Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Messiah our passover is sacrificed for us. (1Co 5:7 KJV)

Passover Versus Easter
The Debate Continues
Quartodeciman Controversy
Council of Nicaea

Transcribed and edited from Video
https://www.answersoflife.com/

We have made great progress in the Four Part Presentation series that we’ve been going through and are now on Part Eight.

We have looked at the evolution of the 14th day Passover, the domestic household Passover as it was kept in Egypt some 3500 years ago. We’ve been looking at how it has changed over the years and how the Feast of the Jews encroached upon it in the first century CE. This time we will go beyond the first century to the first three centuries of history and we will see that not only was the controversy about whether the Passover is on the 14th or 15th prevalent. We will see a new controversy arose in the early part of the 2nd century. That had to do with what is called “Easter” today and the honoring of the resurrection on a Sunday during the Holy Day
Season. This particular presentation is going to be about the history of it and how it evolved. The question I ask is Passover the proper day to keep or is it what has become known as Easter?

There was much contention in the early church in the first few centuries. Something developed that was named the Quartodeciman Controversy about the 14th. The word fourteen in Latin is Quarto for four and deciman for ten so it makes the word Quartodeciman Controversy. I have mentioned that previously in this series.

We are also going to examine the Council of Nicaea in 325, sponsored and held by Emperor Constantine. We will look at the agenda of what they actually did and some myths and legions that were a part of that particular council.

We are at the end of our purpose and objectives, all of the eight objectives now will have been examined and this time we will analyze the evolution of Passover to Easter. It really wasn’t named Easter until after the 3rd or 4th century, it just became pasha on Sunday. We will not go into that history; we will just talk about the 14th day that evolved to the Sunday worship in the 2nd and 3rd century churches.
An American legend, Mark Twain, it’s reported that Mark Twain said, “It ain’t what you don’t know that gets you into trouble. It’s what you know for sure that just ain’t so.”

Mark Twain 1835-1910

Early Church History
Geopolitical Struggle
Chaos and Persecution

Starting with the early church in the first century during the time of the early apostles and just after the crucifixion in 30 CE, chaos and persecution started to develop. It was in place in the
early part of the first century during Yahushua’s time but it developed and continued to foment and thrive. Starting with an anchor in Acts 18, it is mentioned just in passing but read the account.

- Emporer Claudius expels Jews from Rome 49 CE

  *After these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth; And found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla; (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome:) and came unto them.*
  
  *(Act 18:1-2 KJV)*

Pricilla and Aquila walked in a more excellent way; they expounded a more perfect way. My wife Linda and I embrace the thought of the more excellent way for us today.

The Jews were ordered out of Rome in these days.

Gentile Believers allowed to remain this is the beginning of the separation

Separation of Jews and gentiles as we see it in the early history of the church

Roman pagan customs prevail - the pagan gods that they worshipped were all around and definitely that was an influence in the early church

Sets stage for gentile church leadership which we will see evolve over a hundred year period.

With that event in mind in 49 CE we will just bump one year ahead to the Council of Jerusalem.

- Jerusalem - original headquarters, Council of Jerusalem - c.50 CE

  *When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, the Judaizers they determined that Paul and Barnabas... should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question.*
  
  *(Act 15:2 KJV)*

Jerusalem is clearly mentioned here as the headquarters location. It was the original headquarters of the early church and this Council of Jerusalem took place in about 50 CE, there is some controversy about the exact date. We see evidence of a group of early believers called the Nazarenes.

- Early Messianist Nazarenes (Ebionites) viewed as Jews c. 55 CE

  *For we have found this man Paul a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes:*  
  
  *(Act 24:5 KJV)*
We have all read this and if you look it up you find the word Nazarenes is mentioned in several places. Of course Yahushua was from Nazareth so that is how this came about. The early Nazarenes were a sect and Paul was accused of being a ring leader of them. We will find the Nazarenes an interesting part of this study in the early history and what happened to them. They were early believers; there is an association with them called the Ebonite’s. If you research this you will see that some lump the Nazarenes and the Ebonite’s together. Some have them somewhat separated, but the Ebonite’s were a group of believers and were likely mostly Jewish because the word Ebion comes from a Hebrew word Ebion which means destitute or beggar.

The historical record of the Ebonite’s is that they were a very poor group. We see evidence of that in Luke 6.

> And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of YHWH. (Luk 6:20 KJV)

In the Matthew 5 account it says blessed by the poor in spirit, but here in Luke it says blessed be you poor, talking about the destitute, beggars and needy.

The Ebonite’s were poor financially, poor in world’s resources group that was alongside and had the same belief system as the Nazarenes. We won’t delve too much further into the Ebonite’s but just to know that they are there. They are in the historical record when you start researching this topic of what was going on in the first century.

We are at 55 CE and will jump ahead to a group of three wars that are significant.

- 1st Jewish - Roman war 66 - 7- CE
  Temple, Jerusalem and surrounding villages destroyed in 70 CE

The first Jewish Roman war was effectively what we know as is the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. That war went on for several years though, it resulted in the Temple and Jerusalem and the surrounding villages being destroyed ultimately in 70 CE. Of course there was an ongoing effort at Masada that went up to about 72 CE where about a thousand Zealot Jews were pushed to the top of Masada and ultimately they all committed suicide with their leader Eleazar so they wouldn’t fall into the hands of the Romans. That was going on at this point in time also and was a big deal after the destruction of the Temple.

- 1M Jewish casualties (Josephus)

In all of this, when you look at it in Josephus, there were over a million Jewish casualties took place. It would be more like a couple of million but it was a huge number of Jewish casualties.
• Vespasian abolished Sanhedrin, prohibited Jewish worship customs

Vespasian and his son Titus Vespasian were in the ruler-ship chair in the Roman Empire at this point in time. They abolished the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, the group of 70 (I think) a group of men that met for the Jewish legal system and there was a calendar court also by the way. It was a smaller group consisting of 10 or 12. The priests were in a calendar court at that time, you see this talked about in the Mishnah and Talmud. In any case, Vespasian abolished all of that and prohibited Jewish worship in any associated customs.

• Anti-Semitism develops
  Nazarenes flee

Obviously, a huge degree of anti-Semitism was developing and the end result is that in 70 CE we are about to see that the Nazarenes fled Jerusalem and the surrounding area. It wasn’t just Jerusalem that was at war with the Romans, it was the entire surrounding area.

• Early Church History - Geopolitical Struggle - Nazarenes Flee

We get our first bit of history from Eusebius. This is Eusebius of Caesarea; I will quote him several times in this presentation. He lived approximately 260 - 340 CE and so he was writing with the view in the rear view mirror. He is also known as Eusebius Pamphili. This is one of the accounts that I will be using and there will be others from his church history. He is a real patriarch of the early church and particularly of the Roman church that became known as the Catholic Church. He has written volumes of historical accounts.

  The people of the Church in Jerusalem likely Nazarenes were commanded by an oracle given by revelation before the war to those in the city who were worthy of it to depart and dwell in one of the cities of Perea which they called Pella Jordan. To it those who believed on Christ traveled from Jerusalem, so that when the royal capital of the Jews and the whole land of Judea the judgement of God might at least overtake them the Jews for all their crimes against Christ and His apostles...

  (Eusebius, Church History 3.5.3)

  Eusebius of Caesarea
  Ca. 260 - 340 CE AKA Eusebius Pamphili
  Legend of Nazarenes escape

Eusebius is saying that the early church in Jerusalem and the believers in Messiah were given an oracle to flee. We get a couple of things out of this, one is that there was a group that fled and they were believers but there were also the Jews that were left behind, they were started to be
considered criminals because they were the ones that were held responsible for the death of Yahushua.

You see that flavor written into the historical record that the early church writers, mostly gentiles, Romans and Greeks always liked to point their finger at the Jews and accuse them of crucifying Yahushua. Of course what they don’t realize is that their fingers that are pointing back at them that they are guilty of Yahushua’s blood and Yahushua gave his blood for all of us not just the Jews at that time.

It’s probably more than just a legend but I’m going to label it the legend of Nazarenes escape. You see it in the historical record, Eusebius mentions it and several others mention it. What’s that all about? It’s about the account in Luke 21. Yahushua is speaking.

\[
\text{And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.}
\]

(Luk 21:20-22 KJV)

Of course we have read Luke 21 and the parallel of it in Matthew 24 and Mark 13 for that matter, and have applied that to today. We expect something like this to happen yet in the future before the return of Messiah. Apparently these Nazarenes knew about the writings of the Gospels, keep in mind this is 70 CE and Matthew, Mark and Luke were written 10 to 20 years before that.

These scriptures that we know of about the desolation and Jerusalem being surrounded by armies were known about, and this oracle that is being talked about here in Eusebius is probably the connection to Luke 21, where the early believers, the Messianic were told by Luke to leave when they saw the armies coming. That is exactly what happened. Titus’ army surrounded the place, there was a breach in the siege, and there were people inside that left and probably they were the Nazarenes. It’s an interesting historical event and you see tracks and traces of it when you do this research.

The other account of this is from Epiphanius of Salamis. He wrote his works called ‘Against Heresies’. He lived fundamentally a little after but contemporary to Eusebius 310 to about 403. There is a question of when he was born, 310 or 320. He was the Bishop of Salamis which is in Cyprus. Again, he’s looking in the rear view mirror.

The Nazarenes do not differ in any essential thing from them (Orthodox Jews), since they practice the customs and doctrines prescribed by Jewish Law; except that they
believe in Christ. They believe in the resurrection of the dead, and that the universe was created by God. They preach that God is One, and that Jesus Christ is His Son. They are very learned in the Hebrew language. They read the Law (the Law of Moshe).... Therefore they differ....from the true Christians because they fulfill until now (such) Jewish rites as the circumcision, Sabbath and others.

*(Epiphanius of Salamis, Against Heresies, Panarion 29.7.pp 41.402)*

You get the drift of this account, again this is fourth century writing and the original Christians, the original believers are thought to be legalists at this point because us “true Christians” don’t have to abide by the Torah and the Law of Moses and the Jewish rites. You see all of this unfold over a little bit of time and by the way, with no credibility in terms of it being done because the scriptures say thus and such. The statements are just made, it’s pretty interesting.

With that interjection we will go on to the second and third Jewish Roman wars.

- **2nd Jewish - Roman war**
  - Kitos war 115 - 117 CE
  - Hatred, reprisal and mutual disdain was fomented in this time between the Romans and the Jews
  - Roman decrees provoked Jews to even greater anger
  - 450K Roman casualties
  - 200K Jewish casualties maybe more depending on the account you read

- **3rd Jewish - Roman war** most significant in terms of the repercussions
  - Simon Bar Kokhba Revolt 132-136 CE
  - Proclaimed to be the Messiah by the Jews, nearly beat the Romans
  - 100K Roman casualties
  - 580K Jewish casualties
  - 50 fortified towns and 950 local villages razed by Hadrian
  - Judean communities depopulated
  - Anti-Semitism is Roman mantra

- **Jerusalem leveled by Hadrian’s army**

A lot has happened here, we are just at 132, a hundred years after the crucifixion and resurrection. This guy Hadrian is a real interesting study all by himself. He was the general in charge of flattening Jerusalem and the whole area. His armies just decimated the area. They tore down what wasn’t torn down from Titus and they made what we know as the Temple Mount a flat surface. That is probably why it’s flat today, or as flat as it is because Hadrian brought in dirt and flattened the area.

- **Renamed the whole city area Aelia Capitolina new city until 638 CE**
  - Hadrian got rid of Jerusalem as its name, he called it Aelia Capitolina, the new city. Actually
he had a family name of Aelia. His family name of a new city, and that lasted until 638 when the Arabs came through and re-took it. Hadrian built a new temple.

- New temple built and dedicated to Jupiter
  All by itself this temple that Hadrian built gives us some clues to where the old Temple really was. There is a huge controversy about where the Temple Mount is, if is it on the Dome of the Rock where the Muslim shrine is or is it someplace different. I’m not going to get into that today.

This temple that Hadrian built there obviously that’s been torn down and the interesting thing about Hadrian is that he built two of these temples. He built the second one in a place called Baalbek in Lebanon and if you search on that on the intranet you will see pictures of it because some parts of it are still standing. A lot of archeology is taking place on that existing one. It turns out that if you put a footprint of the existing Baalbek temple on the Temple Mount it fits precisely.

There was also apparently a statue of Hadrian riding on his horse that would have been about in the place of something called the Al-Aqsa fountain on the Temple Mount today. That’s thought by some, including me, that the Al-Aqsa fountain was the abomination of desolation that Hadrian did. That may well be where the original Temple site was which is close to the Al-Aqsa Mosque.

- New temple was built and dedicated to Jupiter on what used to be the temple mount, and the city was re-named

Jews and Christians, the Christians were seen as just a sect or arm of Judaism, and they were all expelled from Jerusalem until the edict of Toleration in 311 CE which by the way was Constantine’s work. Constantine tried to re-unite the area, his kingdom basically, the empire there and in 311 Constantine said that anybody could go back to Jerusalem.

All things “Jewish” were condemned and illegal
This included the Sabbath, holy days, circumcision
The early Messianic were viewed as a branch of Judaism

**Early Church History - Geopolitical Struggle - Nazarenes Apostatize**

Another account in Eusebius about this time, he writes about the third Jewish Roman war.

And thus, when the city had been emptied of the Jewish nation and had suffered the total destruction if its ancient inhabitants, it was colonized by a different race, and the Roman city which subsequently arose changed its name and was called Aelia, in honor of the emperor Aelius Adrian. And as the Church there was now composed of Gentiles,
the first one to assume the government of it after the bishops of the circumcision was Marcus.


The bishops of the circumcision were the original leaders that were there, likely including the Nazarenes. But there is a new guy now because everybody else has been kicked out. So long as you aren’t part of anything Jewish, you could come along and that is what happened. This guy Marcus came along and became the new leader.

Marcus abandoned apostolic traditions for Roman compliance. Effectively what we are going to see are the Nazarenes apostatize.

Out of a book “Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire” by Gibbon.

The Nazarenes had only one way left to escape the common proscription prohibition of Mosaic law, and the force of the truth was on this occasion assisted by the influence of temporal advantages. They elected Marcus for their bishop, a prelate ecclesiastical dignitary of the race of the Gentiles, and most probably a native either of Italy or of some of the Latin provinces. At his persuasion the most considerable part of the congregation renounced the Mosaic law, in the practice of which they had persevered above a century. By this sacrifice of their habits and prejudices they purchased a free admission into the colony of Hadrian.

*(Gibbon E. Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Volume 1, Chapter XV, Section 1.ca. 1776-1788)*

See what this says? The Nazarenes that were there in the area elected Marcus for their bishop. They got to return by abandoning their Mosaic Law and heritage. They have a new leader now which is a Gentile. It’s astounding to me, I didn’t know anything about the Nazarenes other than to know they were true believers but it looks like they were true believers, they had to flee, but things got pretty tough for them. A new leader came along that convinced them to forsake their old ways.

**Early Church History**

**Passover Date Controversy Develops**

Epiphanius weighs in on this, was another basically fourth century; we’ll call him an early church father, or leader.

The controversy arose regarding Quartodeciman Passover after the exodus of the bishops of the circumcision (135 CE) and it has continued until our time.... the original Bishops prior to Marcus say you shall not change the calculation of time, but you shall celebrate it at the same time
as your brethren who came out from the circumcision of the Jews. With them observe the Passover.

(*Epiphanius, Adversus haereses pg 42, 357-358*)

Epiphanius of Salamis 310 - 403 CE

Based on document known as Apostolic Constitutions

Reference to fifteen Apostolic bishop administrators of Church of Jerusalem until 135 CE

Practiced Quartodeciman Passover

The exodus of the bishops were the original leaders in Jerusalem. Remember that he wrote this in 400 CE, I would submit it has continued beyond to our time. This Passover controversy of the date starts to develop here. You see that for some reason there was a controversy about when to keep the Passover. It is talking about the 14th, the 14th versus what? Well, the historical records show that what developed was that it was either the 14th or the Sunday following it, which became known as Easter to us today.

This reference in Epiphanius is a reference to the original fifteen apostolic bishop’s administrators of the Church of Jerusalem until 135 CE and they practiced the Quartodeciman Passover, the 14th Passover.

Look what it says in Acts though, this is amazing:

> For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you. Paul is speaking, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse distorted things, to draw away disciples after them. (Act 20:29-30 KJV)

What a prophetic word here in Acts 20 that is being stated here and sure enough that did happen. As a side-note, if this subject interests anyone, there is a good book by Samuele Bacchiocchi and he was a Seventh Day Adventist, he died in 2008 or 2010. He wrote a book called Sabbath to Sunday and is full of historical meat including records and quotes from his research. In any case, it’s available as a pdf file from this url:

www.anym.org/pdf/from_Sabbath_to_Sunday_samuele_bacchiocchi.pdf

You can search through it, it’s pretty lengthy but it’s a real eye opening account of what was transpiring in the early days of the church.

**Two Groups Emerge**

**East West Doctrinal Rivalry**

- Western Bishops
- Rome and Alexandria included Jerusalem
• Allegorical apologetics
• Greek and Roman leadership
• Political alignment to Rome
  Note not same as East - West Schism in 1054 CE
  Split between Catholic Church and Eastern Orthodox Churches
• Eastern Bishops
• Asia Minor
• Literal Apologetics
• Jews and Gentiles
• Spiritual outcasts
  Labeled as Jews
  Kept Sabbath, Holy Days and 14th Passover

From all of this an East West rivalry was established and became in play. It was a doctrinal rivalry, and I am going to label it East - West, it was two groups that emerged. Fundamentally the two groups could be thought of as East and West. The Western Bishops included Rome and Alexandria. That is where most of this new thinking started to come from that started to replace the 14th Passover.

However, it included Jerusalem; you see what happened in Jerusalem as I have put all of the history of the early days of Jerusalem in here so that you could see that Jerusalem, as a result of Jewish Roman wars got side-tracked for a long period of time. That is why I am including Jerusalem in the Western Group.

What became evident when the Western groups’ apologetics was allegorical in nature, they made the scriptures into allegories. Many of the early teachers went that direction. The teachers were mostly gentile, Roman and Greek and the leadership followed that.

They also had a political alignment with Rome. Obviously they wanted to get along with the Roman Empire, the big gorilla in the room. This is not the same as the East-West schism that occurred in the 1054 CE timeframe so if you look you will see that the Roman Catholic Church that had evolved out of all of this that we are talking about had an east/west split also. That was a split between what was then known as the Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Churches. That is what remains to this day.
This original Western split versus Eastern Bishops rivalry that I’m talking about morphed into the early Catholic Church which absorbed effectively as a little bit of time went along. In contrast to the western group, the eastern group of bishops was largely in Asia Minor. Most of the accounts that you read about what was going on talk about being from Asia or sometimes they will mention one of the locations in Asia like Smyrna or Laodicea and so forth.

It’s not only, but largely these Asian churches that are outlined in some amount of detail interestingly enough. There is a report card given on each of these Seven Churches in Revelation chapter 2 and 3. It says what they did well and what they didn’t do well, what their reward was going to be and what their penalty was going to be, an A B C through F marking on how they are doing, if you will.

The Eastern bishops had a strong sense of literal apologetics. They read the scriptures for what they say as we do. We read the scriptures for what they say; we don’t try to make an allegory out of them or a parable out of all of the scriptures, we take the word as literal. Obviously there are things that are allegorical but the body of everything is mostly literal.

The Eastern bishops were made up of Jews and Gentiles, you didn’t see if any, Jews in the Western bishop group. They were all Gentiles. The Eastern group was small and considered spiritual outcasts. They were labeled as Jews even though they weren’t, they were labeled because they kept the seventh day Sabbath, the Holy Days, and the Fourteenth Passover which is what we are examining and what happened to it. With that in mind, Jude spoke of the early
days of this and wrote his one chapter somewhere around 70 to 90 CE, I don’t know if it is absolutely clear but the best scholarship puts it in that range.

\[
\text{Jude, the servant of Yahushua, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by YHWH the Father, and preserved in Yahushua Messiah, and called: Mercy unto you, and peace, and love, be multiplied. Beloved, when I gave all diligence} \quad \text{G4710=speed, earnestness to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful \text{G1864=implied distress} \quad \text{for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. (Jud 1:1-3 KJV)}
\]

Most of us have read this scripture and understood it, but when you take a look at some of the Greek that is under the covers, there is urgency, speed and earnestness that is associated with Jude’s writing. “\text{When I gave all diligence}”, he’s talking about speed and earnest. He was eager and needed to write “\text{to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful}”, the word needful implies distress. “\text{It was needful for me to write unto you,}” Stuff was going on, but of course the big thing that had just happened was that the Temple had been torn down. Jews were becoming an outcast so Jude is writing about what was developing in the Believer’s community at this point in time. He probably knew about the Nazarenes and what had happened to them.

Passover Calendar Debate Develops

- Easter alternative introduced to early church ca. 120 CE
  Western Apostolic tradition - no scripture

- The passion or the resurrection?

- Quartodeciman controversy develops
  Believers in Messiah from Asia Minor versus Greek/Roman Bishops from Rome
  14\textsuperscript{th} of Nisan vs. Easter Sunday
  Anti-Semitic prejudice
  Allegorical reasoning
  No scriptural basis

You saw some of the early indications of the Passover calendar. This is a summary account that is in the Catholic Encyclopedia and several other historical accounts that show us what happened.

\text{Catholic Encyclopedia Summary} A letter of St. Irenaeus is among the extracts just referred to, and this shows that the diversity of practice regarding Easter had existed at least from the time of Pope Sixtus (c. 120 CE). Further, Irenaeus states that St. Polycarp \text{lived 69-155 CE},
who like the other Asiatics, kept Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, whatever day of the week that might be, following therein the tradition which he claimed to have derived from St. John the Apostle, came to Rome c. 150 CE about this very question, but could not be persuaded by Pope Anicetus to relinquish his Quartodeciman observance. Nevertheless he was not debarred from communion with the Roman Church.

St Irenaeus, while condemning the Quartodeciman practice, nevertheless reproaches Pope Victor (c. 189 CE) with having excommunicated the Asiatics too precipitately and with not having followed the moderation of his predecessors....

You see that the Catholics have translated Pasha to Easter even though it is referring to the fourteenth day. You just have to get through all of that. What you see is Pope Victor had a heavy hand but his predecessors did not regarding keeping the fourteenth versus the Sunday which became the day of the resurrection or Easter.

Also what you see through all of this is that the Western apostolic tradition that has developed has no scriptural basis. This is just what happened and what people started to do.

The Quartodeciman controversy develops, Believers in the Messiah from Asia Minor versus the Greek/Roman bishops in Rome. You should see this from the account we have just read. It is all about the fourteenth of Nisan versus Easter Sunday as it has become named. You will see a huge anti-Semitic prejudice that will develop and it develops from the background of these wars that I talked about and the Roman hatred of the Jews and how despicable they were and so forth. They also had the Gentile view that went along with that. The allegorical reasoning of course that goes along with the interpretation of the scriptures, but you don’t find much, if any scriptural basis for these changes, it’s just what happened.

The end of this little summary that I pulled out of the Catholic Encyclopedia says:

The question thus debated was therefore primarily whether Easter was to be kept on a Sunday, or whether Christians should observe the Holy Day of the Jews, the fourteenth of Nisan, which might occur on any day of the week. Those who kept Easter with the Jews were called Quartodecimans or terountes (observants).


Notice that it says “Holy Days of the Jews” not the Holy Days of YHWH. This all boils down to something you will see through the rest of this presentation, at least this first half or so, about the passion versus the resurrection. The passion, is keeping the Passover on the fourteenth, Yahushua’s passion day, when he died, or the resurrection day when he rose.
What did Paul have to say about this?

*Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Messiah our passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.*

(*1Co 5:7-8 KJV*)

Paul doesn’t say anything about the resurrection; he’s talking about Messiah being sacrificed for us. Fundamentally Paul is encouraging a lot of Gentile Corinthians to keep the fourteenth day Passover. There wasn’t a thought to Paul that this would ever be changed to Sunday, he probably didn’t have any inclination about that. Paul is telling the Corinthians to keep the Days of Unleavened bread and the Passover.

**Passover Calendar Debate Develops** - Contention I the Early Church

- Meeting between Polycarp (Smyrna bishop) and Anicetus, (Rome bishop) in ca. - 155 CE
  Polycarp disciple of John

- The passion or the resurrection?
  Passover or Easter
  What did John say?

The next account has to do with Polycarp and Anicetus. This account is around 155 CE. You see we are moving forward into the middle part of the second century now.

*And when the blessed Polycarp was sojourning in Rome in the time of Anicetus, although a slight controversy had arisen among them as to certain other points... For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp to forego the observance (in his own way), inasmuch as these things had been always observed by John the disciple of our Lord, and by other apostles with whom he had been conversant; nor, on the other hand, could Polycarp succeed in persuading Anicetus to keep (the observance in his way), for he maintained that he was bound to adhere to the usage of the presbyters who preceded him. And in this state of affairs they held fellowship with each other; and Anicetus conceded to Polycarp in the Church the celebration of the Eucharist, by way of showing him respect.*

(*Fragments From The Lost Writings of Irenaeus, Translated by Roberts and Donaldson. Excerpts Volume 1 of the Ante-Nicene Fathers; American Edition copyright ©1885 and © 1997 by New Advent, Inc.*)
Polycarp went to Rome, he was from Smyrna in Asia Minor located on the map on page 13. Polycarp and Anicetus just agreed to disagree and walked away from each other. The other accounts that you read about this show that they wanted to maintain the unity in the church at this point in time on a topic that had ultimately become completely divisive and developed into an order from Constantine at the Council of Nicaea.

The question is; is it the passion on the fourteenth, or the resurrection? You see that Polycarp was the fourteenth guy about the passion and Anicetus was the resurrection guy about Sunday. What did John say (what are the scriptures showing us that might give us some inclination as to which side of this argument should we be on)?

But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Yahushua Messiah his Son cleanseth us from all sin not the resurrection.
(1Jn 1:7 KJV)

I added “not the resurrection” of course, but Yahushua’s blood cleanses us from all sin. Those that honor his resurrection, honor it because they say it’s the hope that we have. I understand that, and it’s actually a good argument but the scriptures don’t say to honor the resurrection, they all say to honor Yahushua for what he did, which was on the Passover on the 14th.

Polycarp was a student of John so do you think Polycarp started doing the 14th on his own, or do you think John taught him that? John’s practice would have been to keep the 14th and that is what Polycarp would have continued on with the tradition. It’s interesting to note that because some of the Fifteeners like to take the account of John’s gospel and try to make it into a fifteenth Passover. We have gone through that in the presentation called “The Feast of the Jews”.

John kept the fourteenth Passover as did Polycarp, Polycarp didn’t change what John did, Polycarp amplified and continued it.

Passover Calendar Debate Develops
Contention in The Early Church

- Servilius Paulus - Likey Sergius Paulus 168 CE
- Melito of Sardis (Asia Minor) ca. 180 CE
  Favored 14th Passover
  New moon calendar inconsistency
  Proper season - after spring equinox insinuated
- The passion or the resurrection?
  Passover or Easter
• Apollinaris AKA Claudius of Hierapolis (Turkey) ca. 175 CE - favored 14th
  Famous for his polemical treatises
  Apollinaris wrote pro 14th Passover and against Fifteeners
  Remaining fragment from Apollinaris

• The passion or the resurrection?
  Passover or Easter
  What did Matthew say?

The next account that comes along is from the writings of Melito. I have only included a little snippet because there isn’t a lot about Melito but he wrote about a controversy in Laodicea. It’s interesting that it is in Laodicea and it took place around 168 or so CE. Again Melito is from Asia Minor and he favored the 14th Passover. One of the problems that was starting to develop that needs to be remembered is that the new moon calendar became inconsistent.

What we know in this period of time is dating back to the first century. The Calendar Court in Jerusalem made the determination when the new moon was observed, and when the beginning of the month was. They also made the determination of when the beginning of the first month and when the Passover and Days of Unleavened Bread were. Of course that was torn out by Titus and further torn out by Hadrian.

The new moon observation started to become problematic for anyone who wanted to keep the Biblical calendar, for the Jews particularly. There wasn’t a Calendar Court to make the decisions, plus there wasn’t a Jerusalem observation point to make it from. The calendar became a problem and started to fall into debate itself of when the new moon was seen whether it was cloudy, or clear. People in the Roman Empire could see the first crescent on different days because of where they were geographically. They didn’t have the internet to communicate with one another so they had a consistency. It became an inconsistency about when the beginning of a month occurred and associated with that was the beginning of the Holy Day season in the spring time having to do with Passover.

There also became a controversy about the spring equinox such as, if the new moon be counted as the first month of Nisan or Abib if it occurs before the equinox or after. That controversy is in the mix of all of this; it isn’t our purpose to go into that but just to know that there were problems with the calendar in this period of time which is referenced in this writing of Melito. By the way, this is Sergius Paulus, there doesn’t seem to be a guy named Servilius. Sergius seems to be the right guy in this account.

Melito and Laodicea controversy

When Servilius Paulus was proconsul of Asia, at the time that Sagaris suffered martyrdom, there arose a great controversy at Laodicea concerning the
time of the celebration of the Passover, Which on that occasion had happened to fall at the proper season. (Melito - Translation by Roberts and Donaldson, On the Passover. Copyright © 2001 Peter Kirby)
http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/melito.html

What you find when you look into this, the discussion about what the proper season was, one of the comments that Constantine made was that sometimes the Jews were keeping two Passovers in a year. The reason that happened is because there was early barley. There was an early declaration that the new moon for Nisan occurred before the equinox which put it in the previous year so two Passovers occurred in the same twelve month period. That controversy is here on the table and that is what is going on here in Laodicea, the time of the celebration of Passover in addition to not only what day the new moon should be counted from. What day of the week should it be on, the 14th day of the new moon we are talking about? Or should it be the Sunday after that?

The controversy gets mixed in with several other problems, of course these were all problems of the day and again, John wrote a little bit about this through Yahushua giving him the words in Revelation 3. It’s about the account of Laodicea itself and what was going on there. It would have been around 95 CE so maybe 45 years later. Did Laodicea improve its spiritual foundation or did it continue to be lukewarm? Probably it continued to be lukewarm which part of this controversy is.

And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write... I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. (Rev 3:14-16 KJV)

The Laodicean’s were probably easily moved to new doctrines and new arguments because they were not hot or cold. They weren’t abiding by the faith that was once delivered.

We have an account of Apollinaris who was famous in his writings. He is also known as Claudius of Hierapolis which is in Turkey in Asia Minor. He wrote around 175 CE and was a Quartodeciman. He is famous for his polemical treatises against the heretics of his day writing about controversy, and the fourteenth Passover and the Fifteeners. There was a fragment from Apollinaris that is available today.

There are, then, some who through ignorance raise disputes about these things (though their conduct is pardonable: for ignorance is no subject for blame, it rather needs further instruction), and say that on the fourteenth day the Lord ate the lamb with the disciples, and that on the great day of the feast of unleavened bread He Himself suffered: and they quote Matthew as speaking in accordance with
their view. Wherefore their opinion is contrary to the law, and the Gospels seem to be at variance with them.....

The account in Matthew says:

*Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Yahushua, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?* (Mat 26:17 KJV)

Take a look at that closer. The Fifteeners which continued through this period of time and are being mentioned here, use this scripture to say that the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread the disciples came to him and asked him where they were going to eat. They are saying this is the First Day of Unleavened Bread and the next day they are saying the fifteenth and what Apollinaris is calling them out on this and quoting Matthew to try to make their point. When you look at what Matthew says, at least the Authorized Version that we generally use, maybe some of this has been corrected in some of the other versions. With the Authorized Version today, now maybe some of this has been corrected in some of the other versions. The Authorized Version says:

*Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Yahushua, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?* (Mat 26:17 KJV)

To properly repeat this it would be:

*Now the first of the unleavened bread the disciples came to Yahushua*

The “day” and “feast of” aren’t really in the translation so I’m not sure if Apollinaris knew that but he was calling out to people that were trying to make the point that Matthew is used as a bases of some of the Fifteener beliefs.

The account goes on to say:

...The fourteenth day, the true Passover of our Lord; the great sacrifice, the Son of God instead of the lamb, who was bound, who bound the strong, and who was judged, though Judge of living and dead, and who was delivered into the hands of sinners to be crucified, who was lifted up on the horns of the unicorn, and who was pierced in His holy side, who poured forth from His side the two purifying elements, *water and blood, word and spirit*, and who was buried on the day of the Passover, the stone being placed upon the tomb.
I think it’s interesting that Apollinaris said this; he must have known what John said in I John. This scripture is known to have been corrupted, not at this point in time, but in the 15th century.

_This is he that came by water and blood, even Yahushua Messiah; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness_, (1Jn 5:6)

Verse 7 is an addition that you find in the transcripts dating to the 15th century.

_(The next verse): because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one._ (1Jn 5:7 KJV)

That is an addition that you find in the transcripts dating to the 15th century. The earlier transcripts of this didn’t have the words that became known as “the trinity”. But Apollinaris knew about the water and the blood and the word and the spirit because 1 John 5:6 shows us that.

It is the water and the blood and the spirit that bears, so the spirit is the word. Apollinaris knew this and it’s interesting to pull it out of his writing.

The account of Pope Victor that I mentioned is in this account in Eusebius’s writing.

**Passover Calendar Debate Develops - Contention in The Early Church**

- Pope Victor I - Bishop of Rome 189 - 199 CE  
  Intolerant of Quartodecimans  
  Severed relation with Asia Minor

- Eusebius of Caesarea - AKA Eusebius of Pamphili  
  ca. 260 - 340 CE  
  Bible polemicist, historian, scholar

- The Passion of the resurrection?  
  Passover or Easter  
  What did Paul say?  
  Western Apostolic custom and mystery  
  No scripture
• Heated controversy - Polycrates (Ephesus) and Victor (Rome) c 195 CE

What did YHWH say?
What did the gospel of Mark say?

Pope Victor is severely intolerant of Quartodeciman and he severed relations with the Asia Minor group. This is what Eusebius wrote:

Pope Victor
A question of no small importance arose at that time (the time of Pope Victor c. 190 CE) The dioceses of all Asia, as from an older tradition held that the fourteenth day of the moon, on which day the Jews were commanded to sacrifice the lamb, should always be observed as the feast of the life-giving pasch, contending that the fast ought to end on that day, whatever day of the week it might happen to be. However it was not the custom of the churches in the rest of the world west Roman Church to end it as this point, as the observed the practice, which from Apostolic tradition has prevailed to the present time, of termination the fast on no other day that on that of the Resurrection of our Savior Sunday. Synods & assemblies of bishops were held on this account, and all with one consent through mutual correspondence drew up and ecclesiastical decree that the mystery of the Resurrection of the Lord should be celebrated on no other day but Sunday & that we should observe the close of the paschal fast on that day only.

(Eusebius - Church History V.23)

Here is something else that gets thrown into the mix. When it says: “contending that the fast ought to end on that day,” They were fasting and the fast day ended on Passover depending upon which Passover day you were keeping whether it was the 14th Passover or a Sunday Passover. This fast day gets thrown into the mix here on top of the calendar. Keep that in mind.

You see the argument now gets thrown out on the table; people were fasting and because the people that kept the 14th ended their fast too early for the people that kept Sunday. The people that kept Sunday didn’t like that the Fourteeners were fasting and stopping before the Sunday people were done with their fast. Notice also that it is the “apostolic tradition” of the west and there isn’t a scripture mentioned of why we should do this. It’s about the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord in this account.

Again, we are asking this question. Is it the passion or the Resurrection? Is it Passover or what the resurrection became known as Easter? What did Paul say?

_in whim we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; (Eph 1:7 KJV)_
The Western Apostolic custom was a mystery but they didn’t have a scripture that backed it up in any of these accounts that you see. Eusebius weighs on this again because Polycrates who followed Polycarp weighed in and wrote a letter to Victor of Rome.

From Eusebius - Polycrates letter to Victor of Rome

**We observe the exact day;** neither adding, nor taking away. For in Asia also great lights have fallen asleep, which shall rise again on the day of the Lord’s coming, when he shall come with glory from heaven, and shall seek out all the saints. Among these are Philip, one of the twelve apostles, who fell asleep in Hierapolis; and his two aged virgin daughters, and another daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and now rests at Ephesus; and moreover, John, who was both a witness and a teacher, who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord, and, **being a priest, wore the sacerdotal plate,** he fell asleep at Ephesus. And Polycarp in Smyrna, who was a bishop and martyr; and Thraseas, bishop and martyr from Eumenia, who fell asleep in Smyrna....

I’d like to do a little investigation on the sacerdotal plate, I haven’t yet but I have never seen this before, that John wore a sacerdotal plate. I’m not sure what that refers to. It might be something here that John did that we don’t know about other than through this account.

Polycrates is talking about keeping the feast as they were originally given in Leviticus 23 that YHWH gave them.

What did YHWH say?

> These are the feasts of YHWH, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons. In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is YHWH’s passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto YHWH: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. (Lev 23:4-6 KJV)

Here is the foundation that Polycrates was referring to. Polycrates goes on to say:

...Why need I mention the bishop and the martyr Sagaris who fell asleep in Laodicea, or the blessed Papirius, or Melito, the Eunuch who lived altogether in the Holy Spirit, and who lies in Sardis, awaiting the episcopate from heaven, when he shall rise from the dead? All these observed the fourteenth day of the Passover according to the Gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith. And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, do according to the tradition of my relatives, some of whom I have closely followed. For seven of my relatives were bishops; and I am the eighth. And my relatives always observed the day when the people put away the leaven. I therefore, brethren, who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord, and have met with the brethren throughout
the world, and have gone through every Holy Scripture, and am not affrighted by terrifying words.....

We will finish this account on the next page.

What did the gospel of Mark say?

*After two days was the feast of added the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death. And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover?* (Mar 14:1, 12 KJV)

It should be just: *After two days was the Passover, the feast was added.* We have gone through these scriptures and how they harmonize in detail in the last presentation. This is one of the gospel accounts that Polycrates is mentioning and what they are abiding to.

It goes on in this account to finish it.

- For those greater than I have said ‘We ought to obey God rather than man’... I could mention the bishops who were present, whom I summoned at your desire talking to Victor; whose names, should I write them, would constitute a great multitude. And they, beholding my littleness, gave their consent to the letter, knowing that I did not bear my gray hairs in vain, but had always governed my life by the Lord Jesus...

Eusebius continues with commentary:

Thereupon Victor, who presided over the church at Rome, immediately attempted to cut off from the common unity the parishes of all Asia, with the churches that agreed with them, as heterodox not conforming with accepted or orthodox standards or beliefs; and he wrote letters and declared all the brethren there wholly excommunicated.

(Eusebius, The History of the Church, Book V Chapter XXIV, Verses 2-7, Translated by Cushman McGiffert, Published Stilwell (KS), 2005.p.114)

That is the story of Victor and Polycrates’ letter to him.

What do we have? That is the argument the passion or the resurrection? Passover or Easter?

What did Paul say?

*For I have received of the Master that which also I delivered unto you, That the Master Yahushua the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had*
supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. (1Co 11:23-25 KJV)

What else did Paul say?

For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Master's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Master, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Master. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. (1Co 11:26-28 KJV)

Paul is pretty clear about what we ought to be doing. He is telling the Corinthians in no uncertain terms and in clarity of word to keep the Passover, and keep it on the same day that Yahushua did. Those are the symbols and that is what we are to do today.

Quartodeciman Controversy - Means 14th

- Dispute develops
  Original believers of Asia Minor (east) - Passover celebrated on the fourteenth of Nisan versus
  Roman church (west) - Sunday is the resurrection festival without regard to Jewish chronology
    3 Jewish Roman wars - prejudice developed
    Titus Vespasian 66-73 CE. Keto’s war 115-117 CE (Lucius Quietus). Hadrian 132-136 CE

- Asia Minor (east) disciples held to apostles John and Philip
  14th of Nisan was Yahushua’s last paschal supper without regard for a fixed day of the week.
    Voluntary fast ended on the 14th

- Roman church (west) honored death of Messiah on Friday and the Resurrection on Sunday.
  Resurrection followed on Sunday after first full moon after vernal equinox.
  Voluntary fast ended on Sunday

- Lack of uniformity developed in great scandal
  Emphasis on Messiah’s death versus
  Emphasis on Messiah’s resurrection
  Eucharist - AKA Holy Communion of Yahushua’s Last Supper
    Ceremony commemorating the Last Supper
    Bread and wine are consecrated and consumed
With the historical record, the Quartodeciman controversy dispute develops all throughout the original believers in Asia which is the East versus the Roman Church. The Eastern Asia Minor group kept the Passover on the 14th day of Nisan or Abib as it would be in the Hebrew, versus the Roman Church that proclaimed Sunday as the resurrection festival without regard to Jewish chronology.

Lots of impact of this and I am sure there are other events, but three Jewish Roman wars were a major influence. The prejudice just ballooned and exploded and developed as a result, both the Jews to the Romans and the Romans to the Jews. With Titus Vespasian taking down Jerusalem and the Temple, Keto’s war and Hadrian in 132 - 136 were all the major players involved in this. Obviously there were major repercussions from these wars.

The Asia Minor group, the East disciples, held to the apostles of John and Philip. The 14th of Nisan was Yahushua’s last Passover supper without regard to a fixed day of the week. They had this voluntary fast, keep in mind, that was going on. There wasn’t scriptural evidence that I see that associates a fast with Passover, but this voluntary fast that they had went on to the 14th.

In contrast to the Roman church in the west that honored the death of Messiah on Friday and the resurrection on Sunday, but the resurrection was followed on Sunday after the first full moon after the vernal equinox. That is ultimately how it got observed, but also the voluntary fast that was originally mentioned associated with the 14th was extended to Sunday. That argument became part of the debate.

There was a lack of major uniformity that developed into a great scandal. A lot of people were martyred as a result of it. They wouldn’t bend to any of these proclamations from the Western bishops. The emphasis was on the Messiah’s death versus Messiah’s resurrection.

The Eucharist somewhat developed out of this, the communion that mainstream Christians use today versus Yahushua’s Last Supper which was the Passover. Some people use the Eucharist or the ceremony commemorating the Last Supper to honor that. They do it any day of the week or any Sunday but the bread and the wine are consecrated and consumed as a result of what Yahushua said on his Passover supper. This all developed and is well known the historical records.

Council of Nicaea - 325 CE - AKA - 1st Ecumenical Council

- 300 + Bishops assemble in Iznik (Nicaea) Turkey - 2.4 months
  - No Asia Minor Bishops
  - Convened by Roman Emperor Constantine I
• Agenda
  1. Determine nature of Yahushua and His relationship to the Father
     Arius versus Athanasius doctrine (both from Alexandria Egypt)
     Terminology - homoousios (Greek) = hypostasis
  2. Establish uniform date for Easter - settle fasting issue
  3. Resolution of Meletian schism (break away sect in Lycopolis Egypt)
  4. Authorization of 20 church canons for Priestly duties and administration
  5. Legends

• Major accomplishments - by Imperial Decree
  Construct Nicaean Creed
  Easter date independent of new moon calendar - no scriptural authority
  Domestic household Passover replaced by Easter - no scriptural authority

• Accepted by - Eastern Assyrian Church, Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental
  Orthodox, most Protestants

Next council meeting - First Council of Constantinople

The Council of Nicaea is also known as the first Ecumenical Council in 325 BCE. There were over
three hundred bishops that assembled in Iznik Turkey and was nearly two and a half month
study session. What is interesting is that there seems to be no record of any of the bishops
from Asia Minor. They didn’t have any representation but was fundamentally only the western
bishops.

It was convened by Roman Emperor Constantine, who had good intentions. He wanted to bring
the empire into unity and he saw this great spiritual battle that was going on between the east
and west that had to do with the resurrection of Messiah versus the death. He wanted to bring
that to conclusion and have commonality of worship. He thought it would be better for the
empire to do that so that was his motivation.

The agenda of the meeting is reasonably well documented; the first item on the agenda was to
determine the nature of Yahushua and his relationship to the Father. This has to do with a
couple of guys, Arius and Athanasius. Arius had the view that Yahushua was created because
he was the Son and was born. Arius tried to convince everyone and that Yahushua was a
created Son and that he didn’t always exist.

Athanasius on the other hand disagreed with that but as well Athanasius bought into and tried
to proclaim that there was a third party to the divinity called the Spirit. Both of these guys were
from Alexandria, the terminology that you see in the Greek is homoousios, and it means what is
the nature of things. We would say hypostasis in English. What would be the hypostasis of the
divinity? What is it made up of? What does it consist of? Homoousios in the Greek, that was the first agenda items that they set out to solve and they largely did.

The second item was to establish a uniform date for Easter and settle the fasting issue. Obviously they did that which was the focus of this presentation.

The third item was to resolve this Meletian schism which was a breakaway group sect in Egypt. They solved that issue as well and in addition there were something like twenty church laws that they wanted to canonize. This would be about canonizing and the administration of the priests and bishops. That was also solved.

There are legends associated with the Council of Nicaea. I get a chuckle out of some of them and I have heard a couple of them just recently on a phone call with a person. Some of the legends are what people believe. Just as “It’s not what I don’t know that concerns me, it’s what I know to be true that just ain’t so”. Here are some things that just ain’t so:

- Constantine decided which books were scripture and which ones were burned. You don’t find any traction for any of these in the historical record of this council of Nicaea.

- The council separated divinely inspired writings from those of questionable origin

- Constantine decided the names God and Jesus some say JeZeus from a list of 50 names

Some say that Jesus came from JeZeus, and oftentimes say that this is what Constantine did from a list of 50 names and JeZeus came from this Council of Nicaea. There is no credibility that this really happened. What you usually find about any of these legends, some are pretty amazing but what you find is that Person A states it as fact, and when you research it, because Person A said it Person B says who they got it from. You go from the first person to the second person to the third person to the fourth person and they reference each other. You get this circular doctrinal argument.

Whenever I’ve gone to look at these kinds of issues, it ends up what you find. You think that fake news is just for today? You can go back a long way and find that fake news was being applied to some of these things. From today and backwards, and some of the accounts are spurious.

- Constantine had 300 versions of the Bible burnt

- The raising of Lazarus was removed from Mark on the instructions of the Council. I like this one.

- The Roman Catholic Church created the canon of Christian scripture at the Council of Nicaea
These are all fabricated and certainly have no traction or depth when you go look. Did any of them happen? I don’t think so, but that is why I labeled them legends.

The major accomplishment from this council was by imperial decree and it was the construction of the Nicaean Creed. Easter date proclamation was independent of the new moon calendar. By no scriptural authority, it was just declared.

The domestic household Passover that we have talked so much about has now been replaced by what became Easter. They still called it Passover in this early date but it wasn’t too long after that it started to be called Easter. Of course there is no scriptural authority for any of this; however, the Council of Nicaea is widely accepted by the Eastern Assyrian Church, the Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox and most Protestants to this day.

We find a follow-up session to this original Council of Nicaea which is the First Council of Constantinople, another location in Turkey some 50 years or so later. I didn’t include yet a third modification to it which is called the Athanasian Creed which is lengthier than either of these but these were the foundation for that too. What you see in each evolution of this creed that came out, each evolution of it got a little more detailed and specific over the years, particularly to the trinity and the Catholic Church.

**First Council of Nicaea (325 CE)**

**Emperor Constantine**

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things Visible and indivisible

And in one Lord Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father the only-begotten; that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father. The homoousios foundation and the argument of Arius that is being written against.

By whom all things were made both in heaven and on earth

Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate and was made man;

He suffered, and the third day he rose again, ascended into heaven;

From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead

And in the Holy Ghost Keep in mind how this started “We believe in all these things”: (This is the conclusion of it, just to make sure that Arius was going to shut up, he was exiled back to his home land and was excommunicated from ‘the group’, or ‘the church’)
But those who say: ‘There was a time when he was not’ and ‘He was not before he was made’ and ‘He was made out of nothing’ or ‘He is of another substance’ or ‘essence’ or ‘The Son of God is created’, or ‘changeable’ or ‘alterable’ --They are condemned by the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church

They didn’t like what Arius had to say. What you see in the next version of this in Constantinople was an expansion in a couple of areas. One is, originally we believed in the Holy Ghost. Now what you see in the next version of this in Constantinople was an expansion in a couple of areas. One is that “we believe in the Holy Ghost”, now look what it says, “And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, who spake by the prophets.”

**First Council of Constantinople (381 CE)**

**Emperor Theodosius I**

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible

And in one Lord Christ, the only begotten of the Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father

By whom all things were made;

Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary & was made man;

He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures & ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father

From thence he shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead

Whose kingdom shall have no end

**And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, who spake by the prophets.**

In one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; we look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen

We start to get the combination of the trinity being talked about here and the Holy Ghost is a part of that trinity statement. Of course, when you study the trinity you see its evolution starting in about the second century CE. It is another side issue to what we are talking about,
the Passover versus Easter we see the evolution of the trinity doctrine coming along about the same time, as well as the immortal soul by the way.

The Council in Constantinople started to add the influence and authority of the Catholic Church, as stated: “In one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; we look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come Amen.”

That was the output but it changed 50 years later and changed one more time. People today particularly Protestant groups recite the Athanasian Creed which had at its basis the original Nicaean Creed.

First Ecumenical Council - Constantine Letter to Bishops
Emperor Letter to Those Not Present

For those that weren’t at this meeting Eusebius documents that there was a letter sent to everyone, and this is the letter.

- When the question relative to the sacred festival of Easter arose, it was universally thought that it would be convenient that all should keep the feast on one day; for what could be more beautiful and more desirable, than to see this festival, through which we receive the hope of immortality, celebrated by all with one accord...It was declared to be particularly unworthy for this, the holiest of all festivals, to follow the custom (the calculation) of the Jews, who had soiled their hands with the most fearful of crimes, and whose minds were blinded... We ought not, therefore, to have anything in common with the Jews, for the Saviour has shown us another way... we desire, dearest brethren, to separate ourselves from the detestable company of the Jews, for it is truly shameful for us to hear them boast that without their direction we could not keep this feast... (without the calendar direction) They do not possess the truth in this Easter question; for, in their blindness and repugnance to all improvements, they frequently celebrate two Passovers in the same year...

This is the comment that I made about the calendar. In some years the calendar ends up being like that, 2019 was a good example for the Holy Day calendar.

- Changed from the Passion to the Resurrection
  - No scriptural support
  - Hope of immortality only by Yahushua’s death

- Eusebius of Caesarea - AKA Eusebius Pamphili, 260-340 CE
The change was made from the Passion on the 14th to the resurrection, and you notice there isn’t scriptural support in here. The hope of immortality is mentioned here, but the hope of immortality is only by Yahushua’s death. It says so in a lot of places, here is one in Hebrews:

But we see Yahushua, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of YHWH should taste death for every man. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through Yahushua’s sufferings. (Heb 2:9-10 KJV)

We are made perfect through his suffering and his death; we are not made perfect through the hope of his immortality. Yes, we have the hope; we see the hope of immortality and eternal life through Yahushua’s resurrection but our true hope and future is based on our salvation as a result of him covering our sins and is done only by his blood.

To finish this account up in Eusebius

* For to celebrate the Passover twice in one year is totally inadmissible… Our Saviour has left us only one festal day of our redemption, that is to say, of his holy passion…For this reason, a Divine Providence wills that this custom should be rectified and regulated in a uniform way… I have added: Eusebius and Constantine would have seen that the passion was important but they are changing it here. The custom now followed by the Churches of the West, of the South, and of the North, and by some of those of the East, is the most acceptable…as it is followed at Rome, in Africa, in all Italy, Egypt, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Libya, in all Achaia and in the dioceses of Asia, of Pontus, and Cilicia….To sum up in a few words: By the unanimous judgment of all, it has been decided that the most holy festival of Easter should be everywhere celebrated on one and the same day, and it is not seemly that in so holy a thing there should be any division. As this is the state of the case, accept joyfully the divine favour, and this truly divine command… We can rejoice together, seeing that the divine power has made use of our instrumentality for destroying the evil designs of the devil, and thus causing faith, peace, and unity to flourish amongst us. May God graciously protect you, by beloved brethren. (Eusebius, Bita Const..Lib.iii., 18-20)
The specific date for Easter came up later, there ends up being a calendar discussion about that also.

Quartodeciman Controversy 8th Century - 14th Passover vs. Easter
I will briefly mention it here with this final account that the 14th continued to be talked about up through the eighth century. Obviously it continues until today.

- Bede the Venerable
  673-735 CE
  He is a highly respected guy by the way in the 7th century

- English Benedictine monk
  Three vows: stability, fidelity to the monastic way of life, and obedience
  He was quite a guy and wrote about this subject.

- Author, teacher, scholar

- The Venerable Bede’s Computus
  Calculation that determines calendar date of Easter
  Dating forward from birth of Messiah (Anno Domini - in the year of our Lord)
  Dionysius Exiguus
  6th century Scythian Monk
  Carried forward to this very day
  The saga continues.....

- Dialogue from 8th century Catholic Abbot named Wilfrid who was trying to justify why it was acceptable not to follow the Apostle John’s practices regarding Passover and change the 14th to an Easter Sunday:

- Far be it from me to charge John with foolishness; he literally observed the decrees of the Mosaic law when the Church was still Jewish in many respects, at a time when the apostles were unable to bring a sudden end to that law which God ordained...So John, in accordance with the custom of the law, began the celebration of Easter Day in the evening of the fourteenth day of the first month, regardless of whether it fell on the Sabbath or any other day.
This account shows us even up until the 7th and 8th century CE. This question was still in the minds of somebody although the church had firmly fixed Easter by this point. Apparently there were still some that were holding to a 14th and that doesn’t surprise me, I suspect that the Apostolic succession has gone from originally in Jerusalem at 30 CE through this day there have been representatives of the true assembly of YHWH. Followers of Messiah have honored YHWH with the original faith that was delivered up until this day, and throughout history. I don’t think there was a time when it was ever totally lost. It was underground for a long period of time while this period of the Roman Church flourished and prevailed.

By the way, Bede is known for what is called his computus and it’s the calculation of the day of Easter. If you look into this you see there is a complicated calculation of how Easter is calculated. Fundamentally, the calculation goes from the first Sunday after the spring equinox after the Passover and at the end of the seventh day of the week. There is a calculation of each year how it comes about.

There was an implication of this by a guy named Dionysius Exiguus, if you look into calendar matters Dionysius was the guy that started this AD. Calendar, so when we see AD today in a date Anno Domini, that in Latin means in the year of our Lord.

Dionysius tried to make a calendar that went back with 1 AD as the birth of Yahushua and that got put in place. The problem is it was found out later that Yahushua’s birthdate was incorrect. The real birthdate of Yahushua wasn’t 1 AD, it was -3, or -4 depending if you count 0 or not.

We have this problem today when we look at calendars, AD is a reference to when Yahushua was born and the Roman calendar tried to implement that. This guy Dionysius Esiguus was really wrong in his date. All of this of course is carried forward to today in our calendar and in our system and worship and the saga continues.

Take a look at some of the symbols that are involved in this on the next page, I won’t get into where the word Easter came from but I thought the Passover lamb is obviously the symbol of the 14th and the Easter bunny is obviously the symbol of the resurrection, where do we find all of that in the scriptures? Well, we look up the word lamb and you can find 107 matches in the Authorized Version. We will take a look a few of them.

If we look for rabbit or bunny, we don’t find any. I looked under ‘hare’ and found a couple of scriptures that have the word ‘hare’. What we do find are a couple of scriptures about the hare, and the hare because he chews the cud, but divides not the hoof. He’s not clean to you,
both of these scriptures say about the same thing. I don’t want to dig farther into the Easter bunny symbols.

   And the hare, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he is unclean unto you. (Lev 11:6 KJV)

   Nevertheless these ye shall not eat of them that chew the cud, or of them that divide the cloven hoof; as the camel, and the hare, and the coney: for they chew the cud, but divide not the hoof; therefore they are unclean unto you. (Deu 14:7 KJV)

We do want to read the scriptures about the lamb, they are pervasive and significant and we will take a look at a handful of them.

- Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out and take you a lamb according to your families, and kill the Passover (Exo 12:21 KJV)

- He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. (Isa 53:7 KJV)
• Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples; And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the **Lamb** of **YHWH**! (Joh 1:35-36 KJV)

• Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Messiah, as of a **lamb** without blemish and without spot: (1Pe 1:18-19 KJV)

• For the **Lamb** which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and **YHWH** shall wipe away all tears from their eyes. (Rev 7:17 KJV)

• And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our **Elohim**, and the power of his **Messiah**: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our **Elohim** day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the **Lamb**, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. (Rev 12:10-11 KJV)

• And I looked, and, lo, a **Lamb** stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. (Rev 14:1 KJV)

• And they sing the song of Moses the servant of **YHWH**, and the song of the **Lamb**, saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, **YHWH** Elohim Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. (Rev 15:3 KJV)

• These shall make war with the **Lamb**, and the **Lamb** shall overcome them: for he is Master of Masters, and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful. (Rev 17:14 KJV)

• Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the **Lamb** is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. (Rev 19:7 KJV)

• And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the **Lamb's** book of life. (Rev 21:27 KJV)

• And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the **Lamb** shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him: (Rev 22:3 KJV)
Quartodeciman Controversy
The Passion versus the Resurrection
Are you saved by Yahushua’s blood or by His Resurrection?
What do you do in remembrance of Him?

For I say unto you,
I will not drink of the fruit of the vine,
until the kingdom of YHWH shall come.
And he took bread and gave thanks and brake it
and gave unto them saying,
This is my body which is given for you:
This do in remembrance of me!
(Luk 22:18-19)

This is an opportunity for some homework. That which you thought you knew and know, is it really so? The scripture in Colossians 2 comes to my mind when I look through the list to do your own homework.

Originally when the Colossians were in place, the Judaizers were a big influence. The philosophy that is mentioned here specifically in Greek means Jewish sophistry. These were guys that were trained in the Jewish philosophy and went to finishing school and wanted you to go to finishing school with them, but the only problem was their sophistry wasn’t in all cases true.

Looking forward, look what has happened, the philosophy conveyed deceit, that’s happened as a result of this debate of the Quartodeciman Controversy. All you can say is that we want to look into the scriptures to see what they say.

Do your own Homework

For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made know unto you the power and coming of our Master Yahushua Messiah, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. (2Pet 1:16 KJV)

Sophism (Merriam Webster) – an argument apparently correct in form but actually invalid; especially such an argument used to deceive.

All scripture is given by inspiration of YHWH, and is profitable for doctrine for reproof for correction . (2Ti 3:16 KJV)
Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the remittents of the world, and not after Messiah. (Col 2:8 KJV)

And this I (Paul) pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; That ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Messiah. (Php 1:8-10 KJV)
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