

- [Home](#)
- [Catholicism Exposed](#)
 - [The Antichrist Revealed](#)
 - [Antichrist controls a man who's name equals 666](#)
 - [Antichrist destroys 3 nations after Rome falls](#)
 - [Antichrist gets it's seat and authority from Rome](#)
 - [Antichrist has a church that fights the saints](#)
 - [Antichrist has his church & state sit on 7 hills](#)
 - [Antichrist hates Bible and anyone that uses it](#)
 - [Antichrist influences all the world to worship him](#)
 - [Antichrist is a "church" mixed with Babylon](#)
 - [Antichrist is a power which the world admires](#)
 - [Antichrist is both a political & religious power](#)
 - [Antichrist is the beast "that was, is not, yet is"](#)
 - [Antichrist is to be a blasphemous power](#)
 - [Antichrist is to preach 'another Jesus' unto all](#)
 - [Antichrist is to rule the world for 1260 years](#)
 - [Antichrist is to use craftiness and deceit](#)
 - [Antichrist is wounded after 1260 year reign](#)
 - [Antichrist must join with the "kings of the Earth"](#)
 - [Antichrist receives "deadly wound" that heals](#)
 - [Antichrist understands dark sentences of hell](#)
- [Contact Us](#)

Subscribe Today!



Recent Posts

- [Did Paul keep Sunday Holy?](#)
- [Is Catholicism Christianity?](#)
- [Important Message](#)
- [Only Catholics are Christians?](#)
- [Rise and Fall of the Catholic Church \(satire\)](#)

Recent Comments

- [Stephen Korsman](#) on [Did Paul keep Sunday Holy?](#)
- [Erol](#) on [Did Paul keep Sunday Holy?](#)
- [Stephen Korsman](#) on [Did Paul keep Sunday Holy?](#)
- [Erol](#) on [Did Paul keep Sunday Holy?](#)
- [Stephen Korsman](#) on [Did Paul keep Sunday Holy?](#)

Ads by Google

Christ's end-time Word

Brings the chosen into
Kingdom Age God is
judging man with the
word
endtimeworkofgod.org

The Rapture

Secrets of the holy bible
revealed and explained in
great detail.
www.accdatabooks.com

Free Bible CD

Beautiful Bible Software
plus complete Library on
CD - Free!
FreeSoftwareCD.net

exAdventist Outreach

Ministry of former
Adventists with Biblical
Answers on Adventism
www.exAdventist.com

Free Biblical Magazine

Articles re Bible,
prophecy, God, Jesus,
family, world events, etc.
www.gnmagazine.org



« [Is Catholicism Christianity?](#)

Did Paul keep Sunday Holy?

About 3 years ago, yup that long ago :), I commented on a Roman Catholic blog called Theotokos on their topic of seventh day adventism.

Today I found their reply to that post of mine and I found it necessary to comment on it.

The author of this blog tries to use Acts 20:7 as to proof that Paul supposedly kept Sunday holy. Lets take a closer look at the verse shall we.

“And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.” Acts 20:7

The verse describes Paul's gathering with followers in Troas. In the Bible the date changes at sunset, not at midnight.

“And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.” Genesis 1:5

So we see that this gathering took place at the start of the firstday (after sunset), (Saturday night for today's standards). And in the morning, “at the break of day,” thus Sunday morning, Paul continued his journey to Assos.

Clearly Paul did NOT keep the first day holy.

1 Chorintians 16:2

Another verse Theotokos quotes as support of so called keeping Sunday holy is 1 Chorintians 16:2 they try to claim that this is a church service, its not and I will show why in a minute.

But lets first quote verse 16:1, he conviniently left that out, it will become clear why in a second.

“Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.” 1

Corinthians 16:1

The context of this verse and related scripture shows that Paul was collecting for the needy because of a famine. See Acts 11:27-30; Romans 15:25-26.

“Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.” 1 Corinthians 16:2

In greek “lay by him” and “in store” reveal that this verse talks about people being in their homes for paul to come by and collect their gifts to the needy. This verse nowhere talks about a church service or gathering!


Clearly Theotokos does not know what they are talking about.



Tags: [lords day](#), [sabbath](#)

This entry was posted on Wednesday, February 18th, 2009 at 5:53 pm and is filed under [Uncategorized](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0](#) feed. You can [leave a response](#), or [trackback](#) from your own site.

11 Responses to “Did Paul keep Sunday Holy?”

1.  [Stephen Korsman](#) says:
[February 22, 2009 at 6:36 pm](#)

“What you really question is why I say that “No gatherings” does not mean church services.”

We’ve already established that “no gatherings” does not mean “church services” - it means “no collections”.


“Also it would make no sense for Paul to have meant he did not want to hold a collection and then say he would “come by”.”

Paul did say he did not want collections when he came; these are his words: “that there be no gatherings when I come.”

If Paul wants to not hold a collection when he comes, the collection must have been completed when he comes. There’s nothing there that doesn’t make sense.

“you are twisting the verse.”

No, all I have is a different interpretation of what it means. Your interpretation and my interpretation happen to differ. And it has nothing to do with me being Catholic - many people without connections to the Catholic Church would agree with my interpretation. The real problem now is deciding how to know whose interpretation is correct.

2.  [Erol](#) says:
[February 22, 2009 at 3:56 pm](#)


What you really question is why I say that “No gatherings” does not mean church services.

For the gazillioned time, in greek the terms “lay by him” and “in store” refer to being at home. Thats not a private interpretation but a linguistic and contextual fact.

Also it would make no sense for Paul to have meant he did not want to hold a collection and then say he would “come by”.

There was a famine, people where in need, you are twisting the verse.

And thats the last thing I am gonna say about it to you.

3.  [Stephen Korsman](#) says:
[February 22, 2009 at 3:41 pm](#)

“Then it says to not gather, but stay home”

Where does it tell them “to not gather”? I understand where you get the idea from that they should stay home; I disagree with your personal interpretation of those words. But I do not see anywhere where it says they should not


gather. Please could you highlight those words?

“it says Paul will collect the gifts”

Actually, it doesn't say that. Paul says he doesn't want to hold a collection when he comes - “that there be no gatherings when I come”. How do you conclude that Paul will do the collecting based on that?

“that there be no gatherings when I come” means the same as “that there be no collections when I come” - so how do you get the idea that Paul will collect the offerings when he comes?

Why do you refuse to explain this?

4.  *Erol* says:
[February 21, 2009 at 3:44 pm](#)

I will paste the full passage again, like i did so many times before.

“Now concerning the **collection for the saints**, as **I have given order** to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.” 1 Corinthians 16:1

“**Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store**, as God hath prospered him, **that there be no gatherings when I come.**” 1 Corinthians 16:2

The passage very clearly says their are collections to be held “Now concerning the collection for the saints...”.

Then it says to not gather, but stay home “... lay by him in store...” (the greek reveals this).

And last but not least it says Paul will collect the gifts “...when I come...” also if we read the passage in context we see that it is Paul who ORDERS the people to stay at home for him to come by.


So again, there is no room for a private interpretation here, the verse clearly says this.

And concerning the misunderstanding, thats on your side, not mine, because you try to twist the passage to confirm to roman catholic tradition, only it does not confirm to it when you read it in CONTEXT.

I have very clearly explained the verse three times now, a babe in Christ understands it, my fellow believers in Yeshua understand it (of various denominations).

I can keep explaining the verse allowing scripture to define scripture again however you won't understand it, so I won't.

“But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” 2 Corinthians 2:14

5.  *Stephen Korsman* says:
[February 20, 2009 at 8:22 pm](#)


Perhaps my most recent comment will still be posted as you have time to reply.

In the mean time, I'd like to ask about something you said to Janet. She's right when she says that Paul didn't want to hold a collection when he was there. Paul says “that there be no gatherings when I come” - that says exactly what Janet said. Gatherings = collections in that verse.

Where is the misunderstanding coming from?

And when were the collections to be held? And by whom? On the first day of the week? If so, why that day? Or when Paul came, going from house to house?

Perhaps if we understood your view, there would be less confusion.

6.  *Erol* says:
[February 20, 2009 at 7:18 pm](#)

Hi Janet,

Have you even read my post, or just the comments?

“Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.” 1 Corinthians 16:2

In greek “lay by him” and “in store” mean to be at home. This verse talks about people staying at home awaiting for paul to come by and collect their gifts.


You don't have to believe me, just study the meaning of these words in context in Koine Greek, you'll see.

You also did not read 1 Corinthians 16:1 or you would have never claimed Paul did not talk about collecting.


“Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.” 1 Corinthians 16:1

So Janet, reading your unfound claims it appears you have not read the entire passage or you would have never made remarks like “Paul said he *doesn't* want to have a collection when hes there. Why would he want to organize the collection himself??”

He ORDERED the collection at his terms, the context is clear, there is no room for private interpretation, we oughta allow scripture to define itself, not let man define scripture as Roman Catholics too often do.

7.  Janet says:
[February 20, 2009 at 11:16 am](#)

Where on earth do you see in those Scriptures that Paul told them to stay at home and he will collect the money from each of them himself?? Youre adding your own traditions to the Bible. Paul said he *doesn't* want to have a collection when hes there. Why would he want to organize the collection himself?? He wants it together in one place so he can send it to Jerusalem with someone. All Christians can see that, we don't need Roman Catholic tradition to make this sort of thing obvious.

8.  Erol says:
[February 19, 2009 at 10:06 pm](#)

Please notice my replies to Stephen, I put his in block quotes below:

Erol states that Paul “therefore did not keep the 1st day holy.”

He makes the assumption that Paul would apply the Jewish Sabbath laws to any day he observed.

That is not true, I never made any such assumption nor claim.

Re 1 Cor - “If Stephen had read the context he would have noticed that this is not the case at all in this passage.”

He then goes on to discuss the idea that these were orders, and that this was therefore not a regular practice. But the orders were to put aside a donation, and nobody is claiming that this was a regular practice.

Wrong again, If one reads the context of the verse it is clear that his orders where to gather at home so Paul could collect the money at a specific moment when he passed through town.

“Like I showed in the post, the Greek shows the true meaning of the place where they gathered, at home!”

He bases his interpretation on the phrases “lay by him” and “in store”. “In store” can in no way be used to differentiate between storage at home or storage at a central location. “Lay by him” might, at first glance, appear to mean at home, but the context doesn't make sense if we assume that interpretation. Such an event could occur on any day, not only the first day of the week. There's some reason why Paul wanted it done on the first day of the week, and there could be no business-related reason for that, since the finances of the time did not work according to a 7-day Jewish week. The only other feasible explanation is a weekly gathering.

This again is Stephen's assumption as assumption can go a long way when you have no evidence to support your claims. The context is clear, Paul giving people specific instructions not to gather and to be at home for him to collect the money upon passing trough the city. I have explained this twice now however its normal for a roman catholic to try

to twist it because they simply cannot accept it, it would contradict their church tradition.

“Since Rome claims Sunday is now the Sabbath ...”

That is an Adventist teaching about the Catholic Church, not a Catholic teaching about Sunday and the Sabbath. There is a big difference between claiming that Sunday is now the Sabbath (the Adventist teaching about Catholicism) and applying the logical principles of setting aside a specific day (of which Sunday is one) for God (the actual Catholic practice.) Catholicism and Adventism agree that Saturday is the Sabbath; they disagree on whether it remains to be observed by Christians. Most Adventist apologists don't realise that, hence the claim that Rome changed the Sabbath.

So according to Stephen the Roman Catholic church never changed the sabbath, hmm strange because I have evidence from Roman Catholic sources that supports the exact opposite.

"Of course the Catholic Church claims that the change (Saturday Sabbath to Sunday) was her act... And the act is a MARK of her ecclesiastical authority in religious things." H.F. Thomas, Chancellor of Cardinal Gibbons.


"Sunday is our MARK of authority. . .the church is above the Bible, and this **transference of Sabbath observance** is proof of that fact" Catholic Record of London, Ontario Sept 1,1923.

"Sunday is a Catholic institution and its claim to observance can be defended only on Catholic principles From beginning to end of Scripture there is not a single passage that warrants the transfer of weekly public worship from the last day of the week to the first." (Catholic Press, Sydney, Australia, August, 1990.)

As you can see people, its not a mere claim, its a FACT!

Rome did change the Sabbath and she claims that act proudly by saying its her MARK, furthermore she claims she needs no authority for she herself assumes authority over the BIBLE to make up whatever bat crazy idea's come to her mind.

Pray for this person people, that he may see the true light soon.

9.  [Stephen Korsman](#) says:
[February 19, 2009 at 8:16 pm](#)

Erol states that Paul “therefore did not keep the 1st day holy.”

He makes the assumption that Paul would apply the Jewish Sabbath laws to any day he observed. That assumption is necessary to arrive at his conclusion, but the assumption has no basis in either the Bible or early Christian practice.

Re 1 Cor - “If Stephen had read the context he would have noticed that this is not the case at all in this passage.”

He then goes on to discuss the idea that these were orders, and that this was therefore not a regular practice. But the orders were to put aside a donation, and nobody is claiming that this was a regular practice.

“We do not claim, scripture does!”

Here we run into problems. The Bible does not make this claim. It is Erol's interpretation of what the Bible says, which has no more authority than my own interpretation.


“Like I showed in the post, the Greek shows the true meaning of the place where they gathered, at home!”

He bases his interpretation on the phrases “lay by him” and “in store”. “In store” can in no way be used to differentiate between storage at home or storage at a central location. “Lay by him” might, at first glance, appear to mean at home, but the context doesn't make sense if we assume that interpretation. Such an event could occur on any day, not only the first day of the week. There's some reason why Paul wanted it done on the first day of the week, and there could be no business-related reason for that, since the finances of the time did not work according to a 7-day Jewish week. The only other feasible explanation is a weekly gathering, which is in keeping with the first-century and second-century historical record of Christians observing the first day of the week.

“Since Rome claims Sunday is now the Sabbath ...”

That is an Adventist teaching about the Catholic Church, not a Catholic teaching about Sunday and the Sabbath. There is a big difference between claiming that Sunday is now the Sabbath (the Adventist teaching about Catholicism) and applying the logical principles of setting aside a specific day (of which Sunday is one) for God (the actual Catholic

practice.) Catholicism and Adventism agree that Saturday is the Sabbath; they disagree on whether it remains to be observed by Christians. Most Adventist apologists don't realise that, hence the claim that Rome changed the Sabb:

10.  *Erol* says:
[February 19, 2009 at 4:06 pm](#)

Here's a quote from the first page in Stephen's reply on acts 20:7

Acts 20:7 refers to a Christian worship service that was held on the first day of the week. According to the text, the service began AFTER the sunset which signaled the start of the first day, so it wasn't even a continuation of a service that began the day before. A look at the grammar of the text in a reliable English translation, and better still, the original Greek, will prove wrong the claims by some Sabbatarian groups that this was a Sabbath service that extended into the next day - the text is explicit that the Christians only gathered for the service AFTER the first day had already begun.

I never claimed this was a sabbath service. It was a gathering of believers on the 1st day. However the point i was making is that Paul traveled on the 1st day, he therefore did not keep the 1st day holy.

In reply to 1 chorinthians 16:1-2 he said and i quote.

1 Cor 16:2 is quite good evidence for regular Sunday observance. It shows that every week - regularly, weekly - on a certain day, the people collected money for mission work done by Paul.

If Stephen had read the context he would have noticed that this is not the case at all in this passage. The context shows that this was an emergency event (famine) and that because of that Paul had to give them ORDERS to do this. "... as I have given orders to the churches of galatia..."(16:1). It was not their regular practise.

The passage does not directly state that there are worship services on the first day of the week, but one can deduce from the context that this had to be so.

Again, assumption is not evidence. He assumes that there where worship services even though the context reveals there where not. ea, people being at home, not gathering together in a place etc. Paul even said it himself, ""that there be no gatherings when I come."".

Sabbatarians often claim that the money was to be collected at home on a weekly basis.

We do not claim, scripture does! Like I showed in the post, the Greek shows the true meaning of the place where they gathered, at home!

in the Bible there are NO prohibitions for CHRISTIANS to collect money on the Sabbath


So he assumes that because there are no specific instructions given to Christians for sabbath keeping that the sabbath rules do not (all) apply to them?

He does this because he knows that Sabbath forbids work and if there is work there is no observance of the Sabbath. Since Rome claims Sunday is now the Sabbath they have to do away with such verses because they expose their lies too easily.

That is the real reason Stephen assumes and claims but shows no scriptural evidence for his claims.

What I hear from Roman Catholics most often is "We can assume, it might, it should, maybe, it must be so etc."

We should not assume, rather we should obey his word, not man's.

11.  *Stephen Korsman* says:
[February 19, 2009 at 7:08 am](#)

Hi

The two verses discussed above are explained at the following links:

<http://www.theotokos.co.za/adventism/acts20.html>
<http://www.theotokos.co.za/adventism/1cor16.html>

I believe they deal with the arguments made above, even though this post is a reply to them.

Stephen

Leave a Reply

Stepher Korsman Name (required)

adventism@theotokos.co.za Mail (will not be published) (required)

http://www.theotokos.co.za Website

You are subscribed to this entry. [Manage your subscriptions.](#)

Vote for us!



Archives

Select Month

Search for:

Tags

[bible](#) [catholic](#) [catholic book](#) [catholic church](#) [christian](#) [heretic](#) [lords day](#) [mary](#) [pope](#) [protestant](#) [sabbath](#)

Powered by [WordPress](#) and [WordPress Theme](#) created with [Artisteer](#).
[Entries \(RSS\)](#) and [Comments \(RSS\)](#).