

Response to Ron Du Prez', *Feast Keeping and the Final Crisis*, broadcast live on 3ABN.

I viewed this dvd as if 3ABN might offer something to persuade me that feast keeping was not a valid practice today. I took 6 pages of legal sized notes during their 2 hour dvd, and hope you will give me the same time. I will use a blue font when presenting the thoughts and arguments given by Brothers C.A. Murray and Ron Du Prez during their broadcast (who rather unbelievably, did not pray on air before opening their Scriptures). I will not attempt to quote them as my notes were written in haste, but the thoughts are accurately preserved. If you are reading this, it is more than likely because you have seen the dvd and believe it to be the straight truth regarding the feasts. If you have viewed the dvd, you will remember these thoughts and/or can review the dvd to see if I have accurately presented their arguments against modern feast keeping.

Before I begin, I appreciate their kind attitude toward feast keepers. They were very careful to present their side of the issue without offending those to disagree with their conclusions. I hope to be so kind. I must say here that the degrees that Du Prez possesses or is about to earn are impressive. I am a mere layman with a 2 year college degree in Nuclear Medicine Technology and only a student of the Word, but I will show you that very little of what Bro. Du Prez said about the Feasts of YHVH is true. I will let you, the ladies and gentlemen of the jury decide if Bro. Du Prez accurately presented what Scripture says about the "Sacred Seasons."

Here is how I determine what is truth, how I apply the weight of evidence. I will refer to this list frequently:

- 1.** If I find a single text that says "thus saith YHVH", (**Deuteronomy 8:3b**, Matthew 4:10, Luke 4:8), it is truth, and I must admit it, and obey His command, whether there are 2-3 witnesses or not.
- 2.** If I find 2-3 witnesses, texts saying the same thing, (**Genesis 41:32, Deuteronomy 19:15**, II Corinthians 13:1) then it is truth that I must admit, and comply with.
- 3.** If I find a chain of texts where there is an unfolding of truth, one expounding upon the other, (**Isaiah 28:9-10**), this reveals truth that I am responsible for.
- 4.** If it agrees with the Torah and the prophets, neither adding nor subtracting anything, (**Isaiah 8:20, Deuteronomy 4:2**), it is the straight truth. The standard listed in these texts can trump test 2 if the 2-3 witnesses are false witnesses (speaking not according to the Torah and the prophets).
- 5.** A lack of all the above means that something is NOT true. If there is no "thus saith YHVH, no 2-3 witnesses, no chain of textual evidence and no support found in the Torah and the prophets, then it is false. It is my privilege to admit it and tell others that it has no foundation in truth.
- 6.** Any historical evidence that agrees with Scripture (e.g. the Torah and the prophets) is acceptable as supportive evidence to the truth. Any historical record that disagrees with Scripture is a lie of the highest order of magnitude.

7. If someone makes a statement, it does not matter if a thousand scholars come later saying that he did NOT say such or did not MEAN such and such; the word of the person in question takes precedence over all others.

When we think something is in error, we need to say that.

I will take the same position here and explain why the position of these two sincere brothers have taken regarding the Feasts is not Scriptural. Sincere does not mean they are without error. Sincerely presenting the position of the SDA church does not and should not impress anyone.

“There is no excuse for anyone in taking a position that there is no more truth to be revealed, and that all our [SDA] expositions of Scripture are without error. The fact that certain doctrines have been held as truth for many years by our [SDA] people, is not proof that our [SDA] ideas are infallible. Age will not make error into truth, and truth can afford to be fair. No true doctrine will lose anything by close investigation.” *Review & Herald, 12-20-1892*

People believe things that do not line up with the weight of Scriptural evidence. We are going to look at the weight of Scriptural evidence. What does Scripture say?

Indeed, what DOES Scripture say? Bro. Du Prez quoted many texts, and used his education to a great degree in order to “prove” that his position (the position of the church) is correct. However, error is still error no matter how many accept it or how credible its supporters.

“We [SDA’s] have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn. God and heaven alone are infallible. Those who think that they will never have to give up a cherished view, never have occasion to change an opinion, will be disappointed. As long as we hold to our own ideas and opinions with determined persistency, we cannot have the unity for which Christ prayed.” *Review & Herald, 7-26-1892* Notice we have twice as much to **unlearn** as we have yet to learn.

“There are new truths to be revealed to the humble seeker. The teachings of God’s word are to be freed from the errors and superstition with which they have been encumbered. Doctrines that are not sanctioned by the Scriptures have been widely taught, and many have honestly accepted them; but when the truth is revealed, it becomes the duty of every one to accept it. Those who allow worldly interests, desire for popularity, or pride of opinion, to separate them from the truth, must render an account to God for their neglect.” *Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. 4, p. 186*

William Miller once said:

1. Every word must have its proper bearing on the subject presented in the Bible;
2. All Scripture is necessary, and may be understood by diligent application and study;
3. Nothing revealed in Scripture can or will be hid from those who ask in faith, not wavering;
4. To understand doctrine, bring all the scriptures together on the subject you wish to know, then let every word have its proper influence; and if you can form your theory without a contradiction, you cannot be in error;
5. **Scripture must be its own expositor**, since it is a rule of itself. If I depend on a teacher to expound to me, and he should guess at its meaning, or desire to have it so on account of his sectarian creed, or to be thought wise, then his guessing, desire, creed, or wisdom is my rule, and not the Bible.” *EGW, RH 11-25-1884* Mrs. White gives William Miller credit for this quote.

This study will prove beyond the shadow of any doubt that Murray and Du Prez did not follow the “trail to truth” expostulated in the quote above.

Du Prez said he LOVES to dig deeply into Scripture, has read the Scriptures 30 times reading 30 different translations and admits that the truth steps on toes, but develops character.

Without a trace of sarcasm, let me say that Du Prez said that the truth steps on toes (and it does) without the slightest hint that the toes that would be stepped on were his. He is that confident in his position, the official position of the church.

One would think that after reading Scripture 30 times that he would have seen what I am about to share with you in the ensuing pages of this response to their broadcast refuting the feasts. I can't honestly say I have read the Scriptures through entirely even once, and while I have a dozen different translations, I'm a basic KJV guy (without apology).

Du Prez used the term “ceremonial law” 4 times though he later admitted that this term is not in Scripture. He also used the term Mosaic Law once, a reference to “the Law of Moses.”

The term “ceremonial law” is not in Scripture. The phrase was coined by Catholic lawyer and scholar, Thomas Aquinas in the early 13th century. The pope commissioned him to help stem the Reformation so he started looking up the Latin roots of the words of Jerome's Vulgate. To his extreme pleasure, he found that the first two of the Ten Commandments were indeed commandments, the next three were considered statutes and the last five were judgments.

Commandments are stated direct commands, telling us “who” to worship. Statutes tell us how to worship. Commandments are something we must acknowledge--they are direct commands. Statutes are illogical to us--contrary to our nature, but we may learn the reason by doing--the result of experience. Judgments are logical, meaning that if there were no Creator/Law Giver, that mankind would sit down and reasonably come to these same conclusions... “You know, it really isn't a good idea if we steal from each other or kill each other...”

Aquinas made an interesting discovery which has been bequeathed to Protestantism. The original Hebrew word for *statute* had been translated into Latin as *caerimnia*. Our English word “ceremony” comes from the Latin root word “caerimnia” which means *statute*. [Middle English ceremonie, **from Latin caerimnia, religious rite.**] Aquinas' argument was that the Sabbath and feasts are a package. He correctly argued that they are both statutes; to divorce them is to change the word and intent of the original Hebrew. The Protestants were just as hostile to the “Jewish feasts” as Catholicism and Aquinas made progress in stemming the tide of the Reformation. Protestants found they had common ground with the papacy with their disregard for the Sabbath. Protestants also hated the “Jewish” feasts and were glad to learn that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was perpetually linked to the feasts as both are statutes. This they believed made this law temporary as the “Law of Moses” and could summarily be dismissed.

The problem is that it is YHVH's law, not Moses'. Remember, Scripture is the standard for our discussion and there is no such thing as the moral law or ceremonial law in Scripture. The law of YHVH is broken down into three sections: commandments, statutes and judgments. All are part of the Law of the Universe. Now as Scripture believing folks on this end of history, we have a decision to make. Will we summarily dismiss YHVH's statutes as well or will we align ourselves in obedience?

EGW comments on the statutes, also known as the ceremonial law.

“The great statute-book [*EGW is referring to Scripture*] is truth; and truth only; . . . Satan claimed to be able to present laws which were better than God’s statutes and judgments, and he was expelled from heaven.” *Review & Herald, 6-17-1890*

“In consequence of continual transgression, the moral law was repeated in awful grandeur from Sinai. **[YHVH] gave to Moses** religious precepts which were to govern everyday life. These statutes were explicitly given to guard the ten commandments. They were not shadowy types to pass away with the death of Christ. They were to be binding upon men in every age as long as time should last. These commands were enforced by the power of the moral law, and they clearly and definitely explained that law.... *Review & Herald, 5-6-1875* **Actually, YHVH gave it to Moses, but it is not Moses’ law. More on this later. A thing that guards the ten commandments, cannot be the ten commandments. Binding as long as time should last is a long time. For an example of a statute guarding or explaining a commandment...**

“Again the people were reminded of the sacred obligation of the Sabbath. Yearly feasts were appointed, . . . The object of these regulations was stated: they proceeded from no exercise of mere arbitrary sovereignty; all were given for the good of Israel.

“These laws were to be recorded by Moses, and carefully treasured as the foundation of the national law, and, **with the ten precepts which they were given to illustrate,** the condition of the fulfillment of God’s promises to Israel.” *Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 311* **We are Israel, the seed of Abraham. Whether by blood or by adoption, believers are Israelites and our requirements are the same as for ancient Israel.**

“The instructions given to Moses for ancient Israel, with their sharp, rigid outlines, are to be studied and obeyed by the people of God today.” *SDA Bible Commentary, Vol. 1, p. 1103.*

“God has given us probationary time in order that it may be made manifest whether we will be loyal, obedient children, rendering obedience to His commandments, His statutes, and His laws, or whether we will persist in following a course in disobedience, and prove ourselves unworthy of eternal life.” *Review & Herald, 10-9-1894* **Hello! If this doesn’t arrest your attention, perhaps this next one will...**

“God will **not** take into His kingdom and give eternal life to those who will **not** come under His laws and statutes **in this life.**” *Signs of the Times, 9-8-1887* **I didn’t say this was an issue of salvation. Ellen White does.**

“The statutes of the Lord are to be revered and obeyed. *Review & Herald, 12-20-1898* **She doesn’t say which of the 613 statutes, so logic alone tells us that all of them are to be revered and obeyed.**

“God has not changed. He is as particular and exact in His requirements now as He was in the days of Moses.” *SDA Bible Commentary, Vol. 1, p. 1111.*

“The words of Moses to Israel, concerning the statutes and judgments of the Lord, are also the word of God to us,...” *Signs of the Times, 3-21-1895*

The point here is that the statutes and feasts (which are statutes) are just as binding today as the Commandments. They met no end at Calvary, and did not point to Messiah. They are not “inextricably linked” to the sacrifices either, if they are, then EGW is apparently a liar.

But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the Law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith YHVH of hosts.

*Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law. **Malachi 2:8-9***

We don't get to pick and choose. The Torah, the Law of YHVH is not a smorgasbord where you get to choose which precepts you will observe. You are either all in or all out. *You cannot eat at the table of YHVH and the table of devils,* I Corinthians 10:21.

Whose law? The Law of Moses or the Law of YHVH?

*Ye shall therefore keep My statutes, and My judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them: I am YHVH. **Leviticus 18:5.** See also **Leviticus 19:37, Ezekiel 20:19-20.***

*Yet YHVH testified against Israel, and against Judah, by all the prophets, and by all the seers, saying, Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep My commandments and My statutes, according to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets. **II Kings 17:13.***

And here's another witness. *With whom YHVH had made a covenant, and charged them, saying, Ye shall not fear other gods, nor bow yourselves to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them: But YHVH, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt with great power and a stretched out arm, Him shall ye fear, and Him shall ye worship, and to Him shall ye do sacrifice. And the statutes, and the ordinances, and the law, and the commandment, which He wrote for you, ye shall observe to do for evermore; and ye shall not fear other gods. **II Kings 17:35-37***

There were statutes and feasts named in the initial giving of the covenant (**Exodus 20:22** through **23:33**--the feasts are found in **Exodus 23:14-17**) and there are statutes and feasts named in the abbreviated version of the covenant (**Exodus 34:10-28**) that was written after Moses' little fit of apoplexy. The same three feasts are named in second writing of the covenant, **Exodus 34:18, 22.** I hope you agree that the covenant is perpetual and is intended for the created universe. If this is not your understanding, then reading any further will probably not be of any benefit.

I just applied **Test 1** and **3**, providing ample witnesses all saying that YHVH wrote the law, not Moses. Let's let EGW weigh in, she says the same thing...

*“Moses of himself framed no law. [YHVH] gave to Moses statutes and requirements necessary to a living religion and to govern the people of God. Christians commit a terrible mistake in calling this law severe and arbitrary, and then contrasting it with the gospel and mission of Christ in his ministry on earth, as though he were in opposition to the just precepts which they call the law of Moses.” *Review & Herald (RH), 5-6-1875**

*“The instruction which Moses gave to the children of Israel concerning the statutes and the precepts of God, did not originate with Moses, but with the God of heaven.” *Review & Herald, 7-15-1890* **“Law of Moses” is a misnomer.***

“During the loud cry...the light of present truth will be seen flashing everywhere...The Word declares: ...’I will put My Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes’ [Ezekiel 36:25-27] This is the descent of the Holy Spirit, sent from God to do it’s office work....

“As men, women, and children proclaim the gospel, the Lord will open the eyes of the blind to see His statutes, and will write upon the hearts of the truly penitent His law.” *Review & Herald, “The Closing Work”, 10-13-1904* **Rejecting the present truth of the Loud Cry (Malachi 4:4-6) means rejecting the Spirit whose job is to cause us to walk in the statutes of YHVH. Notice that His statutes are also part of His law!**

Du Prez likes to apply the following test when examining evidence:

When, Why, By Whom, For Whom, Til When?

He applies this to the Sabbath, which he says is NOT astronomical, the sacrifices, circumcision and the feasts, which he graciously calls “sacred seasons.”

Du Prez used **Exodus 12:25-27** to “prove” that Passover does not need to be observed today then said that Israel had to go to Jerusalem or the temple to keep the feast, that it was location centered. He said that the sacrifices, circumcision and the feasts have all been fulfilled. When the Temple was destroyed, they had no place to go, so the feasts were done away.

Let’s see if the weight of evidence in Scripture agrees. I find it interesting that the first Passover was observed in Egypt. The second one was observed in the wilderness, and they observed one right after the crossed the Jordan before Jericho fell, **Exodus 12**, **Numbers 9:1-2**, and **Joshua 5:10** respectively. There was no Jerusalem or temple in sight, yet Israel observed the feast. One might argue that the command was location centered after then entered the land, but **Joshua 5:10** overrules that notion. The temple was not built in Jerusalem for another 400 years AFTER they had entered the land, yet the feasts were to be observed.

When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should say so.

Passover: When, Why, By Whom, For Whom, Til When?

When? Abib 14 (**Exodus 12:1-6**, **Leviticus 23:5**, **Numbers 28:16**).

Why? As a memorial of Israel’s deliverance (**Exodus 12:26-27**, **13:8-9**, **14**, **Deuteronomy 16:1-3**).

By Whom? YHVH (**Exodus 12:28**, **Leviticus 23:5**, **II Chronicles 35:6**).

For Whom? Israel (**Exodus 12:24**, **28**) and anyone in the care of an Israelite or who joins himself to Israel (**Exodus 12:41-42**, **12:48**, **Numbers 9:14**), for all their generations.

Til When? Every year, forever as a perpetual covenant, for a 1000 generations, (**Exodus 13:8-10**, **12:24**, **II Kings 23:21**, **I Chronicles 16:15**, **Psalm 105:8**)

Know therefore that YHVH thy Elohim, He is Elohim, the faithful Elohim, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love Him and keep His commandments to a thousand generations;

And repayeth them that hate Him to their face, to destroy them: He will not be slack to him that hateth Him, He will repay him to his face.

*Thou shalt therefore keep the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which I command thee this day, to do them. **Deuteronomy 7:9-11***

I just applied **Tests 1, 2** and **3** proving that Passover and the other feasts/statutes are still binding.

Here is a dirty little secret. There have still not been 1000 generations here on earth since Adam. So, are the commandments, statutes and judgments still binding? You be the judge. Don't let men, no matter how sincere, do you thinking for you. If every man had a child at the age of 25 (meaning that a generation was 25 years in length) and earth is 6000 years old, then there have only been 240 generations since creation. However, when you consider the great ages to which early man lived, and that they often did not have children until they were in their hundreds of years of age, there have not even been 200 generations on earth since creation.

Point: Passover has nothing to do with Messiah or Calvary. Passover was a memorial of Israel's deliverance from Egypt. That is all. It was never given a future context, it ALWAYS pointed backward in time, not forward. Ellen White agrees, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 540.

Circumcision: When, Why, By Whom, For Whom, Til When?

When? Started with Abraham. **Genesis 17:9-10**

Why? As a covenant sign between YHVH and Abraham's seed. **Genesis 17:9-11**

By Whom? YHVH Himself. **Genesis 17:1-2**

For Whom? Abraham's seed, everyone in the care of Abraham's seed and every stranger who joined himself to Israel. **Genesis 17:9-10, 17:12-13. 17:27**

Til When? As long as Abraham's seed remain. **Genesis 17:9, 17:12-13**

Behold, the days come, saith YHVH, that I will punish all them which are circumcised with the uncircumcised;

*Egypt, and Judah, and Edom, and the children of Ammon, and Moab, and all that are in the utmost corners, that dwell in the wilderness: for all these nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart. **Jeremiah 9:25-26***

Point: Circumcision of the penis comes BEFORE circumcision of the heart. We were commanded to circumcise our hearts (**Deuteronomy 10:16**), but that command came WELL after the command to be circumcised in the flesh. The text above is an end time prophecy. Notice that Israel, who would already be circumcised in the flesh, will be punished with the uncircumcised (slang for wicked) because they are not circumcised in the heart as well. If you don't think circumcision is still part of the binding covenant YHVH made with Abraham, please read the following passage. It too is an end time prophecy.

*And thou shalt say to the rebellious, even to the house of Israel, Thus saith the Sovereign YHVH; O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of all your abominations, In that ye have brought into my sanctuary strangers, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it, even my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant because of all your abominations. And ye have not kept the charge of mine holy things: but ye have set keepers of my charge in my sanctuary for yourselves. Thus saith the Sovereign YHVH; No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any stranger that is among the children of Israel. **Ezekiel 44:6-9***

I just applied **Tests 1** and **3** showing that circumcision is still binding; still the covenant sign of Abraham's seed, and still required to enter YHVH's sanctuary. When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should say so. It appears that Du Prez neglected to weigh in these texts with the evidence he hand picked to support his conclusion, thus being partial in the law (**Malachi 2:8-9**).

If strangers, to whom the command to circumcise was not given, are kept out of the sanctuary, how do you suppose this affects the descendants of Abraham to whom this command WAS given? Please note that BOTH flesh and heart circumcision is necessary, both are required of strangers among the children of Israel, and that Israel was to have only ONE law in the land that applied to both themselves and the nations that joined themselves to Israel. **Exodus 21:49, Leviticus 24:22, Numbers 15:16**, et al.

Here's a dirty little secret. If you are of European stock, YOU are Abraham's seed. [Please ask for this evidence.] You are not a gentile, or a stranger who needs to join himself/herself to Israel; you are a blood descendant, meaning that all the requirements of YHVH apply directly to you!

Of course the **When, Why, By Whom, For Whom, Til When?** regarding the Sabbath should be self evident. It was established at creation by YHVH so man could rest from his labors, and will ever be observed. However, Jesus did not do away with the sacrificial law. He said so himself...

Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.

For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. Matthew 5:17-19

Go outside. Look up, now look down. If heaven and earth are still there, the law stands. If the man from Galilee did away with the sacrifices, what are the sacrifices in the following passages all about? **Isaiah 19:21** shows a future sacrifice that the Egyptians will offer to YHVH. **Daniel 11:31** and **12:11** reveal a daily sacrifice that will someday be taken away as BOTH of these chapters are about end time events (pay close attention to **Daniel 12:1, 2, 4, 8-9**). **Zephaniah 1:7-8** shows YHVH preparing a blood sacrifice at the end of time. **Zechariah** chapter **14** is an end-time prophecy showing the Father coming down and cleaving the Mount of Olives. Read **Zechariah 14:21**. Even at THAT late date, the righteous will offer a blood sacrifice to YHVH.

If you doubt my words, please look up the underlying Hebrew word in Strong's Concordance for sacrifice in each of these passages. The reason we do not sacrifice now is because we are in bondage, **Hosea 3:4-5**. When in bondage or apostasy, YHVH's law was set aside. We are not free to sacrifice in the prescribed manner. It has nothing to do with the death of Jesus.

Du Prez said that the Sabbath is not a Mo'ed (the Hebrew term translated as feast or appointed time) or "sacred season", his own term for the feasts. He went on to say that a Jewish scholar agreed, saying that the "Sabbath is not a feast."

*And YHVH spake unto Moses, saying,
Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, Concerning the **feasts** [Hebrew word Mo'edim] **of YHVH**, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are **My feasts**. [Hebrew word Mo'edim]*

*Six days shall work be done: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of YHVH in all your dwellings. **Leviticus 23:1-3***

I'm sorry, but the weekly Sabbath is TWICE here called a Mo'edim by none other than YHVH Himself. You can check Strong's Concordance if you wish. I just applied **Test 1**. When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when clearly they have not, we should say so.

Du Prez said that the Mo'edim are set by the moon, but the Sabbath is NOT set by the moon.

Genesis 1:14 says that the two great lights (sun and moon in context) would be for **signs, seasons**, days and years. Thus the calendar of Yah is in the lights in the heavens.

Exodus 31:13, Ezekiel 20:12, and 20:20 all say that the Sabbath is a **sign**, using the SAME Hebrew word found in **Genesis 1:14** (owth), meaning signal or beacon.

Psalms 104:19 says that the moon will regulate the **seasons** (Mo'edim--appointed times, set feasts, "sacred seasons"). **Leviticus 23:1-3** shows the weekly Sabbath to be the first in a list of **feasts** (Mo'edim--appointed times, set feasts, "sacred seasons").

This alone is enough to prove that the Sabbath is by the moon, but it does not answer every possible question as to HOW or WHY that might take place. Yours is not to ask WHY. Either do (obey) or do not. The HOW will only be answered by going outside and looking AT the clock and watching for patterns. I just used **Tests 1, 2 and 3** to show that the Sabbath is lunar.

When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should say so.

Du Prez admits that the months in Scripture were lunar, and that the days were numbered as days of the month (Passover was the 14th day of the first month).

The weight of evidence is that every weekly Sabbath that is date identified in Scripture, both OT and NT, falls on either the 8th, 15th, 22nd or 29th days of the admittedly lunar months. Here is just the tip of the iceberg:

Exodus 12, 16 and 19 reveal that the Sabbaths fell on the 15th of the month for three consecutive months. If you know anything about lunar months, the full moon comes 14.5 days after new moon and rose the evening before announcing the 15th as the weekly Sabbath.

Exodus 12 reveals that Israel was released from bondage on Abib 15, the 15th day of the first month. It is not called a Sabbath in **Exodus 12**, but later Scripture does reveal the nature of this day. **Leviticus 23:4-8** shows us that Passover (Abib 14) is preparation day for Abib 15, the Sabbath of Unleavened Bread. Some say that Abib 21 is also a Sabbath, but his is not the case. The evidence is that the 15th of the first month is the weekly Sabbath; Scripture is not saying that the 21st is an annual Sabbath at all. Consider the following.

The first day of the feast and the “seventh day” [of the week in context] are one and the same. The 21st is the 6th day of the week and of course the 7th day of a seven day feast, but....

9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22

...the “seventh day” spoken of in **Exodus 13:6** is called a Chag (H2282) which is used 62 times in Scripture and is only used to refer to the pilgrimage feast days (found in **Exodus 23:14-17**), in this case, Abib 15. It is not referring to the last day of the feast, rather the first. This Chag can only be the 15th of Abib. See also **Deuteronomy 5:12-15** and **Leviticus 23:6-8**.

The Sabbath commandment in **Exodus 20** is linked to Creation week. The 4th commandment listed in **Deuteronomy 5** is linked to the deliverance of Israel. That date was the 15th of Abib.

I submit to you that this “seventh day” is Abib 15, and it is not only an annual Sabbath, but a weekly Sabbath as well. There are no back to back Sabbaths in Scripture. The 15th is without question a Sabbath, meaning that the 22nd of the first month is also a Sabbath. If the 21st is an annual Sabbath, there would be two Sabbaths back to back, and there would be no preparation day for the second Sabbath of the two. Common sense, right?

Exodus 16 is the first place where the word “Sabbath” is used in Scripture. In the first verse, YHVH is speaking to Moses and Aaron on the 15th day of the 2nd month and gives them what turns out to be a simple math equation. From day 15 add 6 days of manna = 21. Next day (22nd) is the Sabbath.

	1	1	1	1	1	2	Sabbath
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
	23	24	25	26	27	28	29 30
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Israel was to collect one portion of manna from the 16th to the 20th and a double portion on the 21st because the morrow was the Sabbath. If the 22nd is a Sabbath, so is the 15th (as well as the 8th and the 29th). The first day of the month is new moon day, not a Sabbath.

Exodus 19:1 also proves that the children of Israel arrived at Sinai on the 16th day of the third month. Please read the context. Moses indicates that the children of Israel rested at Rephidim the 15th of the third month. The root word for *Rephidim* means “rest” and this passage says that they arrived at the Wilderness of Sinai the “same day” of this month that they left Egypt (two months earlier). If you’ll remember, Israel got as far as Succoth the 15th, and actually left Egypt the on the 16th. **Numbers 33:3-6**. So Israel arrived at Sinai on the 16th and Moses was immediately summoned up the mount. YHVH told Moses to go back down the mountain and to tell the people to consecrate themselves for on the third day of the week (the 18th) He would come down on the mount in a cloud, **Exodus 19:10-11**.

If the 18th is the third day, then the 16th is the first day, meaning that they were “resting” in Rephidim on the Sabbath, the 15th, which is the weekly Sabbath.

Looks like this:

1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22

Amazing isn’t it? There is always harmony in the truth. It is physically impossible to have the weekly Sabbaths fall on the 15th day of three consecutive months using the pagan/papal calendar in use today.

Please find for me a single text that says satyrday is the Sabbath? Please find for me a single text that says the Sabbath falls every seven days in an unbroken cycle of seven day weeks. Scripture says ONLY that the Sabbath is the seventh day of the week; it does not say the seventh day of the current pagan/papal week (the pagan seven day planetary week adopted by Rome in 321 A.D.), Scripture is referring to the week as known to ancient Israel, which was lunar.

“The New Moon is still, **and the Sabbath originally was, dependent upon the lunar cycle.**”
Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 410.

“... each lunar month was divided into four parts, corresponding to the four phases of the moon. The first week of each month began with the new moon, so that, as the lunar month was one or two days more than four periods of seven days, these *additional days* were not reckoned at all.”
Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 10, p. 482. Article “Week.”

“...the Hebrew *Sabbathon* ... was celebrated at intervals of seven days, corresponding with changes in the moon’s phases...” *Encyclopedia Biblica, 1899. p. 4180*

“In the time of the earliest prophets, the New Moon stood in the same line with another lunar observance, the Sabbath. Ezekiel, who curiously enough frequently dates his prophecies on the New Moon ... describes the gate of the inner court of the (new) temple looking eastward as kept shut for the six working days, but opened on the Sabbath and the New Moon.” *Scribner’s Dictionary of the Bible (1898 edit.), p. 521*

“The Hebrew month is a lunar month and the quarter of this period—one phase of the moon—appears to have determined the week of seven days.” *Encyclopedia Biblica*, p. 4780. **And why have we never been taught any of this???**

“...The [early] Hebrews employed lunar seven-day weeks...which ended with special observances on the seventh day but none the less were tied to the moon’s course.” *Hutton Webster*, in his book, *Rest Days*, page 254.

“... the custom of celebrating the Sabbath every 7th day, irrespective of the relationship of the day to the moon’s phases, led to a complete *separation* from the ancient view of the Sabbath...” *Encyclopedia Biblica*, (1899 edit.), p. 4179.

“With the development of the importance of the Sabbath as a day of consecration and the emphasis laid upon the significant number seven, the week became more and more divorced from its lunar connection...” *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia: Vol. 10, 1943 edit. Article, “Week,”* p. 482.

I have just applied **Test 6** showing that there are scholars who agree with the evidence in Scripture. Actually, they did not record this because they were lunar calendar observers; they wrote this because ISRAEL observed a lunar Sabbath. To record otherwise would have been to be dishonest with Scripture and the historical evidence.

When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should say so.

Du Prez had Bro. Murray read **Leviticus 23:37** then used this verse to “prove” that without the sacrifices, there was no reason to keep the feast.

He and Bro. Murray said the same thing several different ways:

They said “eat”, “kill” and “keep” (the Passover) was used interchangeably, and that without the food, there could be no feast. That there was no difference between eating the Passover, sacrificing the Passover or Passover Day.

Said that keeping the feasts is like keeping one foot on the ground, that the other foot was the sacrifices. Gotta have both feet on the ground they said.

These men do err, not knowing the Scripture. Apparently they are not aware that we are to be LIVING sacrifices unto YHVH (Romans 12:1). Either that or they were negligent in their presentation as **Hosea**, the one who says we will be without sacrifice for a time in **3:4-5** says that YHVH will accept the sacrifice of our lips (the singing and speaking praises unto YHVH), **Hosea 14:2**.

I find it difficult to understand how any logical being can rationalize that an animal set aside to be slaughtered and a segment of time are one and the same thing. There were double sacrifices offered on the Sabbath (which Du Prez admitted), yet he spiritualizes this away saying that because the Sabbath was instituted before sin (and the sacrifices afterward) that the weekly Sabbath could be observed without the sacrifices, but the annual Sabbaths cannot.

The reason for the sacrifices and the feasts seems to have been lost on these two men. The double sacrifices on the weekly Sabbath were JUST as expected/commanded as the sacrifices to be offered during the annual “sacred seasons.” They were JUST as inextricably linked as the sacrifices offered on the annual Sabbaths. The sacrifices were a temporary reprieve from result of sin, actually set up to teach us that the end result of sin was death. Overcome, stop sinning, and there was no more need for sacrifice. The feasts were the plan of salvation that was to be acted out every year, kind of like a dress rehearsal where you can see, smell, taste and hear and play a part in the plan YHVH has established for the salvation of his children. Oddly enough, while the sacrifices took place during the appointed times (and every day for that matter), not a single step in the plan of salvation portrayed by these appointed times or “sacred seasons” involves the sacrifice(s) that took place on that day. To wit:

Passover: Without earning or deserving it, YHVH releases us from bondage.

Unleavened Bread: We recognize that we do not deserve this reprieve and desire to do something to show our gratitude. YHVH says to go without leaven (which represents sin and hypocrisy) for seven days. Moral, what wants us to overcome sin, which is playacted out by observing this feast, but should be put into practice in real life.

Feast of Weeks (a.k.a. Pentecost): A purging fire attends this feast. As we overcome sin displaying the Fruit of the Spirit (*But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.* Galatians 5:22-23. See also Ephesians 5:9) YHVH entrusts us with the gifts of the Spirit, I Corinthians 12:4-11. Do you think YHVH will give us the gifts of the Spirit if we have not overcome our carnal natures, pride, arrogance, intemperance, impatience, unhappiness, uncontentedness and hatred?

Feast of Trumpets: The most festive of all the appointed times. Have a good time, but get ready. In just a short time, judgment is coming!

Day of Atonement: Judgment day, a day of reckoning. Will you be found a wheat or a tare, a sheep or a goat? Will you have overcome sin in the time allotted you? Will you have followed the path of righteous to it’s end, the making right of every sin?

Feast of Tabernacles (a.k.a. Feast of Final Harvest): After the final judgment, the “final harvest” or the final separation of the righteous and the wicked, YHVH tabernacles with righteous believers, this time forever.

Every year, this plan is rehearsed again so that no one has reason or excuse for not knowing the steps it takes. There is no sacrifices necessary in these steps save that YHVH demanded they occur at certain times. There is a transfer of our sin to the head of the scape goat, but that goat is not even killed, it is led into the wilderness (where one supposes it dies of whatever cause). All the blood sacrifices remind us of is our own death to self. They are examples, reminders of the end result of sin if left unconfessed, unrepented and unforgiven, so of course they are integral parts of the festivals, but they are not part of the plan of salvation. More on this later. MUCH more.

Du Prez said that no work was to be done on Day of Atonement, but only no “servile work” on the other feast days.

Please get out your Strong's Concordance. The Hebrew word for *servile* in **Leviticus 23**, **Numbers 28** and **29** is H5656. The Hebrew word for "work" in **Exodus 20:10** and **Leviticus 23**, **Numbers 28** and **29** is H4399. I'm quoting from Strong's here...

H5656-servile, From H5647; *work* of any kind: - act, bondage, + bondservant, effect, labour, ministering (-try), office, service (-ile, -itude), tillage, use, work, X wrought.

H4399-work, From the same as H4397; properly *deputyship*, that is, ministry; generally *employment* (never *servile*) or *work* (abstractly or concretely); also *property* (as the result of *labor*): - business, + cattle, + industrious, occupation, (+ -pied), + officer, thing (made), use, (manner of) work ([-man], -manship).

Servile work means ANY kind of work/employment. Work (by itself) means employment, **never servile work**. From the meaning of the words, servile work covers more "work" than just plain work. Du Prez just looked at the English and deduced from there his false conclusion, that *servile work* is somehow less involved than *work*. However, to be perfectly honest with the text, the "work" in the fourth commandment is preceded by the word, "any".

H3605-any, From H3634; properly the *whole*; hence *all*, *any* or *every* (in the singular only, but often in a plural sense): - (in) all (manner, [ye]), altogether, any (manner), enough, every (one, place, thing), howsoever, as many as, [no-] thing, ought, whatsoever, (the) whole, whoso (-ever).

So *servile work* means ANY kind of work/employment and *any work* means all MANNER of work or employment, **but not servile work**. Either Du Prez got it backward or these two terms are nearly identical. If he got it backward, he is a false teacher. If they are the same, he has no argument. Either way, his argument fails.

Du Prez said that the feast days and sacrifices came about because of sin, therefore they are inextricably linked and cannot be separated.

He also said this a different way:

The feasts point to Christ, the sacrifices point to Christ. The feasts are inextricably intertwined with the sacrifices. The Sabbath points to creation.

I must agree that the feasts and sacrifices came about because of sin; neither would have been necessary had Adam not fallen. However, Du Prez' understanding that they cannot be separated is a general assumption on his part because he does not understand the meaning of the feasts and what they represented or the roll that the sacrifices played.

This stems from the false idea that Jesus' death was somehow the fulfillment of the sacrificial law. Jesus said he came to change not a jot or tittle of the Torah until all was fulfilled, that the law would remain until heaven and earth were destroyed, Matthew 5:17-18. The sacrificial law is recorded in the Torah. This is **Test 7**. Jesus said it, so it does not matter if 11 BILLION Christians come afterward saying that the law of ordinances was taken away because of his death. These men do err, not knowing the Scriptures. When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should point this out so that others will not be deceived.

Point: Du Prez is looking for ways to link the feasts to the sacrifices in order do away with them both. And here he reveals a fatal flaw in this theology. The Commandments, statutes (including the feasts) and judgments were ALL given to Moses by YHVH at Mt. Sinai, the feasts being included as part of the covenant YHVH made with Israel—and by extension, all believers as the covenant was with Yah’s people for a 1000 generations. As already shown, there have been MAYBE 200 generations on earth since creation. The sacrificial law was given in the wilderness some nine months later by the bright light of Shekinah. Usher’s dating has the Sinai experience at 1491 B.C. Israel arrived at Sinai in the third month of that year. The events recorded in Leviticus where the sacrificial ordinances are given are dated at 1490—at least 9 months later.

I find the fact that YHVH gave the commandments, statutes (including the feasts) and judgments altogether as part of His perpetual covenant, writing them all on tablets of stone and the giving of the sacrificial law at a considerably later date a much more compelling and inextricable link than Du Prez’ effort to link the feasts and sacrifices together because sin entered the picture. I can prove my position from Scripture; he has to assume his position. So, you’ve never heard, seen or read that the statutes were also written on the tablets of stone? Behold the word...

But as for thee, stand thou here by me, and I will speak unto thee all the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which thou shalt teach them, that they may do them in the land which I give them to possess it.

Ye shall observe to do therefore as YHVH your Mighty One hath commanded you: ye shall not turn aside to the right hand or to the left.

*Ye shall walk in all the ways which YHVH your Mighty One hath commanded you, that ye may live, and that it may be well with you, and that ye may prolong your days in the land which ye shall possess. **Deuteronomy 5:31-32.***

The preceding verses in this passage put this into context as **Deuteronomy 5:1-21** is where the Ten Commandments are listed the second time. Listed from **Exodus 20:1** to **Exodus 23:33** is the complete covenant as spoken and written by the Creator and given to Moses. Only the first 17 verses are the Ten Commandments, the rest are statutes and judgments. **Exodus 20:18-22** reveals that the people were terrified and fled from the mount. As YHVH was not finished giving His covenant, Moses drew near and YHVH finished his oratory which was later written on stone and given to Moses who subsequently broke the written information in a fit of rage.

Exodus 32:15 states that the tablets which Moses broke had writing on “*both sides.*” Need witnesses of Divinity using both sides? Please see **Ezekiel 2:7-10**, Revelation 5:1. In context, it appears more space was needed, but for what? *And it came to pass at the end of forty days and forty nights, that YHVH gave me the two tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant.*

Deuteronomy 9:11. (See also Hebrews 9:4) We need look no further than the remaining portion of the covenant. It would be inconsistent for the Almighty to write only a portion of His perpetual covenant--the Law that governs the entire universe. If He intended to speak the whole covenant to Israel assembled below (and that was His intent) then would He not have written the whole covenant? If this covenant is important enough to have a written record (so we would not forget) then this concept must be addressed.

Just because trembling Israel was afraid to hear another word from the mouth of the Almighty, does not mean that what He privately shared with His servant Moses on Sinai was not of equal importance or was not part of the covenant. Moses was commanded to reveal everything that was spoken to him on the mount to the children of Israel.

There is a second witness. **Exodus 34:10-28** is the Biblical account of what was written on the second set of tablets and it includes the feasts. Even though there is plausible evidence that more than the Decalogue was written on the tablets of stone, I can sense that you will require proof that there was more than just the Decalogue written by the very finger of the Almighty on the tablets of stone. First witness: The Almighty says He wrote the law (Torah) and the commandments on the tablets, **Exodus 24:12**. The Law [Torah] is all the instructions found in the 5 books Moses wrote.

And here's yet another witness. *With whom YHVH had made a covenant, and charged them, saying, Ye shall not fear other gods, nor bow yourselves to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them: But YHVH, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt with great power and a stretched out arm, Him shall ye fear, and Him shall ye worship, and to Him shall ye do sacrifice. And the statutes, and the ordinances, and the law, and the commandment, **which He wrote for you, ye shall observe to do for evermore; and ye shall not fear other gods. II Kings 17:35-37***

I just presented as evidence **Tests 1, 2** and **3** to prove that the feasts are part of the perpetual covenant YHVH made with His people and that this covenant consisted of much more than just the commandments.

Had Bro. Murray read [John 1:29](#) and [Luke 24:27](#) as proof that Jesus fulfilled the sacrificial law, especially where John says “behold the lamb of Yah, that takes away the sin of the world.”

Here, Du Prez once again, for all his education and degrees, shows his ignorance of the festival system. Ignorant does not mean stupid, it just means lack of knowledge. Knowledge is the remedy for ignorance; stupid is forever. Clearly these men were not stupid. Immersed for too long in the doctrine of the church, yes; stupid, no.

Please look at the ordinances of the Passover found in **Exodus 12**, **Leviticus 23:14**, and **Deuteronomy 16:1-8**. Du Prez and Murray are Adventist pastors who know very well know the meaning of type/anti-type. Passover in type was a memorial of the exodus. The Passover lamb was not a blood sacrifice; it was a commanded part of the meal. The sin offerings were ONLY eaten by the priests who offered them, never by the sinner, **Leviticus 1, 4, 5, 6, 7**. Passover was eaten by the entire congregation. The sacrifice that took away the sin of the nation was YHVH's goat at Day of Atonement, not Passover, so how was Jesus the Lamb of Yah that took away the sin of the world? The Passover in type was not an atonement offering, which means that it cannot be an atonement or sin offering in anti-type.

As further proof: Type--The throat of the sacrificial offerings was slit. The fat of the sin offerings was removed and the quarters were burnt. This did not happen to Jesus. He was crucified by Roman soldiers. And this is anti-type?

Type--The Passover lamb was killed, THEN eaten and the remains burnt. **Exodus 12:3-11**. Jesus was eaten (symbolically), THEN killed but his remains were NOT burnt. And this is anti-type?

Type--The Passover lamb (and ALL sacrifices for that matter) had to be perfect, without spot or blemish. Jesus was beaten, he was bruised, he was scourged (twice) and he bled from the crown of thorns, **he was not without blemish before his death**. And this is anti-type?

If anyone says we have to keep the feasts, they are saying we have to offer sacrifices, which nullifies what Jesus did.

He said this several ways, as if saying it 2-3 different ways would somehow make it a truthful statement:

A person keeping the “Jewish celebrations” is tantamount to denial of Jesus Christ’s Messiahship.

Should people who believe that Jesus Christ was Messiah be keeping the feasts? Answer: No.

Why not? What did Jesus do? How did his death help me? Only clean animals were accepted as an offering to YHVH. Humans are more unclean than swine. If you touch the carcass of an unclean animal you are only unclean until even, **Leviticus 11:24**. If you touch the carcass of a dead man, you are unclean for **seven** days, **Numbers 19:11**. Child (human) sacrifice is condemned in the Torah. **Deuteronomy 18:10, II Kings 16:3**. Human sacrifice was for the atonement of sins only for pagan deities and rejected by YHVH as an abomination.

To top it all off, Passover was not a sin offering. Torah and the prophets confirm that no one can die for the sins of another.

The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin. Deuteronomy 24:16

In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.

But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge. Jeremiah 31:29-30

Ezekiel 18:4 *Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die.*

Ezekiel 18:20 *The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.*

Please read all of **Ezekiel 18** in context. There is no way Jesus could die for our sins. I just applied **Tests 1** and **2** as I’ve provided 2-3 witnesses of the Father Himself speaking. Jesus was anointed (Messiah) or appointed to obey the Torah before a nation in apostasy and bondage. He kept the feasts, he spoke the Father’s Name (which nearly got him stoned at least twice), he was commissioned to restore Torah observance and destroy the Babylonian Talmud and doctrines of men. I John 2:6 says that those who “abide in him” (Jesus) ought to walk just as he walked. See also Matthew 11:29. Jesus was a Torah observant feast keeper who rightly used the Father’s Name before the congregation. I do not deny anything he did; in fact, I am walking just as he walked. Those who deny Yeshua (a.k.a. Jesus) and his ministry are men who say we do not have to know or speak the sacred Name YHVH or keep the feasts as he clearly did.

Du Prez said his presentation was canonical, contextual and comprehensive.

Well, considering all the contextual evidence I've presented from the Hebrew canon that contradicts his position, I would have to say that I disagree. I just applied **Test 5**. Comprehensive means looking at ALL the evidence before coming to a conclusion. Obviously, Du Prez did nothing of the sort.

*To the Law [Torah] and the testimony [of the prophets], if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. **Isaiah 8:20***

Du Prez had Bro. Murray read **Daniel 9:27** and said that this verse was about Jesus coming and confirming the covenant and then in the middle of the week [seven year period] would cause the sacrifices and oblations to cease, that this would end the sacrifices and offerings. He also said that this verse predicted the end of the sacrificial system.

Well, at the bottom of page 8 above, Scripture reveals that the sacrificial system is NOT done away with, that both righteous and wicked will still offer sacrifices unto YHVH near the end of time. I guess the prophets who wrote these inspired Words of YHVH didn't get the memo that Jesus' death would nullify the sacrificial system.

Agreed, this Messiah is killed, but for no crime committed. **Daniel 9:25-26** also says that the followers of this "Messiah" (the people of the prince) shall destroy the city AND the sanctuary. I don't know about you, but I never counted on following a Messiah that would ask me to destroy the city of Jerusalem or the sanctuary where YHVH's Name is housed. See **I Chronicles 22:19, I Kings 5:5, 8:17**, et al. There is more than one Messiah in Scripture. In all, there are at least 4 named Messiah's in Scripture and many un-named as the priests were all called Yah's anointed (**Leviticus 4:3, 4:5, 4:16**, et al) using the same Hebrew word, Mashiyach translated as Messiah.

The nation of Jacob/Israel (**I Chronicles 16:11-22**), Saul (**I Samuel 24:5-6**, et al), David (**II Samuel 19:16-23, Psalm 18:50**, et al) and the pagan king Cyrus (**Isaiah 45:1**) are all called Messiah in Scripture. The word Messiah (H4899) is used 39 times in 38 different verses.

Agreed, this Messiah is cut off, but why do his people destroy the Jerusalem and the sanctuary that was rebuilt in **9:25**? Whose side are they on anyway? Or more probative, just who is this Messiah whose followers are so destructive to the city of Yah and His sanctuary? If I were YHVH, I would cut off this "Messiah" too. You have to remember, Messiah only means anointed, it does NOT mean righteous. Cyrus, a pagan king, was named Messiah 150 years before his birth, **Jeremiah 45:1**. He was anointed by YHVH to take Babylon, yet he was a pagan king.

Also, there are two Messiah's mentioned in **Daniel 9:24-26**, the vowel markings are different for the spelling of each. The first Messiah (the one called Prince) seems to be the bad guy because it is his followers that destroy the city and sanctuary after the second Messiah is cut off. Is it possible for two messiah's to be here at the same time? Sure, both King Saul and David were called mashiyach (messiah or anointed) simultaneously, so it can happen again.

In I Corinthians 5:7, Paul says that the sacrificial system would come to an end. Said that Paul and the apostles kept the feasts because of their culture, they "knew" they were done away with, but still worshipped in the same synagogue and observed the same calendar (oh my, this is an interesting admission!) so of course they would keep the feasts from time to time by habit.

That's odd. Scripture does not say or teach this. Du Prez is adding to the text here, which is a dangerous proposition. **Deuteronomy 4:2**, Revelation 22:18. Let's see what we can learn by simply finding out what the NT DOES say...

Paul Wanted to go to Jerusalem to (a) Convert Israelites, (b) Keep the Feast, or (c) Both.

Believers, neither adding nor subtracting, should never have trouble accepting what is plain ink on the pages of Scripture. Du Prez says the only reason Paul attended the Hebrew festivals was in order to meet and convert Israelites to christianity but not actually to keep the feasts as commanded in Scripture.

The Newer Testament says Paul, a Pharisee, was in complete harmony with the Torah (Acts 24:13-14, Acts 25:7-8). Pharisees were zealous for the law (Torah). Sure Paul wanted to be in Jerusalem for Passover; the place would be full of Hebrews. Paul was an evangelist--evangelists like big crowds. Regarding Acts 20:6, one author says this:

“At Philippi Paul tarried to keep the Passover. Only Luke remained with him, the other members of the company passing on to Troas to await him there. The Philippians were the most loving and true hearted of the Apostles converts, and during the eight days of the feast he enjoyed peaceful and happy communion with them.” *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 390-391. **My margin says this event took place 29 years after the crucifixion.**

Acts of the Apostles, p. 389, says Paul wanted to--but could not go to Jerusalem this particular year because of a plot on his life. So, at Philippi--a place that did not have then and still does not have an Israelite synagogue--Paul kept Passover and the feast of Unleavened Bread with gentiles. If the only reason Paul was going to Jerusalem was to preach the good news to unconverted Hebrews, but not to keep the feasts himself, why then, without a multitude of Israelites in sight, does Paul **still** keep these two feasts with his gentile converts? Paul, by keeping the feasts named in the covenant (**Exodus 23:14-15**) even with Gentiles, is displaying spiritual integrity. In a place where no Israelite could witness or judge his behavior, Paul still obeyed the command of YHVH. Why?

The simple solution: Paul taught the Philippians and all his other converts to do as he did, and as Jesus did for that matter. *Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do*, Philippians 4:9, (see also Philippians 3:17, I Corinthians 4:16 and I Corinthians 11:1). It certainly was not a cultural thing, a habit hard to break. Culture prohibited Israelites from keeping feasts with gentiles, remember? When Paul is connected at all with a feast, he is either hurrying to keep it, is keeping it, or has kept it already, all well after Calvary.

Acts 18:21 [AD 54] ==> Unspecified feast, probably Passover as this was the most highly attended feast.

1 Corinthians 5:7-8 [AD 59] and **Acts 20:6** [AD 60] ==> Passover/Unleavened Bread.

1 Corinthians 16:8 [AD 59] and **Acts 20:16** [AD 60] ==> Pentecost

Acts 27:9 [AD 62] ==> Day of Atonement.

Peter, who preached at Pentecost after the ascension, the disciples, and the rest of the 120 in the upper room must have missed where the man from Galilee did away with this feast. Pentecost represents the indwelling of Yah's Spirit, which is precisely what occurred during this feast. If Jesus' death had nullified the feasts, why did the Spirit of YHVH attest to and bless this feast?

Why so many references to the feasts after the fact if they all met antitype at Calvary? Acts 18:21 shows Paul's personal responsibility in festival observance: "I must...keep this feast," while I Corinthians 5:8 indicates our corporate responsibility for festival observance: "Therefore let us keep the feast..."

The burden of proof for those believe that the feasts are not part of the Good News of Salvation rests on the shoulders of those who present this argument. The Good News includes the entire Israelite economy (which includes the feasts). Here are two (of many) witnesses:

"Far, very far, are human minds from grasping the teachings of Christ. These are old truths in new settings. The entire system of Judaism was the gospel veiled. Those who will not consider are like the Jews. It is humbling to their dignity and pride to work the mines of truth. But the Light of the world is sending his divine rays to illuminate **the entire Jewish economy**, and the minds that have been accepting the sayings of men as the commandments of God are to be educated to look to God himself, the author of all truth." *Review & Herald, July 12, 1898*

"**The system of Jewish economy was the gospel in figure, a presentation of Christianity which was to be developed as fast as the minds of the people could comprehend spiritual light.** Satan ever seeks to make obscure the truths that are plain, and Christ ever seeks to open the mind to comprehend every essential truth concerning the salvation of fallen man. To this day there are still aspects of truth which are dimly seen, connections that are not understood, and far-reaching depths in the law of God that are uncomprehended. There is immeasurable breadth, dignity, and glory in the law of God; and yet the religious world has set aside this law, as did the Jews, to exalt the traditions and commandments of men." *Fundamentals of Christian Education, p. 238*

On a secular talk radio program recently we heard that "Christmas is a vital part of the U.S. economy." If this feast day is part of the American economy, it would be dishonest to say that the Creator's appointed times (feast days) were not a vital part of the Hebrew economy. In light of this, re-examine the above quotes.

No doubt you already understand the Commandments; if so, what's left? The word Law means *Torah*. Please note this letter from Polycrates, a 65 year old elder in his assembly, to Victor, Bishop of Rome, quoted in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*...

*"Therefore we keep the day undeviatingly, neither adding nor taking away, for in Asia [Minor] great luminaries sleep, and they will rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he shall come with glory from heaven and seek out all the saints. Such were **Philip** . . . and his two daughters. . . . There is also **John**, who lay on the Lord's breast. . . . And there is also Polycarp at Smyrna, both bishop and martyr, and Thraseas, both bishop and martyr, from Eumeneae. . . . [Also] Sagaris, . . . Papirius, . . . and Melito. . . . All these kept the fourteenth day of the Passover according to the gospel, never swerving, but following according to the rule of faith. And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, love according to the tradition of my kinsmen, and some of them have I followed. For seven of my family were bishops and I am the eighth, and my kinsmen ever kept the day when the people put away the leaven. Therefore, brethren, I who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord and conversed with brethren from every country, and have studied all holy Scripture, am not afraid of threats, for they have said, who were greater than I, "It is better to obey God rather than men." . . .*

About 160 years after the crucifixion, Polycrates was summoned to appear before the Bishop of Rome to explain why he refused to teach the observance of Easter.

In his letter, Polycrates is very emphatic about the practices of the early body of believers. The early assembly unswervingly observed Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, (which, history says, it did for **300 years** after Calvary). Regrettably as the early leaders died off, paganism began to creep into the assembly. With the influx of half converted gentiles, Easter entirely replaced Passover, only Israelites remained faithful to the holy days ordained by the Almighty. As the “Jews” were more and more hated and reviled, persecution increased. “Christianity” further distanced itself from the faith of Israel by adopting so called “christian festivals,” completely forsaking the Divinely ordained festivals, including the Sabbath. Satan very cleverly used time and bigotry (anti-Semitism) to his advantage. It is time for truth seekers to awake! Do New Years, Valentines, Easter, Halloween, and Christmas sound familiar? **Beast days** vs. **Feast Days**, indeed! The festivals that christianity has adopted are not very Yah-like; they were and are pagan, just given religious sounding titles.

“In the time of the end every divine institution is to be restored.” *Prophets and Kings*, p. 678. We believe it is well past time for believers to return to the original holy days as appointed by YHVH. If you are serious about returning the original holidays [YHVH’s holy days] please study **Leviticus 23**.

I just used **Tests 2, 3** and **6** to prove that Paul kept the feasts, not because of any cultural consideration or habit, but because he was compelled to do so by the Word of YHVH, and taught his gentile converts to do likewise. When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should say so.

[The sacrifices that occurred on the Sabbath were separate, distinct from the Sabbath. The sacrifices that occurred on the annual Sabbaths were inextricably linked, intertwined though.](#)

This is illogical and is, when taken to its deepest level of understanding, a double minded statement. The sacrifices were ordinances that were performed on a certain day. The feasts themselves were statutes commanded by YHVH to a thousand generations. The sacrificial law was not written on the tablets of stone, the feasts were as revealed above.

[Du Prez said that perpetual means as long as something lasts, until it meets its purpose](#)

And I agree 100%. That is the meaning of the word. If I said that the log burned forever without any other qualifiers, that means that when it was reduced to ashes, forever was over, there was nothing left. However, there is a qualifier added to the term perpetual regarding the covenant and feasts. One thousand generations was added to this equation and we are only about 200 generations into them.

Considering that none of the feasts met their anti-type with the birth, life, ministry or death of Jesus, they still have their purpose, and are still therefore as binding as the day they were given.

[Question: Are they Jewish feasts \[meaning ancient Israel, not modern Jews\] or YHVH’s feasts?](#)

Answer: **Numbers 29:39**--*These things ye shall do unto the LORD in your set feasts, beside your vows, and your freewill offerings, for your burnt offerings, and for your meat offerings, and for your drink offerings, and for your peace offerings.*

Then Du Prez went to **Numbers 27:2** to get the context of the passage in chapter **29**, and “proved” that Moses was speaking to the Israelite congregation. So his conclusion was that these feasts are the JEWS’ feasts.

Correct Answer: *And YHVH spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, Concerning the **feasts of YHVH**, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are **My feasts**. Six days shall work be done: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of YHVH in all your dwellings. **Leviticus 23:1-3***

After telling Moses that the weekly Sabbath was His FIRST feast [Hebrew word, Mo’edim], YHVH continues in **Leviticus 23:4**...

These are the feasts [Hebrew word, Mo’edim] of YHVH, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons.

Leviticus 23:5-36 then lists the Feasts of YHVH in chronological order, Passover, Unleavened Bread, Feast of Weeks (a.k.a. Pentecost), Feast of Trumpets, Day of Atonement, and Feast of Tabernacles. Please also read **Exodus 12:11**, **Leviticus 23:37, 44**, **Ezra 3:5**, and **II Chronicles 2:4**. I have just used **Tests 2** and **7** to prove that YHVH claims the feasts given to Israel as HIS feasts. In the first two texts above, YHVH Himself is speaking.

In order to prevent a spitting match with some sharp minded student out there, let me address **Isaiah 1:11-13** before this goes any further. In Isaiah 1, it is evident that Israel is in apostasy, so there are two possible explanations. 1. Israel has adopted pagan feasts and sacrifices and holydays and so are presuming to pay homage to YHVH with a pagan system of worship. 2. Israel is keeping the correct feasts at the proper times as written in the Torah, but are in apostasy elsewhere, worshipping other gods. Read **Isaiah 1:2-9** and tell me what you think. Either way, I understand why the Father would distance Himself from these people at the appointed times in question. Originally, when they were first given to Israel, they were Yah’s feasts. Any deviation to this original plan made them apostate Israel’s version of Yah’s feasts; thus they were rightly called, “your feasts”. Please note that YHVH also condemned “your new moons” and “your Sabbaths” in this passage, and EVERYONE knows that the 7th day Sabbath was created and established BY YHVH for man. There is no question of ownership or authorship for the weekly Sabbath, so whatever happened in this chapter, the Father was not distancing Himself from honest observance of days, appointments He set apart for us.

When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should say so.

Du Prez says that the council of Acts 15 does away with circumcision, and said that the feasts AND circumcision pointed to Messiah.

Before I address Acts 15, can anyone tell me what circumcision has to do with Messiah? Paul said that everything that happened to Israel was for our example [meaning an example to follow].

I John 2:6 also says that if you abide in Jesus, you should walk even as he walked. Jesus was circumcised on the 8th day, in obedience to the Torah. Since when can someone else's obedience be accounted to me? If that is the case, I need not obey at all because Jesus obeyed all the commandments. Come now, let us reason together.

Read Acts 15:6-29 for the original account. Men like Du Prez say this proves that the rest of the "law of Moses" was done away with--eliminating the need to keep the statutes and feasts. Why, at the Jerusalem Council, was it settled upon that Gentile converts must refrain from things strangled and from blood (Acts 15:19-20)? Because the "Law of Moses" says so—**Leviticus 3:17**, and **17:14**. These are statutes that men like Du Prez think were nailed to the cross, yet in 51 A.D. (20 years after Calvary) these statutes were STILL being asked of new believers. Why?

If the only laws Gentile converts had to worry about 2000 years ago were circumcision, eating blood or things strangled, eating food offered to idols, recognizing the difference between Hebrews and Gentiles, fornication and the ritual aspects of the sacrificial law--then why do we teach new converts Sabbath observance, tithing, to not eat unclean meat, and how to properly dispose of the bread and wine, etc. (these are statutes listed in the Torah), then teach them that the other statutes were nailed to the cross. Says who? Certainly not the Giver of these statutes and laws; YHVH says that those who are partial in the Law (Torah) are contemptible and base, **Malachi 2:8-9**. Why eat unleavened bread at all at "communion" if the statutes were done away with? Jesus DIED after he ate the unleavened bread with his disciples.

These gentiles in Acts 15 were coming out of paganism and were struggling with certain issues as they were constantly exposed to their former lifestyle. SDA's are a health conscious bunch. Has it ever occurred to them that eating things offered to idols would spiritually plug the gentiles brains, and eating blood and things strangled would physically plug their brains. The health message is the right hand of the gospel, remember? (EGW said it many times, *Southern Watchman*, 1-29-1901, 1-15-1903, et al.) You have to start SOMEWHERE with pagans, why wouldn't you start right there? Those who sat in on the Jerusalem Council were apparently better Adventists than the current batch. When a new convert joins the church today, all they have to do is profess to believe the 28 fundamental beliefs, which does not translate into perfect practice, but they have to start SOMEWHERE, right?

The Jerusalem Council took place in 51 A.D. Paul observed Passover and Unleavened Bread with GENTILE converts nine years later in Philippi in 60 A.D. What happened? Paul ATTENDED the Jerusalem Council. Did he forget that he was not supposed to teach festival observance to the gentiles? Come now, let us reason together!

Did you know that a New Testament man and his wife (Ananias and Sapphira) lost their lives for breaking an Old Testament statute two years after Calvary? Read Acts 5:1-11 and check the marginal reference for verse 3. Now read **Numbers 30:2** and **Deuteronomy 23:21-23**. Don't be fooled! You can transgress against the statutes in the "Law of Moses" and there is a penalty—death! Even after Calvary. Read Acts 5:3 and verse 9. These two were killed by the Spirit of YHVH. What, didn't the Set-Apart Spirit of YHVH get the memo that the statutes were no longer binding and breaking them no longer held a penalty? Come now, let us reason together!!!

I just used **Tests 2** and **3** to prove that Acts 15 was not an exclusive or comprehensive list of requirements for early believers.

Du Prez admits that the theme of Salvation is found in the feasts, but then asked, “But should we be keeping them?” he asks. His answer is no.

I have already proven with Scripture the error of his conclusion. Here are some quotes from the pen of one Ellen White...

“At these yearly assemblies the hearts of old and young would be encouraged in the service of God, while the association of the people from the different quarters of the land would strengthen the ties that bound them to God and to one another. Well would it be for the people of God at the present time to have a Feast of Tabernacles--a joyous commemoration of the blessings of God to them. As the children of Israel celebrated the deliverance that God had wrought for their fathers, and His miraculous preservation of them during their journeyings from Egypt, so should we gratefully call to mind the various ways He has devised for bringing us out from the world, and from the darkness of error, into the precious light of His grace and truth.

“**The Feast of Tabernacles was not only commemorative but typical.** It not only pointed back to the wilderness sojourn, but, as the feast of harvest, it celebrated the ingathering of the fruits of the earth, and pointed forward to the great day of final ingathering, when the Lord of the harvest shall send forth His reapers to gather the tares together in bundles for the fire, and to gather the wheat into His garner. At that time the wicked will all be destroyed. ...” *Patriarchs and Prophets, pp. 540-541*

“In consequence of continual transgression, the moral law was repeated in awful grandeur from Sinai. [YHVH] gave to Moses religious precepts which were to govern everyday life. These statutes were explicitly given to guard the ten commandments. They were not shadowy types to pass away with the death of Christ. They were to be binding upon men in every age as long as time should last. These commands were enforced by the power of the moral law, and they clearly and definitely explained that law.... *Review & Herald, 5-6-1875* **A thing that guards the ten commandments, cannot be the ten commandments. Binding as long as time should last is a long time. For an example of a statute guarding or explaining a commandment...**

“Again the people were reminded of the sacred obligation of the Sabbath. Yearly feasts were appointed, . . . The object of these regulations was stated: they proceeded from no exercise of mere arbitrary sovereignty; all were given for the good of Israel.

“These laws were to be recorded by Moses, and carefully treasured as the foundation of the national law, and, with the ten precepts which they were given to illustrate, the condition of the fulfillment of God’s promises to Israel.” *Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 311* **Believers are the seed of Abraham, whether by blood or by adoption, and our requirements are the same as for ancient Israel.**

“The statutes of the Lord are to be revered and obeyed. *Review & Herald, 12-20-1898*

“God has not changed. He is as particular and exact in His requirements now as He was in the days of Moses.” *SDA Bible Commentary, Vol. 1, p. 1111.*

I just used **Test 4** to show you that the statutes and feasts are still binding.

Du Prez said that Paul, the apostles and early believers kept the feasts for cultural reasons, kind of like we keep Thanksgiving. He admits that he observes Thanksgiving with his family.

The Unvarnished Origin of Thanksgiving

Believe it or not, Thanksgiving is as pagan as they come. If we are going to observe holidays, national or otherwise, it would be well to make sure that they have a pure origin. If we wish to honor the Creator then we need to make sure that we do not create our own ways of doing so. Are you interested in learning the historical facts about Thanksgiving? Let's not assume that we have no need for further enlightenment or no need to advance beyond our present condition.

When we first began observing the Creator's feasts it was easy to see the pagan underpinnings of Easter, Halloween and Christmas. We figured that our National holidays (July 4th, Labor Day, Thanksgiving, etc.) were all safe. Were we ever wrong! After learning the truth behind Thanksgiving, it too has been jettisoned along with the other pagan holidays. Most of the following information on Thanksgiving is from a book written by Catherine Sinclair, PhD.

Thanksgiving for the annual harvest is one of the oldest holidays known to man though celebrated on different dates. The Chinese and Hindus are said to have celebrated harvest feasts thousands of years ago. The Israelites were instructed to keep the feast of Tabernacles (Sukkoth) a convocation that was to last eight days. The Old Testament is replete with commands to gather harvest and rejoice. The most well known are found in **Deut. 16:14** and **Lev. 23:10**.

The ancient Greek harvest festival was called Thesmophora and celebrated Demeter, the founder and goddess of the harvests. The symbols of Demeter were poppies and ears of corn, a basket of fruit and a little pig. The Roman goddess of the harvest, Ceres (from whom we get our word cereal) had a festival, which occurred on October 4th and was called the Cerelia.

SYMBOLS OF THANKSGIVING OR SYMBOLS OF THE FRUITFUL GODDESS AND HER FERTILITY RITES

Cornucopias- In Greek Mythology, the horn of Amalthea (the name of the goat who suckled Zeus) became known as the cornucopia or horn of plenty. ISIS (the Egyptian faithful wife, mother, and goddess) was identified with Hathor, the HORNED COW Goddess. Horns are still used in pagan festivals today.

Harvest Queen- A name given to Ceres the Roman goddess of agriculture and crops or to a young woman chosen from among the reapers to whom was given a post of honor at the harvest home. Also the 1948 edition of The Universal World Reference Encyclopedia tells us, "Demeter, the Greek version of the Egyptian goddess Isis and Roman version of Ceres, is one of the principle Grecian deities, the great mother goddess, the nourishing and fertilizing principles of nature."

Corn - represents Ceres, the corn goddess (agriculture and crops) or Xilonen -goddess of the new corn.

Poppies - Ceres corresponds with Isis of the Egyptians and Demeter of the Greeks. She is represented with a garland of ears of grain on her head, holding in one hand a lighted torch and in the other a poppy, which was sacred to her.

Piglet (Sow)- Demeter was presented with a cow and a sow as well as honey, poppies, corn and fruit indicating thanksgiving for a land of plenty. [Swine are an abomination to YHVH, see **Isaiah 65:3-4.**]

Thanksgiving - a holiday, or holy day? Remember YHVH has given, through His Holy Scriptures His holy days. YHVH tells His people to keep His feasts in Leviticus 23. He says these are signs for His people. The Feast of Tabernacles is the only feast to be celebrated as the feast of ingathering for His people.

In England, the autumnal feast was called Harvest Home and was derived from the druidical harvest feast. [The druids are the most openly Satanic in their form of worship.] This three-day feast began with a special service at the village church, which had been decorated for the occasion with fruit and flowers, afterwards followed a communal dinner. In America the celebration of Thanksgiving sprang up haphazardly and was celebrated, if at all, on different days in different parts of the country.

In America, the Puritans originally shunned the Harvest Home (Thanksgiving). All saint's days were swept off the calendar as well as Christmas and Easter, on the grounds that these mixed "papal" rituals with pagan customs. Their religious beliefs as well as the austerity and difficulty of their lives did not permit them the luxury of gay and merry holidays. Their severe living conditions required discipline and sacrifice. Later, Thanksgiving, a holiday thanking God for the harvest enabling them to survive the winter, seemed to them to be a more fitting celebration than the other more established feasts of the church. But was it the right decision?

Now let's take a closer look at our Thanksgiving holiday, today, celebrated by nearly all in the United States, and in different countries throughout the world. In 1620, as the story goes, the small band of Pilgrims of Plymouth Colony braved the perilous North Atlantic in quest of religious freedom. Instead of landing in spring and further south as planned, they landed in the winter months (November) and faced a harsh winter with meager supplies. Those meager supplies dwindled rapidly and only 55 of the original 102 survived till spring. Because the summer was blessed with sunshine and rain and the autumn harvest was bountiful the Pilgrim colony, appropriately grateful, established a three-day feast of Thanksgiving. Today nearly all Americans celebrate this holiday believing it pure and holy, a day thought to be closer to really pleasing and praising God with thanksgiving than any other. However ... is it?

THANKSGIVING VENEER EXPOSED

The first veneer layer (liar): The Plymouth Colony was not the first English Colony to land in America, nor were they the first to offer thanks.

The second layer: The first Thanksgiving was held August 9, 1607, by colonists enroute to found the short lived Popham Colony at what is now Phippsburg, Maine. After their two ships had reached one of the George's Islands off the Maine Coast, they gave "God" thanks for their "happy metinge and saffe aryval into the country." The first permanent English settlement in America was founded at Jamestown, VA 1607. As early as December 4, 1619 the settlers set aside a day to give thanks for the survival of their small company. Their day of thanks continued to be observed on December 4, until 1622, when a conflict with Indians almost devastated the colony.

The third layer: The historical official pilgrim Thanksgiving Day, was not even a day completely given to thanks and praise to God as some believe we do today. This day was a show of military power for the Indians as seen in the following article:

“The first autumn, an ample harvest insured that the colony would have food for the winter months. Governor Bradford, with one eye on the divine Providence, proclaimed a day of thanksgiving to God, and with the other eye on the local political situation, extended an invitation to neighboring Indians to share in the harvest feast. In order to guarantee that the feast served to cement a peaceful relationship, the three-day long feast was punctuated by displays of the power of English muskets for the benefit of suitably impressed Indian guests.” *Thanksgiving, an American Holiday, an American History* by Diana Karter Applebaum

Fourth Veneer layer: As much as we'd like to think of Thanksgiving as a pure and holy holiday begun by the Pilgrims in Plymouth in 1621 it is not the truth. On the contrary, the Pagan harvest festival can be traced to the land of Ancient Babylon and the worship of the Great Mother (whore).

“The Christians took over the Roman holiday and it became well established in England, where some of the Roman customs and rituals for this day were observed long after the Roman Empire had disappeared.

“In England the “harvest home” has been observed continuously for centuries. The custom was to select a harvest queen for this holiday. She was decorated with the grain of their fields and the fruit of their trees. On Thanksgiving Day she was paraded throughout the streets in a carriage drawn by white horses. This was a remnant of the Roman ceremonies in honor of Ceres. But the English no longer thought of Ceres or cared much about her. They went to church on this day and sang their Thanksgiving songs.” *Our Wonderful World by Grolier Incorporated, New York, 1966, Vol. 17, pp. 220.*

The Primitive Fertility Religions have been portrayed through “cute” stories which effectively hid the vile, hideous meaning behind them. This worship during the day of “Thanksgiving” is emphatically the Ancient Fertility Rites merely veneered with the so called “respectability” of Christianity! The fact remains, that it is still the Ancient Fertility Worship.

“But,” you say, “Weren't our Pilgrim Father's righteous?” The Pilgrims only served YHVH as far as they would. Definitely, the Pilgrims worshipped on Sunday and they definitely did not keep the Feast Days as ordained in **Leviticus 23**. They did not keep the clean and unclean food laws as listed in **Leviticus 11** and **Deuteronomy 14**. As the Pilgrims studied the Scriptures they would have read of the Sabbath, Feast Days and about the clean and unclean food laws for themselves, but did not obey these commands.

Like so many Christian churches and denominations today, the Pilgrims wanted to do it their way and not YHVH's way. Is it any wonder then, that the Pilgrims would be just as deceived as the churches and assemblies of today--chasing after Baptized Paganism? However, there has always been an advocate for the TRUTH through out all ages, not all our early fathers were deceived. *As for me and my house we shall serve YHVH*, says Joshua the successor of Moses. Can we say that with conviction? May our Father in Heaven have great mercy on us as we continue to study the origins of these holidays which have sought to usurp the authority, praise and worship of our Heavenly Father, Creator of the Heavens and the Earth. [End]

I'm going to assume Du Prez does not observe Easter, even though he admits he preaches resurrection sermons at that time of the year. I'm going to give him the benefit of the doubt. He probably knows Easter is a pagan holiday and just has not researched the history and origin of Thanksgiving. However, I find it duplicitous of him to "accuse" Paul of observing the Feasts of YHVH only because the people around him still were or when his cultural upbringing caused him to accidentally forget "that the feasts were no longer binding". At least Paul was erring on the side of prudence, keeping YHVH's commands. Actually he made no error at all, he was in humble obedience. What excuse can Du Prez offer to YHVH when he observes pagan holidays, even if only to meet the people where they are but at the same time teaches them to NOT observe YHVH's sacred seasons?

I just used **Test 6** to prove that Thanksgiving, a feast Du Prez enjoys observing with his family, is a pagan holiday. When you add to this the fact that he does not observe the feasts and teaches men to do likewise, what sort of man is this that I should follow him? **Jeremiah 23:1**, Matthew 5:19, 23:15.

Question: New moon to new moon [**Isaiah 66:23**]. Does that lend itself to feast keeping?

Answer: The moon was an ancient clock or watch. ...

That's right!! Question: If the moon was the ancient clock or watch created and ordained by YHVH and observed by Israel, why isn't it STILL observed as a clock or watch created and ordained by YHVH? The Sabbath was given by YHVH, and was observed in the OT, the NT and will be observed in the new earth, so it should be kept now as well, right?

But alas, he went on to say:

... *Chodesh* is the Hebrew word used in **Isaiah 66**, translated as month. The primary meaning of *chodesh* is month, so **Isaiah 66:23** is really saying month to month, not new moon to new moon.

For instance, Revelation 22:2 says: *In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.* So every month we will worship before the Lord. **Isaiah 66** is not prediction we will keep the feasts in the new earth.

I agree; *chodesh* is most often translated as "month." The problem is that the way a word is translated is not necessarily any evidence at all as to its true meaning. For instance, the Hebrew word *Elohim* is translated as God in the KJV. The Hebrew actually means "mighty one" or "Almighty". God is a Scandanavian word, and is the name of their pagan sun deity.

God -- "...Common Teutonic word for personal worship, formerly applicable to super-human beings of heathen myth; on conversion of Teutonic races to Christianity, term was applied to the Supreme Being." *Encyclopedia Americana (1945 Edition)*.

Teutonic Druids called the sun Gud, Gudh, Goth, Gawd or Gott. The peoples of Sweden, Finland, and other nearby lands called the sun "Gott" in everyday language and have only recently changed to the Latin word, *Sol*.

I could go on and on and ON giving examples of poorly translated words in Scripture, but this one will suffice. Point is, Du Prez is relying upon a translation not the original Scripture. Despite his many degrees, and his ability to read and understand ancient languages, he goes with a modern translation of *chodesh* rather than the literal Hebrew meaning. Here is Strong's...

2320. חֹדֶשׁ Chôdesh, kho'-desh; from 2318; the new moon; by implication a month:--month(ly), new moon.

Let's follow the link... 2318. חָדַשׁ Châdash, khaw-dash'; a primary root; to be new; causatively to rebuild:--renew, repair

Chodesh means month ONLY by implication. Look up the meaning of *implication*! By inference, by insinuation, by suggestion, by allusion or allegation, *chodesh* means month. The word *chodesh* means rebuilding. The rebuilding what? The rebuilding of the moon. The word month comes to us from the word moonth, and originally the months were by the MOON. Imagine that? The months observed by most people today are misnamed. There is no link to the moon at all other than by implication really. And there is a reason for this...

“In 46 B.C., Julius Caesar asked astronomer Sosigenes to suggest ways to improve the calendar. Acting on Sosigenes suggestions, Caesar ordered the Romans to disregard the moon in calculating their calendars.” *World Book Encyclopedia, Vol. 3, p. 28.*

Whoever is in charge is in charge of the calendar. The calendar you observe tell you when to work and when to worship. WHEN you worship tells heaven and the on-looking universe WHO you worship, so getting the day right is THAT serious. Everyone who uses the daughter Gregorian calendar (mother calendar was the Julian calendar) for their system of worship is paying homage to a first century B.C. pagan emperor and a 16th century pope.

In Scripture, each month began on *chodesh* (“new moon” day). Presently, you can look at the modern calendar and “new moon” day can appear on any day of the Gregorian calendar months, and in fact on rare occasions, there are two “new moon” days in a 31 day papal month; one at the beginning and another near the end. I think everyone reading this recognizes that we will not be using the Gregorian calendar in the new heaven and the new earth. Well, maybe I should not assume this at all. Let me proceed thusly... When exactly do you suppose the new fruit will appear on the tree of life? On the first days of january, february, march, april, may, june, july, august, september, october, november, and december or on each successive new moon day?

When you can answer this honestly and without prejudice, you will understand that Du Prez and Murray were sincerely dishonest with **Isaiah 66:23** and Revelation 22:2. More importantly, they were dishonest with you, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. **Isaiah 66:23** literally says *from one rebuilding of the moon to the next rebuilding of the moon, and from one Sabbath to another Sabbath shall all flesh come to worship before My, saith YHVH*. There is a reason for this. Anciently, the children of YHVH had a Set-Apart convocation on each Sabbath. They also had a sacred assembly on new moon days, **Numbers 10:1-10**.

I just used **Tests 1** and **4** to show that Isaiah is indeed predicting that the new moons will be observed in the new earth. They were observed anciently and will be again in the future (just like the Sabbath), so why aren't Du Prez and Murray teaching new moon observance today?

Question: What did the apostles do? What was their practice?

Answer: Hebrews 11:28, they kept Passover by faith. Then Du Prez added that the Greek word for kept means instituted (to make or do), implying that Moses instituted the Passover.

Um, Hebrews 11:28 says by faith MOSES kept Passover in Egypt. It says nothing about why/how the apostles kept it. Further more, I think Du Prez is in dire peril, adding to Torah:

And YHVH spake unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying,

This month shall be unto you the beginning of months: it shall be the first month of the year to you.

Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house:

And if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbour next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls; every man according to his eating shall make your count for the lamb.

Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year: ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats:

And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening. Exodus 12:1-6

The Torah says, strike that, YHVH, the Creator and King of the Universe says that HE told Moses when, where and how to keep the Passover. Moses added:

Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of YHVH your Elohim which I command you.

Deuteronomy 4:2. See also Revelation 22:18-19.

Again, it seems duplicitous of Du Prez for asking us to accept a translation of the word chodesh and here he wants to stick to the literal root meaning of the word. Not to worry though, the word was translated nearly 3 dozen different ways (Strong's G4160), and taken together, means to make something happen or to do. It does not mean institute, and was never translated that way. YHVH instituted Passover, and gave Moses the instructions; it was to Moses to carry them out.

Acts 15 (written circa 49 A.D.) discusses what issues? Circumcision, which was the Abrahamic Covenant. The Jerusalem Council did not require it of the gentiles.

Well, YHVH does (**Ezekiel 44:6-9**), so who do you think I'm going to follow, Du Prez or YHVH? I just used **Test 1** to show that YHVH DOES require circumcision of strangers (gentiles). When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should say so.

Early in Acts, Peter used Pentecost to reach the Jews for the Lord. Paul in Acts 20 is not going to keep the feast, but to preach to the Jews. Du Prez admits that the text itself does not say why Paul wanted to go, but used the New Living Translation version of I Corinthians 9:20-21 as evidence that Paul was not going to keep Passover; he went only to reach people.

Du Prez admits he is adding, inserting his own conclusion to the text. How many watching immediately recognized him as a false teacher at that moment of admission? He was honest with his intentions. He admitted he was forcing his own conclusion onto the passage, yet how many of YOU let him get away with it without batting an eyelash? He insists over and over that he is presenting comprehensive, contextual, and canonical evidence. What book did Du Prez write that was added to Scripture?

Well friends, I, for one, am going to hold his feet to the fire. I'm going to call a spade a spade. Acts 18:21 (54 A.D.) shows Paul's personal responsibility in festival observance: "I must...keep this feast," while I Corinthians 5:8 (59 A.D.) indicates our corporate responsibility for festival observance: "Therefore let us keep the feast..." I guess he anticipated my response because he followed up with this...

Paul goofed up several times, but by the 60's when he wrote Colossians, finally he understood. These things were done away with.

Acts 20:6 ==> Passover/Unleavened Bread. [AD 60]

Acts 20:16 ==> Pentecost [AD 60]

Acts 27:9 ==> Day of Atonement [AD 62].

OK, you got me. Colossians was written in 64 A.D. Paul finally figured it out in the MID 60's. There's his safety outlet. However, Du Prez terribly misrepresents what Paul wrote in Colossians 2:14-17. Hang on; this is just getting good!

Du Prez says that Colossians 2 is difficult but CAN be understood in context.

Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;

And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ. Colossians 2:14-17

I agree, but I am surprised that he did not look at the context of the Hebrew Canon as that is the ONLY Scriptures known to Paul. The context I put to Colossians 2 is found in **Isaiah 8:20**. The context Du Prez puts to this passage is the tradition of the church. The rest of this rebuttal will show you exactly what I mean, starting immediately below...

Says that *chirographon tois dogmasin* (the Greek translated here as "handwriting of ordinances") means "ceremonial law" [even though he earlier admitted that this term is found nowhere in Scripture]. Then used Ephesians 2:15 intertextually to prove that dogmasin means ceremonial law, or ordinances other than the Ten Commandments.

While I LOVE to respond to erroneous doctrines, it is with some regret that nice men such as Du Prez and Murray set themselves up so poorly as experts in this particular arena. They establish the rules they wish to use to establish their conclusions, but when tested and scrutinized, the foundation they wish to present as rock solid is found to be severely flawed. For example:

Du Prez says that *chirographon tois dogmasin* means “handwriting of ordinances” then uses the context of Ephesians 2:15 to intertextually prove his point. His position is that this handwriting of ordinances is the ceremonial law, or ordinances other than the Ten Commandments. This, by the way, is the position of the SDA church.

There is a Greek translation of the Hebrew canon, the Septuagint. This body of work was referred to by Du Prez a few times. If he was really trying to establish the context of “handwriting of ordinances”, why didn’t he prove his point from the Septuagint?

If Du Prez is REALLY interested in establishing the context for the meaning of the Greek in Colossians 2, why wouldn’t he go to the Septuagint where the Torah is recorded in Greek? The Torah is where these “ceremonial” laws and ordinances (other than the Ten Commandments) were originally written. The reason he didn’t is because *chirographon tois dogmasin* is not used a SINGLE time to describe the sacrificial law, the ceremonies or the ordinances in the Greek OT, and these ceremonies and ordinances are mentioned hundreds of times. The word *dogma* is not even found one time in the Septuagint. So the comprehensive, contextual, and canonical evidence is that *chirographon tois dogmasin* has nothing to do with the ceremonies/ordinances.

Scripture is not the only ancient written resource out there. They are constantly digging up clay writing tablets in the middle east. *Chirographon tois dogmasin* is not an uncommon phrase. It was a business phrase, written on business receipts and tablets that record a paid transaction. For Du Prez so summarily dismiss “certificate of debt” as an accurate translation of *chirographon tois dogmasin* is a clumsy but calculated attempt to cover up the evidence. He can’t claim he was not aware of “certificate of debt” as a possible translation, but because this blows up his theology, Du Prez calls this an interpretation not a translation even though many, many scholars have translated it as “certificate of debt” because that was the way this phrase was used.

If you say something that I agree with or like, I might say, “COOL!”. Translation of that word would be: low temperature, not cold, but without warmth. Interpretation would be that I heartily agree, what you said was extremely acceptable to me. Very different so which one is incorrect? Fact is, both are correct IN THE CONTEXT of their use. Du Prez ignores this and his oversight here is more akin to willful negligence. He presented the position of the church, bending and distorting anything that impeded his effort. I am about to present Scripture, **Test 2** and **3**.

With very little research, *Handwriting of ordinances* is found to be a Greek idiom, and indicates a legal note of indebtedness, not the “ceremonial law.” The margin in our KJV says this phrase means “bond”--our NKJV margin says “certificate of debt with its (requirements).” Anciently, an IOU--a certificate of debt--was written on a clay tablet. When it was PAID IN FULL, it was ‘cancelled’ in a peculiar manner. A nail was driven through it destroying the record of debt. Interestingly--Paul was only using the commonly recognized business language of his day.

Indebted? Indebted for what? Well, what did you and I break? **1 John 3:4**. What do we owe? **Romans 6:23**. What do we need blotted out? Could it be the handwritten record of our sin that has been kept so faithfully? Here are four witnesses using the same language Paul used in Colossians. Paul was only repeating a wonderful truth made known in the scrolls in which he was so familiar. Fact: The Hebrew canon was all Paul had. Here are the verses Paul had in mind when he wrote Colossians 2:14...

Have mercy upon me, O Mighty One, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions. Psalm 51:1

Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities. Psalm 51:9

I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins. Isaiah 43:25

I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins: return unto me; for I have redeemed thee. Isaiah 44:22

By the way, Peter agrees with Paul, see **Acts 3:19**. There are no other inspired instructions regarding **Colossians 2:14**. So, we must allow Scripture, in the original language, to interpret itself. Du Prez is on record as saying:

Du Prez said that “Certificate of debt” is an interpretation, not a translation, and one has to go to extra-biblical sources to find this interpretation, so handwriting of ordinances is NOT a record of our sins. He added with a smile that we have to have the Bible interpret itself.

I agree, but I think Scripture just disproved his position. The difference between he and I is that he is trying to prove church doctrine in any manner possible. I have no agenda, I just want to know the truth, so I let Scripture tell ME what to believe, not a denomination.

He brings up the fact that *nomos* (the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew word Torah) translated as law does not appear in the book of Colossians. He said that this was because Paul did not want the gentiles to think that the Ten Commandments, health laws or tithing had been nailed to the cross. That this was ONLY limited to the ceremonial law or sacrificial law that pointed to Jesus Christ, and so were done away with, having met fulfillment.

I hate to break it to you if you have thus far accepted Du Prez’ conclusion but the health laws and tithing are ordinances OTHER than the Ten Commandments. The SDA denomination and Du Prez want these particular precepts, statutes or ordinances un-nailed, proving once and for all the hypocrisy of their position. They are partial in the law, **Malachi 2:8-9** which is contemptible and base according to YHVH.

Considering that he didn’t come close to proving his point above, I’m calling his bluff here. Where’s his proof? This is his OWN idea and he presents it as fact! And it is so far off as to be laughable if it weren’t so utterly sad. Paul didn’t use the word *nomos* (law) because he wasn’t trying to nail ANY law to the stake, ceremonial or otherwise. If Jesus said that until heaven and earth passed not one jot or tittle would change from the law, nothing Paul can say or do can change that fact. So, whatever Paul was trying to say should not only agree with Jesus, it had also better line up with the law and the prophets. The conclusion I presented above shows Paul in alignment with the only Scripture he knew. Du Prez arrays Paul against Jesus and the law.

“Christ, to enforce the will of his Father, became the author of the statutes and precepts given through Moses to the people of God. Christians who extol Christ, but array themselves against the law governing the Jewish church, array Christ against Christ.” *Review & Herald, 5-6-1875.*

Du Prez tried to use **Deuteronomy 31:26** as evidence for his position on Colossians 2; he said that Colossians 2 is an echo of **Deuteronomy 31**, which reads as follows:

Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of YHVH your Elohim, that it may be there for a witness against thee.

Here it is with the Strong's numbers attached:

Take^{H3947 (H853)} this^{H2088} book^{H5612} of the law,^{H8451} and put^{H7760} it in the side^{H4480 H6654} of the ark^{H727} of the covenant^{H1285} of YHVH^{H3068} your Elohim,^{H430} that it may be^{H1961} there^{H8033} for a witness^{H5707} against thee.

Do you see the problem with Du Prez' conclusion? The Law of Moses is not against us...it is a **witness**. *Against thee* should have been in italics as it was supplied by the translators. Every law, including the Decalogue is a witness against us, but ONLY if we transgress against it. A law points out our lack. Observing the statutes (also known as the ceremonial law and the law of Moses) is for our good. **Deuteronomy 6:24, Deuteronomy 10:13, Nehemiah 9:13**. Observing any righteous law is always in our best interest. It is not legalism. It's called obedience. Legal means that something is right. Men who say otherwise perhaps prefer illegalism?

Colossians 2:14 DOES say "against us" in Greek, the Hebrew in **Deuteronomy 31:26** does NOT say "against us." Can someone please explain how Colossians is an echo of Deuteronomy? No law of the eternal Yah is against us, it is there for our protection, a hedge about the body of believers. The record of our sin IS against us and it is THIS record that the prophets say will be blotted out. So, is Colossians 2 an echo of **Deuteronomy 31:26** or is it an echo of **Psalms 51:1, 51:9, Isaiah 43:25 and Isaiah 44:22** (seen at the top of page 33)? In the quotes below, does it sound to you like the law of YHVH is against us or for our good...?

"Jesus addressed all the people present; but the priests and rulers answered. 'He will miserably destroy those wicked men,' they said, 'and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.' The speakers had not at first perceived the application of the parable, but they now saw that they had pronounced their own condemnation. In the parable the householder represented God, the vineyard the Jewish nation, and the hedge the divine law which was their protection." *Desire of Ages, p. 596, para 3.*

"Whenever men choose their own way, they place themselves in controversy with God. They will have no place in the kingdom of heaven, for they are at war with the very principles of heaven. In disregarding the will of God, they are placing themselves on the side of Satan, the enemy of God and man. Not by one word, not by many words, but by every word that God has spoken, shall man live. We cannot disregard one word, however trifling it may seem to us, and be safe. There is not a commandment of the law that is not for the good and happiness of man, both in this life and in the life to come. In obedience to God's law, man is surrounded as with a hedge and kept from the evil. He who breaks down this divinely erected barrier at one point has destroyed its power to protect him; for he has opened a way by which the enemy can enter to waste and ruin." *Thoughts from the Mount of Blessing, p. 52, para 1*

"God will not take into His kingdom and give eternal life to those who will not come under His laws and statutes in this life." *Signs of the Times, 9-8-1887*

Du Prez continued saying, don't judge me. This passage says to judge not. Paul is saying: Don't let men judge you for NOT keeping these things that have been fulfilled, and believes he has arrived at the rock bottom truth of this matter.

Again, I could almost laugh were it not so utterly, utterly sad. Du Prez repeatedly speaks of contextual and intertextual evidence, yet blatantly ignores the contextual evidence here. Let no man judge you. There are only 2 persons are in position to judge in the context of the passage....

1. The person speaking, (Paul) or,
2. The false teachers spoken of in verses 4, 8, 18 and 20-22.

4--Beware lest any man should beguile you with enticing words.

8--Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men.

16--Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath *days*.

18--Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility.

22—Teaching the “commandments and doctrines of men.”

Where (in whose system) was wisdom and knowledge found? Read Colossians 2, verses 2, 3, 6 and 7. Whose system did Paul teach? Man's or Yah's?

Paul was saying not to let the false teachers with their vain precepts judge the service of the Colossians (which Paul had taught them). And Paul DID teach his followers statute and feast observance. Scholars say that the line “Which are a shadow of things to come” is a parenthetical statement, meaning that if you put it in parentheses that it will be better understood. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath (which are a shadow of things to come), but the body of Christ. Do not let anyone **BUT** the body of righteous believers judge you.

Du Prez gets clever in his presentation of his understanding of “holy days, new moons and Sababth *days*” saying that the Greek, *heorte* (translated as holy days) only referred to the pilgrimage feasts, Passover, Feast of Weeks (a.k.a. Pentecost) and Feast of Tabernacles and the Sabbath days must therefore refer to Feast of Trumpets and Day of Atonement because these are not included in the *heorte*. He mentioned that feast keepers look at these appointed times as being annual, monthly and weekly. He disagrees, saying that the Holy days are an annual event, the new moons are a monthly event, and the sabbath days are also an annual event.

Yearly, monthly, yearly. He says it is dishonest argument to say that these are annual, monthly and weekly events.

Really now? The Greek for “Sabbath *days*” is *Sabbaton*. Days is in italics, having been added by the translators. *Sabbaton* is the Greek word for the WEEKLY Sabbath, not the annual ones.

Strong's **G4521**, *σάββατον*, *sabbaton*, *sab'-bat-on*:

Of Hebrew origin [**H7676**]; the *Sabbath* (that is, *Shabbath*), or day of weekly *repose* from secular avocations (also the observance or institution itself); by extension a *se'nnight*, that is, the interval between two Sabbaths; likewise the plural in all the above applications: - sabbath (day), week.

If you are not familiar with H7676, that is *Shabbat*, the Hebrew word for the weekly Sabbath.

Strong's **H7676**, שַׁבָּת, shabba'ath, shab-bawth'

Intensive from H7673; intermission, that is, (specifically) the Sabbath: - (+ every) sabbath.

Du Prez likes to present intertextual evidence when he thinks it supports his position. He will not like this. All Paul did was use the language he was familiar with, that of the Hebrew canon.

Hebrew Canon	Annual	Monthly	Weekly
1 Chronicles 23:31	set feasts	new moons	sabbaths
2 Chronicles 2:4	solemn feasts	new moons	sabbaths
2 Chronicles 8:13	solemn feasts	new moons	sabbaths
2 Chronicles 31:3	set feasts	new moons	sabbaths
Nehemiah 10:33	set feasts	new moons	sabbaths
Ezekiel 45:17	the feasts	new moons	sabbaths
Hosea 2:11	feast days	new moons	sabbaths
Colossians 2:16	holyday	new moons	sabbath days

And to add insult to injury, in every other place in the NT that “*Sabbath days*” is used as a phrase it refers to the weekly Sabbath. (**Matthew 12:5, 12:10, 12:12, Mark 3:4, Luke 4:31, 6:2, 6:9, and Acts 17:2**). THIS is the evidence that is intertextually, linguistically, semantically, structurally and contextually correct. Why would **Colossians 2** be the exception? Fact is, *days* is in italics--therefore is added text and should be immediately discarded. It should read as Sabbaths. (Note: The term *ceremonial Sabbath* or *annual Sabbath* is foreign to Scripture.) Paul was actually referring to the OT passages above where the three different appointments in time are listed together: annual feast days, monthly new moons, and weekly Sabbaths. If Paul was referring to the annual Sabbaths, he was needlessly repeating himself. Feast days, new moons, feast days. A thought well presented by another Adventist theologian;

Dr. William Richardson, chair of the Dept of Religion, Andrew's University says, “The implication is that the Sabbath being described is the weekly Sabbath...when Paul here refers to the ‘Sabbath...[*days*],’ if he meant the ceremonial Sabbaths, he was needlessly repeating himself. In that case he would be saying, ‘Let no one pass judgment on you in regard to aceremonial Sabbath, or in regard to a new moon, or in regard to a ceremonial Sabbath,’ a statement neither logical nor likely.” *Ministry Magazine, May, 1997, p. 15*

It seems to me that the SDA church is arrayed against itself if the leaders cannot agree amongst themselves. That said, I have to give Richardson credit for having the brass to tell the truth.

Continuing, Du Prez said: Holy days = annual pilgrimages
 New moons = monthly services
 Sabbaths = annual non-seventh day Sabbaths.

That this is linguistically called A B A+, and gave another example from Colossians 2:21, touch not, taste not, handle not, where *touch* and *handle* are similar. He says his presentation is intertextually, linguistically, semantically, structurally and contextually correct. Then says that **Hosea 2:11** (see the above illustration) proves his point, that linguistically it does not follow for this to be understood as annual, monthly, weekly that it **MUST** be annual, monthly, annual.

In the verses in the illustration above, the Hebrew for the feasts, new moon and Sabbath is moedim, chodesh, and Shabbat, except **Ezekiel 45:17**. There, the Hebrew word chag is translated as feast; chag is the Hebrew word used to describe the pilgrimage feasts. In **Hosea 2:11**, there is a distinction made; both chag (Strong's H2282) and mo'edim (Strong's H4150) are used in this passage making a distinction between the pilgrimage feasts and the other annual feast days. This is not as strong of evidence as Du Prez would like. In **Leviticus 23** the word mo'edim is used to describe ALL of the appointments in time, weekly (**23:1-3**) and annual (**23:4**).

The word *mo'edim* is kind of like using the term automobile. It is a general term. Using *chag* is like saying Ford, being very specific about which kind of automobile. Du Prez is trying to say that Sabbath days in Colossians means annual feast days, then compares it to **Hosea 2:11** where the word for Sabbath means the WEEKLY Sabbath. What was he thinking? That no honest truth seeker would ever discover his deception?

Bottom line, the word for Sabbath in EVERY ONE of these passage recorded above is Shabbat in Hebrew or Sabbaton in Greek, the respective word for the weekly Sabbath. That is an intertextual, linguistical, semantical, structural and contextual fact. Couple this with the fact that in every place that "Sabbath days" appears in the NT it is referring to the weekly Sabbath (texts given above), and Du Prez is once again found to be a false teacher. Paul was using the A B C linguistic pattern found in the OT, not the A B A+ pattern drawn up by the wishful thinking of men who do not want to keep all the precepts found in Scripture or to live by EVERY word that proceeds out of the mouth of YHVH.

*And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of YHVH doth man live. **Deuteronomy 8:3***

Deuteronomy 8:3 is a statute QUOTED by Jesus as recorded in Matthew 4:4 and Luke 4:4. I just used **Test 2** and **3** to prove that Paul was referring to the weekly Sabbath days, not the annual non-seventh day Sabbaths.

When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they clearly have not, we should say so. Am I being unkind or am I being a watchman on the wall? *Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?* Galatians 4:16

Du Prez admitted that Israel observed a lunar year.

That is correct, and a huge admission on his part. Israel also observed lunar months that began with a new moon, as well as Sabbaths and the other mo'edim that Scripture says were regulated by the moon.

Admits that in the phrase “the Sabbath days” the word *days* in italics, but adds that the *the* is also in italics. Then he jumps through hoops to try to prove that because the *the* is not there, that means these are annual Sabbaths, not THE weekly Sabbath, which is always preceded by the article *the*.

In the Hebrew Canon, the phrase “the Sabbaths” is not preceded by the article *the*, it is supplied by the translators. So this is not a linguistic absolute, it is just something done in the Greek when an article is required. Which proves my point here-- In Acts 17:2, “Sabbaths” is not preceded by the article *the* because it is not necessary, being preceded by the word *three*.

THE Sabbaton = the weekly Sabbath

Three Sabbatons = three weekly Sabbaths.

In Colossians 2:16, there is a list of three things—holy days, new moons and Sabbaths. Please note that I did not have to say, the holy days, the new moon days, and the Sabbaths when stringing together this list of items. The article *the* is not necessary. If you can find a list of items anywhere else in the NT, I guarantee you will not find the article the preceding each item in the list because it is not linguistically necessary.

For examples: Please add water, butter and sugar to the cake mix does not have to be written, please add the water, the butter then the sugar. I purchased wrenches, screwdrivers and wire cutters in order to repair the tractor does not have to be written, I purchased the wrenches, the screwdrivers and the wire cutters. I'm no scholar, but if Acts 17:2 linguistically does not require a *the*, neither does Colossians 2:16.

Not only his Du Prez' conclusion shaky on linguistic and semantic grounds, the fact is the Greek word Sabbaton is always used when referring to THE weekly Sabbath. There is not a single exception anywhere in the NT, yet he wants you to believe (without any substantial evidence) that Colossians 2 is the exception to the rule. Come now, let us reason together.

Du Prez also points out that in the *s* in Sabbath in Colossians 2:16 is lower case, which indicates that this is not the weekly Sabbath saying that it is upper case everywhere else.

This just gets better and better. I have about 20 versions, and nearly every time the word Sabbath or Sabbaths appears in either the old or new testaments, the *s* is in the lower case.

First he tells us that his conclusions are intertextually, linguistically, semantically, structurally and contextually correct, and he chides us for accepting “interpretations” over translations, then he comes up with this lame excuse, calling it evidence. Whether the words are capitalized or not is up to the modern translators. There were/are NO capital letters or punctuation marks in Hebrew and ancient Greek didn't have any LOWER case letters or punctuation marks, so how on earth can Du Prez think to use this as evidence? He's accepting the theology of the translators!!

Du Prez states that something that is a shadow is to be differentiated from something eternal. Adding that the ceremonial Sabbaths are shadows of Jesus Christ but the weekly Sabbath is not a shadow.

Well, first of all, Paul WAS talking about the weekly Sabbath. This has been intertextually, linguistically, semantically, structurally and contextually proven above to you, the ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Du Prez and Murray have offered the position of the church as evidence and had to spin the texts they cherry picked out of Scripture in order to create any evidence at all. They did not follow anything that even closely resembled the list I follow in order to determine what is truth, nor did they follow the one written by the pen of Ellen White:

“1. Every word must have its proper bearing on the subject presented in the Bible;
2. All Scripture is necessary, and may be understood by diligent application and study;
3. Nothing revealed in Scripture can or will be hid from those who ask in faith, not wavering;
4. To understand doctrine, bring all the scriptures together on the subject you wish to know, then let every word have its proper influence; and if you can form your theory without a contradiction, you cannot be in error;
5. **Scripture must be its own expositor**, since it is a rule of itself. If I depend on a teacher to expound to me, and he should guess at its meaning, or desire to have it so on account of his sectarian creed, or to be thought wise, then his guessing, desire, creed, or wisdom is my rule, and not the Bible.” *EGW, Review & Herald, 11-25-1884* [Emphasis my own.]

Now, let’s see what PAUL had to say on this subject. I’ve taken the liberty of removing the words in italics (added by the translators) and adding the parentheses that scholars say are needed around Paul’s parenthetical statement:

Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;
Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.
Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or new moon, or sabbath:
(Which **are** a shadow of things to come); but the body of Christ. Colossians 2:14-17

So you see the problem Du Prez has? It is underlined and bold. Colossians 2 was written in 64 A.D., about 33 years after Jesus death, and Paul uses the present indicative tense, NOT past tense when speaking of these shadows. The feast days, new moon and Sabbath ARE a shadow of things to come. He did not say WERE shadow of things in the past.

There are so many problems with Du Prez’ assessment of Colossians 2 that his earlier statement about this chapter being difficult seems prophetic.

Here is a recap:

1. Du Prez says that *chirographon tois dogmasin* means the ordinances of the ceremonial law, but really it means the handwritten record of our sin.

The reason men like Du Prez try to nail the “ordinances” to the cross is because Passover is an ordinance (**Exodus 12:12-14**). This argument fails when you realize that the verb is singular not plural. If you presented a school paper that said “The ordinances was nailed to the cross,” you would have been penalized for bad grammar, yet this is precisely what many, including Du Prez and Murray, are doing. They are forcing their theology onto the text. Please note also that “of ordinances” is a prepositional phrase and cannot be the subject of the verb. The “handwriting” was nailed to the cross and it was the “handwriting” that was against us. This is the handwritten record of our sin (made by our recording angel) that is “nailed” when we repent.

Here’s another problem: notice the pronoun, *and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross*. If “ordinances” were in reference here, Paul would have said “and took them out of the way, nailing them to his cross.” Now, read **Colossians 2:14** again!

And Du Prez believes that linguistically he is presenting the correct evidence!

2. Du Prez says *chirographon tois dogmasin* means the ceremonial ordinances and that “certificate of debt” is an interpretation, not translation of *chirographon tois dogmasin*, yet when you go the Septuagint, the Greek OT, you cannot find *chirographon tois dogmasin* anywhere in the text even though the “ceremonial” or sacrificial law is mentioned hundreds of times.

3. Du Prez says that Paul did not use *nomos*, the Greek equivalent of Torah because he did not want to confuse his gentile converts, causing them to think he was referring to the ten commandments, health laws and tithing. The health laws and tithing are actually statutes that are part of the ceremonial laws and statutes Du Prez wishes to nail to the stake.

4. Du Prez says that Colossians 2 is an echo of **Deuteronomy 31:26**, proving that the law that was nailed to the stake was against us. In truth, **Deuteronomy 31** proves that the law in question (all laws for that matter) is a witness, and is not against us. Scripture proves that the law is for our good, in fact every word that proceeds out of the mouth of YHVH we are to live by.

5. Du Prez says that we are not to judge one another. Yet Colossians 2 says we are not to let false teachers judge our service to YHVH, only permitting the righteous body of believers judge our service.

6. Du Prez believes that when Paul wrote holydays, new moon and Sabbaths, he meant annual feast days, new moons, and annual non-seventh day Sabbaths. Scripture proves Paul wrote EXACTLY what he meant. Annual feast days, monthly new moon days, and weekly Sabbaths.

7. Du Prez says that the article *the* and *days* are in italics, which proves that this is referring to annual, non-seventh day Sabbaths. Which makes absolutely NO sense at all, considering that the Greek word Sabbaton is used exclusively for the weekly Sabbath elsewhere in the NT.

8. Du Prez says that the lower case s is also proof that his conclusion is correct, that this is not the weekly Sabbath. Which makes absolutely NO sense at all, considering that the Greek word Sabbaton is used exclusively for the weekly Sabbath elsewhere in the NT. Ancient Greek had no lower case letters, so this lower case s is there because of the translators.

When someone is in error, we should say so. When someone believes they have come to their conclusion using all the weight of evidence in Scripture, when they have not, we should say so.

Du Prez closed with 2 passage from EGW trying to prove she agreed that the feasts were done away. He did not read the entire passage, just short portions. Here they are in there entirety.

There are many who try to blend these two systems, using the texts that speak of the ceremonial law to prove that the moral law has been abolished; but this is a perversion of the Scriptures. The distinction between the two systems is broad and clear. The ceremonial system was made up of symbols pointing to Christ, to His sacrifice and His priesthood. This ritual law, with its sacrifices and ordinances, was to be performed by the Hebrews until type met antitype in the death of Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. **Then all the sacrificial offerings were to cease.** It is **this** law that Christ “took . . . out of the way, nailing it to His cross.” Colossians 2:14. But concerning the law of Ten Commandments the psalmist declares, “Forever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven.” Psalm 119:89. And Christ Himself says, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law. . . . Verily I say unto you”--making the assertion as emphatic as possible--“Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” Matthew 5:17, 18. Here He teaches, not merely what the claims of God’s law had been, and were then, but that these claims should hold as long as the heavens and the earth remain. The law of God is as immutable as His throne. It will maintain its claims upon mankind in all ages. *Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 365*

This ordinance does not speak so largely to man’s intellectual capacity as to his heart. His moral and spiritual nature needs it. If his disciples had not needed this, it would not have been left for them as Christ’s last established ordinance in connection with, and including, the last supper. It was Christ’s desire to leave to his disciples an ordinance that would do for them the very thing they needed,--that would serve to disentangle them from the rites and ceremonies which they had hitherto engaged in as essential, and which the reception of the gospel made no longer of any force. To continue these rites would be an insult to Jehovah. Eating of the body, and drinking of the blood, of Christ, not merely at the sacramental service, but daily partaking of the bread of life to satisfy the soul’s hunger, would be in receiving his word and doing his will. *Review & Herald, 06-14-1898*

Please read the bold highlighted sentence above again. Mrs. White specified what “ceremonial system” she was referring to. The **sacrifices** came to an end. The feasts are not sacrifices; they are segments of time to appear before YHVH, no different than the weekly Sabbath. If you believe that EGW was inspired AND that she was doing away with the feasts, then the quotes I am about to present are going to array EGW against EGW. IF Sister White is nailing the feasts to the stake in the above quotes, then she is double minded. Actually she isn’t double minded; men like Du Prez misuse the context of her writings as you will clearly see.

“Christ was standing at the point of transition between two economies and their two great festivals. He, the spotless Lamb of God, was about to present Himself as a sin offering, that He would thus bring to an end the system of types and ceremonies that for four thousand years had pointed to His death. As He ate the Passover with His disciples, He instituted in its place the service that was to be the memorial of His great sacrifice. The national festival of the Jews was to pass away forever. The service which Christ established was to be observed by His followers in all lands and through all ages.” *Desire of Ages, p. 652.*

Some say this proves we are no longer required to keep Passover, that type met antitype at Calvary. Let us examine the evidence given in this passage, neither adding nor taking away.

First, the types and ceremonies spoken of that are coming to an end had been in place for **4,000** years. Those who want to nail Passover (the day) to the cross need to check their math. Four thousand years **from Calvary** puts one right at the time of Adam. As a “National festival of the Jews,” (Israelites actually) Passover had only existed since their deliverance from Egypt only 1,500 years **prior to** Calvary. Either we must admit that the feasts of YHVH have been observed since Adam **or** that only the sacrificial system, instituted shortly after Adam sinned, is what came to its end. And this is EXACTLY what EGW is saying. Friend, if you accept EGW and this quote from *Desire of Ages* as divinely inspired then pay attention. If she is referring to Passover, that means the Feasts are not Mosaic, they were appointed at Creation by the Creator. If she is referring to the sacrificial law, that means Passover day, the 14th day of Abib (**Leviticus 23:5, Deuteronomy 16:1**) is still binding. Actually, this is a double bind! As we’ve been saying, YHVH’s festival calendar is still in effect.

In spite of the inaccuracy of her statements—considering the blood sacrifices that Scripture prophetically reveals are yet future (see the bottom of p. 8)—if you will read the 2 quotes offered by Du Prez in context, Ellen White is referring to the sacrificial law alone, not the statutes. The statues, which include the feasts, were given at Mt. Sinai, and were written on the tablets of stone as part of the perpetual covenant. The sacrificial law was given at least nine months later in the wilderness by the bright light of Shekinah from the desert tabernacle and of course will not continue throughout eternity once sin is eradicated, but the three pilgrimage feasts will continue, as they are memorials to remind us of our deliverance and redemption. They are part of the perpetual covenant. SDA’s do NOT want to deal with the following quotes. Trust me...

“I saw that God had children who do not see and keep the Sabbath. They have not rejected the light upon it. And at the commencement of the time of trouble, we were filled with the Holy Ghost as we went forth and proclaimed the **Sabbath more fully**. This enraged the churches and nominal Adventists, as they could not **refute** the Sabbath truth. And at this time God’s chosen all saw clearly that **we had the truth**, and they came out and endured the persecution with us. I saw the sword, famine, pestilence, and great confusion in the land. The wicked thought that we had brought the judgments upon them, and they rose up and took counsel to rid the earth of us, thinking that then the evil would be stayed.” *Early Writings, p. 33*

In *Early Writings, supplement p. 85*, it says, “On page 33 is given the following: ‘I saw that the holy Sabbath is, and will be, **the separating wall** between the true Israel of God and **unbelievers**; and that the Sabbath is the great question to unite the hearts of God’s dear, waiting saints. I saw that God had children who do not see and keep the Sabbath. They have not rejected the light upon it. And at the commencement of the time of trouble, **we were filled with the Holy Ghost as we went forth and proclaimed the Sabbath more fully.**’

“This view was given in 1847 when there were but very few of the Advent brethren observing the Sabbath, and of these but few supposed that its observance was of sufficient importance to draw a line between the people of God and unbelievers. Now the fulfillment of that view is beginning to be seen. ‘The commencement of that time of trouble,’ here mentioned **does not refer to the time** when the plagues shall begin to be poured out, but to a short period just before they are poured out, while Christ is in the sanctuary. At that time, while the work of salvation is closing, trouble will be coming on the earth, and the nations will be angry, yet held in check so as not to prevent the work of the third angel. At that time the ‘latter rain,’ or refreshing from the presence of the L-rd will come, to give power to the loud voice of the third angel, and prepare the saints to stand in the period when the seven last plagues shall be poured out.”

Now why would Adventists, nominal (meaning *in name only*) or otherwise, be enraged over the Sabbath message? Haven't they already accepted the Sabbath? And please note that they are enraged at a **truthful** Sabbath message, not a false one, as the message spoken of is backed by the Spirit of YHVH. Mrs. White also said these things were going to happen near the end of time. What does she mean "Sabbath more fully"? Let her answer for herself and not put words in her mouth.

"The minds of the people, blinded and debased by slavery and heathenism, were not prepared to appreciate **fully** the far-reaching principles of God's ten precepts. That the obligations to the Decalogue might be **more fully** understood and enforced, additional precepts were given, illustrating and applying the principles of the Ten Commandments." *Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 310.*

Here is an example of a statute illustrating the fourth commandment more fully....

"Again the people were reminded of the sacred obligation of the Sabbath. Yearly feasts were appointed, The object of these regulations was stated: they proceeded from no exercise of mere arbitrary sovereignty; all were given for the good of Israel.

"These laws were to be recorded by Moses, and carefully treasured as the foundation of the national law, and, with the ten precepts which they were given to illustrate, the condition of the fulfillment of God's promises to Israel." *Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 311.*

If the statutes and feasts are symbols pointing to the death of Jesus, and to continue these "rites" would be an insult to YHVH, then why did both Ellen White and YHVH say that the statutes would be binding in our day, even forever?

"These **statutes** [given to Moses] were explicitly given to guard the ten commandments. They were **not shadowy types** to pass away with the death of Christ. They were to be binding upon man in every age as long as time should last." *SDA Bible Commentary, Vol.1, p. 1104.*

"In consequence of continual transgression, the moral law was repeated in awful grandeur from Sinai. [YHVH] **gave to Moses** religious precepts which were to govern everyday life. These statutes were explicitly given to guard the ten commandments. They were **not shadowy types** to pass away with the death of Christ. They were to be binding upon men in every age as long as time should last. These commands were enforced by the power of the moral law, and they clearly and definitely explained that law.... *Review & Herald, 5-6-1875*

"The L-rd did not leave his people with the precepts of the Decalogue alone. Moses was commanded to write, as G-d should bid him, judgments and laws giving minute directions in regard to their duty, thereby **guarding** the commandments engraved on the tables of stone. Thus did the L-rd seek to lead erring man to a strict obedience to that holy law which he is so prone to transgress

". . . Moses wrote these judgments and statutes from the mouth of God while he was with him in the mount. The definite directions in regard to the duty of his people to one another, and to the stranger, are the principles of the ten commandments **simplified** and given in a definite manner, that they need not err. . . *Signs of the Times, 6-17-1880*

“He did not stop with giving them the precepts of the Decalogue. . . Moses was commanded to write, as God should bid him, judgments and laws giving minute instruction as to what was required. These directions relating to the duty of the people to God, to one another, and to the stranger were only the principles of the Ten Commandments amplified and given in a specific manner that none need err. They were designed to guard the sacredness of the ten precepts engraved on the tables of stone.” *Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 364*

The statutes explain, enforce, illustrate, guard, simplify, and amplify the Ten Commandments. Something that explains, enforces, illustrates, guards, simplifies, and amplifies the Ten Commandments cannot BE the Ten Commandments. They are a separate part of the codified Law of YHVH. His Law is separated into three categories, Commandments, Statutes and Judgments, not moral and ceremonial. The commandment is the command. The statute explains the commandment more clearly if you have any questions. The judgments take place if you break the commandments and/or statutes. The Law of YHVH is as eternal as He is.

Jesus' death could alter no part of the covenant and altered no part of the Divine Calendar. The covenant YHWH made with Israel can only be changed by YHWH, and He changes not. The statutes are for our benefit. The Creator changes not (**Malachi 3:6**). He is the same yesterday, today and forever (**Hebrews 13:8**), and with whom is no variability, neither shadow of turning (**James 1:7**). “God has not changed. He is as particular and exact in His requirements now as He was in the days of Moses.” *SDA Bible Commentary, Vol. 1, p. 1111*. Nor will He alter a thing that is gone out of His lips (**Psalms 89:34**).

I know that, whatsoever the Almighty doeth, it shall be for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it: and the Almighty doeth it, that men should fear before him. Ecclesiastes 3:14.

Does it sound like YHVH's law, which includes the statutes, has changed any?

“God will not take into His kingdom and give eternal life to those who will not come under His laws and statutes in this life.” *Signs of the Times, 9-8-1887*

End time prophecies:

And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith YHVH of hosts.

*Remember ye the law of Moses My servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, **with the statutes and judgments.** Malachi 4:4*

Behold, the days come, saith YHVH, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:

Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith YHVH:

But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith YHVH, I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their Mighty One, and they shall be My people. Jeremiah 31:31-33

The New Covenant will be written on our hearts, rather than on parchment and stone. You may be amazed to learn that the New Covenant is exactly same as the Old Covenant, just written on a heart of flesh. And notice what this heart change does...

*A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.
And I will put My Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes, and ye shall keep My judgments, and do them. Ezekiel 36:26-27. See also Ezekiel 11:19-20.*

What is, or is included in the covenant?

And it came to pass at the end of forty days and forty nights, that YHWH gave me the two tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant. Deuteronomy 9:11. (see Hebrews 9:4)

*With whom YHVH had made a covenant, and charged them, saying, Ye shall not fear other gods, nor bow yourselves to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them: But YHVH, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt with great power and a stretched out arm, Him shall ye fear, and Him shall ye worship, and to Him shall ye do sacrifice.
And the statutes, and the ordinances, and the law, and the commandment, which He wrote for you, ye shall observe to do for evermore; and ye shall not fear other gods. II Kings 17:35-37*

And the king commanded all the people, saying, Keep the passover unto YHVH your Elohim, as it is written in the book of this covenant. II Kings 23:21

“The covenant that G-d made with His people at Sinai is to be our refuge and defense. This covenant is of just as much force today as it was when the Lord made it with ancient Israel.”
SDA Bible Commentary, Vol. 1, p.1103.

And this day [Passover] shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to YHVH throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever. Exodus 12:14.

Jesus said he would keep the Passover ordinance with his friends in the kingdom...

But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. Matthew 26:29

This last day message is not for everyone though...

“That God who reads the hearts of everyone, will bring to light hidden things of darkness where they are often least suspected, that stumbling blocks which have hindered the progress of truth may be removed, and God have a clean and holy people to declare His statutes and judgments.

“The Captain of our salvation leads His people on step by step, purifying and fitting them for translation, and leaving in the rear those who are disposed to draw off from the body, who are not willing to be led...” *Testimonies to the Church, Vol. 1, p. 333*

“As in earlier ages, the special truths for this time are found, not with the ecclesiastical authorities, but with men and women who are not too learned or too wise to believe the Word of God.” *Christ's Object Lessons, pp. 78-79.*

At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.
Matthew 11:25

He does not save us by the law [Torah]; but neither will he save us in disobedience to the law [Torah]. *Review & Herald, 9-25-1900*

I respect Brothers Murray and Du Prez. They are sincere men who are just sincerely in error. I do not (and cannot) condemn them; they are only presenting what they have been taught. Only the Righteous Judge can judge them. He alone can discern whether their words and actions against His Law and covenant are willful or negligent. I too once believed and taught the SAME exact message, but have been shown a great light. The issue here is will they stop listening to the denomination and its carnal doctrines and start listening to the Spirit of YHVH which is the revealer of all truth to men? In just how high esteem do they hold the church? Are they willing to forsake all the sake of obtaining the truth? As for me and my house, we will serve YHVH.

That said, the position Murray and Du Prez have taken on the feasts should in no way keep you from understanding the truth of this matter. Their credentials only mean that they are even more responsible to present the truth than folks like you and I, see **Jeremiah 23:1**. Study to show your self approved, a workman that need not be ashamed. I was very ashamed when I learned that what I had been taught and was teaching was a flat out lie, which reminds me of an interesting Winston Churchill (1874-1965) quote: “Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing ever happened.”

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, what is your verdict? Who has presented the weight of evidence? More importantly, has Scripture defended itself from this gracious attack-presented-with-a-smile? Indeed. “All error does not become truth by reason of multiplied propagation, nor does truth become error because no one will see it.” Gandhi

Respectfully submitted,

Troy Miller
www.CreationCalendar.com.