed to Sunday “because of the Resurrection” is an empty, shallow and false idea that has no relationship to the Lord Yeshua or the Word of God (i.e. Scripture).

Although the Pharisees of old and also traditional Judaism and Messianic Judaism of today, wrongly think that First Fruits can fall on any day of the week,<sup>64</sup> First Fruits is always on a Sunday. We know that Yeshua rose on *this* Sunday of First Fruits/Sheaf because Paul twice speaks of Yeshua as *the First Fruits* to rise from the dead, as we saw above in 1st Cor. 15:20, 23. Paul’s words about Yeshua being the First Fruits to rise from the dead *establishes* the Resurrection on Sunday and that, over a Sabbath Resurrection as some teach, and as I used to think.<sup>65</sup>

Just as Israel couldn’t eat of the new spring grain (barley) until it had been elevated to Yahveh as a sign that the spring, summer and fall harvests existed because of Him (Lev. 23:10-11, 14-16), so Israel could not eat of Messiah Yeshua’s Body and Blood, could not be “Harvested” or Born Again and receive the Baptism in the Holy Spirit until Yeshua had been placed “in the ground” (dead), like a seed (Jn. 7:39; 12:24). Once *that* Seed sprouted and came to Life, on the Sunday of Passover Week (First Fruits), the Holy Spirit could use the Body and Blood of the Lamb to cause the Apostles, Jews and Gentiles to be Born from Above and filled with the Spirit, transforming human vessels into the Image of the Son.<sup>66</sup> Now the Father, the Holy Spirit and the Son dwell within each Christian. Yeshua said in John 16:5-7:

“But now I go away to Him who sent Me, and none of you asks Me, “Where are You going?” But because I have said these things to you, sorrow has filled your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the Truth. *It is to your advantage that I go away*” (i.e. die), “for if I do not go away, the Comforter will not come to you, but if I depart, I will send Her to you.”<sup>67</sup>

*It’s wrong and sinful* for Christians to keep the pagan feast of Easter, which some, wanting to distance themselves from its obvious pagan name and rites (e.g. sunrise services and chocolate Easter Bunny Eggs), now call “Resurrection Sunday,” for Easter honors a pagan Christ called Tammuz from ancient Assyria. He allegedly died to *save* his followers and give them eternal life, and he was raised from the dead by his goddess mother, *Ishtar*, which in English is *Easter*. *That’s the name of the goddess; Ishtar*, the Queen of Heaven!<sup>68</sup> *That’s Easter Sunday* or using her Assyrian name—*Ishtar Sunday*.<sup>69</sup>

God did *not* make the Sunday of First Fruits an annual Sabbath, which means, at the very least, that He never intended to have the Sunday Resurrection of His Son to override or replace His 7th day Sabbath or to make it, “the Lord’s Day.” Also, if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath, shouldn’t it at least have the same honor or value as the Sabbath it was replacing? Shouldn’t it at the very least, be written in the New Testament that Sunday was blessed and holy, as the Sabbath was? (Gen. 2:1-3) There is no such designation for Sunday, not even a hint of it, anywhere in God’s Word; New or Old.

---

[bath to Sunday](#), pp. 49-50f. On p. 50 Bacchiocchi quotes some parts of a sermon of Melito’s (160-177 AD) that centers on the death of the Passover Lamb, only mentioning His Resurrection “in passing.”

<sup>64</sup> See [First Sheaf](#) as to the two different Jewish methods of calculating when the day of First Sheaf/Fruits falls on, and why the Sunday of Passover Week is the biblical day for First Fruits.

<sup>65</sup> The Gospels are silent as to the day and the hour that Yeshua rose from the dead. They only say that He was first *seen* on Sunday, but that doesn’t give us the time nor the day He actually rose. First Corinthians 15:20, 23 give us First Fruits as the day He rose: the first day of the week, which begins on Saturday night at dark and goes through to Sunday night at dark, for that’s what Paul calls Yeshua: the First Fruits to rise from the dead, which is Saturday night to Sunday night.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Romans 8:29; 1st Cor. 15:49; 2nd Cor. 3:18; Col. 3:10.

<sup>67</sup> The Comforter, the Holy Spirit, is not a male, but a female, just as the Father and Son, conversely, are male. For how this can be biblically see [Yeshua—God the Son](#) and [Three Persons—One God?](#)

<sup>68</sup> See Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17, 18, 19, 25.

<sup>69</sup> See Alexander Hislop’s, [The Two Babylons—The Full Hislop](#), pp. 80-87, for why Easter was a pagan holy day a thousand years before Yeshua was born in Bethlehem, and how the Roman Catholic Church embraced this pagan day honoring the pagan “Christ” as the day of Yeshua’s Resurrection. Jesus didn’t rise on Easter Sunday.



The reason why Yeshua rose on Sunday, the first day of the week, is easy to see from Mosaic Law, no matter if every Christian theologian and pastor shout from Mt. Everest that “Sunday is the Lord’s Day!” Most every Rabbi says that Jesus is *not* the Messiah, but that doesn’t make their words true, and the same applies to what Christian theologians, scholars, pastors and Christian plumbers declare about Sunday being the Lord’s Day *and* the new day to assemble on over the Sabbath. How sad that they can’t see the hand of Satan in their Sunday.

How is it that all these Christians have failed to see this simple parallel between the Old Creation beginning on Sunday and the New Creation beginning on Sunday? *First Fruits* is God’s reason for *why* His Son rose on Sunday, despite all the theological gymnastics that theologians, experts in the Word of God, put forth for Sunday. The Pharisees were experts in God’s Word too, and these Christian theologians and pastors are truly Pharisaic Christians, for they nullify God’s Mosaic Law as God’s lifestyle for all Christians, and so the Feasts of Israel are not on the radar of most Christians. Hence, not only their ignorance of why Yeshua rose from the dead on Sunday, but also why they think that Sunday is God’s new day for them to assemble on and also the Lord’s Day. Traditions of Man that nullify God’s Word, whether Jewish or Christian, camouflage and destroy God’s Truth, even if they are certified as “beyond all reasonable doubt” by the religious authorities. With that we see Christian lifestyle as following Satan, not Jesus.

## YAHVEH’S DAY

Two more points that help us understand that John isn’t speaking of the Lord’s Day being Sunday is that the Greek word for “on” can also mean “in.” The English translation, “I was in the Spirit *on* the Lord’s Day,” can equally be translated as, “I was in the Spirit *in* the Lord’s Day.”<sup>70</sup> This opens up the perspective that it wasn’t a literal day that John was “on,” but that he was “in” the End Time *Day* of the Lord.

Also, it seems that John is using the English term (the) *Lord* for *Yahveh*, which certainly means he’s saying that it’s the End Time “Day,” not Sunday or even the Sabbath. The Greek word for “Lord” is *Kurios* and it’s used 6,823 times in the Greek Septuagint where the Hebrew word “Yahveh” is seen in the Hebrew (Old Testament) Masoretic text. *Kurios* is also used in the Greek New Testament for “Yahveh,” and should be translated as “Yahveh”<sup>71</sup> in English, not “the Lord.” Revelation 1:10 would better be translated as, “I was in the Spirit *in the Day of Yahveh* and I heard behind me a loud voice, as of a trumpet.”<sup>72</sup> John is speaking of the End Time “Day,” which has nothing to do with making the Lord’s Day, Sunday.

---

<sup>70</sup> ἐν, Joseph Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 3,697. “ἐν; en, a preposition taking the dative after it; Hebrew *bē-*; Latin *in* with abl.; English *in, on, at, with, by, among.*”

ἐν, 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* (third edition, 2001; Accordance Bible Software), p. 326; “marker of a position defined as being in a location, *in*...marker of a state or condition, *in.*”

Also interesting to realize is that the “in” in the first English phrase for Rev. 1:10, “I was *in* the Spirit,” has the exact Greek word (ἐν) for the next phrase which is usually translated as “on,” as in “*on* the Lord’s Day.” Therefore, the second Greek phrase is easily translated as “*in* the Lord’s Day.”

<sup>71</sup> There are many places in the Greek New Testament where *Kurios*, literally “Lord” is written, and where English Bibles have “Lord” or even “LORD,” but the Old Testament cite that it speaks of has “Yahveh.” Matthew 3:3; 4:7; 21:9; 23:37; 22:44; 23:39; 27:10; Mark 1:3; 11:9-10; 12:29 (twice), 30, 36; Luke 1:46; 2:23; 3:4; 4:8, 12, 18-19; 10:27; 13:35; 19:38; 20:42; John 1:23; 12:13, 38 (twice); Acts 2:20-21, 25, 34; 3:22; 4:26; 7:33, 37, 49; 15:17 (twice); Romans 4:8; 9:28-29; 10:13, 16; 11:13, 34; 12:19; 14:11; 15:11; 1st Cor. 1:31; 2:16; 3:20; 14:21; 2nd Cor. 6:17-18; 10:17; Hebrews 1:10; 7:21; 8:8, 9, 10, 11; 10:16, 30 (twice); 12:5-6; 13:6; James 5:10-11 (twice); 1st Peter 1:25; 3:12 (twice), 15; 2nd Peter 3:8, 9, 10; Jude 1:5, 9, 14; Rev. 1:8; 4:8, 11; 6:10; 11:17; 15:3-4; 16:5, 7; 18:8; 19:1, 6; 21:22; 22:5.

<sup>72</sup> See Isaiah 13:9-11; Jeremiah 46:10-12; Zephaniah 1:14-16; Joel 2:31, etc.

# AFTER THE APOSTLES

After the Gospels, Acts, the Letters of the New Testament, Hebrews and Revelation were written (44-95 AD), Christians wrote letters of encouragement and instruction to one another. Many of them, from 150-300 AD and following, contained specific references to the Lord's Day being Sunday—the new day for Christian assembly. The four earliest documents are seen by Catholic and Protestant theologians to confirm their eisegesis of the three New Testament Scriptures, meaning their projection unto those texts of Sunday being the day for Christians to assemble on, and that Sunday is the Lord's Day (Rev. 1:10).

There are three letters and one document, written from 95-150 AD, that scholars use to support their “Lord's Day is Sunday” position, and “Sunday is the new day for Christians,” but there are problems with them. Three of their proofs are easily disproven, and the one that has “Sunday” is “off the charts.”

1. Clement's *Letter* speaks of the Resurrection, but there's no link to a weekly Sunday being the new day for Christians or of it being the Lord's Day. Instead he speaks of the Messiah as the First Fruits.
2. Ignatius' *Letter* actually confirms the Sabbath as being the day of Christian assembly, not Sunday.
3. *The pseudo Letter of "Barnabas"* speaks of Sunday in Gnostic terms, which opposes God's Word.
4. *The Didache* mentions communion, but doesn't have Sunday as the weekly day to take it on.

The four ancient documents, with their dating, are:

1. Clement's *Letter to the Corinthians* .....95 AD
2. Ignatius' *Letter to the Magnesians* .....110-115 AD
3. The pseudo "*Letter of Barnabas*" .....70-138 AD
4. *The Didache* .....70-150 AD

I'll cover them in the order I've listed. Although the last two have possible earlier dates of 70 AD and following, there is evidence that points to later datings for them.

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), a Dominican priest, was, and still is, the most influential Catholic philosopher and theologian. Aquinas encouraged his fellow Catholics that their Catholic *faith was to be "identical with that of the ancients."*<sup>73</sup> Unfortunately, living more than a thousand years after the change of Sabbath to Sunday, etc. (120 AD), he didn't realize that Catholicism was not a Christian church at all, but a damnable cult (e.g. how Catholics are “saved,” by babies being sprinkled with baptismal water), and heretical in their Sunday and Easter assembly, etc. His concept though, that one's Christian faith should be similar to, if not identical with that of the ancients, that is to say the Jewish Apostles, is correct.

Mark Hulme, in *The Path to Sunday*, questions Aquinas' “choice of a day to regard as holy” (i.e. Sunday) and insightfully asks, “**When**, and on *what authority*, did that change come about?”<sup>74</sup> Hulme goes on to list two Catholic Councils that in their time, affirm Sunday to be the Christian day of assembly and the Lord's Day. The “fourth-century Synod” (Council) “of Laodicea” (364 AD) exhorts Catholics *to not be like the Jews*,

“who rest on the Sabbath, and” the Synod “called any Christian who did, “anathema”—  
cursed, excluded, rejected, no longer members of the” (Catholic) “community.”<sup>75</sup>

Hulme thoughtfully says that many Christians must have been keeping the Sabbath day holy for a Synod to have to condemn it.<sup>76</sup> He also speaks of “the earlier Council of Nicea” (325 AD), which demanded,

---

<sup>73</sup> [The Path to Sunday](#) by Mark Hulme.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

now with political power since Constantine had elevated Catholicism to political-religious status as one of the two religions of the Roman Empire, that all Christians “in the East” (i.e. modern day Turkey, Syria and Israel, etc.), *keep Easter and not Passover*.<sup>77</sup> Here too it seems there were enough Christians keeping Passover to bring down Catholic wrath upon them, for Constantine was taking religious direction from Rome. In other words, there were Christians who continued to keep Sabbath and Passover for at least 300 years *after* the Resurrection. These Christians did this because they were convinced that the Sabbath and Passover were to be kept as part of their Christian lifestyle (cf. 1st Cor. 5:6-8; Heb. 4:9).

Hulme writes that the Apostle Paul wouldn’t recognize the Christian *lifestyle* of today (e.g. Sunday, Easter and ham) because it is so different *from how Paul walked out his faith in Jesus*, and how he taught others to do so (cf. 1st Cor. 4:16-17; 5:6-8; 11:1). Scholar Paula Fredriksen, Professor Emerita at Boston University, writes that the Apostle Paul would be shocked at the Christianity of Rome and Constantine.<sup>78</sup>

Satan entered the Church of Rome in 120 AD through Pope Sixtus, who changed Sabbath to Sunday, etc.<sup>79</sup> When heretical tradition is taught and accepted as Scripture, scholars are blind to critically ascertaining it, as we’ve seen with “beyond all reasonable doubt,” the Lord’s Day is Sunday. This same blindness is apparent in the way Christian theologians determine that these four ancient documents confirm their presupposition that Sunday is the Lord’s Day and the new weekly day of assembly for Christians.

## ***Clement—The Letter to the Corinthians***

Clement was Bishop of Rome from 88-99 AD, when biblical Christianity was still found in Rome. He wrote a letter to the Corinthians in 95 AD, when the Apostle John was still alive, encouraging them to persevere in the faith. In wanting them to be strengthened in their hope of their own resurrection, Clement lists three reasons to rely on their hope. Noticeably absent is a direct tie-in to a weekly Sunday assembly hosting the Lord’s Supper with the Lord’s Resurrection on Sunday. Samuele Bacchiocchi writes:

“In Clement’s *Epistle to the Corinthians*, known as “the earliest Christian document that has come down to us outside the New Testament” (dated about AD 95),<sup>80</sup> *four chapters* deal with *the theme of the resurrection* (24-27). The writer, *seeking to reassure the Christians of Corinth that “there is to be a resurrection, of which he”* (God) “made the Lord Jesus *the first fruits*” (24:1), employs three different and effective symbols:”

1. “the day-night cycle,
2. the reproductive cycle of the seed (24),
3. and the legend of the Phoenix from whose corpse allegedly another bird arose (25).”

“The *omission* of the Lord’s Supper and of” alleged “weekly Sunday worship—the most telling symbols of all is certainly surprising, if indeed, as some hold” (i.e. the Roman Catholic Church, that), “the Eucharist was *already* celebrated on Sundays and had acquired *the commemorative value of the resurrection*. What more effective way for the

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., ““the type of Christianity Constantine is patronizing is very different from what Paul enunciated. The fact that Constantine’s Christianity understands itself as the only one that’s true to what Paul taught wouldn’t help the historical Paul’s shock in seeing how different Constantine’s Christianity was from his own.” How had it shifted so far?”

<sup>79</sup> See [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#) and Daniel 7:25, where God speaks through the Prophet of this change of the *times* (i.e. the Sabbath weekly assembly and holy days), and the Law (Mosaic Law; e.g. what to eat and what not to eat: see [Law 102](#)).

<sup>80</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 48, note 175.



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? Clement, on the contrary, not only omits this rite...but even speaks of "the sacrifices and services" offered "at the appointed times" in the Temple of Jerusalem as "*things the Master has commanded us to perform*" (40:2-4)."<sup>81</sup>

Clement brings up three illustrations to assuage the fear of the Corinthians, but fails to present the alleged weekly Sunday assemblies (with communion) as one of them, even though there are four chapters in his *Letter* that deal with the Resurrection. If the Corinthians were meeting every Sunday because of the Sunday Resurrection he would have spoken of it *as the main illustration* why their hope was "certain."

With Clement speaking of the Temple and sacrifice, and his not writing of Sunday as the weekly day for the Body and the Blood, or just the new day of assembly, Clement, who was later deemed a Pope by the Catholic Church,<sup>82</sup> indirectly presents a very pro-Mosaic Law Christian lifestyle. Those Corinthians were not meeting on Sunday in 95 AD, which certainly dismantles Lenski's points that Sunday had become the weekly day of meeting at the "earliest apostolic times" because Christ made Sunday his very own, and the Apostolic Church chose Sunday as its new day, replacing the Sabbath, as Lenski taught.<sup>83</sup>

How though, could Clement, in 95 AD, speak of Temple and sacrifice in Jerusalem when the Roman general Titus had destroyed the Temple in 70 AD, 25 years earlier? Bacchiocchi reveals that sacrifice on the Temple grounds continued, in reduced form:

"In chapter 41 Clement reiterates the necessity of respecting "the appointed rules of his ministrations" by referring again to the services of the Temple: "Not in every place, my brethren, are the daily sacrifices offered or the free-will offerings, or the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, but only in Jerusalem, and there also, the offering is not made in every place, but before the shrine, at the altar." The reference to the *Temple sacrificial services* reflects not only the high esteem in which they were held by...Christians, but also *continuance of sacrifice*, though in a reduced form, after AD 70."<sup>84</sup>

Sacrifice *after* the Resurrection, by non-believing Jewish people and Jewish Christians, was a common happening, despite the Church teaching that animal sacrifice ended (for Christians) with the death and Resurrection of Jesus. In Acts 21:20-24f., twenty five years *after* the Resurrection, Paul took the Nazarite Vow, which commands a minimum of three animals sacrificed for each person (Num. 6:14), and Paul was willing to pay for four other Jewish Christians to sacrifice animals after their Vow, and his, was completed. It doesn't get "any more Mosaic Law" than the Nazarite Vow with its animal sacrifice. This too shatters the false teaching of the Church that animal sacrifice (for Christians) ended with the sacrifice of Jesus. Yeshua is the ultimate Sacrifice, but His Sacrifice did not invalidate or nullify animal sacrifice at the Temple for Christians in Paul's day, nor today if there was a Temple, nor in Messiah's thousand year reign on this Earth from Jerusalem (cf. Ezk. 40-47; Rev. 20:1-6f.).<sup>85</sup> The sacrificed animals *after* the Resurrection picture our Lord's Sacrifice, and nowhere in the New Testament does anyone say that animal sacrifice has

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., note 177. For animal sacrifice after 70 AD see "K. W. Clark, *Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after AD 70*, NTS 6 (1959-1960): 269-280; J. R. Brown, *The Temple and Sacrifice in Rabbinic Judaism*, 1963.

<sup>82</sup> [Pope Clement I](#) was Bishop of Rome and is listed by Irenaeus and Tertullian as holding office from 88 AD to his death in 99 AD. He is considered to be the first Apostolic Father of the Church; one of three, together with Polycarp and Ignatius of Antioch. The title of Pope (i.e. Papa/Father) isn't officially assigned until 596 AD, when Gregory the Great is given it. In all listings of Popes though, the title goes straight back to Peter, whom the Catholic Church teaches was its first Pope.

<sup>83</sup> See Lenski, p. 2, note 9, and p. 7.

<sup>84</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 48, note 177.

<sup>85</sup> See also [Mosaic Sacrifice and the Blood of Jesus](#), [Mosaic Sacrifice in the New Testament](#), and [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#).

ended, the author of Hebrews notwithstanding. The writer of Hebrews, in stating that Yeshua was sacrificed *once and for all* (cf. Heb. 7:27; 9:12; 10:10) is simply stating that Yeshua doesn't have to come back for every generation and be re-sacrificed (He was sacrificed "once"), and "for all" means that His one time Sacrifice is for everyone who has ever existed or will ever exist. It does not mean that animal sacrifice in the Temple is no longer valid, as the Church currently teaches. Also, no one in Scripture says that animal sacrifice has ended, even with many New Testament Letters and the Gospel of John and Revelation being written *after* the Temple was destroyed in 70 AD. This too speaks of Mosaic Law as God's Standard for Christian lifestyle, for if animal sacrifice is still valid, how much more the Sabbath and Feast Days and Mosaic Dietary laws?

Concerning the Resurrection *as the reason or the foundation for weekly Sunday assembly*, Bacchiocchi reveals that even Catholic scholars like C. S. Mosna understand that the Resurrection doesn't attain *primary* importance as *the reason for Sunday* until *after* 300 AD:

"The *secondary* role of the resurrection in earlier sources is recognized even by scholars who defend its influence on the origin of Sunday. C. S. Mosna notes...that while in the *fourth century* the Fathers established "an explicit link" between the resurrection and Sunday observance, "*in the first three centuries the memory of the resurrection was hardly mentioned.*"<sup>86</sup>

The popular belief that the Resurrection on Sunday is "the reason for changing the Sabbath to Sunday," doesn't become the primary reason in the Roman Church until the fourth century. For the first 90 years *after* the Resurrection though, *all Gentile Christians* were meeting every Sabbath, not every Sunday, just like their Jewish-Christian counterparts. Clement's *Letter to the Corinthians* cannot be used to prove Sunday assembly over Sabbath holiness nor that the Lord's Day is Sunday, especially as he speaks of animal sacrifice in Jerusalem as the things that Jesus "commanded us to perform."

## ***Ignatius — The Letter to the Magnesians***

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch in Syria,<sup>87</sup> like the Apostle Paul before him, was a former persecutor of Christians. In 115 AD,<sup>88</sup> many years after he had come to Yeshua, the Roman Empire condemned to death for his faith in Yeshua and he sent to Rome for execution. While traveling to Rome from Syrian Antioch, Ignatius wrote letters to various churches. One of the letters was to the church in Magnesia (western Asia Minor) about 15 miles south-east of Ephesus. The Magnesians had sent some elders to meet Ignatius in Smyrna,<sup>89</sup> about 80 miles north of Ephesus. Ignatius was a disciple of the Apostle John,<sup>90</sup> and his *Letter* was written only 15-20 years after John had written Revelation.<sup>91</sup> *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* writes that Ignatius speaks of Sunday as the Lord's Day, which must be kept, and not the Sabbath,<sup>92</sup> but that's not what Ignatius actually wrote. Verses 8-9 are usually translated as:

---

<sup>86</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), pp. 48-49. C. S. Mosna, *Storia della domenica*, p. 357; "W. Rordorf, *Sabbat* (texts), p. xvi, in spite of his endeavor to defend an opposite thesis, also admits: "we can indicate with reasons that the justification for Sunday on the basis of the resurrection of Jesus, does not appear until the second century and even then very timidly."<sup>86</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Antioch in Syria is where Ignatius was bishop of: Acts 11:20, 22, 26-27; 13:1; 14:26; 15:22-23, 30, 35; 18:22; Gal. 2:11. Antioch in Asia Minor or modern day Turkey is found in Acts 13:14; 14:19, 21; 2nd Tim. 3:11.

<sup>88</sup> Ignatius most likely died in 118 AD. He was a friend of Polycarp.

<sup>89</sup> [To the Magnesians](#).

<sup>90</sup> John B. O'Connor, [St. Ignatius of Antioch](#), *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 7 (New York: Robert Appleton Company), 1910, fourth paragraph.

<sup>91</sup> See the [Two Disciples of John: Ignatius](#) and Polycarp.

<sup>92</sup> J. R. Michaels, Author; Bromiley, General Editor, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. one, p.

<sup>8</sup>“Do not be led astray by wrong views or by outmoded tales that count for nothing. For *if we still go on observing Judaism*, we admit we never received grace. The divine prophets themselves *lived Christ Jesus’ way*. That is why they were persecuted, for they were inspired by his grace to convince unbelievers that God is one, and that he has revealed himself in his Son Jesus Christ, who is his Word issuing from the silence and who won the complete approval of him who sent him.”

<sup>9</sup>“Those, then, *who lived by ancient practices arrived at a new hope. They ceased to keep the Sabbath and lived by the Lord’s day*, on which our life as well as theirs shone forth, thanks to Him and his death, though some deny this. Through this mystery we got our faith, and because of it we stand our ground so as to become disciples of Jesus Christ, our sole teacher. How, then, can we live without him *when even the prophets, who were his disciples by the Spirit, awaited him as their teacher?* He, then, whom they were rightly expecting, *raised them from the dead, when he came.*”<sup>93</sup>

Ignatius seems to be admonishing Christians *not* to observe *Judaism* (i.e. the Sabbath), but to keep Sunday as the Lord’s Day, at least in this English translation. In 1849, Sir William Domville (1774-1860), a strict Sunday keeper, questioned the traditional English translation of, “*They ceased to keep the Sabbath and lived by the Lord’s Day.*” He wrote that the Greek word *zoen* follows “Lord’s” and so it should read, “and lived by the Lord’s *life*,” not “and lived by the Lord’s *day*.” William Domville wrote,

“there is no phrase or word in the original” Greek “which corresponds to the phrase “the Lord’s *day*”...or they “ceased to keep the Sabbath.” To speak of living according to a day is, in fact, *to use a phrase without a meaning* (whereas) “living according to the Lord’s *life*” agree(s) with the whole tenor of the context.”<sup>94</sup>

This is a major departure from how Sunday theologians understand the text, but it’s plain to see that “day” (Greek *hemera*) does not follow “Lord’s,” but *zoen* (life). There is no “Lord’s Day” here, but they “lived by the Lord’s life.”

Domville also brings up “*kata*,” the Greek word that is written before “the Lord’s life,” and says, “The divine prophets themselves *lived according to Christ Jesus’ way*” or manner of life. *Kata* means, “accord-

---

208; in the last paragraph at the bottom of the right hand column.

<sup>93</sup> [To the Magnesians](#), vv. 8-9; no translator given, but found on the site, Early Christian Fathers. Cf. 1st Peter 3:19; 4:6 where Yeshua went into the underworld and preached the Gospel to the dead and took captivity captive; i.e. those of mankind who were dead who responded to the Gospel; Psalm 68:18; Ephesians 4:8.

<sup>94</sup> [The Path to Sunday](#) by Mark Hulme. In Lightfoot’s translation of his [Letter](#), Ignatius speaks of “our never-failing life” in union with the Lord (1:2; 9:2; cf. 5:2; 10:1, 3).

In speaking of false Christians, Ignatius writes, “Such men appear to me not to keep a good conscience, forasmuch as they do not assemble themselves together *lawfully according to commandment*.” Such wording as “lawfully” and “commandment” evoke God’s commandment to *assemble* on the Sabbath (cf. Ex. 20:8-11; Heb. 10:24-25), not a new change of day to gather on.

In 7:2 Ignatius writes, “*Hasten to come together all of you*, as to one temple, even God; as to one altar, even to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from One Father and is with One and departed unto One.” Isn’t it strange, if Sunday were the new day of assembly, that Ignatius speaks of coming together, but doesn’t mention Sunday?

In 9:1e–2a Ignatius says, “that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ *our only Teacher*. If this be so, how shall we be able *to live apart* from Him?, seeing that *even the prophets, being His disciples*, were expecting Him as their Teacher through the Spirit.” If “Jesus Christ” was their only Teacher, where does Jesus change the Sabbath to Sunday? Interesting too, is that Ignatius mentions the Resurrection, but nothing about a weekly Sunday assembly because on it (*Letter*, 11:1). In 13:1 Ignatius writes, “Do your diligence therefore that ye be confirmed *in the ordinances of the Lord and of the Apostles*, that ye may prosper in all things.” Neither the Lord Yeshua nor any of His Apostles ever spoke of a weekly Sunday assembly that over-rode the Sabbath, or of Sunday being “the Lord’s Day.” Ignatius and all Christians were still keeping the Sabbath day holy in 115 AD.

ing to” or “after the manner of.” He states,

““Still more remarkable is the language of a preceding sentence...for even the most holy prophets lived according to (*kata*) Christ Jesus’ way...What is this but saying in other words, living “according to the Lord’s life”?, that is, according to the pattern He set” for us.<sup>95</sup>

The sentence should be translated like this: “to cease to keep the Sabbath (in the manner of “Judaism,” the legalistic Pharisees), but to keep it in the manner of Christ Jesus’ life or way.”

Samuele Bacchiocchi confirms William Domville, and says that Ignatius was not speaking of keeping Sunday or the Lord’s Day as Sunday, but of keeping the Sabbath in the *manner and life* of Yeshua, and not that of the way of Judaism. From the oldest manuscript of the *Letter to the Magnesians*, Bacchiocchi writes that “life” is what should follow “Lord’s,” not “day:”

“Moreover the noun “life—*zoen*,” is present in the oldest extant Greek manuscript (Codex Mediceus Laurentinus); thus the “Lord’s life” is the most likely translation.”<sup>96</sup>

Speaking of Sunday observance in Asai Minor, Bacchiocchi asks the question:

“Was Sunday already observed by few or by many in the province of Asia at the time of Ignatius (ca. AD 115)? This can hardly be established by the problematic passage of *Magnesians* 9:1. The key sentence “no longer *sabbatizing*, but living according to the Lord’s life (or Lord’s day),” in recent times has been subjected to considerable scrutiny by various scholars.”<sup>97</sup>

No Christians were meeting on “Sunday” in 115 AD. They weren’t meeting on Sunday in Apostolic times, and they weren’t assembling on Sunday in 115 AD. There are no records to support Sunday meetings, *The Letter to the Magnesians* notwithstanding. Sunday didn’t come into the Church until 120 AD, when Pope Sixtus threw out the Sabbath and brought in Sun-day. More on that in a moment.

In speaking of Jewish-Christian legalism, Bacchiocchi says, “More significant, still, is the *context*. As Kenneth A. Strand...incisively remarks,”

“Regardless of what “Lord’s Day” may have meant, either in Magnesia or in Antioch ...the context reveals that it is not the early Christians who are pictured as, “no longer sabbatizing,”<sup>98</sup> but that it is the Old Testament prophets who are described...Surely Ignatius knew that the Old Testament prophets observed the seventh day of the week, not the first! The contrast here then, is not between days as such, but between ways of life—between the” (Pharisaic-Christian legalistic; cf. Acts 15:1, 5), “Jewish “sabbatizing” way of life and the newness of life symbolized for the Christian by Christ’s resurrection.”

Ignatius wasn’t coming against Sabbath worship, but keeping the Sabbath in a legalistic way, and that this passage reflects that *Christians were observing the Sabbath, not Sunday*. Bacchiocchi states:

“The “sabbatizing” then, which Ignatius *condemns* in the context of the conduct of the prophets, could hardly be the *repudiation* of the Sabbath as a day, but rather, as R. B. Lewis asserts, “the keeping of the Sabbath in a certain manner—Judaizing.”<sup>99</sup>

“The fact that Ignatius urges Christians to stop “practicing Judaism” (*Magnesians* 8:1)<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 76.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., p. 132.

<sup>98</sup> Bacchiocchi’s “no longer sabbatizing,” is another translation for, “They ceased to keep the Sabbath,” in the *Letter’s* v. 9. “No longer observing Sabbaths” is another way for Sunday theologians to translate the Greek.

<sup>99</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 132.

or “living like the Jews” (10:3), and to follow the example of the prophets in not judaizing on the Sabbath, *implies that many Christians were “keeping the Sabbath.*” “If such were the case, it would hardly seem reasonable *to presume* that Christians in Asia had already radically abandoned the Sabbath and were observing Sunday.”<sup>101</sup>

Ignatius, being translated as “ceased to keep the Sabbath,” or “no longer sabbatizing, but living according to the Lord’s day,”<sup>102</sup> is a false and heretical translation that seeks to read back into his *Letter* a Catholic prohibition against Sabbath keeping and an exhortation to keep “the Lord’s Day” as Sunday. It would better be translated as, “Not legalistically keeping the Sabbath as the Pharisees, but keeping it according to the Lord’s life” (Ignatius, *Magnesian* 9:6).<sup>103</sup> Bacchiocchi states that, “This in fact is the sense which is explicitly given to the text in the interpolated long recension:”

“Let us, therefore, no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner<sup>104</sup> ...but let every one of you keep the Sabbath in a spiritual manner.”<sup>105</sup>

Ignatius was mentored by “the Beloved Disciple,”<sup>106</sup> the Apostle John. Neither of them speak of Sunday assembly or the Lord’s Day being Sunday. What scholars have seen as “the Lord’s Day” turns out to be the keeping of the Sabbath in the Lord’s Way or manner of life by the Holy Spirit.

John is the last Apostle to write. He wrote his Gospel, Revelation and his three *Letters* within a few years of each other (90-95 AD). Yet there’s not a single hint of this new day of assembly, or of Sunday being the Lord’s Day in any of his writings, let alone two clear and plain verses speaking of this *seismic* shift in days. Also, there’s nothing in his disciple Ignatius, that proclaims a Sunday assembly, or of Sunday being the Lord’s Day. It’s not until the mid to late second century AD that the term “the Lord’s Day” will be used for Sunday.

Sunday and Easter Sunday first came into Christianity in 120 AD, when Pope Sixtus changed Sabbath to Sunday and Passover to Easter, and threw out Mosaic Law.<sup>107</sup> He wanted to avoid persecution from the Roman Empire, which was persecuting all Jews, even Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, because they kept the “Jewish Sabbath” and Passover.

Sixtus, as with all Gentile Christians then, “looked like a Jew” because he met on the Sabbath and kept Passover, etc. Judah rebelled against Rome in 66-70 AD and also in the mid 90s, and so Sixtus threw out Sabbath, Passover and Mosaic Law and brought in Sunday, Easter and the eating of unclean animals, and a contempt for “the Jewish Law.” Sixtus had no biblical reason to do so. He just didn’t want to be perse-

---

<sup>100</sup> [Magnesians 8:1](#): “Be not seduced by strange doctrines nor by antiquated fables, which are profitless. For if even unto this day we live *after the manner of Judaism*, we avow that we have not received grace.”

<sup>101</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 133.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 131.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 132. Pagan and Christian authors constantly condemned the idleness and the feasting which characterized Jewish Sabbath-keeping. Plutarch (ca. AD 40-120) places the Jewish “Sabbath-keeping—*sabbatismos*” among the existing wicked superstitions (*De superstitione* 3). He upbraids especially their drinking (*Questiones convivales* 4, 6, 2) and their sitting “in their places immovable” on the Sabbath (*De superstitione* 8; see...pp. 173-176, notes 24 to 39 for additional references of pagan authors). The author of the *Epistle to Diognetus* denounces the Jewish “superstition as respects the Sabbaths.” He labels as “impious” the Jewish teachings that God “forbade us to do what is good on the Sabbath days” (ch. 4; *ANE* I, p. 26; cf. Justin, *Dialogue* 29, 3; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 6, 16, 141, 7; *Syriac Didascalia* 26; Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 66, 23, 7; Chrysostom, *De Christi divinitate* 4).

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 132-133.

<sup>106</sup> Some think that John wasn’t the Beloved Disciple who leaned on Yeshua chest at the Last Passover (John 13:23), but I expose their fallacious teaching in [Passover and the Apostle John](#), beginning on page 17 and also, that the “Supper” was indeed a Passover (p. 1f.).

<sup>107</sup> See [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#).



cuted “for the Way of Yeshua.” He was not a faithful man to Yeshua and God’s Word for Christian lifestyle, and Satan used him mightily to change the Lord’s Days and Ways (cf. Dan. 7:25) to Satan’s Days and Ways. Satan is who Sunday, Easter and Xmas honor. What Sixtus did reverberates down to our time. *This* is why Christians assemble on Sunday and Easter and eat bacon and shrimp, and despise Mosaic Law (their pastors telling them it’s been done away with by Christ and that it’s legalism assures that fear and contempt).

Bacchiocchi goes back to the basics of common sense, something that most Christians theologians seem to have forgotten concerning Sunday being “the Lord’s Day.” He says that “the Lord’s Day” should be defined by Scripture, not by people who lived more than 50 years *after* the last Apostle died. With words similar to Bullinger he writes:

“It remains for us to define the meaning of the “Lord’s day” of Revelation 1:10 *solely in the light of the text, context, and the teaching of the New Testament. Assuming that* John “intended to specify that on a Sunday he found himself rapt in the Spirit, *would he have designated such a day as “Lord’s day”?* Because in the New Testament” Sunday “is always called “the first day of the week;” *is it not strange that in this one place the writer would use a different expression to refer to the same day?*” (And not tell us why?) “More important still, if, as many exegetes maintain,<sup>108</sup> John the Apostle wrote at approximately the same time both the Revelation and the fourth Gospel, then would it not seem reasonable to expect him to employ *the same expression even in his Gospel, especially when reporting the first-day events of the resurrection and appearances of Jesus (John 20:1, 19, 26)?*”<sup>109</sup>

“Therefore, the fact that the expression “Lord’s day,” used in the New Testament only” once “by John, occurs in his apocalyptic book, but not in his Gospel where the first day is explicitly mentioned in conjunction with the resurrection (John 20:1) and the appearances of Jesus (John 20:19, 26), weakens the claim that “John...wishes to indicate specifically *the day* in which the community celebrates together the eucharistic liturgy.””<sup>110</sup>

“If Sunday had already received the new appellation “Lord’s day” by the end of the first century” (i.e. 90-100 AD), “when both the Gospel of John and the book of Revelation were written, we would expect this new name for Sunday to be used consistently in both works, especially since they were...produced by the same author at approximately the same time and in the same geographical area.”<sup>111</sup>

Bacchiocchi raises an important concern that if John meant the Lord’s Day to be Sunday, why doesn’t he use the Lord’s Day in his Gospel when speaking about the Sunday resurrection and Sunday appearances of Yeshua? Also, why doesn’t John write that Sunday had now become the Lord’s Day because He rose on that day? With John not saying that, but taking it for granted that we should know what he’s speaking about, it’s *certain* that he’s not declaring a *new* day (i.e. Sunday) that no other New Testament writer spoke of, but something we should be familiar with: “The Day of Yahveh.”

It’s not until *The Gospel of Peter*, dated from the mid to late second century (150-200 AD), that Sunday is “unmistakably designated by just the technical term “Lord’s—*kuriake*,”<sup>112</sup> the Greek word used by John in

---

<sup>108</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 71. This position is widely held especially by Catholic exegetes; see Alfred Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction*, 1958, pp. 283-290, 319, 547-557.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., p. 72. C. S. Mosna, *Storia della domenica*, p. 21. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that Sunday was the day for meeting and the taking of the Eucharist (“communion”) in the Apostolic Church. This Catholic understanding of John 20:19, that this Sunday is Easter Sunday and that it is “the Lord’s Day,” may be where Moffat got his unsupported idea that Sunday is “specifically mentioned as “the Lord’s Day”” (see p. 3, note 16).

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., pp. 71-72.

Revelation 1:10. (“Day” isn’t in the Greek *Gospel of Peter*; it’s taken for granted.) Bacchiocchi writes,

““In two different verses it reads: “Now in the night in which the Lord’s (*He kuriake*) dawned...there rang out a loud voice in heaven” (v. 35); “Early in the morning of the Lord’s (*tes kuriakes*) Mary Magdalene...came to the sepulchre” (v. 50-51). In this apocryphal Gospel, *dated in the second half of the second century*,<sup>113</sup> the use of the abbreviated form “Lord’s” without the noun “day—*hemera*” implies, as L. Vaganay rightly observes, “*une façon courante*,”<sup>114</sup> that is, a *common usage of the term*.”<sup>115</sup>

The so-called *Gospel of Peter* is the *first* instance where the abbreviated form “Lord’s,” without “day—*hemera*” is used for Sunday. *Before this there is no reference* to Sunday being “the Lord’s Day.” In other words, “the Lord’s [Day]” being Sunday isn’t seen for more than 120 years *after* the Resurrection, and that, in a *Gospel* attributed to Peter, but obviously wasn’t written by the Apostle, even in 150 AD. Concerning the Lord’s Day and Sunday, Bacchiocchi says there is no evidence in the New Testament that the Lord’s Day means Sunday:

“The equation of Sunday with the expression “Lord’s day” is based *not on internal evidences of the book of Revelation or of the rest of the New Testament*.”<sup>116</sup>

Not realizing these things, Plummer (“the sevens man”), stated, “*we have a complete chain of evidence that ἡ Κυριακή*” (*hay Kuriake*; the Lord’s) “became the regular Christian name for the first day of the week.”<sup>117</sup> As true as that chain is, it doesn’t begin for more than a century and a half *after* the Resurrection. *The Gospel of Peter* is the beginning of Sunday being “the Lord’s Day.”

There isn’t any connection between the Lord’s Day of the Apostle John and Sunday—not in *The Letter to the Corinthians* by Clement (95 AD) who speaks of the Resurrection, but not Sunday assembly, and not in *The Letter to the Magnesians* by Ignatius, a disciple of the Apostle John, whose *Letter* actually cements the 7th day Sabbath as the day of assembly in 115 AD, to be kept “the Lord’s Way.”

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

The Gnostic *Gospel of Peter* is dated around the mid to late second century AD. It is “an ancient text concerning Jesus Christ, only partially known today. It is considered a non-canonical gospel” or a gospel that wasn’t inspired by the Holy Spirit and so “it was rejected as apocryphal by the Church’s synods of Carthage and Rome, which established the New Testament canon.” From [Gospel of Peter](#). (Apocryphal: “of doubtful authenticity, although widely circulated as being true.”) It was written by a Gnostic writer, obviously not the Apostle Peter, and one thing that he said gives away his Gnosticism is, “And they brought two wrongdoers and crucified the Lord in the middle of them. But he was silent *as having no pain*.” The Gnostic Jesus is said to be only a phantom. In other words their Jesus looked like a man, but He wasn’t—He only appeared to be a man, and so their Jesus suffered no pain, and didn’t hunger or thirst, etc. The Gnostic reason for their Jesus to be a phantom is because they believe that the Son of God is so pure and holy, and *all matter* in this Universe, according to them, is evil, and so the Son of God would never take on human flesh; He only appeared to be a man. This heresy is called Docetism, and the Apostle John comes against this in both His Gospel and First Letter (e.g. “Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits, whether they are of God because many false prophets have gone out into the world. By this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ *has come in the flesh* is of God, and every spirit that does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, which you have heard was coming, and is now already in the world” (1st John 4:1-3). John isn’t speaking of the Jews who don’t believe in Jesus, as the label of “anti-Christ” is hung over them from anti-Semites, but of Christians who say He didn’t come in the flesh.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., cf. Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 1969, I, p. 180: ““at the latest the second half of the second century, since Serapion dates this gospel back about a generation at least;” cf. also P. Gardner-Smith, “The Date of the Gospel of Peter,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1976): 401f.”

<sup>114</sup> Ibid. L. Vaganay, *L’Évangile de Pierre*, 1930, p. 292.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>117</sup> Alfred Plummer, *The Pulpit Commentary Series: Revelation*, paragraph 93,463.

## *The Pseudo Letter of Barnabas*

*The Letter of Barnabas* wasn't written by the Barnabas who was a friend of the Apostle Paul, but an unknown man who used the famous name of Barnabas to garner readers, similar to the man who wrote *The Gospel of Peter*. This was a common practice in the ancient world and wasn't seen as unethical. Of course it was, and this deception would get the attention of people who would otherwise not give the *Letter* or the *Gospel of Peter* a second thought. Many naive Christians today seek them out, thinking they are genuine. Estimates place the *Letter's* composition from 70-131 AD, but a date before 120 AD is impossible because Christians didn't begin to assemble on Sunday until 120 AD, and then, only a limited number of them (e.g. in Rome, and eventually in Greece). *The Letter of Barnabas* is also invalid because of what it claims Sunday to be.

The *Letter* presents "the 8th day" or Sunday as the day Christians assemble on. "The 8th day" though, is a Gnostic Christian concept of Sunday as the "8th Day" of a seven day week. Of course there is no 8th day in a seven day week and hence its "mystical-Gnostic" quality and attraction for those who aren't grounded in the Word of God—back then and today. In real life, Sunday just becomes the first day of the week again, but in Gnosticism it speaks of something that is outside of time; outside the natural physical world, and so it symbolizes eternity.

Hulme speaks of the attitude of the *Letter*, saying that Paul's missionary friend Barnabas, would never have written in such an ungodly way:

"Though the letter is often dated to 74 AD when some of the apostles were still alive, the book's contents strongly suggest that it was written considerably later...When the *Epistle* was written, St. Barnabas was certainly no longer alive and even if he had been, *he would not have adopted the violent and severe attitude evinced throughout this document.*"<sup>118</sup>

Even the *Catholic Encyclopedia* says that the letter "must...have been written in A.D. 130-131."<sup>119</sup> Bacchiocchi also states that scholars see *The Letter of Barnabas* as being written between 130-138 AD:

"The *Epistle of Barnabas*, dated by the majority of scholars between AD 130 and 138,<sup>120</sup> was written by a pseudonymous Barnabas, probably at Alexandria."<sup>121</sup>

A major reason why the *Letter* is important to Sunday theologians is because it contains a specific reference to Sunday as the 8th day of the week that "they" meet on. Bacchiocchi writes it has "*the first explicit reference to the observance of Sunday, denominated as "eighth day."*"<sup>122</sup> *The Letter of Barnabas* 15:8-9 has, "We keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead."

*The Letter* presents Sunday as the day they meet on, with the justification of the Resurrection as the 8th day of the week, which understanding and justification is absent in Scripture. It also denigrates the Jewish people, saying that "they lost it" (the covenant) "*completely just after Moses received it.*" (4:6-7)"<sup>123</sup> This

---

<sup>118</sup> [The Path to Sunday](#) by Mark Hulme. J. Tixeront, *Handbook of Patrology*.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 134. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, 1953, I, pp. 90-91; E. Goodspeed, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1950, p. 19; William H. Shea, "The Sabbath in the Epistle of Barnabas," *AUSS* 4 (July 1966): 150; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 1890, I, part 1, p. 349; A. L. Williams, "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas," *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1933): 337-346.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid. J. B. Lightfoot comments in this regard: "The picture...which it presents of feuds between Jews and Christians, is in keeping with the state of the population of that city (Alexandria), the various elements of which were continually in conflict" (*The Apostolic Fathers*, 1926, p. 240).

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., p. 135. James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and Synagogue*, 1934, p. 84, observes: "The whole of the epistle of Barnabas is an exposition of the Church as the true Israel. It is heresy even to try and share the good



heretical understanding in *The Letter*, that the Jewish people lost the covenant that God made with them at Mt. Sinai, has no basis in Scripture, but it does reveal the theological hatred of “this Barnabas” for Israel around 130-138 AD. Of course, his theology goes against the Old Testament concerning God’s everlasting love of, and redemption of Israel, in spite of their unfaithfulness. The Apostle Paul speaks of God redeeming the unsaved Jewish people (cf. Romans 11:25-33). If *Barnabas* was right, the Jewish people completely losing the covenant at Mt. Sinai, God would *not* have led Israel into the Promised Land through Joshua, but would have let them die in the Wilderness. Yet this “teaching” is alive and well today: it’s called replacement theology—the Jews are no longer God’s Chosen people.

*Barnabas* has “a Mosaic Law axe to grind” against the Lord’s people—Israel after the flesh, and also the Israel of God (Gal. 6:16). Here we see specific anti-Semitic words that will condemn all Jews of every generation as being worthy of murder. The Catholic Church, as well as the Reformation churches, as well as Adolf Hitler would wield this sword mightily, and many Jewish men, women and children would be persecuted and murdered because of it. *The Letter of Barnabas* is no friend of Jesus of Nazareth.

Bacchiocchi writes of Sunday that,

“The first theological motivation for the observance of Sunday is of an eschatological nature. The eighth day, in fact, represents “the beginning of a new world.” It is noteworthy that *Barnabas* presents the resurrection of Jesus as the *second or additional motivation*. Sunday is observed because on that day “Jesus *also* (*en he kai*) rose from the dead” (v. 9). Why is the resurrection mentioned as the additional reason for observing Sunday? Apparently because such a motivation had not yet acquired primary importance.”<sup>124</sup>

“The polemic arguments presented by Barnabas both to invalidate the Sabbath and to justify the eighth” (day) “as the continuation and replacement of the seventh, *reveal how strong anti-Judaic feelings motivated the adoption of Sunday as a new day of worship.*”<sup>125</sup>

*The Letter of Barnabas* displays a Gnostic futuristic theology as its main reason for Sunday replacing the Sabbath. Be that as it may, *there is no mention of the Lord’s Day* in this heretical *Letter*, although one can imagine that *Barnabas* wouldn’t have been opposed to it. As for God abandoning His (unsaved) Jewish people, as *Barnabas* teaches, every place in the Old Testament where God has a scorching word against His people Israel, He also seeks to comfort them *with a better future, even in the days of the Apostles.*<sup>126</sup>

*The Letter of Barnabas*, the first document of antiquity that presents Sunday as the day of meeting on, as the 8th Day “overtaking” the Lord’s Sabbath, was written from 130-138 AD, but not by the Barnabas who was Paul’s companion on his first missionary journey (Acts 13:1f.). This *Letter* drives a theological wedge between the biblical Sabbath and Sunday by its symbolic and Gnostic use of the 8th Day. *Barnabas* followed Pope Sixtus (120 AD) in his anti-Semitism for Sixtus justified his evil theology by saying, “The Jews rejected Jesus, and so God has rejected them *and* their Law.”<sup>127</sup> Of course, no one had an Old

---

*things of promise with the Jews.* In tones of unusual gravity, and with a special appeal, the author warns his hearers against such mistaken generosity.”

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., p. 137.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid. C. S. Mosna, *Storia della domenica*, p. 26, aptly remarks that Barnabas’ intricate and *irrational* argumentation is indicative “of the effort which Judaeo-Christians were making to justify their worship” on the Sabbath.

<sup>126</sup> Some places are: Numbers 23:19-24; 24:3-9; 2nd Samuel 7:10-13, 16, 24; Psalm 2:48; 102:16-22; 105:7-11; Isaiah 1:26-27; 2:1-3; 4:2-6; 9:3-4, 6-7; 12:1-6; 14:1-2, 32; 16:5; 24:23; 25:6-10; 26:1-6; 27:6; 28:5; 29:7-8, 22-24; 30:19, 26; 31:4-5; 32:15-20; 33:5, 20-22, 24; 34:8; 35:1-10; 41:8-20; 44:21-23; 45:17, 25; 49:13; 52:8-10; 54:1-17; 60:1-22; 61:4-7; 62:1-12; 63:7; 65:17-25; 66:10-13, 20-24; Jeremiah 23:5-8; 30:3-24; 31:1-15, 23-28, 31-40; 32:37-44; 33:6-26; 34:15; 35:2; 50:18-20; 51:5, 10, 19, 45; Ezekiel 16:60-63; 28:25-26; 34:11-31; 36:6-15, 22-27; 37:11-14, 15-28; 38:1-23; 39:23-29; 43:1-7; 47:13-23; 48:1-29; Hosea 1:10-11; 2:16-23; 3:5; 11:8-11; 13:14; 14:4-7; Joel 2:18-19, 23-32; 3:1-2, 12-21; Amos 9:14-15; Zechariah 2:4-5, 12; 8:18-19, 23; 9:16; 10:6; 12:1-10; 13:1-2; 14:1-21; Malachi 3:3-4, 11-12; Luke 1:30-33; Romans 11:1-12:3; Rev. 21:1-12; 22:16.

<sup>127</sup> See [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#).

and New Testament to see how wrong Sixtus and *Barnabas* were, but this was the beginning of “Christian” Jew-hatred in every generation, and the suppression of Mosaic Law as God’s New Testament lifestyle for Christians, but even in *Barnabas* there is no mention of Sunday being “the Lord’s Day.”

## *The Didache*

*The Didache* is also known as *The Lord’s Teaching to the Gentiles through the Twelve Apostles*, for that is how the first line in the document reads. *The Didache*, which is Greek for “teaching” or “instruction” (διδασκαλία), seeks to divinely justify itself by having the Lord Yeshua as its Author, speaking through His 12 Apostles. It’s considered to have been written as early as 70 AD and as late as 150 AD.

Three obvious flaws in the second name of this document reveal its cry for attention, meaning that it wasn’t written in the time of, or by, the 12 Apostles, and yet, what it states about the Lord’s Day, isn’t against Scripture because it too, like Ignatius’ *Letter to the Magnesians*, when correctly interpreted, actually doesn’t speak of Sunday as the Lord’s Day.

First, in terms of it not being given by the Lord to His 12 Apostles, the Apostle James died about 42 AD, for that is the general dating of Acts 12 when King Herod had James beheaded. That’s not Herod the Great, who murdered the Jewish babies in Bethlehem in the time of Yeshua (cf. Mt. 2:16f.), but Herod Agrippa I, a grandson of Herod the Great. The apple doesn’t fall far from the tree.

Second, Peter and Paul are generally believed to have died before 70 AD, and so there could not have been 12 Apostles who wrote it. Only God knows which the other Apostles might died, aside from John and Philip.

Third, the common understanding is that God led the Apostles in “different directions” to evangelize (e.g. Thomas went east, as far as India, where he met a martyr’s death in 72 AD). Therefore, all the Apostles would not have been alive, let alone in one geographical location to write *The Didache* in 70-95 AD, and none of them would have been living in 110-150 AD when *The Didache* was probably written. Again we see someone using famous names to bring attention to a document.

Be that as it may, many translate a passage in it to say that the Lord’s Day is Sunday, elevating Sunday over the Sabbath. It seems to admonish Christians to meet on “the Lord’s Day” and have communion, but as we’ve seen before, when the Greek is scrutinized, it doesn’t say that. Here’s how a verse in it is usually translated with a comment from Mark Hulme:

““Every Lord’s day gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving.” Hulme writes, “This reference to “Lord’s day” is said to prove that Sunday rather than Sabbath observance was practiced as early as the time of the apostles. But, as is the case with the Magnesians’ passage, the Greek word for “day” is not found in this *Didache* passage. It too begins with the word *kata*, and the context leads one to a different rendering:”

“(According to the) Lord’s (command, teaching, way), gather yourselves together and break bread, and give thanksgiving.”<sup>128</sup>

Sunday keeping theologians take *Lord’s* to mean Sunday and that, for “communion.” *The Didache’s* admonition appears to springboard off of Paul’s writing to the Corinthians about taking the Body and the Blood, but neither Paul nor *The Didache* specify what day it’s to be taken on. The Apostle Paul writes:

1st Cor. 11:20 NKJV—“Therefore *when you come together* in one place, it is not to eat the Lord’s Supper.”

1st Cor. 11:26 NKJV—“*For as often* as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you pro-

---

<sup>128</sup> [The Path to Sunday](#) by Mark Hulme.

claim the Lord's death till He comes." 1st Cor. 11:33 NKJV—"Therefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another."

*It seems that whenever* the Corinthians came together "was a given;" Paul didn't have to mention it, and it most likely was their Sabbath meetings. On that day they would have the Body and the Blood. Paul doesn't write of any specific day, but it's certainly not a weekly Sunday because in Paul's time Christians were meeting every week on the Sabbath for their worship service (cf. Acts 13:42, 44; 18:1-11) and no one speaks of Sunday assembly in the New Testament. Whether they also met during the week is open to question, but they certainly weren't meeting on Sunday in the days of the Apostles. If the issue of Sabbath vs Sunday arose in the days of the Apostles there would have been a lot written about that heresy, but Sunday doesn't begin to show its heretical face until 120 AD, when all the Apostles were dead. Satan is not that stupid.

Bacchiocchi relates how it's the *manner* of taking the Body and the Blood that *The Didache* is speaking of, not Sunday as the Lord's Day:

"In the immediate post New Testament literature, the resurrection is similarly 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 AD 70-150),<sup>129</sup> devotes three brief chapters (chs. 9, 10, 14) to the *manner* of celebrating the Lord's Supper. In the thanksgiving prayer to be offered over the cup and bread, mention is made of life, knowledge, church unity, faith, immortality, creation and food (chs. 9, 10), *but no allusion is made to Jesus' resurrection.*"<sup>130</sup>

*The Didache* cannot be used to establish a cause and effect relationship between the Resurrection and Sunday replacing the Sabbath, and/or Sunday being the Lord's Day because it speaks of the Lord's *way* or *manner* in which Christians should take the Lord's Supper, in a godly way, not the *day* it's taken on. As we saw with *The Letter to the Magnesians* by Ignatius, the word for "day" doesn't follow "Lord's." Therefore, in terms of the Lord's Day being Sunday, it really doesn't matter if *The Didache* was written in 70 or 150 AD because it does not teach that the Lord's Day is Sunday and the day of assembly.

## PASSOVER VS EASTER

In spite of Victor, Bishop of Rome who is known as a Pope today,<sup>131</sup> despite his threats of excommunication of all the Christians of Asia Minor, the Christians there didn't "bend the knee" to him. Polycrates (130-196), Bishop of Ephesus, wrote to Victor in 190 AD declaring that Asia Minor would continue to celebrate Passover, *and not* Easter Sunday. All Asia Minor kept Passover and would not submit to Pope Victor's heretical celebration. This confrontation took place 70 years after Sixtus, in 120 AD, had changed Passover to Easter Sunday; and Sabbath to Sunday—the changing of the Times and the Law that God speaks of in Daniel 7:25.<sup>132</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 48.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid.

<sup>131</sup> Pope or *Papa* (Father), is something that Yeshua expressly forbids us to call any *religious* figure (Mt. 23:9).

<sup>132</sup> "[When Pope Victor wanted to set an official practice of Easter](#) on the whole Christian world, to celebrate Easter Sunday, Polycrates writing in the name of the entire Asian church, argued that the apostles taught to celebrate" Passover "on the 14th day of Nisan. In his letter he appeals to the authority of Polycarp of Smyrna, Thraxas of Eumenia, Sagaris, Papirius and Melito, all of whom were Quartodecimans." (Polycrates of Ephesus; Wace information, [www.earlychristianwritings.com](http://www.earlychristianwritings.com)) This means that all Asia Minor kept Passover on the 14th day of the first biblical month. Easter has nothing to do with Jesus or His Resurrection. Quartodecimans are Christians who keep Passover on the 14th day of the first biblical month according to Scripture (see Ex. 12:1ff.). Quartodeciman is broken down into "quarter" or 4, and "deciman" or 10. It's called the 14th day controversy in many places.

Samuele Bacchiocchi reveals that Easter Sunday first came on the scene in Christianity *in opposition* to God's Passover:

“Easter-Sunday...was...introduced *first in Rome in the early part of the second century* to differentiate it (from) the...Passover...of the Jews.”<sup>133</sup>

In other words, Easter, like Sunday, didn't originate with the Apostles or the New Testament, but with the Roman Catholic Church in 120 AD. Easter is a *pagan*, anti-God religious celebration that honors the pagan Christ and is the satanic counterfeit of the day that God made to honor His Son's Resurrection (First Fruits). Easter has *absolutely nothing* to do with Jesus of Nazareth, who is the Passover Lamb of God (Jn. 1:29, 36), not the Easter Bunny.

Victor *demanded* that all Christians in Asia Minor (Turkey) keep Easter Sunday and not Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, upon threat of excommunication. This reveals how powerful Catholicism had become 220 years *before* Constantine. All Constantine did was elevate Catholicism to official state status and decree that Sunday and Easter were “the days.” Bacchiocchi writes:

“The historian Eusebius (ca. AD 260-340) provides a valuable dossier of documents regarding the controversy which flared up in the second century over the date for the celebration of the Passover.<sup>134</sup> There were...two protagonists of the controversy. On the one side, Bishop Victor of Rome (AD 189-199) championed...Easter-Sunday...and threatened to excommunicate the recalcitrant Christian communities of the province of Asia, *which refused to follow his instruction.*”<sup>135</sup>

---

“Despite Polycrates convening a synod in Ephesus to declare Quartodecimanism official, later the tradition died out” (Catholic Encyclopedia; Ephesus; [www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)). The Council of Nicea in 325 AD, under Constantine, declared Easter to be celebrated on a Sunday, and no Christian was to keep Passover. It was the law of the land. This is why “the tradition died out,” although *many* Christians continued to keep Passover for centuries, as Bacchiocchi brings out on page 32, note 135 of this article.

<sup>133</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), pp. 113-114.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118, note 101. Eusebius' account of the Easter controversy is found in his *HE* 5, 23-24.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 118-119, note 102. “It is difficult to accept Eusebius' claim that with the exception of “the dioceses of Asia...the churches throughout the rest of the world” celebrated Easter on Sunday (*HE* 5, 23, 1), when we consider the following facts:

1. “Pope Victor (ca. AD 189-199) demanded the convocation of councils in various provinces to codify the Roman Easter (Eusebius, *HE* 5, 24, 8), obviously because a divergent custom existed.”
2. “The bishops of Palestine, who assembled together to discuss the matter, according to Eusebius, “treated at length the tradition concerning the Passover” and then they formulated a conciliar letter which was sent “to every diocese that we (i.e., the bishops) may not be guilty toward those who easily deceive their own souls” (*HE* 5, 25, 1). The lengthy discussion and the formulation of a conciliar letter, aimed at persuading and preventing the resistance of the dissidents (possibly Jewish-Christians who had not been invited to the Council), again indicates that in Palestine, by the end of the second century, there were still Christians who persisted in the observance of the Quartodeciman Passover.”
3. “The following testimonies of the” (Roman Catholic Church) “Fathers indicate a wider observance of the Quartodeciman Passover than conceded by Eusebius:”
  - a. “*Epistola Apostolorum* 15 (140-150 AD); two fragments from two works of Hippolytus (one of them was on the Holy Easter) preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale* 6 (*PG* 92, 79) where he states: “Consider, therefore, in what the controversy consists...” This would imply that the controversy was still alive in his time and felt possibly in Rome.”
  - b. “A fragment of **Apollinarius**, Bishop of Hierapolis (ca. AD 170) from his work on *Easter*, preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale* 6 (*PG* 92, 80-81), where it says: “The 14th Nisan is the true Passover of our Lord, the great Sacrifice; instead of the lamb, we have the Lamb of God.””
  - c. “**Athanasius** of Alexandria (296-373 AD), who mentions the “Syrians, Cilicians, and Mesopotamians” as observant of the Quartodeciman Passover (see his *de Synodis* 1, 5 and *ad Afros Epistola Synodica* 2).”

“On the other side, Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus...130-196 AD...and representative of the Asian churches, strongly advocated the...Passover date of Nisan 14,<sup>136</sup> commonly called “Quartodeciman Passover.”<sup>137</sup> Polycrates, *claiming to possess the genuine apostolic tradition* (instruction) “transmitted to him by the Apostles Philip and John, refused to be frightened into submission by the threats of Victor of Rome.”<sup>138</sup>

Bacchiocchi reveals that in 190 AD, or 160 years *after* the Resurrection, all of modern day Turkey was keeping Passover and not Rome’s Easter, and this, from the teaching of two of the Apostles who walked with Yeshua. The Passover was also being kept in Israel, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Iran and India.<sup>139</sup> Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus and representative of all the churches in Asia Minor (modern day Turkey, where Paul, Barnabas and Silas did much of their evangelizing, and where John’s seven churches of Revelation are; Rev. 2:1–3:22), refused to be frightened into submission by the threats of Pope Victor, knowing that *the Apostles Philip and John had taught the Asian churches to celebrate the Passover*,<sup>140</sup> and I’m sure that Paul had done the same thing with his Christians in Ephesus and Lystra, etc.<sup>141</sup> This understand-

- 
- d. **“Epiphanius**, Bishop of Salamis (ca. AD 315-403) deals extensively with the Quartodeciman controversy in his *Adversus haereses* 50 and 70. The Bishop suggests in various instances that the Quartodeciman custom, which he calls “heresy,” was widespread. He writes, for instance: “And another heresy, namely the Quartodeciman, arose—rose up again, in the world—*anekupse palim to kosmo*” (*Adversus haereses* 50, 1, PG 41, 883).”
  - e. **“Jerome** (347-420 AD), who paraphrases a statement from Irenaeus’ work, *On the Paschal Controversy* (ca. 190 AD) where the latter warns Pope Victor not to break the unity with “the many bishops of Asia and the East, who, with the Jews, celebrated the Passover on the fourteenth day of the new moon” (see *De Viris Illustribus* 35, NPNF, 2nd, III, p. 370).”
  - f. **“Severian**, Bishop of Gabala (ca. AD 400), strongly attacked those *Christians* who still maintained the Jewish Passover ritual (see his *Homilia 5 de Pascha*, ed. J. B. Aucher; Venice: 1827), p. 180.”

“On the basis of these testimonies we would concur with Jean Juster’s comment that Eusebius is guilty of “wilful obscurity” when minimizing and limiting the observance of the Quartodeciman Passover only to the dioceses of Asia (*Les Juifs dans l’empire romain*, 1965, p. 309, note 3).”

<sup>136</sup> *Nisan* is the Babylonian name for the first Jewish month of the year. It’s called *Aviv* in the Bible (*Abib* in many English Bibles). The Jewish people, taken into Babylonian captivity (586 BC), after their release from Babylon and return to Israel (516 AD), continued to use the Babylonian names for the months. For an article on the biblical and Babylonian names see [Hebrew Months](#).

<sup>137</sup> *Quarto-deciman* is Latin and means 14. It was the 14th day of the Hebrew month, *Aviv* 14 (called *Nisan* today) that the Passover lamb was sacrificed on (Ex. 12:1-10; Lev. 23:5). This goes a long way into realizing how the ancient Gentile Christians celebrated the Lord’s Passover, for the Passover meal isn’t eaten until *Aviv* 15.

<sup>138</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), pp. 118-119.

<sup>139</sup> See p. 32, note 135.

<sup>140</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 119.

<sup>141</sup> Compare Acts 20:17-31f.; 21:24; 25:8; 1st Cor. 4:16-17; 5:6-8; 11:1. Paul’s coming to Yeshua, the *Jewish* Messiah, in no way cancelled his racial identity as a Jew nor did he ever stop observing all the laws of Moses that applied to him. In Acts 18:18 Paul takes a Nazarite Vow (the cutting off of his hair speaks of it; Num. 6:18-19). The Nazarite Vow entails at least three *animals* sacrificed (Num. 6:14). Luke writes that Paul desired to keep “the coming (*Mosaic*) feast in Jerusalem” (Acts 18:21). In Acts 21:20-24 Paul takes his *second* Nazarite Vow, and James expressly says that it was *to show everyone that he kept Mosaic Law* (v. 24; see also Acts 22:12; 23:1-6), where Paul, after rebuking the High Priest, backs down from continuing to speak against the Aaronic High Priest, and *cites* Mosaic Law; Ex. 22:8 for why he didn’t come against the High Priest), when he could have spoken of Yeshua “as the true High Priest of Israel” (Acts 24:10-18). See also Acts 25:8; 26:6-8, 18, 20-23; 28:17-20, where Paul speaks about having done *nothing against Mosaic Law* nor that it had been invalidated for Christians by Yeshua’s death.

In Romans 3:31 (cf. 7:7, 12, 14, 16, 22), Paul declares that Mosaic Law is *established* by faith in Christ and says that the Law is holy and spiritual, and in Rom. 3:20 Paul teaches that Mosaic Law explains the fullness of what is sin, the Greek word for knowledge being *epignosis*: “Therefore, by the deeds of the Law no flesh will be justi-



ing of Church History torpedoed the modern Church's anti-Mosaic Law theology. Sunday and Easter have no place in the life of a biblical Christian.

Translating from *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Roberts and Donaldson relate that Polycrates had come from a long line of overseers or bishops, thus undergirding his character. Polycrates,

“belonged to a family in which he was the *eighth* Christian bishop, and he presided over the church of Ephesus in which the traditions of St. John were yet fresh in men's minds ...He had doubtless known Polycarp and Irenaeus...*It is..noteworthy that nobody doubted that Passover was kept by a Christian and Apostolic ordinance.*”<sup>142</sup>

Eusebius writes that after Victor's threat, Polycrates convened a conference of Asian bishops and then he wrote a letter to Victor in Rome and spoke of what *all the bishops of Asia* thought about Passover, and their unwillingness to celebrate Easter. Here is part of what Polycrates wrote:

“We observe the exact day; *neither adding, nor taking away.* For in Asia...great lights have fallen asleep, which shall rise again on the day of the Lord's coming, when He shall come with glory from Heaven, and shall seek out all the saints. Among these are Philip, one of the 12 Apostles, who fell asleep in Hierapolis” (about 200 miles due east of Ephesus, in central Turkey), “and moreover John, who was both a witness and a teacher, *who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord.*...he fell asleep at Ephesus. And Polycarp in Smyrna who was a bishop and a martyr...*All these observed the 14th day of the Passover according to the Gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith.*”

“And I also, Polycrates, the least of all of you, do according to the tradition of my relatives, some of whom I have closely followed. For seven of my relatives were bishops, and I am the eighth. And my relatives *always observed the day when the*” (*Jewish*) “*people put away the leaven.* I therefore brethren, who have lived 65 years *in the Lord*, and have met with the brethren *throughout the world, and have gone through every Holy Scripture, am not afraid of terrifying words*” (of Pope Victor). “For those greater than I have said, “We ought to obey God rather than man!” (cf. Acts 4:19-20; 5:29)”

---

fied in His sight, *for by the law is the full knowledge of sin.*”

In 1st Cor. 5:6-8 Paul encourages the Corinthian Christians to keep Passover, and in 7:17-19 he speaks of keeping Mosaic Law as being what *truly matters*. In 2nd Cor. 12:16-18 he speaks of Titus, a Gentile Christian, walking in the same steps as he (i.e. Mosaic Law). There are also a number of places in First Corinthians where Paul uses Mosaic Law to establish his point. This would have been meaningless to the Corinthians if Mosaic Law had been done away with, and that, by the very person whom the Church teaches invalidated Mosaic Law for Christians:

1. Paul encourages the Corinthians to keep “the Feast” (1st Cor. 5:6-8). This can only be Passover—The Feast of Unleavened Bread as he's just spoken to the Corinthians to become unleavened bread, “as they are meant to be” (cf. Ex. 12:8-20; Lev. 23:6).
2. He sums up his ability to receive funds from the Corinthians by citing the Law (1st. Cor. 9:8-9f.; don't muzzle the ox while it treads out the grain; Dt. 25:4).
3. He tells them that women should not speak in the assembly, again citing the Law (1st Cor. 14:34-35).
4. In 1st Cor. 16:8 Paul speaks of staying at Ephesus until Pentecost, which is from the Greek word for the Mosaic Law's holy day of *Shavu'ot* (called the Feast of Weeks in the Old Testament; Ex. 34:22; Lev. 23:15-22; Num. 28:26; Dt. 16:9-10, 16). Why would Paul “note time” to *Gentiles* by an “outdated” Jewish feast that he himself allegedly did away with, unless he still kept Mosaic Law and taught it to his Gentile Christians? (cf. 1st Cor. 4:14-17; 11:1; Phil. 4:9; 1st Thess. 1:6-7; 2nd Thess. 3:7, 9).
5. Finally, as Yeshua is the same, yesterday, today and forever (Heb. 13:8), Paul's *imitation* of the Messiah (1st Cor. 4:16-17; 11:1, must mean that he kept, and taught to his Gentile Christians, the Mosaic Law's 7th day Sabbath, the Feasts of Israel, and the Mosaic Dietary laws, etc.

<sup>142</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 119. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, translated by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 1885.

“I could mention the bishops who were present, whom I summoned at your desire, whose names, should I write them, *would constitute a great multitude*. And they, beholding my littleness, gave their consent to the letter, knowing that I did not bear my gray hairs in vain, *but had always governed my life by the Lord Jesus*.”<sup>143</sup>

Polycrates, speaking of putting “away the leaven” refers to God’s command that no leaven or yeast bread is to be found in the home of one celebrating Passover for the entire seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 12:14-15). This is symbolic of Messiah Yeshua having put away the leaven or sin in our lives (cf. 1st Cor. 5:6-8; cf. Rom. 7:7–8:4f.) and of eating Him, the Bread of Life for seven days, symbolized in the unleavened bread called Matza in Hebrew, and becoming like Him who knew no sin. What a wonderful Feast unto our Lord, Passover is, commemorating what He has done for us in making us new creatures like Himself. Passover begins the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread in the evening of the first day of Unleavened Bread. They are two sides of the same Divine Coin that God has given us to honor Him and His Son in Their great deliverance of us from the Kingdom of Satan.

Church History records that the conflict was about Rome’s desire to overturn Scripture, strip Christians of their ancient biblical New Testament heritage (Mosaic Law, as specifically realized here in the celebration of Passover). Also, the replacing of Passover with the pagan day of Easter Sunday.

The Reformers, for all the good they did, grew up in an anti-Mosaic Law atmosphere, and so they continued in the heretical tradition of Rome, having believed Rome’s heresy. The first Reformer was John Wycliffe (1328-1384), an English-Catholic priest and theologian who translated the New Testament into English for his people, against the threats of Rome. He also questioned,

“the privileged status of the clergy, who had bolstered their powerful role in England, and the luxury and pomp of local parishes and their ceremonies.”<sup>144</sup>

“In the years before his death in 1384 he increasingly argued for *Scripture as the authoritative centre of Christianity*, that the claims of the papacy were unhistorical” (i.e. not biblical), that monasticism was irredeemably corrupt, and that the moral unworthiness of priests invalidated their office and sacraments.”<sup>145</sup>

As you might imagine of any dictator, that didn’t go over well with the Pope, but Wycliffe wasn’t burned at the stake by Rome. That’s because he suffered a stroke and died on Dec. 28th, 1384. His writings though, didn’t fare so well and they were consumed by the fires of Rome, who deemed them heretical.

The second Reformer was a Czech Catholic priest and theologian by the name of Jan Hus. He suffered a torturous death by fire, the fate of those deemed heretical by Rome, for opposing Her “buying of forgiveness” and the bizarre Catholic Eucharist, etc. Only 31 years after the death of John Wycliffe, another John (Jan) died for his position against some of Rome’s heresies:

“On July 6th, 1415, he was burned at the stake for heresy against the doctrines of the Catholic Church. He could be heard singing Psalms as he was burning. Among his dying words, Hus predicted that God would raise” up “others whose calls for reform would not be suppressed; this was later taken as a prophecy about Martin Luther (born 68 years after Hus’s death).”<sup>146</sup>

Whenever Rome has the political power to She tortures and murders Her opposition, placing fear in the hearts of Her adherents as well as Her enemies. From Luther on, all the Reformers, breaking from some horrendous and diabolical Catholic teachings and traditions that make a living mockery of Jesus Christ

---

<sup>143</sup> Eusebius, *Church History*, Book V, Chapter 24.

<sup>144</sup> Lacey Baldwin Smith, *This Realm of England: 1399 to 1688* (3rd ed. 1976), p. 41.

<sup>145</sup> [John Wycliffe](#).

<sup>146</sup> [Jan Hus](#).

and the New Testament, unwittingly took with them Rome's heretical theology on Mosaic Law. They did not critically examine Rome's teaching in that area. This is why all Protestant churches today keep Sunday, Easter and Xmas, and eat animals like pig, but they don't keep the Days and Ways of Yeshua, all His Apostles and all the early Christians (e.g. Sabbath, Feasts of Israel and the Mosaic Dietary laws, etc.).

It's not that we shouldn't celebrate the Resurrection, but not on Easter Sunday and *not* according to an Easter dating, which is done in all churches today. In other words, Easter and "Resurrection Sunday" are calculated the same way, according to the *pagan day for Easter*, which is the Sunday after the first full moon that comes after the Vernal (Spring) Equinox on March 19th in 2024. God though, already set up at Mt. Sinai, a time when His Son's Resurrection would be celebrated, providing the Sunday within the seven-day Feast of Unleavened Bread. First Fruits (Sheaf) is God's Day to honor His Son's Resurrection.<sup>147</sup> Easter is a horrendous and a sinful satanic counterfeit of First Fruits. "Christian Easter" still has all the pagan trappings of the fertility goddess, the Queen of Heaven (e.g. rabbits, which picture the abundant fertility of the goddess Ishtar, the Queen of Heaven).<sup>148</sup>

Bacchiocchi historically traces back from Pope Victor to Pope Sixtus, as the person responsible for bringing Easter Sunday (and Sunday assembly and an anti-Mosaic Law theology) into the Church, stating:

"Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyon...according to Eusebius, intervened as peacemaker in the controversy. In his letter to Victor, Irenaeus not only displays a magnanimous spirit, but also endeavors to show to the Roman Bishop that the predecessors of Soter,<sup>149</sup> namely, Anicetus and Pius, and Hyginus and Telesphorus and *Sixtus*," even though "they did not observe it (i.e. the Quartodeciman Passover)...were none the less at peace with those from the dioceses in which it was observed. By stating that Soter's predecessors did not observe the Quartodeciman Passover, Irenaeus implies that they also, like Victor, celebrated Easter."<sup>150</sup>

From official Roman Catholic Church documents, Eusebius writes<sup>151</sup> that Irenaeus sent his letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome in 190 AD, revealing all the Bishops of Rome before him who had kept Easter Sunday, ending, or rather beginning, with Sixtus. This means that Sixtus was the one who brought in Easter to replace the Lord's Passover, and also Sunday to replace the Lord's Sabbath. Sixtus held the office from 116-126 AD.<sup>152</sup> *He was the first to stop practicing Passover*, which can be celebrated on any day of the week, and instituted an Easter *Sunday* practice straight from paganism, for that is when the pagans celebrated the pagan Christ's resurrection by his mother, Ishtar, the Queen of Heaven. Not until 70 years later though, when the Roman Church had grown powerful, was Pope Victor able to threaten, with excommunication, all the Christian communities in Asia Minor for keeping Passover. Praise the Lord that the leaders of Asia Minor, like Polycrates, did not cave in to Pope Victor's un-Christ-like intimidation.

---

<sup>147</sup> See p. 15f., and also [First Sheaf](#) and Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), pp. 49-51.

<sup>148</sup> Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17f.. On a side note that presents Christianity's pathetic and ignorant understanding of "communion," one day I Googled the term Eucharist. *All* the pictures of the bread were *leavened* bread! I couldn't believe it. There wasn't one picture that had unleavened bread or matza. The Church doesn't have a clue concerning the bread for the Lord's Supper that pictures Yeshua's sinless body. Eating *leavened* bread for the Lord's Supper speaks of Yeshua as full, and I mean *loaded with*, sin.

<sup>149</sup> Soter was Bishop of Rome before Victor.

<sup>150</sup> Bacchiocchi, [From Sabbath to Sunday](#), p. 121. Eusebius, *HE* 5, 24, 14.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*



# CONCLUSION

What Thomas Aquinas said was right—he just didn’t have the right “ancients.” We *should* strive to keep what the ancients kept, as long as those ancients were the Jewish Apostles, and Gentiles like Clement and Ignatius who walked in their steps. We shouldn’t follow the ancient Roman Catholic Church Fathers, for most of them taught the heresies that Sunday replaced the Sabbath and that it was the Lord’s Day.

Not one Christian “Sunday is the Lord’s Day” theologian, ancient or modern, made a persuasive scriptural argument that the Lord’s Day was Sunday because indeed, there are no biblical arguments to be made. That didn’t stop them though, from presenting their “sleight of hand” noble ideas. Their thoughts on the Lord’s Day being Sunday lacked proper Scripture, and yet they also had the audacity and temerity to proclaim their view as “certain” and “without a doubt.” Once one sees through their “smoke and mirrors” though, the picture becomes clear: the Lord’s Day is not Sunday, and even Christian experts in God’s Word are blind to the tradition of Rome that overturn God’s Word.

Most Christians are ignorant of the Scripture facts and reasoning presented in this article that,

1. “The Lord’s Day” is only seen once in all Scripture, in Revelation 1:10 and that,
2. John doesn’t use the term, “the Lord’s Day” in his Gospel (cf. Jn. 20:1, 19, 26) when he certainly should have, to reference the first day of the week, *if* in fact the Lord’s Day was Sunday, and that,
3. John never equates the Lord’s Day with Sunday, nor does anyone else in the New Testament and,
4. Nowhere in the New Testament does anyone write that Sunday has replaced the Sabbath because of the Resurrection (or any other reason, the 8th day of *Barnabas* notwithstanding).

The current Christian understanding of “the Lord’s Day” as Sunday does not stand up to the simple test of Scripture. The three Scriptures that are commonly brought up “to prove Sunday” and consequently, that it’s also the Lord’s Day, have nothing to do with a weekly Sunday assembly nullifying the Sabbath, and one of them (Acts 20:7) doesn’t begin on Sunday, but a Saturday night. There is no *biblical* connection between the Lord’s Day and Sunday.

When I first began this article into “the Lord’s Day being Sunday,” I expected biblical substance from scholars, but what I saw were only opinions that couldn’t be supported by a proper interpretation of God’s Word, even with Sunday being the day of the Resurrection. Yeshua rose on the Sunday of Passover Week known as First Fruits, as God had already planned that out in eternity past, and spoken it to Israel at Mt. Sinai. Christian and Catholic theologians, experts in their field of understanding and teaching the New Testament, couldn’t comprehend this because of the Lie they believe and foster—that Mosaic Law isn’t for Christian lifestyle, and so First Fruits doesn’t appear on their Radar.

They couldn’t add one plus one to get two because one of the one’s is missing. They have the Resurrection on Sunday, but it isn’t First Fruits for them, and so they don’t see the scripturally obvious. Even David Stern, a Messianic teacher, couldn’t add one plus one, although he knew about Passover and First Fruits. All of them, as well as most Christians, have no understanding of why God resurrected His Son on Sunday and *who this* Messiah of Israel is that they say they believe in. Yeshua is the First Fruits or the first to appear in both the Old Creation and the New Creation—Glory to God!

Robert Mounce, Leon Morris and the NIV Study Bible told us that the Lord’s Day was a “technical term” for Sunday, but failed to substantiate it. They said that because Jesus rose on Sunday it became the Lord’s Day, but that’s just theological gobbledygook. Lenski stated that Jesus made Sunday “his own day” because of His resurrection on it, even going so far as to say that Apostolic community chose that day to assemble on, but again, not a shred of evidence (Scripture) to support his noble idea. Nor is there any Scripture to support Moffatt’s claim that the meaning of the Lord’s Day being Sunday is “specifically mentioned.”

Alfred Plummer spoke of the “sevens’ in Revelation beginning on Sunday, but his interpretation was his own. He offered no Scripture to support Sunday or it being the Lord’s Day. Matthew Henry called Sunday “the Christian Sabbath,” but neither he nor anyone else could point to the Bible to justify their term. F. F. Bruce said that Acts 20:7 was “the earliest unambiguous evidence” for Sunday assembly over Sabbath, but there is nothing in Acts 20:7 that leads one to see Sunday as the day of assembly, especially as the service began on Saturday night, and Paul raised Eutychus from the dead. That’s why Luke wrote about it; not because Sunday had become the day of assembly. Yet Acts 20:6 presents Paul & Co. as keeping Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Troas.

Neither John 20:19, or any other Gospel account of the Resurrection appearance of Yeshua on Sunday, declare that Sunday was not the new day of assembly, and they were all written many years after the Resurrection, so any of the Gospel writers could have told us that, “By the way, Sunday is now the day of assembly.” That’s why most theologians steer clear of using any Gospel account as justification for Sunday. Also, 1st Cor. 16:2 speaks of everyone individually laying aside in their homes a special weekly gift on Sunday, the first day of the work week when they got paid, for they got paid every day they worked, as the end of the day, a special gift for the poor Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. There was no tithe and offering basket being passed around the pews on Sunday morning, as they had met “for church” the day before, on the Lord’s Sabbath, as the New Testament and Church History tell us (cf. Acts 15:21; Heb. 4:9).

Not one of the three Scriptures (Jn. 20:19; Acts 20:7; 1st Cor. 16:2) speak of a Sunday assembly, yet theologians and pastors alike are certain that Sunday is the new day of assembly and also, the Lord’s Day of Rev. 1:10. Oh how the Pharisees and Satan are laughing with glee!

No one was able to answer any of the three questions:

1. When did this change from Sabbath to Sunday occur?
2. Where is it written in the New Testament?
3. Why did this change occur? Oh yes, they speak of the Resurrection, but no one declares it as the reason for Sunday assembly or that it’s the Lord’s Day.

These are three simple questions that theologians should be able to answer, if God orchestrated the day change and Sunday became the Lord’s Day. Answers to those three questions would abound in the pages of the New Testament. Since they don’t, we know that God didn’t change Sabbath to Sunday, nor make Sunday “the Lord’s Day.” It’s that simple.

The Apostle John, writing Revelation about 95 AD, uses the term, the Lord’s Day, but doesn’t explain it, which means that those he wrote for understood that it wasn’t Sunday, nor the 7th day Sabbath, but the Day of Yahveh (cf. Zech. 14:1-3f.). This is “the Day of Yahveh;” of God’s wrath upon mankind, which is what Revelation, John’s visions (and even his words to the churches; Rev. 2–3) are all about: Judgment, which primarily means the acknowledgement of the righteous and the condemnation of the unrighteous. Revelation also speaks of the Kingdom of God’s Son set up in Jerusalem for a thousand years, Judgment Day and then eternal Life Christians in the New Jerusalem.

John, writing his Gospel about the same time as Revelation, never speaks of the first day of the week (i.e. Sunday) as the Lord’s Day in his account of the Resurrection appearance of Jesus. If Sunday had become the Lord’s Day, John would certainly have used it in his Gospel.

Bullinger called out the Church on Sunday assembly and it being the Lord’s Day, by saying it was nothing but a Roman Catholic tradition that Rome got from paganism. And Polycrates revealed that all of Asia Minor was keeping Passover in 190 AD.

Church History reveals that for the first 90 years *after* the Resurrection all Jewish and Gentile Christians kept the 7th day Sabbath and Passover, which also points to their keeping other rules of Mosaic Law as their Christian lifestyle (cf. Acts 15:21). Many Christians, for hundreds of years after 120 AD, despite

persecution from the Roman Catholic Church, as seen in their Synods and their own history,<sup>153</sup> continued to celebrate Passover and the Sabbath because they knew that the New Testament and the Apostles taught Mosaic Law as God's New Testament Christian lifestyle. Rome was heretically wrong, and so is modern Christianity in this area of lifestyle or how to walk out our faith in the Messiah of Israel.

Of the four earliest ancient documents outside the Scriptures, the first, Clement's *Letter to the Corinthians* (95AD), sought to assure them of their own resurrection, but he never spoke of their alleged meeting on Sunday and having weekly Sunday "communion;" two sure signs of Sunday having replaced the Sabbath. This reveals that they weren't meeting on Sunday every week, nor having communion on Sunday every week, as the heretical and damnable cult known as the Roman Catholic Church teaches. On the contrary, Clement affirms Mosaic Law as a Christian's lifestyle by positively referring to animal sacrifice at the Altar in Jerusalem, as things that Yeshua looked favorably upon. Strike one!

The second letter, *The Letter to the Magnesians* by Ignatius (115 AD), is heralded by Christian scholars as proof that the Lord's Day is Sunday, but upon simple examination that proof turns to dust. What they present as "the Lord's Day" actually didn't have "day" after Lord, but "life." This means that they kept the Sabbath in the *Way or Life* that Yeshua kept it, from the inside-out by the power of the Holy Spirit; not the Way the legalistic Judaizers kept it. Strike two!

The third document, the pseudo *Letter of Barnabas* (130-140 AD) speaks of Sunday as the 8th Day of the cosmic week, but it's a Gnostic term having nothing to do with Scripture. There is no 8th day in the biblical week. Also, its hatred of the Jewish people and the Law of Moses that God gave to Israel reveals an angry Gentile Christian wanting to discredit the Jews and "their Sabbath" as "temporary," until the time of Jesus, and "of this world," while the 8th Day is presented as the eternal world to come. Without any Scripture to validate the 8th Day, this *Letter* is disqualified from any serious consideration. Yes, by then, Catholics were keeping Sunday and not the Sabbath, but that by Papal decree, which went against God's Word.

Sunday was given to the Church by Pope Sixtus in 120 AD, who changed Sabbath to Sunday and Passover to Easter, and who threw out Mosaic Law as God's Christian lifestyle. This created a giant rift in Christianity between the East, which kept the Sabbath and Passover, and the West, which kept Sunday and Easter. Thanks to Polycrates' *Letter* to Pope Victor (190 AD), we know of the problems the Roman Catholic Church had with those Gentile and Jewish Christians who kept Passover (and obviously the Sabbath), and so now we can rightly judge which day God wants us to keep holy and assemble on.

The last document, *The Didache* (100-150 AD), although it speaks of communion, the Greek word for "day" is absent after "Lord's," as it was with the *Letter of Ignatius to the Magnesians*, which means that communion should be taken in the Lord's Way (not the Lord's Day, which for Catholics and Protestants is Sunday). Also, *kata*, the Greek word for "according to the" Lord's Way is found. Therefore, the sentence should read:

"According to the Lord's (command, teaching, way), gather yourselves together and break bread, and give thanks."

The understanding is that Christians were gathering weekly on the Sabbath, and so there was no need to name the day, as even Paul didn't when speaking of "coming together" for communion in First Corinthians. Someone might say that there were also Christians keeping Sunday, which might be true if *The Didache* was written after 120 AD, but *The Didache* didn't care, which means it was written in a milieu of Sabbath keepers, whether before or after 120 AD. There is no weekly Sunday assembly or Lord's Day here. Strike three! The Church is out!

---

<sup>153</sup> Read Dave Hunt's, *A Woman Rides the Beast*, for a thorough understanding of just how ruthless and corrupt the Roman Catholic Church has been over the last 1,900 years. Also see where Paul prophesies and speaks of the corruption of God's Word in Acts 20:29-30 and 1st Timothy 4:1-3.

Both William Domville and Samuele Bacchiocchi called out the Sunday theologians who used these ancient documents to prove Sunday assembly and that it was the Lord's Day by revealing that it was the keeping of the Sabbath that the documents spoke of. These documents, even though scholars use them "to prove" their Sunday/Lord's Day position, when read through the lens of what the Greek actually says or doesn't say, support the Sabbath being kept in the Way or Life of Yeshua, and also, how the Old Testament Prophets kept it. Domville and Bacchiocchi saw the Greek texts for what they said, and not for what Christian theologians wanted them to say. The Sabbath is still very much intact and God's will for Christian lifestyle today.

Although the Lord rose on the Sunday of First Fruits, it wasn't given "annual Sabbath" status by God, nor is it called Easter Sunday in the New Testament. Therefore, trying to stretch "Easter Sunday" to mean the Lord's Day, which has replaced God's 7th day Sabbath, is an exercise in futility. Easter Sunday, as well as meeting on Sunday and not keeping the 7th day Sabbath holy, are sins.

For the last 1,900 Christianity has taught and worshiped the Jewish Savior, not through His holy Days and Ways, but with pagan and sinful Days and Ways. Pope Sixtus changed the *Times* (the 7th day Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel) and threw out the *Law* of Moses, nullifying it, and also brought in a hatred of the Jewish people and Mosaic Law, just as God spoke of through the Prophet Daniel. Not since the Snake in the Garden has there been such a Great Deception.

In 48 AD, when Acts 15 took place, James speaks of the Gentiles going to the synagogues on the Sabbath day, not Sunday (Acts 15:21), and so weekly Sunday assembly over the Sabbath wasn't in "the earliest apostolic times," as Lenski would have us to believe. Interestingly enough, the Gentile Christians were to learn Mosaic Law on the Sabbath day. Hulme writes of Acts 15:

"The apostles could easily have addressed a change in Sabbath observance here in Acts 15 if it had been at issue, but it obviously was not a concern."<sup>154</sup>

The issue of Sunday assembly over Sabbath assembly and holiness hadn't come up by Acts 15. In other words, there weren't any Christians assembling on Sunday in lieu of the Sabbath. We know that because no writer of the New Testament warns us about this heresy, and none certainly condone it. Despite theologians trying "to pull the wool over our eyes," weekly Sunday assembly wasn't an issue in New Testament times.

Jim Tabor (1946–present) was professor of of Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina. He states that these Gentile Christians that James is writing to in Acts 15, which basically covers all the Gentiles in Christianity at that time, knew,

"nothing of Easter or Christmas...They are going to meetings on the Sabbath; the seventh day Sabbath, Saturday."<sup>155</sup>

There are those who say that the Jewish Christians met on the Sabbath, but that Gentile Christians met on Sunday, but as Hulme says, it's unreasonable to think that the Apostle Paul taught Jewish Christians different days to assemble on then Gentile Christians.<sup>156</sup> First, there's nothing in any of Paul's Letters to suggest this, but if this were the case, with each group meeting on different days, it certainly would not speak of the unity that Yeshua spoke of for His "one" Flock (cf. Jn. 10:16), and of Paul speaking of the "one new Man" (Eph. 2:15). Besides, which day would they all come together for the annual Picnic? : ) And would the Gentile Christians bring pork chops to share with the Mosaic Dietary law keeping Jewish brethren? Great way to start a conversation!

Further on, in 67 AD, when the Letter to the Hebrews was written, Heb. 4:9 expressly speaks of the *Sab-*

---

<sup>154</sup> [The Path to Sunday](#) by Mark Hulme.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

*bath rest* that Christians were to strive to enter into “today:” “There remains therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God” (Hebrews 4:9 NASB).<sup>157</sup> If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath because the 8th Day supersedes the 7th Day, or because of the Resurrection on Sunday, the writer of Hebrews would *not* have spoken of entering into the Sabbath rest.

The time for God’s Truth about Christian lifestyle is now. God is calling all Christians to live out their faith in His Son through all the rules of Moses that apply to them.<sup>158</sup> Without Mosaic Law as a Christian’s lifestyle, Christians are ignorant of God’s will concerning the Sabbath, Passover<sup>159</sup> and the Mosaic Dietary laws, to name three of the five Pillars of Mosaic Law. It’s not that Christians don’t know to love God and neighbor, and not to lie, steal or murder, but there’s more to God’s will than those things. Yeshua reveals that to us in His keeping of all the rules of Moses that applied to Him.

Grace isn’t a divine license to sin against the Lord, and Mosaic Law is God’s understanding of what is sin and what is right. It is the verbal and written reflection of the character of the God of Israel. It’s Who He

---

<sup>157</sup> Both the KJV and the NKJV don’t have Sabbath rest, but only “rest.” Yes, every other English Bible does because the Greek word for the KJV’s “rest” is *Sabbatismos* (σαββατισμὸς). This is found in the Textus Receptus, which is the basis for the KJV, and also the Nestle-Aland Text, the basis for most other Bibles. *Sabbatismos* means a literal Sabbath keeping. Why the KJV and the NKJV don’t have “Sabbath rest” speaks volumes of the anti-Mosaic Law theology and attitude.

<sup>158</sup> Some laws only apply to Levitical Priests, while some only apply to women or farmers, etc. For more on why the Church is wrong about Mosaic Law being our Christian lifestyle, see these articles of mine. And if you have any questions or concerns, let me know through my website, as you’ll be able to contact me though my HomePage at [The Seed of Abraham](#):

1. [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#)
2. [The Two Triangles of the NT](#)
3. [A Letter to Pastors](#)
4. [Grace, Holiness and the Pharisaic Church](#)
5. [Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#)
6. [Law 102](#)
7. [Law and Grace](#)
8. [Mosaic Law is Established—Romans 3:31](#)
9. [Nailed to the Cross—Colossians 2:13-17](#)
10. [No Longer Under the Law?](#)
11. [Romans 14 and the Dietary Laws](#)
12. [Slavery to the Law? Gal. 4:8-11](#)
13. [Ten Ways Yeshua Fulfilled The Law](#)
14. [The Feasts of Israel as Time Markers After the Resurrection](#)

<sup>159</sup> Some Christians say that their Passover is the Lord’s Supper, and so they don’t have to observe the Old Testament Passover, but that’s not biblical. There’s nothing in Scripture that says the Lord’s Supper is equal to Passover or that it has taken the place of Passover. The biblical Passover is celebrated once a year, not once a week, and it lasts all night into the dawn (cf. Exodus 12:42 and my article, [Passover](#)). The Lord’s Supper is not Passover, but is the essence of the Passover, the death of the Passover Lamb. God still commands His people Israel keep Passover, as this passage of Paul’s directly speaks of (1st Cor. 5:6-8).

Other Christians say that the Passover was only given “to the Jews,” and they’re not Jews. This is a false racial point. All Gentile Christians are part of Israel (e.g. Eph. 2:11f.; part of the Commonwealth of Israel). This means that all Gentile Christians who have been grafted into Israel through the Jewish Messiah, must keep all the Feasts of Israel and all the rules or laws of Moses that apply to them, just like their Jewish counterparts in the faith (except for physical circumcision (see [Gentile Circumcision?](#)). It’s not a racial thing, but a Kingdom “thing.” God gives us both Passover for our Lord’s death and First Fruits for His Resurrection, and the Body and the Blood daily or weekly. The Father gave us Passover Week before Mt. Sinai (Ex. 12:1ff.; cf. Lev. 23:4f.), with His Son’s death and Resurrection explicitly in mind.

is, and of course, Who Messiah Yeshua is, and how They want us to live. In this it's easy to see that Sunday, Easter, Xmas and ham aren't of the Lord, but demonic reflections of Satan that curse Christians. There is no blessing in Sunday, Easter or the eating of bacon; all things that would have been sin for Jesus of Nazareth. How can they not be sin for His followers?

Laura Cloer writes about how closed people are to what opposes their views, whether religious or political, etc. In the 60s, Peter Wason found that people “overwhelmingly tended to reject or ignore evidence that does not agree with their” ideas, choosing instead to find answers that confirm their ideas.<sup>160</sup> Welcome to our carnal, sinful human nature. As we've seen from Christian scholars, they “treat evidence in a biased way when they are motivated by the desire to defend beliefs that they wish to maintain.”<sup>161</sup> Cloer says,

“As a rule, then, we search out information that agrees with what we already feel and think...Conversely, we often avoid, downplay or simply ignore evidence that challenges our beliefs.”<sup>162</sup>

My own personal experience with Christians, whether they be scholars or janitors, Moms or Dads, or even those who are “on Fire for the Lord,” is that they don't care about God's Word if it challenges their belief system concerning Mosaic Law. They've been so lied to and thoroughly deceived that they cannot, and will not, see the Divine Forest that the Tree of Satanic Deception hides. Only the Holy Spirit can open their blind eyes, but most don't listen to the Spirit's gentle Voice in this area, for they already are convinced against it.

For those of you who keep Mosaic Law as your New Testament lifestyle—be strong! Yeshua did and He wants you to do so too, by the power of His Spirit and the gift of His Word.

For those of you who are thinking about it, or beginning to walk in a little of it, I pray that this article persuades you to continue your divine Adventure into God's holy Forest.

Two Scriptures from the Old Testament that go far in confirming that God hasn't changed His mind about the 7th day Sabbath or the Feasts of Israel, are found in Isaiah and Zechariah:

““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)

“And it shall come to pass that *everyone who is left of all the nations*, which came against Jerusalem, shall go up from year to year to worship the King, Yahveh of Hosts, *and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles.*” (Zechariah 14:16)

These two speak of the thousand year reign of Messiah Yeshua (Rev. 20:1-6f.). The following is something from the last book of the Bible, which cements all this together:

“And the Dragon was *enraged* with the Woman, and he went *to make war* with the rest of her offspring, *who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.*”<sup>163</sup> (Revelation 12:17 NKJV)

The commandments of God are found in Mosaic Law. God has not changed. His Word is forever (Is. 40:8). To see most Christians today keeping Sunday and thinking that it's the Lord's Day, and also observing Easter or Resurrection Sunday as the day Yeshua rose on, is very disturbing. It's also downright shameful and sinful. It's refreshing though, to know that all Christians, for the first 90 years *after* the Resurrection on God's day of First Fruits, not only kept the 7th day Sabbath, but also Passover and The Feast of Unleavened Bread. To the Word of God and these “ancients” we look to, for they walked in God's holy Days and His holy Ways.

---

<sup>160</sup> [Checking the Bias](#) by Laura Cloer.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid.

<sup>163</sup> See also Luke 1:30-33; cf. 2nd Sam. 7:8-16; Rev. 20:5-6; Rev. 21:1ff.



# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hislop, Alexander. [The Two Babylons—The Full Hislop](#) (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1959, originally published in 1858).

Allen, Ronald B., Author. Gaebelein, General Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed., **The Expositor's Bible Commentary, vol. 2, Numbers** (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1990; Accordance Bible Software, 2012).

Bacchiocchi, Samuele. [From Sabbath to Sunday](#) (Rome: The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977).

Barker, Kenneth. Et al., eds. **The NIV Study Bible** (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985; Accordance Bible Software).

Bauer, Walter. Augmented by William F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and Frederick Danker. **A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature** (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1979).

Bock, Darrell L., Author. Robert Yarborough and Joshua Jipp, Editors. **Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: Acts** (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007).

Bromiley, Geoffrey W., general Editor, Everett F. Harrison, Roland K. Harrison and William Sanford LaSor, associate Editors. **The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, vol. one** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979).

Bruce, F. F., 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 Publishing Company, 1988).

Bullinger, Ethelbert William. **Commentary on Revelation or The Apocalypse** (first published in 1909 by Pantianos Classics; this 2018 edition by Lulu).

**Greek New Testament, Textus Receptus** (Altamonte Springs, FL: Accordance Bible Software, 2012).

**Greek New Testament, Westcott and Hort Edition** (Altamonte Springs, FL: Accordance Bible Software, 2012).

Henry, Matthew. **Matthew Henry's Commentary** (Condensed; Accordance Bible Software, 2012).

Johnson, Alan, Author. Frank E. Gaebelein, general Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed., **The Expositor's Bible Commentary—Revelation, vol. 12** (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1984). Accordance Bible Software (Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).

Lenski, R.C.H. **The Interpretation of St. John's Revelation, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament** (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software).

Lenski, R.C.H. **The Interpretation of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament** (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software).

Lenski, R.C.H. **The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles, Acts 15–28, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament** (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software).

Lenski, R.C.H. **The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament** (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software).

Marshall, I. Howard, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Author. Professor R.V.G. Tasker, M.A., B.D., General Editor. **Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Acts** (Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980).

Moffatt, James, D.D., Author. W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, M. A., LL. D., **The Expositor's Greek Testament, vol. five: Revelation** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002).

Morris, Leon, M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D. **Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Revelation** (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000).

Mounce, Robert H. **The New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament: Revelation** (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishers, 1997).

Pfeiffer, Charles F., Old Testament. Everett F. Harrison, New Testament. **The Wycliffe Bible Commentary** (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977).

Plummer, Alfred, Author. Assisted by T. Randell and A.T. Bott; Henry D. M. Spence-Jones and Joseph S. Excell, Editors. **The Pulpit Commentary Series: Revelation** (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 1890; Accordance Bible Software, 2017).

Stern, David. **Jewish New Testament Commentary** (Clarksville, MD: Jewish New Testament Publications, 1992).

Thayer, Joseph. **Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament** (Accordance Bible Software; Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree software, 2012).

Unger, Merrill F. **The New Unger's Bible Dictionary** (Chicago: Moody Press, 1988).

Williams, David J., Author. W. Ward Gasque, New Testament Editor. **New International Biblical Commentary: Acts** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999).

Witherington III, Ben. **The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998).

Yehoshua, Avram. [The Lifting of the Veil: Acts 15:20-21](#) (Latest revision 2023).

## *Articles*

[A Letter to Pastors](#)

[A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#)

[Checking the Bias](#) by Laura Cloer

Eusebius, Church History, Book V, Chapter 24

[First Sheaf](#)

[Gentile Circumcision?](#)

[Gospel of Peter](#)

Goulder, M. D. **Midrash and Lection in Mathew** (London, 1974).

[Grace, Holiness and the Pharisaic Church](#)

[Hebrew Months](#)

[Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#)

[Jan Hus](#)

[Jerome and the Jews](#)

[John Wycliffe](#)

Lacey Baldwin Smith, *This Realm of England: 1399 to 1688* (3rd ed. 1976)

[Law 102](#)

[Law and Grace](#)

[Letter](#), Lightfoot's translation of the Letter of Ignatius

[Luke the Jew?](#)

[Magnesians 8:1](#)

[Mosaic Law is Established—Romans 3:31](#)

[Mosaic Sacrifice and the Blood of Jesus](#)

[Mosaic Sacrifice in the New Testament](#)

[Nailed to the Cross—Colossians 2:13-17](#)

[No Longer Under the Law?](#)

[Passover](#)

[Passover and the Apostle John](#)

[Pentecost—Shavu'ot](#)

[Pope Clement I](#)

[Romans 14 and the Dietary Laws](#)

[Salvation—The Promise!](#)

[Sherrill Stevens](#)

[Slavery to the Law? Gal. 4:8-11](#)

[St. Ignatius of Antioch](#) by John B. O'Connor

[Sunday—The Catholic Sabbath](#)

[Synagogue and Church Officials](#)

[Ten Ways Yeshua Fulfilled The Law](#)

[The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#)

[The Feasts of Israel as Time Markers After the Resurrection](#)

[The Path to Sunday](#) by Mark Hulme

[The Two Triangles of the NT](#)

[Theophilus—High Priest of Israel?](#)

[Three Persons—One God?](#)

[To the Magnesians](#)

[Two Disciples of John: Ignatius](#)

[When Does The Sabbath Begin?](#)

[When Pope Victor wanted to set an official practice of Easter](#)

[Why Sunday?](#)

[www.earlychristianwritings.com](#)

[www.newadvent.org](#)

[Yeshua—God the Son](#)<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>164</sup> This article was finished on Sunday, November 27, 2022 and last revised on Tuesday, April 18, 2023.