

## 49\_780414 HLH Background to Passover

I was asked to speak on a subject today this evening, Mr. Stephen Martin, which is a theme.

It should be a preparation for our Passover services to come.

I might mention that Mr. Dennis Luker in Phoenix, Arizona, asked me to speak on the subject which I did this past Sabbath.

In the previous Friday evening I had a chance to meet with Mr. Jimmy Friddle from our San Diego church.

We drove east from San Diego. That is, he did the driving. I did the riding.

To our Bible study held in Yuma, Arizona, where a number of individuals are who formerly were teachers at Imperial schools here in Pasadena.

In my group, I certainly extend the best wishes of those of you who know members in either congregation.

On this particular occasion, I would like to address the question that some of you might have heard once before, hardly more than that, which I have given in the Imperial AM congregation.

I would like to cover background material that would be appropriate in advance of the Passover season and do it as a Bible study, because I think, in fact, the topic is more effective as a Bible study, which proved to be so in Yuma, even more than as a sermon, in the manner in which we do address the question at this time.

Now, during the festival, you will necessarily have a chance to hear the events of the New Testament period expounded.

And in time sequence also, sometime or another, the events of the Old Testament period of Moses when the children of Israel were in Egypt, the time that they departed from that land.

And in so doing, you can tell the story in terms of the event, or perhaps when there is need of a reevaluation of some material, it's helpful to at least have had a preliminary understanding of some broad matters where the church should always be willing to come to a new, clearer understanding.

Now, I would like to make two statements, so there's no question, as we begin our study of the background and clarification of some material pertaining to the Passover.

Point number one, the church has, as you know, consistently assembled for an evening occasion in the spring.

We can also assemble once in the evening in the autumn, but in our spring festival season, we do formally assemble a small group, or larger ones, depending on the nature of the local area.

For the night to be much remembered, which is the beginning of the fifteenth day of Nisan, that month's name comes into the Hebrew calendar from the Babylonian captivity.

That particular evening, I think, will have more meaning than ever before.

And that particular evening this year should mean for those who have studied the subject something extra special that hasn't been previously perceived.

The previous evening, the beginning of the fourteenth of Nisan, which means the end of the previous day.

One day before, the church has consistently followed the practice of observing a Passover, a communion, or Lord's Supper, various terms have been used in the history of the church.

Of unleavened bread and wine, to commemorate on that day the events of the death of Jesus Christ.

Now, questions have arisen, times passed, and more recent years, as to the nature of the Passover service with respect to Jewish practice and traditions, the events of the Old Testament and of the New.

We draw the conclusion, at this point, before going any further, one, that the church is correct in observing the symbols of unleavened bread and wine in the beginning of the fourteenth, and it's not to be transferred to a day later, the night to be much remembered.

But on the other hand, this would not necessarily mean that every form of evidence cited in support of that is necessarily correct as we have had it explained over the years.

So we should like to re-examine the question in terms of the background material. There will be, in this sense, no fundamental change in the character of what the church has consistently done in the beginning of the fourteenth.

That means next Thursday night, which commences the fourteenth, which is Friday, and there will be no basic difference in the general pattern of what we might do the following evening, but there will be a major change for many in understanding its significance.

We would like to bring up now the following general thoughts. Throughout the history of the New Testament church, whether in the Biblical account of the first century, the historic account of the second involving Polycarp of Smyrna in Asia Minor and Anna Cetus of Rome, who was Bishop there, or at the close of that century with Polycrates, Smyrna in Asia Minor, and Victor of Rome. He was the Bishop of Rome. These were the two major periods of controversy, one in the middle of the second century, one in the last half that we have addressed in articles on the subject of Easter.

And you should read the materials in Encyclopedia Britannica and the Catholic Encyclopedia if you want to. It's there. You will discover that the practice of those who follow the Apostle John and those who are in the continuum of the New Testament church of God, as distinct from the Catholic church of God, and I use that term as the proper title of the church of Rome.

The very few people are really aware of. Protestants called them Roman Catholics. But in their traditional historic record, they are the Catholic church of God, as distinct from the church of God defined in the New Testament.

And it was the difference of Easter Sunday versus the observation of what we might call the Passover, or in Greek, the Pascha, from which of course the French, the Italians, the Portuguese, the Spanish, and the Romanians have all acquired the same term derived from the word Passover.

Hence the term quarto daeciman from the Roman, or Latin, meaning those who observed something on the 14th. The characteristic of Polycarp or Polycrates or John, and nobody disputed the fact that John the Apostle follows, I should say that those who followed John the Apostle all were observing it in the manner in which the Apostles initially did.

Now, if the word quarto daeciman is used there, and if we find through history the same practice, and if we go to the last century and the controversy within the church of God, between the

Adventists in the church of God and the other members of the church of God, there was this controversy whether it should be on the 14th of Nissan, or whether it should be four times a year in terms of the Methodist background that goes back to the teaching that Ellen B. White had received when she was younger.

We find in the present century in the history of the church of God's seventh day, and in the history of the Radio Church of God, or the Worldwide Church of God, names that have been applied through history to this work, the last two, that is, that always the 14th is the tradition and the custom.

So what we recognize is that though some have wondered about observing the New Testament Passover or Communion or Lord Supper on the 15th, there is no doubt that historically, such a practice is not only unjustified, but in fact, in terms of the history of tradition in the New Testament church, totally unknown.

We may call then the evidence of history to witness that the practice of the church of observing the use of unleavened bread and wine at the beginning of the 14th is, without contradiction, the proper custom.

But what do we do with now the next fact? That the Jewish congregations know no other history than the flames in ancient times, up to 70 AD, of the Passover lamb in the afternoon of the 14th, and eating the lamb as a part of the feast at the beginning of the 15th.

It is commonly stated among us that on the basis of the New Testament examples in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the Galileans must have observed the Passover one day earlier than the Judeans, or it has also been said that the Samaritans observed the Passover on the 14th rather than the 15th in terms of when the disease.

And now we must state that there is a need of correction in this area. One might draw a conclusion that based on the New Testament statement, such a possibility could exist.

But what we have to recognize is, and as one person said, when I heard it stated that the Galileans observed it on the 14th and the Judeans on the 15th in terms of eating the Passover, I thought that there was historic evidence outside of the Bible.

And now I explain to this person that there has never been such historic evidence, nor has the Church ever cited such historic evidence. It is only a conclusion, and if the original premise is invalid, then of course there is no warrant for such a statement.

So now we may conclude the following. There is no historic evidence, apart from any biblical explanation, that the Galileans observed the Passover at any time other than the same time the Judeans did.

You know the Jews were both in Judea and in Galilee and in between were the Samaritans, as you know your map of Palestine to the New Testament period.

The Samaritans never observed such a custom unless there was some misunderstanding on the part of an observer when the Samaritan calendar began one day earlier than the Jewish calendar.

And in observing it on the same day of the month, the 15th, or eating the Passover, it would have appeared to have been the 14th by the Jewish calendar, but it would have been a mistake to conclude that the Samaritans observed it on the 14th.

That was an error, and the error should be corrected.

Or to put it another way, there is no doubt that our practice of using unleavened bread and wine, the form of the New Testament Passover following the example of Jesus, is at the beginning of the 14th, and there is no doubt that the Jewish practice, which we have from time to time, is labeled as an error of playing the lamb on the afternoon of the 14th and eating it at the night of the 15th as the feast, that that statement that it is an error is incorrect, that in fact the Jews preserve a tradition that in reality goes back to Moses and not to some misunderstanding.

Because there is no controversy anywhere in the Talmud, no controversy in Jewish history, and no other way to read the Old Testament when one looks at the Hebrew apart from the question of translation or interpretation of the English language.

Now, the reason why the church drew the conclusion that the Jews somehow were an error is because of an understanding of the New Testament that may or may not have been immediately warranted.

But there is no doubt in initially studying the question that the Armstrong drew the conclusion that since Jesus observed unleavened bread and wine one day earlier that he must have kept that at the proper time the Passover was quaint.

This seems to him on the surface self-evident. Now what we want to find out is indeed is it self-evident in the scripture if we do go to the Hebrew as to think from some statements that might appear to have variable meanings in the English.

Mr. Tin Armstrong publicly opened this question in his book *The Real Jesus* when he pointed up clearly that whatever Jesus did it was distinctly one day earlier than what the Jews did in terms of eating the Passover.

And it was 18 to 21 hours earlier in terms of the sacrifice of the Passover. He concluded also that without any question the Jewish practice was the practice of Moses and it was not an unusual event that was without prophetic significance that Jesus died was feared at the time the Lamb was quaint.

In our previous understanding of the subject you know that we always have had to shy away from the reality that the death of Jesus took place when the Jews began to slay the Passover lamb around 3 p.m. in the afternoon.

And the assumption was that this was one of those peculiar phenomena that might occur but for which there is no real warrant that Jesus was the fulfillment of the Passover in terms of the time the Jews flew to their lamb.

I think we're going to have to come and see the evidence to the conclusion clearly that the reason Jesus didn't die at any other time than shortly after 3 p.m.

And how much after isn't stated but it was the sun was dark and it could have happened within minutes. After 3 p.m. it was dark from noon till about 3.

And there were only a few sentences defining the conversation between the man who offered Jesus the vinegar and the time that he feared him.

And there is no reason now to conclude that what Jesus died at the time the Passover was prophesied, the Lamb of God, to die. That's the Passover with a capital T.

And it's the time that the Passover lamb began to be quaint every year.

I think it is important that we look at the fundamental things first rather than taking up the issue of the meaning of morning, the meaning of night, the meaning of between the two evenings and take a look at the broad picture.

The broad picture is very clear. Jesus died at the time that the Jews flew the lamb and the Jews knew no other time for playing it on the basis of the law.

And they warrant that the church had given that the Jews' practice was an erroneous period of time is false.

We have to recognize that it was based on an assumption that because Jesus did it earlier the Galileans must have and therefore the Judeans were in error.

But that assumption now must be reexamined.

Why now would Jesus have introduced unleavened bread and wine in the evening of the fourteenth? Why are we asked to observe something then, the beginning of that day, when the lamb was normally plain later in the day? So I think we should take a look at the story before we even go back to the original account where many brethren have been reading more and more and drawing the conclusion, of course, that the church has not seen the original events clearly.

In the days of Moses and the Exodus.

Jesus sat down in the evening and you remember when he did that he was sorrowful and it was quite clear that he was under a heavy burden and that he knew his time had come.

The disciples didn't get the picture right away at all.

Jesus explained about his body that is broken.

He explained about the blood of the new covenant.

I'm not turning to these verses, I just want you to get a general picture for the moment.

The disciples apparently didn't grasp it because they didn't have in mind that he was going to die that day.

They were wondering whom Jesus was pointing out as to who might betray him.

But there is a deletion indication that they anticipated his death at that time.

By the middle of the night perhaps Jesus had finished his prayer and at that time Judas came and betrayed him.

The twelve escaped and Jesus was taken.

Now at this time we're still fifteen hours before his death.

He went as we say from pillar to post or from cart to cart from the Jews to Herod to various members of the government.

He appeared before the Sanhedrin all through the night till the next morning.

He was fat upon.

He was crowned with thorns and if you want to know what those thorns are like you should go to the nursery and take a look at the vine that is commonly sold which still bears that name, the crown of thorns.

You know, leaps in there and grabs it and you'll get an idea of what was pushed down on his head if any of you have no other way of perceiving it.

He was beaten.

He was made fun of and all of this was taking place nine to twelve hours before his death.

And then by round nine in the morning it would appear that he was led to crucifixion after being scored.

His body was broken, not the bones but the flesh was opened up in a particular area that is called a stripe so that the New Testament uses the singular.

And some people have confused the issue of healing in this connection because the church has said by his stripes and yet the Greek says by one.

Well, I can only assure you that any fellow who was good with a cat a nine fails intended to strike it at the same place to do the most damage.

By noon, another three hours or so, Jesus was in a land beginning to be covered with darkness supernaturally.

So he was approximately six hours in a state of crucifixion at the end of which he was serious and finally died with the loss of blood.

Now the moment of his death corresponds as you see to the death of the lamb in the practice of the Jewish church which is the congregation of Israel or the congregation of God.

But in advance of the death of Jesus, for upwards of fifteen to eighteen hours, Jesus suffered mentally and physically, emotionally whatever terms you want to use, for us.

Now that's an important point to bear in mind.

The original Passover lamb didn't go through that.

It was only momentarily plain.

But Jesus suffered most of the preceding hours of the Fourth Saints of Nissan.

So when Jesus wanted to introduce unleavened bread and wine to symbolize the flesh of the lamb and the blood that was shed when the lamb was plain, he didn't choose to do it at three p.m.

He chose to do it the evening preceding and the beginning hours of the Fourteenth on which he died.

This is the Fourteenth of Nissan.

Now there is obvious reason.

Because Jesus did not insist that we should commemorate alone the slaying of the lamb in the sense of shedding of blood, or he would have just said, well, taste the fruit of the vine and he wouldn't have had any reference to the unleavened bread.

But insofar as he used both unleavened bread and, in this case, wine, he was symbolizing not only the slaying of the lamb at a particular moment, he was also symbolizing the fact that the body of the Lamb of God, the capital L, was beaten and broken open long in advance of the time of the death of the Lamb of God.

So that the New Testament Church is not asked to commemorate the slaying of the lamb at the hour the lamb was slain, but to commemorate it on the same day the lamb was slain and at the time that begins a series of sufferings of the Messiah at the beginning hours of the Fourteenth.

In order that we can reflect, beginning on that day, the events that transpire throughout the day.

I think this is a very important conclusion.

Now some of the things that I will be emphasizing this evening are not altogether included in Mr. Ted Armstrong's book, *The Real Jesus*.

They are, on occasion, clearly laid out in a study paper presented to those who gathered in the ministry in January conference this year, titled *The Passover in the Bible in the Church Today*, drafted by Dr. Lester Grabe and Robert Stewart.

What I am saying this evening will be a compilation of my own experience, some of the studies we did in 1947, 48 and 49.

A significant part will be derived from the study paper to which I just referred, and the study paper and Mr. Ted Armstrong's book do not always cover the same subject, it's going to give the same weight.

But I was asked by Mr. Stephen Martin to cover some material, and I'm trying to dwell on some very specific topics that I think will be fundamental to the layman to understand the question.

You will note that what I've said has been predicated not on the manner in which we normally have explained, but in terms of the impact of the events of the New Testament, as reflected in particular in Mr. Ted Armstrong's book.

So I have presumed that no lamb was slain at the beginning of the fourteenth, and I have offered a valid explanation as to why Jesus did not ask us to commemorate merely the death of the lamb, but to commemorate the events of the death of the lamb and his sufferings at the time those sufferings began at the beginning of the day.

Now there is another reason for it.

It would hardly be on a regular work day or preparation day, for the night to be much remembered which follows.

It would hardly be the logical thing to ask people to work till one or two p.m. and then take off and immediately assemble with a brethren in the afternoon at three o'clock to commemorate such an event as this.

And to commemorate it in a manner in which those who have experienced this relationship, who in fact symbolically eat his flesh and drink his blood as is recorded in the Gospel of John.

That's an expression that offended so many Jews, you remember? Three p.m. right after work that began at eight in the morning to twelve and began again at twelve thirty, let's say, till maybe two o'clock and you dashed over at three.

This is not what Jesus wanted done.

He wanted something done at the beginning of this day of sufferings that would commemorate now all the sufferings in greater form than merely a singular event like the playing of the lamb.

He no longer wanted the lamb playing for those who came to full spiritual insight.

He asked us further to gather together as if to eat a meal in communion with him, hence the reference to communion with demons or with the cup of the Lord.

Paul discusses this with the Corinthians.

So communion is not an improper term either because it is a particular meal which we share with one another only with two symbols, or with two symbols only, the unleavened bread and wine.

And we take it in the presence, let's say, of Jesus Christ whom we have asked to be here in spirit when we prayed on that evening.

And we are asked further to make it in this sense at the time that he did.

Now the paper brings up clearly that if Jesus did it at this early hour of the day, that is the beginning of the fourteenth, and didn't intend that we should do it at that time, it would have been obligatory for us to have some statement that that example is not valid with respect to time.

There is no such statement.

Therefore the church takes it that Jesus' example is valid with respect to time.

And since we are not asked to shed the blood of a lamb, or the lamb has already been slain, we are not being asked to observe it in the afternoon, but in the early hours of the same day.

I would like to make another statement in this connection.

Jesus did not change the hour of the slaying of the Passover lamb.

Some, in explanations, I think have commented that, well, Jesus changed the time of the slaying of the lamb. No, he did not.

Not only did he not do that, but he was himself slaying at the correct time.

He never asked that the time for slaying of the lamb would be changed.

He asked that new symbols be used instead of the lamb on that day at another hour, and for those who did not perceive it, Christian priests of the family of Aaron, of the family of Levi, were perfectly free to assist in the slaying of the Passover lamb for the Jews who did not understand it, because that was a part of their requirement of the law.

And it would be their responsibility as Christians, and we know that there was a great multitude among the Christian priests who would have had as their responsibility the explanation when the lamb was slain that that is in reference to Jesus the Messiah the Christ.

But their communion, apart from their jobs, would have been at another hour on that day.

Now, when this was discussed some years ago, and this really goes back 30 years when the question arose and when the question was settled that we should observe it at the beginning of the 14th, there was a controversy which some few have also brought up against, and that the study paper in particular lays to rest with an explanation that was not clear and had not come to any of us in either

to Mr. Herbert Armstrong or to Raymond Cole or myself when we did discuss these things or to Raymond McNair.

The one assumption that has been paramount in our previous thinking is that the unleavened bread and the wine commemorate the moment of the slaying, sorry, let me correct that, that's the point that I want to address directly.

We have assumed that the eating of unleavened bread and wine commemorates the New Testament's form of eating the Passover. Hence, we do it that evening because we have said that the Passover originally, apart from the Jewish mistaken practice, was slain at the time the sun went over the horizon and was eaten that night at the beginning of the 14th.

And so we do it that night because that's when the Passover was eaten, that's been the normal explanation.

Now what I want to draw to our attention is that the study paper shows in Mr. Ter Armstrong's book in delineating the experience of Jesus last hour on earth that day, what is shown is that it would be a mistake to conclude that the unleavened bread and the wine replaces the eating of the lamb.

So let me now point out what the Jewish practice would be and then see what the New Testament practice is and means.

When the lamb was slain, blood was shed. This was in the afternoon of the 14th and in the beginning hours of the 15th the lamb would have been roasted whole without breaking the bone.

Normally two hours, two and a half would be seemingly enough, hardly necessary more than three, I think with the size of the lamb, dressed as it would have been that this is a logical period of time.

Then the Feast of the Passover as it is clearly called, for instance in Exodus 34-35 and a reference in Luke's account about the Passover, the days of unleavened bread called the Passover.

The fact that the 15th is called a Feast and is to be used to this day commemorates the fact that the lamb was eaten the night of the 15th by having a bone, for they no longer sacrificed the lamb with the destruction of the temple as you know.

But they have the bone there to commemorate that the lamb was eaten the night of the 15th, not the night of the 14th.

Now it is significantly that the lamb was eaten as a part of the Feast.

Now we never really face the question of why the 15th at night, the night to be much remembered, was called a Feast but no explanation was ever given as to how you were at the Feast.

On the day of trumpet the blowing of trumpets is described, on atonement fasting is described, and the Feast of Tabernacles, Lulling and Booze is described.

In the days of unleavened bread you have unleavened bread, there are Ways Loaves on Tentecost, the slaying of the lamb on the 14th between the two evenings.

But the Feast, a very special term for the 15th and a night to be much remembered, never defined in a manner that one would expect unleashed.

All along it was understood to be the eating of the Passover with the accompanying herbs or whatever else and later on not only with unleavened bread but also with wine.

Jesus didn't ask us to observe unleavened bread and wine as a ceremony called a Passover communion or Lord's Supper the night of the 15th because it does not replace nor is it to be a part of the traditional celebration that goes with the eating of the lamb.

It was meant to commemorate the slaying of the lamb and all the suffering that preceded it and that occurred on the previous day the 14th.

Now as proof, if you eat the Passover lamb in the Old Testament form and if you take the New Testament form for it, you would only have unleavened bread because you don't eat the lamb with the blood, do you? It's forbidden to eat the blood with the flesh. Therefore we would have to draw the conclusion if Jesus' symbolism pertains to the eating of the lamb exclusively there could be no wine symbolizing the blood at that time.

It would only be the unleavened bread.

But what is unique about this ceremony and what shocked the Jews when Jesus said what it is to symbolize, when he said it in advance and his disciples didn't understand, they probably pondered but it didn't defend them like those who left.

We are to commemorate it, whatever it is for the moment, with wine for the fruit of the vine to use Jesus' expression and we're to commemorate it as the symbol of blood shed for the remission of sin and that blood that we shed was the slaying of the lamb.

Therefore, when we use the broken bread and the wine, we are commemorating the events that befell the body of Jesus which was broken open and whipped and the shedding of his blood.

We are not commemorating the eating of the Passover lamb as a part of the night of the feast of unleavened bread to be much remembered.

That distinction, in my estimation, brought out clearly in the study papers was what Raymond Cole and I and Mr. Herbert W. Armstrong overlooked and did not perceive and that to my knowledge until very recent years, no one has clearly perceived and therefore it was not possible to arrive at a proper or clear explanation.

That is, there was always a distinction between the time the lamb was to be playing on the one hand and the festival of the Passover, the feast of the Passover when it was to be eaten on another day the following night.

Now with that in mind, we then ask ourselves if the New Testament practice is to commemorate the eating of the lamb on the 15th, then we ought to be observing it actually on the 15th for which there is no New Testament warrant and then there would be nothing to fulfill the original requirement of something to take place on the 14th which after all is the time that Jesus suffered.

So we now draw a conclusion that I think is extremely helpful that when we observe the New Testament Passover we are observing at a different time but on the same day in New Testament symbolism the playing of the lamb which once was playing properly at the time of day on the 14th when Jesus himself died.

But we commemorate more than just the moment of his death but all of the sufferings and we do so at the beginning hours of the day and not at some other time because that's what Jesus wanted us to do for those who know and understand that he is the Messiah, the lamb of God.

Now with this in mind, before we even go to the Old Testament I will bring up another New Testament matter. We have a suit and some have drawn a conclusion that Jesus observed the Old Testament Passover at a different time than was normally the custom.

I believe at this point that Mr. Ted Armstrong's book written before the study paper came out is in fact less clear at this point than the study paper itself. Though the study paper leaves it indefinite and I would presume that different individuals would be free in the church to take different points of view on this subject.

I am of the opinion in reading the material historically that the study paper brings out though doesn't finally draw the conclusion as the only possible one that brings out the one that will in fact harmonize some of the problems that exist between the three gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke on the one hand and John's on the other.

John's account in John 18:28 and his reference also in John 19:14 to the fact that in the early morning hours of the 14th the Jews didn't want to defile themselves by stepping onto the Praetorium which was the area in front of the governor's care so to speak.

And this was of course the preparation day of the Passover which was yet to come. Jesus had eaten at the night before and we'll just turn briefly to that where John calls it not the Passover but he calls it just supper and we'll just turn to this briefly.

During supper, John 13:2 when the devil had already put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, John calls what Jesus ate that night just supper and the Passover was yet to follow.

John wrote late in the first century of this account because some things Matthew, Mark and Luke wrote could be misunderstood. We misunderstood it and we never understood why John wrote what he did.

We assumed that John was describing Jewish errors instead of the actual practice of the law. The practice of the New Testament church, let me say the practice of the Old Testament church or the congregation of Israel was never told you this was the 14th because the Passover in any case was slain on the 14th.

Now when the day of Unleavened Bread came, which is the day the Passover was slain, this means that we are dealing with eight days of Unleavened Bread as Josephus himself says that at that time the 14th was a day of Unleavened Bread but not the beginning of the feast of Unleavened Bread.

It was a day when leaven was still present but being put out. The feast of Unleavened Bread is seven days when there is no leaven. But when they put it out they were asked to have no leaven around when the Passover lamb was slain and to have begun the eating of leaven at the end of the 14th.

So the Jews looked upon the 14th as a day when Unleavened Bread was eaten and when leavened was being put out for the last few hours. They might have put it out earlier from their homes if they had the journey a distance but those nearer to Jerusalem would have put it out as late as the 14th.

Jesus said to the disciples who had asked him where should we go and prepare for you to eat the Passover. And Jesus said go into the city.

Now mind you go into the city and there you will find the man and there will be a picture and you follow him and there you will find where you shall eat. Where we shall eat the Passover.

Now if the Passover lamb was normally to be slain at the going down of the sun over the horizon at the first second for a minute and within the first hour of the 14th it is most illogical that the day would already have begun.

And then Jesus suggested to the disciples go into the city because they were not there and then he tells them don't go to the temple and insist in the sacrificing of the Passover he says go find a place where we are going to eat the Passover.

There is not the least indication if you look carefully that the disciples were involved in the slain of the Passover lamb at the beginning of the 14th but rather in seeing that a table is ready with unleavened bread and with wine.

So that when the Passover would be easy the following evening everything had been taken care of in advance. That's as far as the disciples do. Jesus had something more in mind.

Any Jew who had journeyed from Galilee and who had come and had certainly been as Jesus was a few days in Jerusalem near Jerusalem which is Bethany would have been hungry and would have eaten that night and the next morning and maybe the next noon briefly and then of course the following night of the feast of the Passover.

Jesus was no different. He said what I want to do is have a meal with you and he sat down not at some table in Bethany but he sat down in Jerusalem at the table that was prepared for the Passover.

With no indication that the Passover lamb was what they prepared. We have assumed it but there is no indication. It is not proved that there was none by reading the New Testament.

There is no evidence that it would have been possible if you read the Jewish law in the Talmud and there is no indication that Jesus said he was changing the time for the slain of the lamb because the slain of the lamb was no longer the issue.

What he did was to sit down as John clearly says at a supper at the same table that they were normally going to eat the Passover the following night.

And Jesus said that evening when they were at supper. I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer and the disciples began undoubtedly to wonder well now when is he going to suffer and then he certainly must be wanting to eat the Passover with us at the regular time we always do so certainly we do expect that tomorrow evening.

And now we'll turn to Luke the count of the Passover that Jesus is referring to.

Knock the lamb, knock the bone. Let it look clearly at what is said.

I have here on this occasion the Revised Standard Version.

When the hour was come verse 14. He sat at the table and the apostles with him. Luke 22.

Now we're going to get back to the end of verse 13 momentarily but right now we want to go on. He said to them I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.

Jesus was not talking about a lamb because there was no need to eat a lamb, listen carefully, in advance of the regular time if he was going to die before the lamb was plain anyway.

I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover. Now this Passover is in Jesus' mind described momentarily.

For I tell you I will not eat it this Passover until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

And so you've assumed that he took a knife and sliced the lamb and did eat it because that's what he wanted to eat.

I mean I think we've taken it for granted but it is not what Jesus calls the Passover.

He is here introducing the New Testament Passover at its proper time.

So instead of taking a knife and cutting a lamb, for which there is no warrant if there was a lamb there, he took a cup which was normally what was set aside for the night of the feast when they ate the Passover.

And when he had given thanks he said take this and divide it among yourselves.

For I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes.

And he took the bread. You'll notice the very things that would have been on the table in preparation for the lamb.

Jesus takes those things that were a part of the Passover ceremony called the feast of the Passover the following night, not the playing which took place at the temple area.

He takes these things and not a lamb. That should be clear.

He took bread and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them saying this is my body which is given for you, this due and remembrance is me.

And now for the first time he discovers what it is that Jesus said, you see, that he would eat this once and not again with the disciples because he would ascend to heaven before the next year had come.

I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine any more than he would be eating of unleavened bread as a part of the Passover service.

So this is my body which is given for you, this due and remembrance is me.

Now of course Jesus, you know, did prepare and apparently did eat bread after his resurrection with the disciples but that was apparently unleavened bread and that's just a part of the feast of unleavened bread.

And he didn't say he wouldn't eat unleavened bread again and I said that he wouldn't as a part of the Passover ceremony, my expression, but he did say he would never drink of the fruit of the vine again.

That was quite clear and that was something he only did on that one evening here and never did again with the disciples.

So he said likewise the cup after supper so even Luke calls what Jesus was eating a supper like John does.

And he said this cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.

So there's what Jesus himself took with the disciples that he says is this Passover that he wanted to eat before he died, involved the wine and unleavened bread.

He first divided the wine much like we do, you know, in our services in advance.

Then he breaks the bread and then he takes the wine so that order is clear.

And now he calls it this Passover.

When Luke wrote about the evening meal Luke calls it a supper so does John.

But when it came to what the disciples prepared that evening before, verse 13 says they went out and found as he had told them and they prepared the Passover.

We have assumed that the end of verse 13 was the preparation of the Passover length.

We fail to realize that when Luke or Matthew and Mark also are writing, they are writing in general practice to some Greek-speaking Jews and Luke most certainly to the Greek-speaking Greeks.

The Greeks did not use any other term but Passover or posthas for this particular ceremony.

Therefore the whole New Testament Greek-speaking church understood by Passover the unleavened bread and wine or the New Testament Passover.

There are many of them never having seen the Old Testament and could only read about it in the early parts of the law.

On this basis, Matthew, Mark and Luke in describing after the events had happened, 10 to 20 years after the events, they looked back on that occasion and they described that what they had prepared that evening was the Passover of the New Testament church, not the Passover lamb of the Old Testament church.

And that's what we never perceived before.

So whether there was lamb that night or not is not relevant.

But as relevant is that they prepared without knowing it, the New Testament Passover and Jesus said that was what he wanted to eat and he didn't start cutting on the lamb.

He took the unleavened bread and the wine.

And because this could be misunderstood and is thought to be the Old Testament Passover, John finally writes with great clarity that this was only a supper at the same table, which would have been where the Passover would have been eaten the following evening for the preparation of the Passover continued that next morning and afternoon.

That whole day was really the preparation of the Passover which was eaten the following evening as the feast.

Therefore, when we commemorate the night to be much remembered, we are commemorating here, not a specific event.

In the New Testament life of Jesus, we commemorate that in the beginning of the 14th, we are commemorating a major historic event.

Not of our personal relationship to the Messiah where we personally eat unleavened bread or personally drink a small symbol full of wine.

The night to be much remembered, the feast night is when we commemorate as family groups or as small churches because it's too difficult to get a large congregation together.

We commemorate the fact that they first heard the congregation of Israel in the days of Moses was delivered that night as a group.

And because of what Christ had done, Christ our Passover sacrificed for us, therefore Paul says let us feast the feast and as a group see that we keep our sins.

And commemorate and celebrate the deliverance from sin that was rocked on that evening when the angel went out the midnight of the 15th of Nisan as all Jewish traditions say.

For you see the Old Testament doesn't say it was on the 14th or the 15th. All we know is it was on the night after the Lamb was slain. That's all we know.

And because it wasn't stated, what day the deaf angel went out at midnight, we drew an erroneous conclusion not seeing the total picture.

Now I've tried distinctly up to this point to speak to the New Testament evidence fundamentally because that was where we initially made the mistake in perceiving what was in the New Testament.

Had we the Old Testament alone, it is doubtful that we would have misunderstood the historic event.

It is having read the New Testament, we've read some things incorrectly back into the Old, the primary one being that we assume that the Passover Lamb was eaten by Jesus and that's what he wanted to eat.

And it was only incidental that he observed the other two symbols, when in fact those were the issues at night, the two symbols of unread wine.

Now in the Old Testament, there have been a number of things and probably the most important one that led to a misunderstanding was the fact that the children of Israel left Egypt by night.

Now references to this, I'll quickly turn to use any Bible to this.

In Deuteronomy 16, just a passing quick reference, the Lord brought you out of Egypt by night, verse 1, and it was, of course, on the morrow after the Passover.

The Passover was on the 14th, that's when it was slain, so we know the Exodus was on the 15th and it was by night and the children of Israel were told that a deaf angel would go out at midnight and the children of Israel were not to leave their houses until the morning.

And so it was assumed that in describing the Old Testament event, that night is in contrast to day and therefore night didn't end until, let's say, sunrise.

And the morning would have been about sunrise and therefore the children of Israel would have had to leave the following night because that's the only way to leave on a night after the children of Israel were to be in all night, not to go out until the morning.

Now what was clearly overlooked in the explanations given in the booklet Mr. Armstrong wrote, pagan holidays are God's holy days quick, is the fact that night and morning overlap, the same as day or evening overlap or evening and night.

As an illustration, if you are up as late as 11 p.m. tonight, we know we use the term night without any doubt. It's night till midnight and we would never think of using the term morning before midnight.

But if you were somehow awake in that 1.30 or 2.00 a.m. in the morning, did you notice what I said? 1.00 or 2.00 a.m. in the morning? It's after midnight and we call it morning in English.

The Hebrews called it morning, or bull care, and so morning can begin at any sensible time after midnight. But it must be clearly enough time after midnight that there would have been no doubt that the deaf angel had passed over and done his duties.

And it happened at midnight. Therefore, the children of Israel, once that angel passed through the land of Egypt, beginning at midnight, and they were persuaded that the angel had indeed done his duties, it didn't mean they had to rush at 12.01 a.m.

But suppose they waited till 1.30 or 2.00. It was now morning and they were to wait until they could at least call it morning. And you and I would call in morning if you got up at 2.00 or 3.00 or at 1.30.

But it would be early in the morning. But it's still night because it isn't day. And unfortunately, having read an idea into the New Testament, we therefore were forced to conclude the Old Testament in a way that morning was excluded from night, when in fact it would have overlapped.

Now, the children of Israel were to be dressed to leave at a moment's notice. They were not even to sleep that night. They were forced out of the land of Egypt. They were expelled.

The implication is that they went out in the, shall we say, the middle of the morning hours, while it was still night, after they had a chance to burn the remainder of the Passover lamb in the early hours of the morning following midnight.

And the Jewish tradition is clearly this, that they flew the lamb in the afternoon. They ate it that night and celebrated that night which was to mark their deliverance. And the angel passed over them and they were forced to leave.

And so this night, to be much remembered, is a night like no other because it witnessed the birth, if you please, of the church out of slavery into freedom.

In this case, freedom from slavery in Egypt, spiritually, freedom from sin. And it is a night very much to be remembered for the fact that we are freed from sin as a group Christ forgives his church.

So it was that night the death angel passed over and that's what we should think about this coming night to be much remembered which is Friday evening one week from now.

Passover will be observed one week from last night, Thursday night.

Now, in Exodus, I mean Deuteronomy 16, is the verse which Mr. Herbert Armstrong always had difficulty with in analyzing this question, because I remember hearing many sermons in those days.

It says here, at the place which the Lord your God will choose, 16.6 Deuteronomy, to make his name dwell in it, that's when they get into the land of the first Shiloh and Jerusalem, there you shall offer the Passover sacrifice in the evening at the going down of the sun.

At the season that you came out of Egypt, that is, it's to be in the spring of the year.

Now, what is significant is that it is at the going down of the sun. We had to explain it as if it required the going down of the sun over the horizon.

But in reality, that's sunset. The going down of the sun in any language that we are familiar with, even beside Hebrew, is in reference to the decline of the sun toward the horizon.

I think we might just as well have it literally as it is given, and there's no other logical meaning. And it is in the evening hours of the day to close of the day.

Now, an evening would begin a day at sunset. An evening would begin afternoon.

And so the expression between the two evenings not only could refer to the dusk between the evening that begins the day and the darkness of night, it's the term also.

And most commonly used in the wall to refer to, that is, between the two evenings is an expression, you know, that is found in Exodus 12.

It's a term that refers to a midpoint, shall we say, between noon and 6 p.m., where the spring of the year and sun normally sets around 6 p.m. in March, our calendar today.

And so between the two evenings and the midpoint between the two would be, in fact, 3 p.m. at somewhere between 12 and 6 p.m.

Normally, that very expression in Mr. Armstrong was unaware of this, that the same expression between the two evenings is used for the evening sacrifice that was always plain in the afternoon of the day, so that it would be burning by evening and all night until the morning sacrifice is put on the altar.

The evening sacrifice was not plain at dusk after sunset. You know, every day had an evening in the morning sacrifice.

So the term did not refer to dusk only, and therefore we could draw no conclusion on that basis. We can draw no conclusion on the basis of morning versus night, because they overlapped.

There's no indication when you read the whole account that when they left on the morrow after the Passover that it was not the next morning, but it was into the next night.

Numbers 33, introducing the story, they left from Ramsey, would almost certainly be understood in only one way if we had no other argument to bring up in this connection.

They set out from Ramsey, verse 3, verse of chapter 33, in the first month on the 15th day of the month, on the day, or that is on the morrow, after the Passover.

Now the Passover was the 14th. We have assumed, here to Ford, was after the deaf angel passed over instead of the night in which the deaf angel passed over and delivered them.

Now the reason I was ultimately persuaded, long ago, let's say this was 1949, when we discussed this at Great Lakes, you see in that day, Mr. Armstrong drew the conclusion that the Passover was flowing at the beginning of the 14th to be eaten at the beginning of the 14th.

Raymond Cole drew the conclusion from observation of his grandmother in Israel that the Passover lamb was flowing in the afternoon of the 14th to be eaten at the night of the 15th, and therefore the church should commemorate 11 bread and wine at the New Testament Passover in the night of the 15th.

Because we assumed that the eating of the lamb was the time when the ceremony of the New Testament should occur. And it wasn't the eating of the lamb, it was the day of the sacrifice. That's what I didn't understand.

That's what Raymond Cole didn't understand, up until Mr. Herbert Armstrong didn't understand. We assumed that we were commemorating the eating of the lamb, which is not the case.

That is commemorated on the night to be much remembered. We commemorate the sacrifice of the lamb and hence the wine symbolizing the blood and the suffering of the lamb on that day.

But we concluded that the 14th was correct but for wrong reasons. One of those now that persuaded me was that we assumed also that because God gave the land of Goshen to the children of Jacob in the days of Goshen, if you remember, the children of Israel were in the land of Goshen and must have kept the Passover throughout their homes in the land of Goshen and would have needed the daylight of the 14th in order to get to the city of Ramsey in order to leave the following evening.

And that was valid and that is what persuaded me that the Passover should be eaten at the beginning of the 14th in its New Testament symbolism and not on the 15th.

But our arguments before, with Mr. Armstrong, were basically the arguments of the paper but we completely overlooked. The one thing that I think answers the whole question and the controversy can be settled on at once and for all, is that the unleavened bread and wine commemorates the slaying of the lamb. They commemorate the slaying of the lamb in which we drink the blood symbolically and eat the flesh, which is like the lamb that is slain.

Now, the implication is that since they left the night during which the death angel passed over and they were expelled, having asked their immediate neighbors for the last remnants of their good cloth and gold and silver and jewelry as they were passing from the presence of the Egyptians.

It didn't take them all day to ask for that because they were already at Ramsey. We now must draw the conclusion, though it is not stated, it is a deduction. It's as much a deduction as the other was a deduction.

The children of Israel had already been gathered through the area of Ramsey. Some may have been dwelling there, some may have come and dwelt in tents.

So in any case, in whatever dwellings they may have had, they were in fact prepared to mark that very night and it was the night of the 15th. And they were already at Ramsey and not scattered through the land of Goshen.

That error, that assumption that I took for granted, which is what persuaded me that the practice of the church was right, that error should be acknowledged, but it doesn't alter the fact that the church was right.

It was, we had a wrong explanation for some of the events surrounding the original because indeed if they were in the land of Goshen, suppose the land of Goshen were 25 miles either side from the center or 50 miles, it would have taken you all day to get to Ramsey.

But if they were at Ramsey, then indeed they would have left that night and there could be no other understanding. So we discover that evening in morning can have more than one meaning, that between the two evenings can have more than one meaning, that it isn't proved that the children of Israel were all through the land of Goshen, they could just as well have been through at Ramsey and prepared to leave. And indeed once you see the general tenor and the fact that there is no indication that what the Israelites were thrust out the night that the death angel passed over, there is no other indication in the verse.

And it would have been on the morning, in the morrow, in Mimahara, after the Passover was slain the previous late afternoon in the fourteenth. And it was the early hours of the morning while it was yet night before there was any light of daybreak.

And as they were passing out of the land of Egypt that day, they saw the Egyptians burying their dead along the way.

So we could go through a number of other cases. We could look at Joshua 5.10 where the word evening is used and not between the two evenings. And that evening is the expression that is used also in Exodus chapter 12 for the end of the fourteenth, at which time one eats unleavened bread.

So I think that we can say that it really should hinge not on some specific meaning read into a verse when more than one meaning is even possible in the Hebrew.

But we should see the tenor of the event and recognize that the church to which Jesus came practiced it as Moses intended it and Jesus found no fault with the practice. That is something we must recognize.

We need to know that when Luke is inspired to speak of the days of unleavened bread called the Passover, or then came the day of unleavened bread.

No, I don't want that verse, I want this one, 22-1. And the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh which is called the Passover. There is no doubt.

That indeed, the days of unleavened bread got the name Passover because the angel passed over that very night of the fifteenth beginning of the festival.

Now, I think sometimes, you know, in trying to be very careful, I would say super scrupulous in the study paper, I think the paper, in fact, can be sprinkled in some places.

There is a connection in my estimation between the death angel passing over and the Passover lamb.

But the assumption that because the passing over of the death angel is the verb formed, who passed over, and the lamb is also called the translated Passover, to assume that there is no connection between the two, I think was a way of trying to resolve the argument that the Armstrong always used that the fourteenth is called the Passover because the death angel passed over.

No, the fourteenth is called the Passover because that's when the Passover lamb was flamed. The lamb, whose death brought about our sins, was being passed over when the judgment come and forgiven.

The fourteenth is named after the Passover lamb, which was flamed.

The fifteenth, and this is what is important, the fifteenth is also called the Passover.

Now, the Feast of Unleavened Bread drew near, which is called the Passover, and the reason the fifteenth is called the Passover also, and the whole festival is because the death angel passed over on the fifteenth.

I think we might just as well speak plainly on that subject.

And so both the fourteenth, in terms of the slaying of the lamb, is the Passover, and the fifteenth is the Feast.

And a little later it is described as the Feast of the Passover.

And there is no doubt then that there is no reason to disassociate the meaning of the word Passover from either the movement of the death angel or the lamb.

Because not only is the fourteenth the day of the slaying of the Passover, the fifteenth is also called the Feast, and it is also called, introducing the whole festival of Unleavened Bread, the Passover Festival, because that is the night that the angel passed over.

And in Exodus 34-25, you shall not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven.

Neither shall the sacrifice of the Feast of the Passover be left until the morning.

No, we even discover the Feast of the Passover is in reference to the events that follow the plain.

You are not to offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven. It must have unleavened bread present.

Neither shall the sacrifice, that is this lamb that is sacrificed, that you eat as a part of the Feast of the Passover be left until the morning.

And so without any question here, the term Feast of the Passover, Exodus 34-25, is really a definition for the first time of the word Passover for the festival called the Feast.

That is not to be left over until the morning is finished. You are at the meeting which seemed to be that, because they were to take care of it.

In fact, later on they seemed to have taken care of it that night, even before midnight, rather than to leave it after midnight like the first occasion of the accident.

And so we now should draw a conclusion that the night to be much remembered has very great meaning in terms of the original events.

And I think that within the last two to three years, the night to be much remembered, the 15th had been falling into laxity and a lack of understanding why the children of Israel should commemorate this so much.

But merely gathering together at a city of Ramses and Levis is hardly the warrant expressed for the only night of the year which is called the night to be much remembered.

But it has, excuse my voice, it has far more meaning if we see in it the night that surrounded the deliverance of the church of Israel, the congregation of Israel, the Old Testament church, and that we are commemorating that night that in a sense symbolizes also the deliverance of the church collectively, the New Testament church, from sin.

If there are any questions, I would certainly say you might like to reread Mr. Ted Armstrong's book in the section.

You should listen to what is said. I do not think that every minister would feel as free as I do on the subject because I can tell you, you see, I went over all these things far more and probably argued this subject more 30 years ago than I ever discussed any other topic.

And I think that indeed the papers, that is the study paper, gets back to most of the things we presented and adds to one thing that could have persuaded all of us originally and didn't, and that is the understanding of the difference between the two days and the fact that it was slain, the Lamb was slain on one day and eaten on the other at night.

And that we are commemorating the slain of the Lamb, we are not commemorating the eating of the Lamb which is a part of the night to be much remembered.

And on that evening some Jewish custom would have only a bone and would substitute eggs like to do in Purge if for instance is the main protein part of it.

And we are not asking brethren at this point to do anything but to celebrate and to be happy on this evening.

And if you have beef or if you have lamb or if you have mutton or if you have seven or if you have eight or if you have chicken or if you have turkey, you have vegetables and fruits, you may even have bitter herbs.

For some people all herbs are bitter, but I think it would not hurt to take a look at how it was celebrated and remember also that this night the Jews no longer eat the Passover.

It is as if what they did not acknowledge God prevented them from doing anyway.

They did not acknowledge the Lamb of God so God has not allowed them to eat the Lamb because the temple was ultimately destroyed.

They had roughly 40 years, not quite, but they had roughly 40 years in which to think the problem through before their sacrifice is ceased and now all they have is the barren symbol.

There is no reason why you shouldn't eat lamb that even many of us do and that is only to commemorate and not sense what the children of Israel originally ate when they were delivered because our lamb has already been sacrificed and we commemorate that death the previous evening.

I hope you will very much enjoy the night to be much remembered and take a far broader view of why we observe the symbols of unleavened bread and wine as we do, introducing a whole day of suffering and we ought to reflect next Thursday night and Friday on that suffering.

And the joy that is lost by that suffering the night following that is by the evening a week from now is your private respective homes and obviously there will be no Bible studies.

And I hope that you will understand also why we are observing the Passover in April and not in March because this was a 13th month year that has elapsed.

If we had kept the Passover one month earlier, the Feast of Cabernacles would have fallen on September 16th through 22nd and that would have been holy in the summer because autumn starts 23rd and it is certainly a law based on the scripture which says that the Feast of In Gathering, the Feast of Cabernacles, that is, is to be observed at the tukufa, that's the Hebrew meaning the turn of the year, or the autumnaliquina.

Hence this year not only is a 13 month year but it also was a year in which if we did not have that 13th month in spring we would have been observing the Feast of Cabernacles in the summer holy when in fact not less than one day by doing practice must be in the autumn.

Feel free to ask any in the ministry and I think it wouldn't hurt you to reread anything that we have written on the subject, go back to the Biblical account and reread the matter carefully.

Happily the basic practice of the church stands firm as it should. Have a very nice evening and wherever you'll be assembling tomorrow enjoy the Sabbath services.