

**THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL**

**AS TIME MARKERS**

*After* **THE RESURRECTION**

**BY AVRAM YEHOSHUA**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL AS TIME MARKERS <i>After</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	1
<b>THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL <i>After</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	2
<b>1. ACTS 2:1</b> .....	2
<b>2. ACTS 12:3</b> .....	3
<b>3. ACTS 12:4</b> .....	3
<b>4. ACTS 18:21</b> .....	3
<b>5. ACTS 20:6</b> .....	3
<b>6. ACTS 20:16</b> .....	4
<b>7. ACTS 27:9</b> .....	4
<b>8. FIRST CORINTHIANS 5:8</b> .....	6
<b>9. FIRST CORINTHIANS 16:8</b> .....	8
<b>THE SABBATH DAY <i>After</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	9
<b>1. ACTS 1:12</b> .....	9
<b>2. ACTS 13:14</b> .....	10
<b>3. ACTS 13:27</b> .....	10
<b>4. ACTS 13:42</b> .....	10
<b>5. ACTS 13:44</b> .....	10
<b>6. ACTS 15:21</b> .....	10
<b>7. ACTS 16:13</b> .....	13
<b>8. ACTS 17:2</b> .....	13
<b>9. ACTS 18:4</b> .....	13
<b>10. COLOSSIANS 2:16</b> .....	13
<b>11. HEBREWS 4:9</b> .....	14
<b>TWO SABBATH SCRIPTURES <i>Before</i> THE RESURRECTION</b> .....	15
<b>SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT</b> .....	16
<b>Sunday—Mentioned Only Once From Acts To Revelation</b> .....	18
<b>CHURCH HISTORY AND MOSAIC LAW</b> .....	20
<b>Sunday—Pharisaic Catholicism</b> .....	21
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	22



# THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL AS TIME MARKERS

## *After* THE RESURRECTION

Avram Yehoshua

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

Luke and the Apostle Paul speak of the Feasts of Israel nine times in the Book of Acts and First Corinthians. Eight times they use the Feasts as *time markers* to tell their perspective audience when an event happened or would happen, and the ninth time Paul admonishes the Corinthians to keep Passover. Nowhere do either of them relate time in Roman terms (e.g. *Dies Lunae* [Day of the Moon or Moon-day; i.e. Monday],<sup>1</sup> or *Junius* [June]).

Their use of the Feasts this way is extremely significant for at least two reasons. One, Luke wrote Acts about 64 AD or 34 years *after* the resurrection. The Church teaches that after the death of Yeshua (Jesus) Mosaic Law, in this case, the Feasts of Israel and also the seventh day Sabbath, had given way to Sunday, Easter and Christmas, and that, allegedly by Apostolic decree (i.e. New Testament Scripture). Yet, Easter and Christmas aren't seen anywhere in the New Testament. How, then, can they be of the Apostles?

Also, nowhere in the New Testament does it speak of Sunday replacing or nullifying the seventh day Sabbath. The Sabbath is mentioned eleven times *after* the resurrection, while Sunday (which in the Greek New Testament is written in Hebraic terms as the first day of the week) is seen only twice from Acts to Revelation, and one of those times it's actually not Sunday at all, but Saturday night.<sup>2</sup> If Scripture determines God's will for us, and it is the only divinely inspired authoritative book that does, God never intended Christians to observe Sunday, Easter and Xmas (hereafter also known by the acronym, *illicit SEX*). The Church has *adulterated* God's Word, and hence, why the phrase *illicit SEX* is appropriate.

The second reason why the use of the Feasts of Israel and the Sabbath as time markers are important is because the Church teaches that the Law of Moses, except for its moral aspects, was cancelled (for Christians) when Christ was crucified—"the Law was nailed to the cross," pastors will say, erroneously citing Colossians 2:14<sup>3</sup> and a few other proof texts. As will become biblically obvious, Mosaic Law (and not just the Ten Commandments) was still God's holy standard by which Luke and Paul lived their lives, and as we'll see, how the early Gentile Christians also lived their lives by.<sup>4</sup>

---

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

The Roman days of the week correspond "to the planets as Roman gods: Diana as the moon for Monday; Mars for Tuesday; Mercury for Wednesday; Jupiter for Thursday; Venus for Friday; Saturn for Saturday, and Apollo as the sun (god) for Sunday." See [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Names\\_of\\_the\\_days\\_of\\_the\\_week](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Names_of_the_days_of_the_week), and also, <http://www.unrv.com/culture/roman-days-of-week.php>.

<sup>2</sup> I address that under the section, *Sunday in the New Testament*, p. 17. Many scholars believe that Paul began preaching on Saturday evening because biblically, that begins the first day of the week. In Scripture one day ends at darkness and the next day begins in darkness, so the first day of the week actually begins on Saturday night. For why the biblical day begins at darkness, ask for the PDF, *Sabbath—When Does The Day Begin?*

<sup>3</sup> What was nailed to the cross was not Mosaic Law, but the *χειρόγραφον kai'rographon*, the written record of our *sin-indebtedness* to God. As for Mosaic Law, Paul, in his greatest theological letter, calls it 'holy and spiritual' (Romans 7:12, 14) and God's standard for what is sin according to God (Rom. 3:20; 7:7). Obviously, then, Mosaic Law is God's will for us (Rom. 3:31; 7:25; cf. Dt. 4:5-8). For a greater understanding of Colossians 2:14, ask for the PDF, *What was Nailed to the Cross?*

# THE FEASTS OF ISRAEL *After* THE RESURRECTION

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

## 1. ACTS 2:1

The Book of Acts was written by Luke in 64 AD, but this first Pentecost *after* the resurrection took place in 30 AD. There were approximately 1,470 Pentecosts *before* this one dating back to the first Pentecost in the days of Moses at Mt. Sinai.<sup>5</sup> Pentecost is the Greek name for the Hebrew ‘Feast of Weeks.’ Luke doesn’t mention the Roman month Pentecost occurs in, but only presents the Holy Spirit coming upon the Apostles, etc., at this Mosaic feast. Pentecost occurs in early June, but with Luke not mentioning *when* it occurred, it implies that Theophilus, whom Luke wrote Acts to (Acts 1:1), already knew *when* Pentecost was.

Some might say, ‘Well, of course Theophilus would know when Pentecost was because it was such a special day—the Holy Spirit was given!’ We have to realize, though, that Pentecost is a holy day *within* Mosaic Law *and* that this, for Luke, begins a pattern, which runs throughout the Book of Acts (and Paul also uses this). Luke will mention the Feasts of Israel six more times, but never once does he tell Theophilus *when* they occur in the year. This means that Theophilus, a Gentile Christian like Luke,<sup>6</sup> *knew* when all the Feasts of Israel were, with the implication being that he kept them. This will open up Mosaic Law still being valid for Christians because the Feasts of Israel are only found within the Law of Moses.

Also poignant is the realization that on the first Pentecost at Mt. Sinai all Israel *saw* and *heard* God *speak* the Ten Commandments, which symbolize all the words that God would give to Moses for Israel (i.e. Mosaic Law). This means that both the Word of God *and* the Spirit of God were given to Israel *on the same Mosaic holy day*—the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost).<sup>7</sup> The Spirit being given on Pentecost does not negate God’s words that were given on the same day, but makes it possible for us to walk as Yeshua did.

---

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

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

<sup>6</sup> For why Luke was a Gentile see *Luke the Jew?* at [http://seedofabraham.net/Luke\\_The\\_Jew.html](http://seedofabraham.net/Luke_The_Jew.html) or ask for the PDF.

<sup>7</sup> The Ten Commandments picture or symbolize all of God’s words, which is known as Mosaic Law (basically Genesis through Deuteronomy). For more understanding as to how both the Word of God and the Spirit of God were given to Israel on Pentecost see *Pentecost—Shavu’ot: Learning to Walk in God’s Freedom*, at <http://seedofabraham.net/pentecst.html> or ask for its PDF. Also interesting to realize is that at the Pentecost of Acts 2 there were only Jews who received their Messiah and the Holy Spirit. The first Gentile doesn’t come into Yeshua’s Kingdom until Cornelius & Company in Acts 10 (see Acts 11:18, which confirms that). The point is that the first Pentecost *after* the resurrection wasn’t the beginning of the Church, separate from Israel, but of Israel recognizing Her Messiah and being baptized in the Holy Spirit, a promise which God had made to Israel more than 600 years earlier (Ezk. 36:24-27; Joel 2:28).

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

## 2. ACTS 12:3

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

## 3. ACTS 12:4

Luke then says that after Passover (Ex. 12:1-8f.; Lev. 23:5), Herod intended to bring Peter ‘before the people,’<sup>8</sup> meaning that Herod was going to murder Peter as he had murdered the Apostle James (Acts 12:1-2). These two verses have confused some people because Passover is celebrated on the *first* night of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, so how could Luke write that it was *during* the Feast of Unleavened Bread that Peter was arrested, but that *after* Passover Herod would murder Peter? This is easily solved by realizing that in the time of Yeshua the terms Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread had become interchangeable.<sup>9</sup> That’s how Luke could say it was *during* the seven days of Unleavened Bread when Peter was arrested, but *after* Passover (literally meaning the end of the Feast of Unleavened Bread) that Herod intended to murder him. Passover is just another name for the Feast of Unleavened Bread and vice-versa.

Be that as it may, Luke uses two Feasts of Israel to convey to Theophilus *when* Peter was arrested and *when* Herod would seek to murder him. If Theophilus wasn’t aware of the two of them, their interchangeability, and *when* they were, these time markers would have meant nothing to him.

## 4. ACTS 18:21

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

“I must by all means *keep this coming feast in Jerusalem*, but I will return again to you, God willing!’ And he sailed from Ephesus.” (Acts 18:21)

Who would have ever thought that the Apostle Paul, given the opportunity to witness Christ to his fellow Jews (Rom. 9:1-3), would have declined in order to keep a Mosaic feast in Jerusalem?

## 5. ACTS 20:6

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

---

<sup>8</sup> Every English Bible, except the KJV, has Passover. The KJV has Easter instead of Passover, but this is a glaring mistake. The Greek word is *πάσχα paska*, which is the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew *פֶּח'שָׁח peh'sach*, which in English is Passover.

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

strongly implies that the Feast of Unleavened Bread was seen as valid by Gentile Luke, known by Gentile Theophilus, and therefore, kept by all Gentile Christians during the days of the Apostles.<sup>10</sup> In terms of the feast's validity it would hardly seem relevant for Luke to use a time marker that had been relegated to the biblical trash bin due to Christ's death.

Also, this passage reveals that the Feasts were kept outside of Israel. Every Christian would conceptually agree with the ability to celebrate their feasts in their own lands. After all, how many pastors teach that you can only celebrate Xmas in Bethlehem? Christians keep their holy days wherever they are, and so do the Jewish people, and so do we. We do not have to be in Jerusalem to keep Passover or the Feast of Tabernacles, etc.<sup>11</sup>

## 6. ACTS 20:16

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

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

## 7. ACTS 27:9

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

If Gentile Theophilus wasn't *intimately* aware of the Feasts of Israel *and* their subtle nuances, 'the Fast' would have meant absolutely nothing to him, and he would not have known *what time of year* Luke was speaking of (late autumn). Unfortunately, most Christians today have no idea what Luke was saying, let alone when the Fast occurred because the Church has lied to them about Mosaic Law, and has instituted a false lifestyle in its place. This event happened **30 years** *after* the resurrection, when the Church says that *illicit SEX* had already become 'the new reality.' If that's so, where is it in Scripture?

It doesn't celebrate God's Feasts, but instead the Church teaches Satan's Feasts, and yes, Sunday, Easter and Christmas are Satan's feasts, kept by pagans to their gods and goddesses more than a thousand years *before* Christ. Any Google search on their origin will reveal that. All the Church did was to remove the pagan names from the pagan feasts and 'baptized' those feasts 'in the name of Jesus,' but Jesus doesn't approve of them, nor has God given the Church the authority to use them (Dt. 12:28-32; cf. Luke 22:15).

Have you ever wondered how bringing a Xmas *tree* into your *house*, and eating chocolate Easter *bunnies and eggs* have anything to do with the birth and resurrection of Jesus Christ? God doesn't want Christians

---

<sup>10</sup> For how to celebrate Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, as well as all the Feasts of Israel, and why they are still valid for Christians today, see the Feasts of Israel at <http://seedofabraham.net/feasts.html> or ask for their PDFs.

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



practicing *illicit SEX* because those days have nothing to do with His Son. The creation of holy days remains within the exclusive domain of the God of Israel. Christians have noble reasons for *illicit SEX*, but God, through His Word, has not given authority to man to create holy days, especially holy days that nullify His holy days. The Pharisees, too, had noble reasons for their traditions that nullified God's Word.

The sheer biblical force of these seven Feasts of Israel in Acts, six of which Luke uses as specific time markers, reveals that the Feasts were kept by everyone in the Apostolic Church for at least the first 34 years *after* the resurrection (which is when the Book of Acts was written). Nowhere does Luke hint at, let alone declare, that the Feasts of Israel were outdated, nullified or replaced, but on the contrary, with their continually appearing in the Book of Acts, and that, as time markers, their sanctity and validity for Christians is a biblical fact.

Some have said that the reason Luke used the Feasts of Israel as time markers was because Luke was Jewish, and therefore, they were familiar to him, as if that would stop him from writing about the alleged 'new reality,' as Christians call *illicit SEX*. Luke being Jewish, though, is negated by the fact that Paul classifies him as a Gentile (Col. 4:10-14).<sup>12</sup> Also, the idea of writing anything to anyone, especially Acts, which is rightly seen by the Christian community as divinely inspired, is so the person receiving it will understand what is written. If Theophilus didn't know about the Feasts and *when* they occurred during the year, Luke's writing of them, as time markers, whether Luke was Jewish or Gentile, would have meant nothing to Theophilus, and he certainly wouldn't have understood anything about 'the Fast.'

Was Luke just a poor, disoriented writer, as some say, trying to trample over Luke and the inevitable conclusion that the Feasts were still valid? On the contrary, most credible Christian theologians and scholars see Luke as not only a great communicator, but also as extremely accurate in his details. World renown Christian scholars, F. F. Bruce and I. Howard Marshall speak of Luke's ability to communicate, in the highest terms. Neither of them uphold the Feasts of Israel or Mosaic Law, so no one can accuse them of furthering their own theological agenda when they speak of how important Acts is, its accuracy and reliability. Bruce states,

'Luke has made a great, indeed, a *unique* contribution to the record of early Christian expansion. His narrative, in fact, is *a sourcebook of the highest value for the history of civilization.*'<sup>13</sup>

One reason why Bruce speaks of Acts as unique is because it's the *only* divinely inspired historical account of the first 34 years of the early Spirit-filled Church. Marshall adds that Luke is extremely accurate in the Book of Acts, stating,

'One of the major contributions of Ramsay to Lucan study was his demonstration that on matters of detailed historical background *Luke shows remarkable accuracy.*'<sup>14</sup>

The Book of Acts is reliable. This clearly refutes anyone who claims that we 'cannot take theology' from Acts, no doubt, because it goes against their anti-Law Christian theology, and therefore, the Feasts of Israel. The Feasts, though, were being observed by Luke, Theophilus and all the Apostles (Acts 21:20-24) for the entire period of the early Church, which means they were kept by Christians then, and therefore, they're valid for Christians now. Not only valid, but necessary for every Christian who wants to walk in

---

<sup>12</sup> See information for *Luke the Jew?* on p. 2, note 6.

<sup>13</sup> F. F. Bruce, author; Gordon D. Fee, general editor, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1988), p. 16. Bruce quotes Tertullian (p. 14, note 58) as having said of Acts, 'Those who do not accept this volume of Scripture *can have nothing to do with the Holy Spirit*, for they cannot know if the Holy Spirit has yet been sent to the disciples.' (Tertullian, *Prescription against Heretics* 23).

<sup>14</sup> I. Howard Marshall, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., author; Professor R.V.G. Tasker, M.A., B.D., general editor, *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Acts* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000), p. 36. *Italics* are Marshall's.

God's Truth and obey Him, as Jesus did (Mt. 26:17; Lk. 22:8; Jn. 2:13; 8:29).

Others, realizing that Luke's writing is impeccable, but still wanting to bypass what he wrote, say that the Jewish Apostles and Luke just didn't realize the full ramifications of what Christ had done by His death and resurrection, but that *eventually* they would come to understand this. Aside from never seeing that in Acts, Luke writes that Yeshua was seen by the Apostles (and others) *after* His resurrection for 40 days off and on, *and that Yeshua taught them about the Kingdom of God.* One would have to argue that Jesus didn't tell His Apostles that the Feasts (and therefore, Mosaic Law) had been done away with, and also, that the Holy Spirit didn't alert any of them, including Paul,<sup>15</sup> to this 'new reality,' *throughout the first 34 years of the Apostolic Church, which Acts deals with.* Neither of those two positions is spiritually realistic or biblically tenable, which means that the reason why Luke uses the Feasts of Israel as time markers is because they were still valid and being celebrated by all the early Christians, and that the 'new reality' of *illicit SEX* and the rejection of Mosaic Law was not a biblical reality.

Some Christians believe that they should keep the Ten Commandments (minus the fourth commandment; the Sabbath day), but not Mosaic Law, yet the Feasts are found *within* Mosaic Law, not the Ten, and so, this proves that Mosaic Law was valid for all Christians. How can it be, as the Church contends, that what was sin for Christ is *not* sin for Christians? How can it be that if Jesus failed to keep Passover He would have sinned, but Christians don't have to keep it?<sup>16</sup>

The Book of Acts is *not a teaching* on the Feasts of Israel, yet *seven times in its 28 chapters*, Luke uses them. That's an average of *one feast every four chapters*, and they're not only mentioned, but Luke uses six of the seven as specific time markers to let Theophilus know *when* an event occurred during the year. That's shocking, for something the Church teaches 'was done away with at the death of Christ.'

Lest it be said that the good doctor 'was out of his mind' when Luke wrote the Book of Acts, his best buddy and traveling companion, the Apostle Paul, the one whom the Church runs to for proof that the Law of Moses was done away with at the death of Jesus, speaks of two feasts of Israel. In Paul's his first letter to the Corinthians, written 23 years *after* the resurrection (53 AD), he writes of two Feasts of Israel eleven years *before* Luke wrote Acts. The first time Paul speaks of a feast he admonishes the Gentile Corinthians to keep Passover. The second time, he lets the Corinthians know of his plans to *stay* in Ephesus until the Feast of Weeks—Pentecost, and then travel towards them (west to Greece, from Ephesus in what is now western Turkey).

## 8. FIRST CORINTHIANS 5:8

In 1st Cor. 5:8 Paul writes to the Corinthians and says, 'let us keep the feast.' The feast is Passover (and the ensuing seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread because Passover begins Unleavened Bread, and biblically, the keeping of Passover entails the keeping of the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread), because the passage (vv. 6-7) speaks of unleavened bread and Christ as the Passover (Lamb). In verse eight the Apostle Paul encourages and admonishes the Corinthians to keep Passover in holiness, with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

Paul speaks in v. 7 of purging 'out the old leaven,' so the Corinthians could be a new loaf of bread, *unleavened*, as they 'truly' were, the Apostle says, because 'Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed.' Most Christians have no idea what Paul means by telling them to 'purge out the old leaven,' and be 'unleavened bread' because the Church has failed Christ and themselves in the vital area of His holy days.

Paul then says to the Corinthians in v. 8 to '*keep the feast*, not with old leaven, nor with the leaven of mal-

<sup>15</sup> Paul kept Mosaic Law: Acts 21:20-24; 25:8; Rom. 3:31; 7:12; 1st Cor. 5:8; 7:19; 11:1; cf. John 8:46; 12:26.

<sup>16</sup> See *Law 102* at <http://seedofabraham.net/law102.html> or ask for its PDF. This article deals with most of the Church's proof texts that it uses to justify the eating of unclean meats and the breaking of the Sabbath.

ice and wickedness, but with the *unleavened* bread of sincerity and truth.’ Some Christians, wanting to circumvent Paul’s simple admonition to the Corinthians say that he was only speaking metaphorically, not literally. Paul wasn’t speaking figuratively or non-literally though, but spiritually and to the heart in *how* the Corinthians were to keep Passover and Unleavened Bread.

Leaven (yeast) raises or puffs up bread dough. When we see a man full of pride we say that he is ‘all puffed up.’ Leaven, which can be seen as a good thing (e.g. Mt. 13:33), is also seen as sin (Mt. 16:6; 11-12). It’s in this latter concept that Paul speaks of *purging* out the old leaven (sin, v. 7), and *being* an unleavened (sinless) loaf of bread, *just as Christ was*. This is why God gave the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which commands the eating of this bread for each of its seven days (Ex. 12:15). The bread that our Lord Yeshua raised and broke at His last Passover<sup>17</sup> was *unleavened* bread, which pictured His *sinless* body.<sup>18</sup> Spiritually, eating this bread in faith makes one like Christ. That’s why He told His Apostles to eat of it and that’s why we need to eat of it every day during the Feast. Yeshua couldn’t do that with Italian or French bread, or any other bread that has yeast in it because leavened bread represents Him as full of sin.

God the Father gave Passover to ancient Israel so that His Son could walk into it, take the unleavened bread at the table and say that it was His (sinless) body.<sup>19</sup> The eating of food nourishes our bodies and gives us life, and the spiritual eating and drinking of the Son of Man nourishes us and gives us His divine Life. In this we become like Him, for He is the (sinless, *unleavened*) Bread of Life (John 6:1f.). Truly, the adage, you are what you eat, applies to Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread. With the eating of the unleavened bread we become more and more like He was, holy and sinless. The full manifestation of this reality will happen on Judgment Day when we shall become as He is now—the God-Man.<sup>20</sup>

This is why God used the blood of a lamb in Egypt to free Israel and instituted unleavened bread to be eaten for Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread. It pictures His Son as the Lamb of God (John 1:29) and the Bread of Life, who frees us from slavery and eternal Darkness, and transforms us into new creatures, like He is (2nd Cor. 3:18; 5:17). This is one of many reasons why Passover, *after* the resurrection, is even more important to observe than it was before Christ came. This teaching, of the unleavened bread and the lamb for Passover, is just the tip of the biblical and spiritual iceberg that are the Feasts of Israel and why they are so important for Christians and why God wants us to celebrate them *especially after* the resurrection. Easter has no divine theological backbone to it.

The Church projects the Father and the Son unto their feasts of *illicit SEX*, but those feasts have nothing to do with Them. Inherent within the Feasts of Israel, though, is what the Father and Son (and the Holy Spirit) have done for us, are doing for us and will do for us.

The Apostle Paul, admonishing the Corinthians to keep Passover (and the Feast of Unleavened Bread) without ‘malice and wickedness’ (sin), but with ‘sincerity and truth’ (holiness), was telling them how their hearts should be when they celebrate it. He wasn’t saying that sincerity and truth were only metaphorical substitutes for celebrating Passover, anymore than a Christian pastor today would tell his flock to keep Xmas with joy and thanksgiving, but to only keep it metaphorically (i.e. not keep it).

---

<sup>17</sup> Not the ‘Last Supper,’ which is a Catholic phrase designed to strip the event from its Hebraic reality.

<sup>18</sup> Ex. 12:8, 14-15; Mt. 26:17.

<sup>19</sup> Having communion with leavened bread pictures Christ as sinful, and the person as taking sin into himself.

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

## 9. FIRST CORINTHIANS 16:8

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

<sup>5</sup>“Now I will come to you when I pass through Macedonia (for I am passing through Macedonia). <sup>6</sup>And it may be that I will remain, or even spend the winter with you, that you may send me on my journey, wherever I go. <sup>7</sup>For I do not wish to see you now on the way, but I hope to stay a while with you, if the Lord permits. <sup>8</sup>I will stay in Ephesus until Pentecost.<sup>21</sup> <sup>9</sup>For a great and effective door has opened to me, but there are many adversaries.” (1st Cor. 16:5-9)

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

The nine Feasts of Israel, in Acts and First Corinthians, tear asunder the theological fabric of the Church concerning Easter and Xmas, and also positively supports how both Luke and the Apostle Paul viewed Mosaic Law. It was the lifestyle of all the Apostles (Acts 21:20-24) and what all Christians observed as part of their faith in the Messiah of Israel for at least the first 34 years *after* the resurrection.<sup>22</sup>

There was no keeping of Easter and Christmas in New Testament times, at least, not by Christians, yet the Church is adamant that Easter and Xmas are good for Christians because they worship Jesus on them. The scriptural and spiritual reality, though, is that they have no authority from Above to do so, and that it's very displeasing to God, and sin for them. If Jesus wanted Christians to keep Easter and Xmas, He would have taught His Apostles that, and they, in turn, would have written about it in the New Testament. Since they aren't even mentioned, Christians have no *divine authority* for them, especially when the New Testament, *after* the resurrection, reveals the use of the Feasts of Israel as time markers. Easter and Xmas are traditions of the Church that have nothing intrinsically to do with Jesus Christ because they were taken from paganism. Jesus and His Apostles always kept the Feasts of Israel. Shouldn't we?

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

---

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

Acts 18:21 (49 AD); 1st Corinthians 16:8 (53 AD); Acts 20:16 (57 AD).

<sup>22</sup> The Church has wrongly taught the Apostle Paul's position on Mosaic Law, not realizing that there are two different streams to it. When Paul speaks of it as an *addition* to belief in Jesus for salvation (justification), he rightly negates that as its function because nothing can be added to the finished work of Messiah's salvation (e.g. Gal. 2-5; cf. Acts 15:1-31). When Paul, though, speaks of Mosaic Law as the divine guideline of instruction for the Christian lifestyle he speaks of it in glorious terms (Rom. 3:31; 7:12, 14; 1st Cor. 7:19; 2nd Tim. 3:10-17).

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

# THE SABBATH DAY *After* THE RESURRECTION

God's seventh day Sabbath is mentioned eleven times in the New Testament *after* the resurrection. Four of those times biblically support the continuance of the Sabbath day for Christians. Although the other seven times are nominal, it's significant that none of the writers who speak of the Sabbath say that Sunday has replaced it (Luke nine times, Paul once, and the author of Hebrews once). We'll go through all the cites that mention the term Sabbath, as they're listed in Acts, Colossians and Hebrews.

## 1. ACTS 1:12

Luke writes that the Apostles 'returned to Jerusalem from the mountain called Olives, which is near Jerusalem, *a Sabbath day's journey*.' After they had seen Yeshua ascend into the Heavens the Apostles went back to Jerusalem. This was 40 days *after* the resurrection or ten days before Pentecost in 30 AD.

Acts 1:12 is a nominal entry relating to the Sabbath because it's not speaking about the Sabbath day, but about a unit of measurement (distance) that a Pharisee could walk on the Sabbath without sinning (at least in his eyes). It's one kilometer or about two thirds of a mile, and it's still maintained in Judaism today.

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

The second biblical passage is when Joshua led the Army of Israel around Jericho. For six days Israel walked around Jericho once a day, but on the seventh day, which most likely was the seventh day Sabbath, Israel was commanded by God to walk around it seven times (Joshua 6:1-4).

With Yeshua first appearing, alive from the dead, on the Sunday of Passover week,<sup>24</sup> and being seen by the Apostles and many others for 40 days, off and on,<sup>25</sup> it was a Thursday when the Apostles left Jerusalem with Yeshua, to go to the Mt. of Olives, and then saw Him ascend into the Heavens. This was the second ascension.

The first ascension happened 40 days earlier, after Yeshua saw Mary (John 20:11-17), and before He met the Apostles that evening (John 20:19-21f.). This Sunday during Passover week is known as First Sheaf or First Fruits and Paul speaks of Yeshua as the First Fruits to rise from the dead (1st Cor. 15:20, 23). God had already appointed this day for that purpose. Also, to show us that this day (i.e. Sunday) wasn't to be immortalized, God didn't make it an annual holy day (Sabbath), unlike Pentecost, 50 days later.

---

<sup>23</sup> The only practical difference between an annual Sabbath and the weekly seventh day Sabbath is that God allows us to prepare and cook our food on the annual Sabbath (Ex. 12:14-16).

<sup>24</sup> On that Sunday of Passover week some barley grain, the first grain of spring, was offered up as 'first fruits' and known as the *Omer*, which is the amount of grain received, about two pounds or 0.9 kilograms (Ex. 23:19; Lev. 2:14; 23:9-14; 1st Cor. 15:20, 23). Counting 40 days inclusive, from the Sunday of Passover week, brings us to a Thursday when Yeshua ascended from the Mount of Olives. That means that the Apostles waited in Jerusalem for ten days, until the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) for the Spirit to be poured out upon them and other Jews.

<sup>25</sup> Acts 1:1-3; cf. Acts 13:26; 1st Cor. 15:6.

Luke uses ‘a Sabbath day’s journey’ to let Theophilus know how far it was from Jerusalem to the place on the mountain where Yeshua ascended. Even though this is a nominal cite, it’s interesting that Luke chose to use a Jewish expression for distance. He could just as easily have told Theophilus that the distance was five stadia,<sup>26</sup> a Roman expression for the same distance that Theophilus would certainly have understood, being a Roman himself.<sup>27</sup> Or, Luke could have omitted the reference to distance without taking anything away from the account, but he didn’t.

## 2. ACTS 13:14

Acts 13 took place in 46 AD. This chapter has four nominal references to the Sabbath. Luke writes that Paul went into the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia (modern day mid-Turkey),<sup>28</sup> on the Sabbath day. This reference to the Sabbath does not, in and of itself, confirm that the Apostles still met and kept the seventh day Sabbath because it’s a traditional synagogue. Paul went to it in order to tell the Jewish people, and the Gentile ‘God-fearers’ who also assembled there (Acts 13:16; cf. 10:2; 13:26), about the Messiah of Israel.

## 3. ACTS 13:27

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

## 4. ACTS 13:42

The Gentile God-fearers at the synagogue begged Paul to preach to them on the next Sabbath. Even though this is a nominal reference to the Sabbath day, it’s interesting to realize that if Sunday had become the day when Christians met, Paul would have told them that they could hear him the next day, on Sunday, but he didn’t do that. Acts 13 takes place about 16 years *after* the resurrection. Obviously, there wasn’t any Sunday meeting that Paul was preaching at the next day and encouraging others to come to.

## 5. ACTS 13:44

On the following Sabbath almost the whole city came out to hear Paul preach about Messiah Yeshua. This is the last of the four nominal passages referencing the Sabbath day in Acts 13 on which the traditional synagogue met.

## 6. ACTS 15:21

Acts 15:2 took place in 48 AD. This is the first of four significant passages about the Sabbath *after* the resurrection. The chapter deals with what the Gentiles needed to do in order to be saved (Acts 15:1-6f.), and then implies that the Gentiles would assemble on the Sabbath day to learn Mosaic Law.<sup>29</sup> At the end

---

<sup>26</sup> Literally, a Sabbath day’s journey is about 5 stadia (about 3,000 feet or 920 meters).

<sup>27</sup> Most scholars believe that Theophilus was a Roman nobleman whom Luke wrote both his Gospel (62 AD) and Acts (64 AD) for, when Luke was in Rome with Paul.

<sup>28</sup> This reference to Antioch in Pisidia is made to contrast it with Antioch on the Orontes River, where the first believers were called Christians (Acts 11:26). Antioch Orontes is in modern day Syria, about 32 kilometers (20 miles) east of the Mediterranean Sea, just north of Lebanon.

<sup>29</sup> For a complete understanding of how Acts 15:20-21 is the centerpiece of the New Testament, which declares

of the discussion, James, the half brother of Yeshua, gave four rules for the Gentiles, and then said,

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

Of course, all the Jewish believers at the assembly in Jerusalem knew that Moses had been read ‘for many generations...in the synagogues every Sabbath,’ but what most Christians don’t realize is that the word *synagogue* also means ‘a *Christian* assembly.’<sup>30</sup> James is speaking of both the traditional Jewish synagogues and the Christian assemblies as places for the Gentiles to learn of Moses (Mosaic Law). In other words, both a synagogue of Jews that didn’t believe in Jesus, as well as an assembly like Antioch on the Orontes River, made up of only believers (Jewish and Gentile), would equally be called a *synagogue*, especially with James using the same word in his letter referring to a Christian congregation (James 2:2;<sup>31</sup> cf. Acts 9:1-2; 26:11). The mention of Moses ‘being read in the *synagogues* every Sabbath,’ meant that both believing and unbelieving synagogues were places where Gentile believers could meet and learn Mosaic Law. Additionally, the word ‘church,’ as a distinct entity, separate from the Jewish people, wasn’t how the Apostles, including Paul, used it.<sup>32</sup>

James was making a statement of observation, as well as one of expectation. James had already seen that the Gentiles *had been going* to the synagogues to learn Mosaic Law from the days of the first Gentile believer, Cornelius, a ‘God-fearer’ (Acts 10:2; see 10:1–11:18; 38-40 AD or ten to twelve years earlier) and that the Gentiles would *continue* to go to the synagogues to learn Mosaic Law *on the Sabbath day*.<sup>33</sup>

Most scholars teach that the four rules of James speak of table fellowship (i.e. what the Gentile needed to do in order to eat and fellowship with his Jewish counterpart without offending him), but that’s wrong for a number of reasons.<sup>34</sup> The four rules are actually a cohesive unit on sacrificial sexual idolatry, which if the Gentile didn’t immediately stop, would place his very salvation in jeopardy. In other words, he

---

Mosaic Law for the lifestyle of every Christian, see *The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21* at Amazon.com.

<sup>30</sup> Wesley J. Perschbacher, editor, *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publications, 1990), p. 388. *Synagogue*: a ‘collecting, gathering; a Christian assembly or congregation, James 2:2’ (where James speaks of a *believing* synagogue, ‘for if a man comes into your *synagogue* with a gold ring’).

Walter Bauer, augmented by William F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and Frederick Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, second edition (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), pp. 782-783: a ‘place of assembly...a *Christian assembly-place* can also be meant’ (James 2:2). A ‘meeting for worship, of the Jews...*Transferred* to meetings of *Christian congregations*.’

<sup>31</sup> In James 2:2, the ASV correctly translates the Greek word συναγωγή (*sunagogae*) as synagogue. Most English Bibles don’t have that, instead opting for words that don’t carry a Jewish connotation, such as *meeting* or *assembly* (NIV and KJV, respectively).

<sup>32</sup> The Greek εκκλησία (*ekklaysia*), translated into English as ‘church,’ means an ‘assembly’ or congregation, but literally speaks of those ‘called out.’ Originally it pictured the Greek ‘town meetings’ of free men *called out* of the populace to vote on civic matters. The spiritual aspect relates to believers being ‘*called out* of darkness into His marvelous *Light*’ (1st Pet. 2:9) and is most likely the reason why Paul chose to use this word instead of *synagogue*. Believers are the ‘Called Out Ones,’ the Greek equivalent of the Hebraic ‘Chosen People.’ Where it says, ‘to the *church* at Corinth,’ it could also read, ‘to the assembly (or congregation) at Corinth’ or ‘to the *called out ones* of Corinth.’ Where Yeshua said, ‘On this Rock I will build My Church,’ it could also be translated as, ‘On this Rock I will build my Assembly.’ (Matthew 16:18). For more on *ekklaysia* see p. 2, note 7.

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

<sup>33</sup> Believing Gentiles wouldn’t be barred from the traditional synagogues until after 90 AD.

<sup>34</sup> One reason is that the four rules don’t tell the Gentiles what foods the Jew would consider unclean (Lev. 11). If this were for table fellowship the Gentiles would have to know which foods were unclean so they wouldn’t offend their Jewish brethren, the very reason, the Church says, why the rules were given.

couldn't 'believe in Jesus' and continue to worship Diana and Zeus. Adding 'one more god' to their pantheon was a normal practice for all the Gentiles, so 'adding Jesus' wouldn't have been seen as wrong, unless they were told. This is the reason for the four rules of James.

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

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

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

At His death Yeshua redeemed Israel, and any Gentile who is Born Again.<sup>35</sup> He didn't do away with Mosaic Law, which reveals God's holy lifestyle.<sup>36</sup> Mosaic Law shows us what is sin, and consequently, what is pleasing to God. Paul confirms the Law as God's standard of what is right and wrong, saying,

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

Paul emphatically states that the Law is God's standard for determining what is sin.<sup>37</sup> Therefore, without the knowledge of Mosaic Law one's understanding of sin is biblically lacking and leads to sinning against God in ignorance. After all, how many Christians keep the Feasts of Israel, the seventh day Sabbath, and the Mosaic dietary laws?<sup>38</sup> By not keeping them Christians are sinning against Jesus, themselves and many others, including the Jewish people. Christians don't do these things that Jesus did, but rather, do things that Jesus would never do (e.g. *illicit SEX*, and the eating of pig; bacon and ham, etc., catfish and shrimp, etc.). Aside from this being a false presentation of the biblical Jesus, it's a great stumbling block for the Jewish people, who believe, and rightly so, that their Messiah would never negate Mosaic Law, and in fact, the biblical Jesus doesn't (Mt. 5:17-19; 22:35-40). Acts 15 took place 18 years *after* the

---

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

<sup>36</sup> Yeshua redeemed us from the *curse* of the Law (Gal. 3:13), but not the Law itself; Matthew 5:17-19; 19:17; 22:35-40; Lk. 10:26; 16:17, 29; 1st Cor. 7:17-19; 11:1-2; Rom. 3:31; 7:7, 12, 14, 16, 22, 25; 8:1-7; 2nd Thess. 2:15 (traditions/customs may equal the Law; see Acts 6:13; 15:1, 5; 26:3; 28:17); James 2:8-11; 4:11-12; 1st John 2:6; 3:4; 5:3; 2nd John 1:6; Rev. 12:17; 14:12; cf. 2nd Tim. 3:10-17.

<sup>37</sup> Some Christians say that the term Law means only the Ten Commandments, but this isn't supported by either the Old or the New Testaments. Even the phrase, 'the Law of the Lord' means Mosaic Law (Ex. 13:9; 2nd Kings 10:31; 1st Chr. 16:40; 22:12; 2nd Chr. 12:1; 17:9; 31:3-4; 34:14; 35:26; Ezra 7:10; Neh. 9:3; Ps. 1:2; 19:7; 119:1; Is. 5:24; Jer 8:8; Amos 2:4; Luke 2:23-24, 39).

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

<sup>38</sup> For why the dietary laws are still in effect for Christians, see *Law 102* on p. 6, note 16.



resurrection. If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath there's no indication of it here. On the contrary, just the opposite is seen—the Gentiles are going to the synagogues on the Sabbath day to learn Mosaic Law.

## 7. ACTS 16:13

Acts 16:13 took place in 49 AD. Paul went out of the city (Philippi) on the Sabbath day to the riverbank 'where prayer was customarily made.' Pious Jewish women were assembling there. For our purpose, of establishing Sabbath over Sunday in the early Church, this doesn't merit much attention because the women were obviously Jewish and Gentile God fearers, and so gathering on the Sabbath would have been normal for them. After hearing Paul preach some would come to believe in Yeshua (Acts 16:14-15).

## 8. ACTS 17:2

Acts 17:2 took place in 50 AD. Luke writes that Paul, *for three Sabbaths*, 'as was his custom,' reasoned with the Thessalonian Jews (and Gentiles). It's a nominal passage because it reflects a traditional synagogue, but if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath, wouldn't Paul have told those Thessalonians of his Sunday meetings? Wouldn't Luke have written of it? Acts 17:2 took place 20 years *after* the resurrection.

## 9. ACTS 18:4

Acts 18:4 took place from 51-53 AD. This is the second of four significant references to the Sabbath *after* the resurrection. Luke writes that Paul 'reasoned every Sabbath' in the synagogue, persuading 'both Jews and Greeks,' but when the remaining Jews opposed him (v. 6), he began teaching in the home of Justus. He taught there for a year and a half (Acts 18:7-11). This is a glaring silence for Sunday Christians—Luke doesn't mention any Sunday teaching or meeting in the home of Justus in all that time. We would certainly expect to see 'Sunday' here, if it was in fact 'the new reality,' and so its absence is significant. All we see in Acts is the Sabbath, and so it's reasonable to think that Paul taught on the Sabbath day in the home of Justus, and that he worked on the other six days of the week with Priscilla and Aquila making tents (Acts 18:1-3). There would be about 80 Sabbaths for that year and half time period (cf. Acts 17:17). This took place more than 20 years *after* the resurrection.

## 10. COLOSSIANS 2:16

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

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

Many Christians use this verse to prove that the Sabbath is gone, but Paul doesn't say that, nor does he even speak about Sunday, let alone say to keep Sunday, either here or anywhere in all his letters. The key word in this verse is 'judge' (κρίνω *krino*), which Paul uses in a simple way, meaning, 'to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong.'<sup>39</sup> Paul didn't want anyone in the group to judge the group wrongly *regarding how* they were keeping the Sabbath (Feasts and New Moons, etc.).

The Sabbath was still the day Paul's Christians kept and assembled on. This is also seen in the very next verse, which speaks of the Feasts and Sabbaths as picturing what is 'to come,' which speaks of the future

---

<sup>39</sup> κρίνω Joseph Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), n.p.

when we will actually see Yeshua). Paul doesn't want anyone judging the Colossians regarding these Mosaic things, "Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body (reality) is of Christ." (Colossians 2:17)

Both the Textus Receptus and the NU text have δὲ (*dae*), which can be translated as 'but,' which contrasts the two phrases, but would better be translated as 'however' (NIV) because Paul isn't contrasting the Sabbath with Jesus, he's teaching that the Sabbath and the Feasts are 'pictures' or shadows that reflect the Messiah, who was not literally present with them. As such the Sabbath and the Feasts are practical divine teaching tools about the Savior in Heaven. They instruct us as to who He is.

An example of how the Sabbath reveals Messiah Yeshua, and how without it, we're at a loss to understand Him and some of His sayings, is that inherent in the Sabbath is the theme of redemption (salvation). God made it that way, to reflect redemption (Dt. 5:12-15). That's how Yeshua could 'break the rules' of the Pharisees regarding healing on the Sabbath, which they considered forbidden work. Note how Yeshua chastises those who opposed Him when He wanted to heal the Jewish woman, bent over for 18 years:

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

The Pharisees condemned the healings of Yeshua on the Sabbath because they didn't understand that the *work* of redemption was lawful. Yeshua, as the Redeemer of Israel, was sent by His Father to do works of redemption, especially on the Sabbath, that would culminate in *the* Work of Redemption (His death). That's why Yeshua could heal (work) on the Sabbath and it wouldn't be considered sin in His Father's eyes. The Sabbath is a perfect picture of Yeshua as the Redeemer of Israel; Sunday can't claim that.

In his letter to the Colossians, Paul comes against the pagan Gnostic practice of fasting on the Sabbath day (Col. 2:23), and the Gnostic understanding of 'how to attain' to God (to be saved). Those new Gnostic Colossian Christians came into Christianity with a lot of baggage from their Gnostic days (Colossians 2:8-10). Most likely they said that *one wasn't saved* if he didn't fast on the Sabbath, etc. Paul rightly comes against such a heresy and the heretics who judged the Colossians. The point is that Paul is actually upholding the Sabbath by saying not to let anyone judge them about how they kept the Sabbath, etc.

The letter to the Colossians was written by Paul, the Church's 'No Law!' champion, 30 years *after* the resurrection. It doesn't speak of Sunday assembly, nor the negation of the Sabbath, but on the contrary, shows us that the Sabbath, the Feasts and New Moons were being kept by Colossian Christians.

## 11. HEBREWS 4:9

Hebrews was written in 67 AD. This is the fourth significant biblical witness for the Sabbath. Hebrews 4:9 states, "Therefore, there remains *a Sabbath rest* for the people of God."

Every English Bible has "a Sabbath rest," except the King James and New King James, which only has 'a rest,' yet the Textus Receptus, which is what the KJV is based on, and to a great extent, the NKJV, has the Greek word σαββατισμὸς *sabbatismos*, which is a literal observance of the Sabbath.<sup>40</sup> This is a glaring translation error for the KJV and the NKJV, with profound theological meaning for the observance of the Sabbath, 37 years *after* the resurrection. The NU text has *sabbatismos* and that's why every Bible, except the KJV and the NKJV, rightfully has, 'a Sabbath rest' *remains* for the people of God.

The author of Hebrews literally tells us that the Sabbath is still valid, and also, points to the spiritual *rest* we experience by faith in Messiah Yeshua's finished work of redemption. It's very telling that he does it through the Sabbath, which if it had been replaced by Sunday could not have been used. Hebrews, like the Book of Acts, never mentions Sunday, let alone speaks of it as replacing God's seventh day Sabbath.

---

<sup>40</sup> σαββατισμὸς Joseph Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), n.p. "to keep the sabbath; a keeping sabbath."

God called Israel to cease from their work on the Sabbath day and rest (Ex. 20:8-11), which meant that He wanted them to have *faith* in Him that He would provide for all their needs. The writer of Hebrews speaks of us ceasing from our dead works, of trying to earn our salvation by good or righteous deeds, and to enter into the finished work of redemption that God has given us through Yeshua (Heb. 6:1; 9:14). The Sabbath is God's picture of that rest both 'in the natural' and in the spiritual realms.

The Sabbath day allows us, once a week, to literally and spiritually cease (rest) from our strivings to earn a living and 'to be good enough' for God, and to enter into both physical and spiritual rest. Yes, we can enter that spiritual rest every day of the week, and we should, but the Sabbath is God's gift to us (Mark 2:27-28) and He wants us to use it to learn to deal with our carnal strivings. On the Sabbath we cease from our physical work, as a base and a natural reminder for ceasing from our carnal anxiety and doubts concerning our standing with God, and we learn to truly trust Him for our needs, both temporal and eternal. In this we enter into the spiritual rest that He has provided through Yeshua's death for us.

Every Sabbath, as we learn (again and again) to trust God at this level, our faith and joy deepen as we realize anew who our Savior is and that our Father is pleased with us because we are trusting in Him. This leads to divine rest for our souls (cf. Mt. 11:28-30), which is the essence of the Sabbath commandment to rest. Sunday does not have this theological meaning. This is why the author of Hebrews used the Sabbath that way. As such, it reveals that the Sabbath was still valid for Christians 37 years *after* the resurrection.

The Sabbath is mentioned eleven times in the New Testament *after* the resurrection. Although six of those times refer only nominally to the Sabbath as it being the day of traditional Jewish assembly,<sup>41</sup> and a seventh time speaks of 'a Sabbath day's journey,'<sup>42</sup> the other four times, written by three different New Testament writers,<sup>43</sup> biblically confirm that the Sabbath was still the day that the New Testament Church kept holy and met on. Also interesting to realize is that not once after any of those eleven times, nor anywhere else in the entire New Testament, does anyone state that Sunday replaced the Sabbath or that it was the 'new day' of assembly.

Jesus and His Apostles always kept the Sabbath day holy. Shouldn't we? The Apostle John wrote: "He who says he abides in Him *ought himself also to walk just as He walked.*" (1st John 2:6)

## TWO SABBATH SCRIPTURES *Before* THE RESURRECTION

The next two passages of Scripture (Is. 66:23; Mt. 24:20), although spoken *before* the resurrection, apply to times *after* the resurrection, and so, merit our consideration in our quest for God's Truth in this area. God speaks through the prophet Isaiah of a time, which obviously has yet to come, where *all mankind* will worship Him on the *Sabbath* day:

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

Although this was written about 700 BC, it still has not yet come. It will happen during the thousand year reign of Yeshua (Rev. 20:4-6; Ezk. 40:1-48:1f). In that time the Son of David (2nd Sam. 7:8f.; Lk. 1:30f.) will reign and rule the nations from this present Jerusalem, with an iron rod (Rev. 12:5; 19:15). The point for us is that it speaks of the *Sabbath* when all mankind will worship the God of Israel, not Sunday.

The seventh day Sabbath has been holy and blessed since Creation and was for all mankind (Gen. 2:1-3). It was given to Israel and will be observed when Yeshua rules this world for a thousand years. God has

---

<sup>41</sup> Acts 13:14, 27, 42, 44; 16:13; 17:2.

<sup>42</sup> Acts 1:12.

<sup>43</sup> Luke twice (Acts 15:21; 18:4f.); Paul once (Col. 2:16); and the author of Hebrews once (Heb. 4:9).

never blessed nor made Sunday holy (on a weekly basis). We would expect Sunday to be given at least those two designations if it were to supersede the Sabbath.

The continuance of the Sabbath is also seen when Yeshua spoke of the destruction of Jerusalem, which took place in 70 AD. It would happen, by the hands of the Roman Army, 40 years *after* His resurrection. Out of His concern for His Jewish people He told them to pray that their fleeing from the city wouldn't be in the winter *or on the Sabbath* (Mt. 24:20). The Sabbath isn't a time 'to run for your life,' but to enter into God's presence so that one can appreciate His creation, the rest He gives us (Ex. 20:8-11), and His redemption of Israel (Dt. 5:12-15; Rev. 5:9). We are to keep the day holy, assemble on it and can minister to others, as Yeshua did (e.g. Mt. 12:10f.; Luke 4:16; John 5:1-9).

Neither God through Isaiah, nor Yeshua in Matthew spoke of Sunday replacing the seventh day Sabbath, but of the Sabbath continuing *after* the resurrection, and even into the days of the thousand year reign of Yeshua. The Scriptures diametrically oppose Church teaching about Sunday.

## SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Sunday, or rather the first day of the week, is mentioned eight times in the New Testament, six of which are found in the Gospels.<sup>44</sup> The Gospel accounts speak of the first *appearances* of Yeshua, alive from the dead, on Sunday, with only Mark 16:9 seeming to say that Yeshua was resurrected on Sunday. This Scripture, though, cannot be used to support Yeshua being resurrected on Sunday because grammatically, scholars say that it can equally be translated that Yeshua was only first *seen* on Sunday by Mary Magdalene. Here's the alternate translation, which we don't usually find even in a note in our English Bibles:

“Now when He rose, *early on the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary Magdalene*, out of whom He had cast seven demons.”<sup>45</sup>

Also, most commentaries have that Mark 16:9 was not written by Mark (but by a later Christian scribe). Therefore, there is no authoritative Scripture that declares that Yeshua rose on Sunday. He was first seen on Sunday, but Scripture is silent as to the day and the hour. When the women get to the Tomb the angel says, among other things, “He is risen,”<sup>46</sup> but he doesn't say how long ago it happened, nor even the day. In other words, it's possible that Yeshua rose on the Sabbath and not Sunday.

Be that as it may, none of the six times that 'Sunday' appears in the Gospels speak of it replacing the Sabbath. Granted, Yeshua was first seen on Sunday, but no one writes that because of that, Sunday has replaced, or even would come to replace the Sabbath. The Gospels were written from 45 to 90 AD, and so, even though they're speaking of the crucifixion and resurrection of 30 AD, their vantage point is 15 to 60 years *after* the resurrection. If Sunday had come to replace the Sabbath 'because of the resurrection,' as many Christians today would say, or even because Yeshua first appeared alive from the dead on Sunday, the Gospel writers would certainly have declared such a monumental change as that. After all, the Sabbath had been with Israel for more than 1,400 years. With nothing being said in any Gospel, of a new day of assembly, we know that Sunday hadn't replaced the Sabbath because of Yeshua's first appearances.

---

<sup>44</sup> Mt. 28:1; Mk. 16:2, 9; Lk. 24:1; Jn. 20:1, 19; and also, Acts 20:7; 1st Cor. 16:2. (John 20:26, although not literally speaking of the first day of the week, is seen to be one week after his first appearance to the Apostles, and this seems to be Sunday night because John 'keeps time' in Roman terms.)

<sup>45</sup> Most Bibles don't have the comma after rose, but after week, like the NKJV: “Now when He rose early on the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom He had cast seven demons.” (Mark 16:9 NKJV) For more insight as to why this verse speaks of Yeshua only appearing to Mary early on the first day of the week, see *The Resurrection and Mark 16:9* at <http://seedofabraham.net/mark169Res.html> or ask for its PDF.

<sup>46</sup> Mt. 28:2-8; Mk. 16:5-8; Lk. 24:5-7 (John doesn't have the angel saying that; see Jn. 20:11-13.)

Also interesting to realize is that three of the four authors of the Gospels wrote divinely inspired letters and a 'book' during the time of the early Church: Peter, whom many believe was the 'voice' behind the Gospel of Mark, wrote two letters; Luke wrote Acts, and John wrote three letters, dating to 90 AD or later, yet none of them, nor anyone else in the rest of the New Testament, speak of Sunday being 'the new day.' It's hard to believe that such a dramatic change as Sabbath to Sunday would not be clearly spoken of by any of the writers of the New Testament. After all, how would future generations know?

Even more bleak for Sunday is the fact that from Acts to Revelation, it's only mentioned twice, and one of those times is not Sunday at all, but Saturday night. Acts 20:7 states that it was the first day of the week when the disciples in Troas met to break bread.<sup>47</sup> Paul began to preach in the *evening* of the first day, as both the lamps (v. 8) and the fact that Paul preached to midnight, and then until daybreak (v. 11) testify to. Biblically, the first day of the week ('Sunday') begins on Saturday night, at darkness, when the Sabbath ends. Saturday night is when Jews get together in synagogues to say 'farewell' to the Sabbath and to welcome in the first day of the week (or rather, the new week),<sup>48</sup> and this is what was happening in Troas.

Many Christian scholars today recognize that Paul began preaching on Saturday night, not Sunday night, as previously had been held. Either way, though, Acts 20:7 doesn't constitute the 'earliest unambiguous evidence ...for Christians gathering together for worship on' Sunday,<sup>49</sup> as F. F. Bruce stated. Luke mentions nothing of it being a 'new day' to assemble on, something we would expect if Sunday had replaced the Sabbath. This wasn't a 'new Christian time,' but an old Jewish one.

The reason why Luke mentions this meeting is not because Sunday 'was already established,' but because at midnight Eutychus fell down 'from the third story' and was dead, and Paul brought him back to life (Acts 20:9-10, 12). Luke wanted Theophilus to realize that the Holy Spirit was working as powerfully in Paul as the Holy Spirit had worked in Peter (Acts 9:40). That's why Luke writes of Troas.

Acts 20:7, which took place in 57 AD or 27 years *after* the resurrection, cannot be used 'to establish' a *weekly Sunday* meeting because Luke's purpose was to reveal the power of the Holy Spirit working through Paul. Also, Luke never mentions Sunday meetings, either here or anywhere in Acts, and for Luke, the evening of the first day of the week is Saturday night because he 'kept time' by biblical means, as his continual use of the Feasts (and the Sabbath) portray in Acts. Even, though, if one thinks it was Sunday night that the meeting began, it wouldn't serve as the basis for Sunday assembly because nowhere in Acts 20, nor anywhere else in all of Scripture, does it state that Sunday had become 'the new day' of assembly, and also, it was a special meeting with Paul who would leave at daybreak (Acts 20:11). Therefore, even if they met on Sunday night, there's nothing wrong with that, or meeting on Monday night, etc., but it doesn't mean that the Sabbath had been replaced. Using this passage 'to prove' weekly Sunday meetings only proves how desperate Sunday pastors are to justify their patently unscriptural position.

---

<sup>47</sup> Samuele Bacchionchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday* (Rome, Italy: The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977), p. 104f. It's p. 63f., in Avram's free PDF of the book. Some think this chapter speaks of Sunday communion with 'the breaking of bread' (Acts 20:7, 11), but the term only came to specifically mean the Lord's Supper *after* Apostolic times. In Scripture it can mean the Lord's Supper, or when Yeshua fed the multitude, or a fellowship meal, etc. Kirsopp Lake believes that v. 7 was a common meal, with the meaning of 'having supper.' Verse 11, using the same term, speaks of Paul, and only Paul, eating food (the verbs are all in the singular). It's not the Lord's Supper or 'Sunday communion,' an essential of Sunday Catholicism, in Acts 20:7, 11.

Acts 2:46 is often quoted as the 'breaking of bread' equaling the Lord's Supper, but it speaks of it happening in their *homes*, which primarily implies the eating of a regular meal together, especially when it writes of *food* and *daily*: "So continuing *daily* with one accord in the Temple and breaking bread from *house to house*, they ate their *food* with gladness and simplicity of heart."

<sup>48</sup> The church is patterned after the synagogue. Church officials parallel synagogue officials. For an article on this ask for the PDF *Synagogue and Church Officials*.

<sup>49</sup> Bacchionchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday*, p. 101; p. 60 from Avram's PDF. The quote is from F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts*, 1954, pp. 407-408.

## Sunday—Mentioned Only Once From Acts To Revelation

The only time that Sunday is actually seen in Scripture, from Acts to Revelation, is in First Corinthians 16:2 and it doesn't have anything to do with assembling in church. Paul is encouraging the Corinthians to set aside some funds in their homes, every Sunday, toward a special gift for the poor Jewish believers in Jerusalem. This way when he came to Corinth they'd have the funds for the gift. This is not a church service, nor is there any mention of them assembling on Sunday:

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

Paul desired to take up a special love offering, from many churches, for the poor believers in Jerusalem as a sign of Gentile love and unity with the Jewish believers in Jerusalem (2nd Cor. 9:1-5f.; cf. Acts 24:17). Here, Paul says to the Corinthians in verse 2, that every Sunday *'let each one of you lay something aside.'* Each individual was to set some money *aside*, which implies that he would do it in his home. This would make no sense if the person was in the church and putting it in a tithes and offering basket.

Paul goes on to say in v. 2, *'storing up as he may prosper.'* This confirms the previous phrase by speaking of the person *'storing up'* his gift, which again speaks of him doing it in his home on Sunday. This is not referring to a church service where the tithes and offering basket is being passed around, or even a central place in the church (e.g. a treasury room), where the people could come and place their funds, but of the individual *'storing up'* his offering in his own home every Sunday. This way, when Paul came to Corinth, everyone would bring their funds they had saved up to the church to give to him for the gift to Jerusalem. This is what Paul means when he says at the end of v. 2, *'that there be no collections when I come.'*

The first day of the week (i.e. Sunday) is also the first day of the (biblical) work week. The ancients were usually paid on a daily basis, and so Paul was telling them to set some of it aside, every Sunday, obviously in their homes. This was a way to ensure that when he came to Corinth they would have funds for the gift because he didn't want to be embarrassed if they failed to have any funds to give him, and he didn't want them to feel embarrassed, either, especially as he was bringing other Christians from different churches and he had spoken to them about Corinth having been ready a year earlier (2nd Cor. 9:1-5).

Some might argue that Christ being resurrected on Sunday<sup>50</sup> (as they think), warrants or justifies meeting on Sunday and not the Sabbath, but there is no Scripture that supports that. In other words, if Scripture had stated that Sabbath had given way to Sunday because of the resurrection (or even His first appearances), *then* Christianity would have had authority from God to replace Sabbath with Sunday, but nothing like that exists. It's a noble idea, but it's not God's idea (cf. 2nd Sam. 7:1-13f.).

Other Christians believe that anyone “can choose to keep any day he likes as his Sabbath,” erroneously citing Romans 14:5-6.<sup>51</sup> Paul speaks of one man esteeming one day above another, while another man esteems all days alike; and that one man fasts and another eats. Paul is dealing in Romans 14 with the same problem he dealt with previously in 1st Cor. 10—the eating of meats from the market place that had been sacrificed to idols, but were now for sale in the market place. Some thought they couldn't eat it because it was associated with idolatry. These were *'veggie only'* eaters (Rom. 14:2), who also fasted on certain days, and hence, they *esteemed* those days above others, but the meat eaters ate all the time and esteemed

<sup>50</sup> Mt. 28:1, 9; Mk. 16:1-2, 9; Lk. 24:1, 30-31, 36; Jn. 20:1, 11f.

<sup>51</sup> For why Romans 14:5-6 cannot be used to support making Sunday one's Sabbath, ask for the PDF, *Romans 14 and the 7th Day Sabbath*. Also, there is no such thing as *'the Christian Sabbath.'* There's only one (weekly) Sabbath in the Word of God and it's the seventh day Sabbath. There is no Sunday *'Christian Sabbath.'*

each day alike (for eating or fasting). Aside from the fact that the Sabbath isn't even mentioned in Romans 14, Paul isn't saying that one can override the Sabbath for any day he chooses, but that he can choose which day he can fast on, thereby *esteeming* that day 'above the others,' as special for him.

If Sunday had replaced the Sabbath during the days of the Apostles we would expect that somewhere in the New Testament it would have been written about—once, twice, three times and more because Scripture says that at the mouth of two or three witnesses the truth is established,<sup>52</sup> yet there's *nothing* written about Sunday being the new day or replacing the Sabbath, 'the Lord's Day,' notwithstanding.<sup>53</sup> With not one scriptural witness it's a biblical fact that Sunday did *not* replace the Sabbath in the time of the New Testament. Therefore, Sunday assembly, in lieu of Sabbath assembly and holiness, is a tradition of the Church that *nullifies* God's Word. Sunday keeping churches have no authority from God to meet on Sunday<sup>54</sup> as an alternative to keeping God's seventh day Sabbath holy.

It's also interesting that the biblical Pentecost is always on a Sunday, 50 days from the Sunday of First Sheaf (during Passover week) and that God the Father made the Sunday of Pentecost an annual Sabbath,<sup>55</sup> but He didn't make First Sheaf an annual Sabbath, even though He knew that His Son would first be seen, alive from the dead, on First Sheaf. This says a lot about how the Father and the Son view the first resurrection appearances, and also, how wrong it is for Christians to try and justify Sunday over Sabbath because of those appearances (or the resurrection as they would say).

Sunday is seen six times in the Gospels in relation to the resurrection, but not one time does it speak of it replacing the Sabbath or of it being the new day of assembly. Sunday is seen only one other time in all the New Testament, and that's in First Corinthians, but this cite speaks of individuals, on Sunday, setting aside funds in their own homes for a future gift to Jerusalem. It has nothing to do with an established weekly Sunday service.

The Word of God reveals that Sunday did not become the day of Christian assembly during the time the Apostles were alive. Therefore, it cannot be God's will for Christians to keep it in lieu of the Sabbath.<sup>56</sup> Adding to this is the fact that neither Easter, nor Christmas are even mentioned in the New Testament, and so, it's crystal clear that *illicit SEX* is not of God, nor what He wants His people to practice.

The time span of the New Testament *after* the resurrection is 30 to 95 AD. Sunday began to replace God's seventh day Sabbath 25 years later in 120 AD. It wasn't by Scripture, but by a decree of the Bishop of Rome, who today is known as the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church. This happened 90 years *after* the resurrection, when all the Apostles were dead, but not everyone listened to him. Most of the churches of the East (Israel, Lebanon, Syria and Turkey, etc.) would continue to keep the Sabbath day holy and disregard Sunday for 200 years, until the Roman Church gained political power (323 AD). Then those who didn't bow to Rome were persecuted.

---

<sup>52</sup> Dt. 17:6; 19:15; Mt. 18:16; 2nd Cor. 13:1; Heb. 10:28. Even though these speak of two human witnesses, it's an axiom that also applies to Scripture, where two or three Scripture witnesses confirm a biblical truth.

<sup>53</sup> The term 'the Lord's Day' is mentioned only once in the New Testament (Rev. 1:10) and some Christians see this as Sunday, but Scripture never equates it with Sunday in either the Old or New Testaments. John is either referring to Judgment Day (i.e. the Day of God's vengeance upon the wicked of mankind; cf. Is. 2:2; 13:6, 9; 34:8; Jer. 46:10; Ezk. 13:5; 30:3; Joel 1:15; 2:11, 31; 3:14; Amos 5:18, 20; Obadiah 1:15; Zephaniah 1:7-8, 14, 18; 2:2-3; Malachi 4:5; Acts 2:20; 1st Cor. 5:5; 2nd Cor. 1:14; 1st Thess. 5:2; 2nd Peter 3:10) or John is simply referring to the seventh day Sabbath (Mark 2:28; cf. Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 20:8-11; 31:12-17).

<sup>54</sup> It's not a sin to meet on Sunday, or Monday, etc., but it is a sin to not keep the Sabbath day holy.

<sup>55</sup> For why the biblical Pentecost is anchored on Sunday, unlike Judaism's 'Pentecost', where it can occur on any day of the week, see *First Sheaf* at <http://seedofabraham.net/feasts4.html> or ask for its PDF.

<sup>56</sup> The fashionable term 'Resurrection Day' has replaced 'Easter' in many churches, but that doesn't change the fact that the date remains the same. Most of the time it's not the day when Yeshua was first seen on Sunday because the time calculation for Easter has nothing to do with Passover and First Sheaf.

# CHURCH HISTORY AND MOSAIC LAW

Church history confirms that the seventh day Sabbath, the Feasts of Israel and Mosaic Law were still valid for Christians in the days of the Apostles and well into the fourth century. The ancient Christian sect of the Nazarenes were the Jewish spiritual descendants of the Apostles.<sup>57</sup> They were based in Jerusalem. Eusebius (260-340 AD), our first official Roman Catholic witness was a bishop and church historian. Writing of the Jewish leadership of the Jerusalem Church in 135 AD, Eusebius says that it,

“consisted of converted Hebrews” and was administered by 15 bishops from the “*circumcision*”<sup>58</sup> and they were “*zealous to insist on the literal observance of the Law.*”<sup>59</sup>

The Nazarenes, more than 100 years *after* the resurrection, were keeping Mosaic Law, which means that they celebrated the Feasts of Israel and kept the seventh day Sabbath holy, etc. Also interesting to note is that some Christians today argue that ‘with no Temple,’ you can’t keep (any) Mosaic Law, but obviously, the Nazarenes thought otherwise. The Temple in Jerusalem had been destroyed in 70 AD, yet 65 years after that Eusebius writes of the Nazarenes keeping (all) Mosaic Law (that they could).

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

“The Nazarenes do not differ in any essential thing from them (i.e. the Jews), *since they practice the custom and doctrines prescribed by the Jewish Law*, except that they believe in Christ...*they fulfill until now Jewish rites as...the Sabbath and others.*”<sup>60</sup>

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

“Easter (was) introduced *first in Rome* in the early part of the second century to differentiate (it from) the...Passover...of the Jews.”<sup>61</sup>

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

Two prominent Catholic historians and a third scholar reveal that the Nazarenes, for at least 300 years *after* the resurrection, kept Mosaic Law, the Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel. This complements and confirms Scripture from the New Testament about the Feasts of Israel, etc., being kept by the Apostles and all Christians in the early Church. Obviously, this means that Jesus wants Christians to keep them today.

---

<sup>57</sup> Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath To Sunday*, p. 156; p. 93 in Avram’s PDF: “the Nazarenes, as most scholars maintain, are indeed the ‘direct descendants of the primitive community of Jerusalem’...(and) retained *the original practice of Jewish Christianity.*” These ancient Jewish Nazarenes are not to be confused with the Nazarene Church, which only came into existence about a hundred years ago.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 152; p. 91 in Avram’s PDF. Eusebius, *HE* 4, 5, 2-11; Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 70, 10, PG 42, 355-356.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid, see also p. 92, note 398 in the PDF. Eusebius, *HE* 3, 27, 3, trans. by Kirsopp Lake, *Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History*, 1949, I, p. 263; cf. Acts 21:20-24.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 156; in Avram’s PDF, p. 93. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 29, 7, PG 41, 402. Circumcision of the eight day old Jewish boy is still required by God because the Jew is literally part of the covenant that God made with Father Abraham (Gen. 17:10-14; Acts 21:20-24), but the Gentile believer and his son must not be physically *covenantally* circumcised because God comes against this in the New Covenant. For why this is, ask for the PDF *Gentile Circumcision?* or see it at [http://seedofabraham.net/Gentile\\_Circumcision.html](http://seedofabraham.net/Gentile_Circumcision.html).

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., p. 192; in Avram’s PDF, p. 114.



## Sunday—Pharisaic Catholicism

The Roman Catholic Church changed God’s Sabbath to Sunday in 120 AD (when it also changed Pass-over to Easter and threw out Mosaic Law). Of course, they didn’t have the authority from God (Scripture) to do any of that, but it didn’t stop them because they believe the Pope and/or the teachings of the Catholic Fathers have greater authority than Scripture. They readily acknowledge the change to Sunday.

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

‘fundamentalists (i.e. Protestants) meet for worship on Sunday, yet there is no evidence in the Bible that corporate worship was to be made on Sundays...It was the Catholic Church that decided Sunday should be the day of worship.’<sup>62</sup>

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

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

‘They do not observe the seventh day, but reject it. *If they do truly hold the Scripture alone as their standard, they would be observing the seventh day as is enjoined in the Scripture throughout*. Yet they not only reject the observance of the Sabbath enjoined in the written word, but they have adopted and do practice the observance of Sunday, *for which they have only the tradition of the (Roman) Church*. Consequently, the claim of ‘Scripture alone as the standard,’ fails, and the doctrine of ‘Scripture and tradition’ as essential (Catholic doctrine) is fully established; the Protestants themselves being (practitioners and) judges.’<sup>63</sup>

Gaspar de Fosso was right about the Protestants not having Scripture to stand upon in relation to Sunday. In changing Sabbath to Sunday the Roman Catholic Church has conceptually followed their true Fathers, the Pharisees, who placed the wisdom and sayings of their Jewish Fathers (i.e. tradition) above Scripture. Yeshua rhetorically asked them, ‘Why do you *transgress* the commandment of God because of your tradition?’ (Mt. 15:3) He’s also asking that of every Sunday keeping Christian today.

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

‘is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday...? But, *you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday*. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.’<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Karl Keating, *Catholicism and Fundamentalism*, copyright 1988 by Ignatius Press, San Francisco, p. 38, bearing the Nihil Obstat and Imprimatur (the official sanction) of the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>63</sup> J. H. Holtzman, *Canon and Tradition*, published in Ludwigsburg, Germany, 1859, p. 263. Archbishop of Reggio’s address in the 17th session of the Council of Trent, in Mansi SC, Vol. 33, cols. 529, 530. The Archbishop of Reggio, Gaspar (Ricciulli) de Fosso made this speech at the last opening session of Trent reconvened under the new Pope (Pius IV) on January 18, 1562.

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

Xmas would come into the Roman Catholic Church around 350 AD, again by decree of the Pope. The Pope took the pagan Roman feast of Saturnalia, where fir trees were set up with silver and gold tinsel, gifts were exchanged, pigs were eaten, sports and banquets were celebrated with uproar, and parties abounded, and placed the name of Jesus over Saturn, and called it Christ's Mass (i.e. Christmas).<sup>65</sup> Xmas is just the Catholic way of celebrating Saturnalia. Alexander Hislop writes of Saturnalia, how it predates Christ and that the Catholic Church brought it into its fold to entice pagans to join the Church:

“Long before the fourth century, and long before the Christian era itself, a festival was celebrated among the *heathen* at that *precise time* of the year (25 Dec), in honour of the *birth of the son of the Babylonian queen of heaven* (aka Ishtar/Easter), and it may fairly be presumed that, in order to conciliate the heathen and to swell the number of the nominal adherents of Christianity, the same festival was adopted by the Roman Church, giving it only the name of Christ.”<sup>66</sup>

The Roman Catholic Church used Saturnalia, changed the name to Christ's Mass, as a way to draw pagans into Catholicism, just as they had done with Sunday and Easter. Most of these new members would remain just as pagan as they had always been, seeing that the only thing that changed was the name of their feast. The Catholic and Protestant churches present the pagan traditions of the Roman Catholic Church (*illicit SEX*) above God's Word in the area of the Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel.

## CONCLUSION

With eight Feasts of Israel being used as *time markers* by Luke and the Apostle Paul, it's clear that during the days of the Apostles all Christians kept the Feasts. This is confirmed by the ninth feast, where Paul exhorts his Corinthians to keep Passover. Because the Feasts of Israel are part of Mosaic Law this means that Mosaic Law was the standard and guideline that Christians used to walk out their faith in the Jewish Messiah.

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

The seventh day Sabbath is seen eleven times in the New Testament *after* the resurrection, with four of

---

<sup>64</sup> James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, *The Faith of Our Fathers*, originally published in 1876, pp. 111-112 (63rd edition); p. 86 (76th edition); republished and copyright 1980 by TAN Books and Publishers, Inc., pages 72-73. See *Sunday—The Catholic Sabbath* at [http://seedofabraham.net/Sunday\\_Catholic\\_Sabbath.html](http://seedofabraham.net/Sunday_Catholic_Sabbath.html).

<sup>65</sup> For more on Christ's Mass see <http://www.angelfire.com/la2/prophet1/chrmass.html>.

<sup>66</sup> Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, 2nd American edition (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1959), p. 92; p. 71 in *The Full Hislop*. Hislop overwhelmingly proves that the Roman Catholic Church is the Babylon of the New Testament (Rev. 14:8; 17:5; cf. 18:4). Ask for the free PDF, *The Full Hislop*, which is Avram Yehoshua's compilation of the entire book with all its illustrations. *The Two Babylons*, like Bacchiocchi's *From Sabbath to Sunday*, are Christian classic 'must reads.' One of the titles of the son of the Queen of Heaven is The Emancipator (i.e. Savior-god) p. 97, note \*; p. 74, note 361 in *TFH*. For the Xmas tree see p. 97f.; p. 74f., in *TFH*.

those times revealing that the Sabbath was still valid, and therefore, kept by all Christians. Six of the eleven times, although only speaking of Sabbath assembly at a traditional synagogue, indirectly confirm the Sabbath being the day of Christian assembly and holiness because nowhere for any of those times do any of the New Testament writers add that the Church was ‘now’ meeting on Sunday, which is the least that we would expect if the day had changed during the time of the Apostles.

The last of the eleven mentions of ‘Sabbath’ refers to ‘a Sabbath day’s journey,’ and although it wasn’t on the Sabbath that the Apostles returned to Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, it’s interesting that Luke uses a Jewish reference to distance that spoke of the Sabbath, and not some Roman measurement. If Sunday had come to replace the Sabbath in Luke’s day, he wouldn’t have written the distance as he had.

The Book of Acts is the only inspired historical account of the Apostolic Church (30-64 AD), yet it contains nothing about Sunday replacing the seventh day Sabbath, nor does the New Testament (which spans 4 BC–95 AD). Also important is that neither Luke, nor any other New Testament writer, was trying to *prove* that the Feasts of Israel and the Sabbath were still valid. It was a ‘given.’ The writers who spoke of the Feasts and the Sabbath were only bringing them up to let us know,

1. *when* an event happened or would happen (Luke with the Feasts and the Sabbath; and Paul with a feast; 1st Cor. 16:8),
2. or to admonish Christians to keep Passover in a holy manner (Paul in 1st Cor. 5:6-8),
3. or who spoke of the Sabbath as the day of assembly (Acts 15:21; 18:4f.),
4. or who used the Sabbath to underscore a theological point (Paul in Col. 2:16 and the author of Hebrews in 4:9).

The *need* to prove that the Feasts and the Sabbath were still valid was not why they wrote of the Feasts and the Sabbath—that need is a modern Christian dilemma due to having been deceived about them. Yet, the writing about the Feasts and the Sabbath by those New Testament writers, without speaking of anything contravening them, also biblically validates them.

Further underscoring the biblical fact of the Sabbath is the glaring theological absence of Sunday (i.e. the first day of the week). It’s mentioned six times in the Gospels concerning Yeshua’s resurrection appearances, but not one Gospel writer speaks of it replacing the Sabbath.

From Acts to Revelation, Sunday is only mentioned once, in 1st Cor. 16:2 and it has nothing to do with Sunday assembly. Paul tells the Corinthians to individually set aside in their own homes (not the church), some of their funds they had made from working on Sunday. This was to be for a special love gift to the poor believers in Jerusalem, which they’d bring to the meeting place when Paul came. There’s no mention of a Sunday church meeting. Therefore, this *lone* Scripture containing Sunday cannot be used to establish that the Church was *already* having weekly Sunday meetings.

Yet, even if one believes that 1st Cor. 16:2 ‘proves’ Sunday replaced the Sabbath, there isn’t a clear second witness to it, Acts 20:7 notwithstanding. That’s because v. 7 doesn’t speak of a Sunday meeting in Troas, but a Saturday night meeting, which is when the first day of the week biblically begins. The believers got together to say goodbye to the Sabbath and welcome in the new week, a standard practice of the Jewish people. The reason Luke writes of it is not to present Sunday as ‘the new day,’ but to reveal that by the raising of Eutychus the Holy Spirit worked in Paul just as powerfully as in Peter. Yet, even if one thinks it was a Sunday night meeting, it still doesn’t prove that weekly Sunday meetings had evolved because nowhere does Luke, nor anyone else state that, something we’d expect to see. Also, this meeting was special, out of the ordinary, since the Apostle Paul had been in Troas for a week and after the meeting he would depart at dawn (Acts 20:6, 11). For a change of this magnitude, of Sunday replacing God’s Sabbath, we’d certainly want to see many crystal clear scriptural witnesses, but there isn’t even one.

Also, even though Yeshua was first seen on the Sunday of Passover week (First Sheaf), there is nothing in Scripture that presents it as the basis for Sunday replacing the Sabbath. There’s not one biblical witness to

a change of days. Underscoring this is the fact that Isaiah speaks of the Sabbath being observed in a time yet to come, and Yeshua said to those in Jerusalem that they should pray that their flight, at the destruction of the city, would not be on the Sabbath. Neither Isaiah, nor the Messiah envisioned Sunday replacing the seventh day Sabbath.

If God wanted ‘resurrection Sunday’ to be holy He would have made the *first* day, Sunday of Creation Week holy and not the *seventh* day Sabbath. Didn’t Jesus speak of being Lord of the *Sabbath*? Isn’t Jesus the *same* yesterday, today and forever? If Jesus is the same, isn’t His Father also the same? Then why would God change the Sabbath day to Sunday? Why would His Feasts be replaced by pagan feasts? Why would Mosaic Law be negated at the cross, even though ‘we’re not under the Law anymore’?<sup>67</sup>

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

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

With the Church of Rome openly boasting of changing Sabbath to Sunday and Passover to Easter (in 120 AD), it proves that Gentile Christians were keeping those Jewish holy times until then. There would have been no need for Rome to *change* Sabbath and Passover if that change had already happened ‘at the death of Jesus,’ or during the time of the Apostles. This confirms what Scripture revealed: Sabbath and Feasts, and therefore Mosaic Law were being kept by all Christians for more than one hundred years *after* the resurrection. It’s still God’s holy lifestyle for Christians, despite what the Pharisaic Church teaches.<sup>68</sup>

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

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

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

Satan loves to mesmerize his victims and he has done a stunning job of it for the last 1,900 years. Without Mosaic Law as the standard of God’s Truth, Christians have been deceived by Satan’s counterfeits and don’t even realize it. *Illicit SEX* and anti-Law teachings are satanic traditions that keep Christians from walking in God’s lifestyle for them and the tremendous blessings He intends for them. Many Christians

---

<sup>67</sup> See *No Longer Under the Law? Two Important Phrases* at <http://seedofabraham.net/nlul.html> or ask for its PDF.

<sup>68</sup> For an article on the Pharisaic Church, its hypocrisy and false ways, specifically in relation to Mosaic Law, ask for the PDF, *Grace, Holiness and the Pharisaic Church*.

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

<sup>21</sup>“I was watching, and the same horn (the Pope) *was making war against the holy ones, and prevailing against them,* <sup>22</sup>until the Ancient of Days came and a judgment was made in favor of the holy ones of the Most High God and the time came for the holy ones to possess the Kingdom. <sup>23</sup>Then He said: ‘The fourth **Beast** shall be *a fourth kingdom* on Earth, which shall be **different** from all other kingdoms (the Roman Catholic Church) and it shall devour the whole Earth, trample it and break it in pieces...<sup>25</sup>He (the Pope) shall speak pompous words against the Most High God. (He) *shall persecute the holy ones* of the Most High God, *and (he) shall intend to change times (Sabbath and Feasts of Israel) and (Mosaic) Law.* Then the holy ones *shall be given into his hand,* for a time and times and half a time.’” (Daniel 7:21-23, 25)<sup>69</sup>

The Popes have persecuted, warred and prevailed against God's holy ones for 1,900 years, and the war continues, but judgment is coming for the holy ones because the time to possess the heavenly Kingdom draws near. Christian eyes are being opened to this deception and war, and are fleeing from it.

The fourth Beast, *unlike* all the other kingdoms of the world, is a *religious* kingdom. The Roman Catholic Church has made war, devoured and trampled the whole Earth (the holy ones/people of God) through its ruthless persecutions and pagan heretical teachings.

The Roman Catholic Church teaches ‘salvation by infant sprinkling,’ which has no biblical basis, prayers to, and worship of ‘Mother Mary’<sup>70</sup> (a totally pagan, non-biblical ‘Mary’), and that the Pope himself is ‘Christ on Earth,’ which is part of the pompous (blasphemous) words against God that Daniel speaks of.<sup>71</sup>

There are one billion, two hundred million Catholics in the world, and the vast majority of them think that by belonging to the Catholic Church they will be in Heaven, for that is what the apostate Roman Catholic Church teaches them, but they are going to be in for the shock of their lives on Judgment Day.

The Roman Catholic Church (RCC) has persecuted God's people, both literally and doctrinally, for 1,900 years.<sup>72</sup> The heretical doctrine, that Mosaic Law was invalidated at the death of Jesus, began with the RCC at the same time they threw out Sabbath and Feasts, and brought in Sunday and Easter (120 AD). When the Protestant Reformers broke away from the RCC (in the 16th century), they didn't realize that the teaching against Mosaic Law was heretical, and so, they took it with them, and also, the practice of *illicit SEX*. The Popes changed the times (the seventh day Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel) and the Law (of Moses), teaching that, except for its moral principles, the Law doesn't apply to Christians.

---

<sup>69</sup> I have translated ‘saints’ as ‘holy ones’ because this is the literal and correct meaning of ‘saint,’ in the New Testament. ‘Saint’ comes from the Latin word *sanctus*, which means to sanctify or make holy.

<sup>70</sup> In December 1854 the Roman Catholic Church decreed that (1) Mary was the *Mother* of God (i.e. the Holy Spirit incarnate; deity herself), that she died, and (2) *rose from the dead*, and (3) *ascended into heaven* and (4) was to be worshipped as the Immaculate Virgin, ‘*conceived and born without sin*’ (and died without ever sinning). Of course, this defies all Scripture about the biblical Mary, but these attributes align perfectly with the ancient pagan Queen of Heaven (which is also a title of the Roman Catholic Church's Mary). For an individual to espouse any of those four points about Mary, we'd say he was greatly mistaken or insane, but for a so-called church to teach these things prove that Alexander Hislop's thesis, that the Roman Catholic Church is the Babylon of the New Testament, and not a Christian church at all, is well founded. The decree's four points were taken from Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, 2nd American edition, p. 267; p. 209 in *The Full Hislop*.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211; p. 166 in *The Full Hislop*. One of the titles of the Pope is the *Vicar* of Christ, which means that the Pope is *the* physical representative of Christ on Earth, with all Christ's authority concentrated in him.

<sup>72</sup> See <http://www.mtc.org/inquis.html> and <http://www.end-times-prophecy.org/secret-history-catholic-church.html> and <http://www.eaec.org/cults/romancatholic.htm>, which states, ‘In 431 AD Mary worship became an official doctrine of the (Roman Catholic) Church at the Council of Ephesus.’

See also <http://www.ramsheadpress.com/messiah/ch10.html> for persecution of Christians by the RCC.

Protestant Christianity believes, and rightfully so, that God's Word is the standard for what they are to believe, and therefore, how they are to walk out their faith in Christ. Yet, they have blindly followed the RCC's teachings for the last 600 years, against Mosaic Law and teach *illicit SEX*. Christianity teaches these two heinous Catholic doctrines...in the name of Jesus! This is a great abomination. Jesus is the Truth, yet these two teachings have nothing to do with Him, but pervert Him and His ways. Christianity causes hundreds of millions of Christians to sin against Jesus and themselves in their ignorance. Great is the power of deception that honors the satanic traditions of man over the Word of God.

God, through His Word and His Spirit, is calling every Christian 'to come out of Her,' meaning to leave the Roman Catholic Church and every church that teaches these two perverse teachings of Her's. This way Christians can learn to walk in God's holy days and holy ways:

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

God is warning all Christians that they should not have anything to do with the Roman Catholic Church, nor any church that teaches her anti-Law doctrine and practices *illicit SEX*. God is very serious about us keeping His Sabbath and Feasts, etc. (Ex. 31:12-17; Num. 9:13), and although Christians have sinned greatly against their Lord in these areas, there is forgiveness. As Paul said to the sin-laden Athenians:

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

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

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

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

Twenty-eight years ago a man by the name of Richard Davis told me how he was challenged about Xmas thirty years earlier. He was driving in his car, listening to a Christian radio station and the pastor exclaimed, 'Let's put Christ back into Christmas!' and Richard said, 'Yes!' Then he heard an audible Voice say, 'How can you put Christ back into something He was never a part of?'<sup>73</sup> Of course, he was shocked, but that began his journey out of the traditional church and into the ways of the God of Israel.

Christianity is the only religion in the world that does not emulate its Founder, but the Lord Yeshua is calling us to correct that. Let us walk as Yeshua did—in all areas of our life.

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

“Whatever I command you, be careful to observe it. You must not add to it nor take away from it.” (Deuteronomy 12:32)<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Read about Richard Davis' journey at <http://seedofabraham.net/christmas.html> or ask for its PDF, *Christmas*.

<sup>74</sup> This article was finished on December 21st, 2015—just in time for Xmas : )