

## Dr Hoeh- Passover

First, I would like to give a bit of background.

Mr. Armstrong, in the 1920s, came upon the question of the festivals of God in addition to the Sabbath, and in 1927 began to observe these days as a result, essentially, of looking into the scripture and studying the chapter in the Epistle of Paul through the important point arising that will give you some idea of why problems can have existed over a period of time.

That is, in the Church of God there was a rather lengthy historic tradition going back to the middle of the last century, the Church of God seventh day, with respect to the keeping of the Sabbath, and with respect to an annual observance of the Passover on the fourteenth.

The Churches of God had not, however, analyzed or given serious consideration at an administrative level over many decades of the last century and into the early part of this one with respect to the annual festivals.

Mr. Armstrong came to the Church of God, which had no basic tradition on either whether or how the days were to be observed.

He did not come from a Jewish background, therefore there might not have been aspects of the Jewish tradition that would have been included had he come from that background.

He came from a Quaker background, his wife was a Methodist background, and in that sense he went to the Jewish community to find some things pertaining to the festivals that might not have been clear.

Sometimes one learns how people understand the Scriptures, it does pay to ask Jews questions about the Hebrew Bible, it pays to ask Greeks, both of whom should be knowledgeable, in commenting on things pertaining to their language.

Now with that background, there were a number of ideas in circulation.

These ideas were not in the Church but in the world dependent on whether the Passover on which Christ died was the 14th or the 15th of the month, first month of the year.

There were questions necessarily with respect to whether Jesus observed the Passover out of sequence or in sequence.

All of these, Mr. Armstrong puzzled over and ultimately came to the same basic conclusion represented by the teachings of the Church of God, certainly beginning in the 1850s.

We're not going back further into the Sabaterians of earlier centuries or earlier history, I'm just tracing the story.

And that is the Jesus died on the 14th, that in fact the Church should observe the New Testament Passover on the eve of the 14th, which the Church does and will.

And anyone who has any other ideas merely because certain corrections have been made is drawing an erroneous conclusion.

The problem however was how to explain apparent differences between New Testament practice, the practice of the Church of God on one hand, and Old Testament practice and Jewish practice, both of which were viewed in different ways.

Should one start a study of this topic by examining the Old Testament or examining the New? As a minister in the Church of Hebrew background said to me, where did Mr. Armstrong begin his study in the New or the Old Testament? I asked him why, he asked the question.

He said if he had started in the Old Testament he could not have drawn the conclusion he did as to the nature of the observation of the Passover with respect to time and manner of observance with respect to time of day.

No, I said from all that I know beginning in 1947, though I read material on the topic earlier than that, which was published, it appeared that Mr. Armstrong focused on the practice and the teaching of the New Testament and sought to reconcile what would appear to be differences with respect to Old Testament and New Testament practices.

Therefore, he drew the conclusion and the Church was correct in concluding that Jesus did institute the Passover for the New Testament on the beginning hours of the 14th day of the first month of the Hebrew sacred calendar, not the 15th, and that Jesus intended that that particular time should continue to be observed.

This small group in the Church of God, however, having gone to Israel, that is the state of Israel today geographically, then Palestine under the British mandate, had drawn the conclusion that perhaps the New Testament practice of observing the Passover should be associated with the beginning of the 15th.

This was a small controversy affecting the Church of God essentially only within the Oregon Conference.

The Church as a whole, however, did not adopt that view, but it brought up the question of why it is that the Jews regarded the Old Testament Passover as being eaten on the eve of the 15th, whereas Jesus sat down to an occasion in which he said, I have desired to eat this Passover before I suffer, which must have been the beginning of the 14th on the clear statements of John, and for that matter the clear statements of Matthew, Mark and Luke with respect to which day was the Holy Day.

Therefore we note that Mr. Armstrong, in attempting to reconcile this, drew the conclusion that the Jews must have erred, and in fact observed the Passover at the Exodus on the eve of the 14th, ate it during the night of the 14th, and that the death angel passed over at midnight of the 14th.

Several events followed, but the Exodus did not occur until the night after the Passover, the night after Pharaoh came and ordered them out of Egypt.

The historic problem is therefore not essentially a New Testament problem, but an Old Testament problem in terms of where we should examine difficulties that the Church might have had in understanding and interpreting the accounts.

Some years before 1990, Mr. Tkach wrote, and I did not feel any need to refer to a single statement there, that in fact the practice of the Church is based on the teaching of the New Testament, and any explanation, which he was not then prepared to write up, pertaining to the Old Testament historic events at the Exodus should be understood not as doctrine, but as history.

And history means that you can examine the material for yourself.

The Church had not then, in 1986 and 1987, chosen to address the question in the sense of clear analysis, nor in 1988 or 1989.

It was only after the Passover in 1990 that we chose to publish the material when everyone had time to examine the evidence, to have it written up, and to be able to clarify it adequately.

So, the teaching of the Church was based on the following premises, that since the New Testament and Old Testament ought to have adequate correspondence, we drew the conclusion that the Passover, undefined further, was entirely associated with the fourteenth day, and that the word Passover never was correctly to be associated with the fifteenth in Old Testament material.

We drew the conclusion that the Lamb was slain during that period called twilight, or dusk.

Dusk in the Jewish translation, twilight in the New King James Version, or some others.

The area that Mr. Armstrong correctly defined and others have in its narrow sense of sunset to nightfall, and that this was, in fact, the beginning of the fourteenth day of the seventh month of this first month, or the beginning of any day of any month.

Because it was assumed at that time that all days begin at sunset, and therefore the fourteenth if it begins at sunset, would include dusk or twilight at its beginning, and since the Scripture makes plain that the Passover was to be slain between the two evenings, between that evening, which represented the afternoon of the day, and that evening, which began with nightfall, it was understood by the church that this must be the beginning of the fourteenth because an unexamined point of evidence taken for granted was associated with this subject and never once examined in the history of the church until the last two or three years, and that is when a day actually begins.

It was taken for granted in all arguments without any question that because the Sabbath or holy days are observed beginning sunset, that the natural day is understood for every day of the year to begin with sunset.

Since that is a true premise, then clearly between the two evenings when the Lamb was to be killed, I'm giving the literal, that is twilight, would have had to have been on the eve of the fourteenth.

That was the teaching of the church.

Further, this being the case, there was a problem that the church could never answer in all those decades.

That is, in simple terms, why the Passover Lamb of God was not slain at the time the original Passover was killed.

Why he was, in fact, slain at the time the Jews slew their lambs.

Why he was slain, in fact, at a different time of day altogether, on the afternoon of the fourteenth and not its eve.

Now, to be plain, the church drew the conclusion that we could not logically accept an explanation that would solve that riddle, because if a day begins at sunset and the original Passover was slain between sunset and dark on the fourteenth, there was no way to reconcile the question of when the first Passover was slain and why Christ was not slain at the same time of day.

That was simply an unresolved problem.

In fact, had we faced the significance of that problem, we would have been able to examine the question and see it much earlier than we did in its historic perspective.

Mr. Armstrong recognized the clear teaching of the New Testament.

He followed the custom of the Church of God from the last century and from Adventists too, and from Jews, that you begin to observe the Sabbath at sunset and holy days from sunset.

I asked some of our people of Jewish background in the church once we came to understand clearly when between the two evenings occurred and why that term never pertains to the beginning of the natural day, but to its conclusion, that the Jews still regard that the day begins at sunset.

It took me years, hounding one of our ministers of Jewish background, and I will use that term because that's what I did.

Why is it that you say? From your Jewish background, that between the two evenings is the conclusion of the day, yet you say every Sabbath and every holy day begins at sunset.

Well, he said those days begin at sunset.

He never thought to address the question that we had.

Now, he does now is very clear.

It never occurred to him in all our discussions, is it possible that we should wait and continue work almost up to the time that the natural day begins with the nightfall? Well, he said, no, you should have ceased work before in order that you are keeping the holy days and the Sabbaths when the natural day begins.

And finally, we were having a breakthrough in an explanation.

Thus, he said, what my problem had been, we have taken for granted that if we begin to observe holy time at sunset, that that's necessarily the beginning of the day.

That's what we took for granted.

That was the thing that we could not resolve in our thinking.

In order to explain to Mr. Armstrong what on the basis of every other evidence of scripture would have indicated the Passover was slain at dusk at the close of the fourteenth and eaten at the night of the fifteenth.

Because that was not possible to demonstrate, and there was no use bringing it up until we could solve the conundrum of whether every day began at sunset or the observation of holy time begins at sunset.

We took for granted that both were the same, which is not the case.

In other words, the practice of the Church of God and of the Adventists and of the Jewish community, Seventh-day Baptist and many others, is, in fact, to observe holy time beginning at sunset rather than to wait to the technical point at which a day begins.

So that all work will have ended that is inappropriate for holy time.

In this sense, the Jewish tradition has always been clear.

Holy days end with nightfall.

They begin with sunset.

They do not end at sunset and begin at sunset.

In the Church of God that has not been our practice.

Among Adventists it may vary, I cannot answer that.

The reason I am addressing this first without going any further is that until that problem was solved it would never have been possible to address this question and to find an answer.

We examined every other one and until that was clearly resolved in our minds it was not possible, for that matter, to be fair to Mr. Tkach and to present papers to him until we ourselves had, that means numerous ones, not just myself please, had examined it and were prepared to present it in such a way that he could present it officially and formally and be satisfied in his own right.

It did not alter our practice as to what we do about the Passover on the eve of the 14th.

It alters radically what we should have been thinking about for the night to be much observed.

It does not alter anything in the practice of the Church, what I will present here today, with respect to what we do on the eve of the 14th, the New Testament Passover or Communion.

It should alter radically, let me restate this, what you should be thinking about for the night to be much remembered.

On page 1, Pastor General's Report, Volume 12, No. 9, this is May 1, 1990, Mr. Tkach wrote the following.

The Passover we eat is to commemorate Jesus' death that took place on the 14th. It is not the same observance as the Passover meal that the Jews commemorate on the 15th.

This brings up now another assumption that was never basic to our present understanding but was important to it, but was basic to the understanding the Church had before.

The understanding that the Church had before is this, that the New Testament symbols of unleavened bread and wine represent the roasted lamb which was eaten under the Mosaic traditions as administered by the Aaronic priesthood. And that, in fact, in place of the roasted lamb we are eating unleavened bread and wine, maybe the word is too partake, would be more appropriate. If that is so, and since it is to be done on the eve of the 14th, Mr. Armstrong had no choice but to say the original Passover was held on the beginning of the 14th, the eve of the 14th, for the simple reason that that is when the New Testament custom was also instituted.

There was a fundamental error in that that should have been understood if we had even read Acts chapter 15 unrelated to our topic. You do not eat the blood with the flesh.

They never ate the blood with the roasted lamb, did they? That's clear. When Jesus introduced the ceremony, he did not say, take this cup and drink all of you of it. Likewise, after supper, eat this bread. Did you notice what I had done in that statement? I had placed the sequence in the reverse order in which Matthew, Mark, Luke addressed the question.

But I gave it to you in the order you should have expected it if you were commemorating the death of Christ, the shredding of His blood, and if you are assuming that the bread is the duplicate in the New Testament Passover of the eating of the roasted lamb. When we should have reversed the order, not only should we have reversed the order of our ceremony, so should Matthew and Mark,

Luke. But it doesn't say this at all. It says this bread is my, and he didn't say roasted body. He said this bread is my flesh, broken for you, which happened before the Passover of God died. Therefore, the use of unleavened bread is to commemorate something that never happened to the paschal lamb, which was not beaten.

God never intended animals to be treated the way He allowed His Son to be dealt with.

The unleavened bread represents something never duplicated by the ceremony of the Old Testament in advance. It represents something new that tragically was to happen over many, many hours on the 14th of the first month. I won't have to go into that. You know all of those verses, what happened once he fell into the hands of those who simply wanted to dispose of him, and even those who wanted to wash their hands of it. Now we understand the New Testament ceremony in an entirely different light. We are commemorating the many hours, for that matter, you could say, of sorrow before midnight and of the seizure certainly shortly after midnight, end of his having been dealt with at the various courts and outside officially and unofficially. If you think police brutality only began this decade, you should read the gospel accounts. And then, the damage further done by six hours at a minimum, while he was still alive, on the basis of his death.

On the basic part of a tree, which must have been a tree trunk, the upright part, and a cross beam which he must have carried, and of course above that was another item nailed in a bi-pilot. So we have there essentially what amounts to 15 and more hours of tragic experience commemorated with the New Testament ceremony of the breaking of bread. Preceding the slaying of the Lamb, which slaying of the Lamb in Old Testament times now was duplicated by the ultimate death of Christ shortly after 3 p.m. on the afternoon of the 14th. Here are many, many hours, 15 hours at a minimum in all probability since we assume that it was near midnight when it occurred, and not later, not earlier than 3 p.m. when he died.

You have there in the New Testament pass over a whole series of events that couldn't be placed at any one moment of time. Jesus chose therefore to commemorate the things that happened to him on the eve of that day after the work on the 13th was over, and while you are preparing on the 14th or working on the 14th since it was not a holy day, he simply chose to have you think about what he was going to endure. At the beginning of that day and to reflect on it on the basis of your Passover ceremony, all of that day, he did not choose to place it in the afternoon after most of the suffering would have been in the past and then introduce you to the Passover. He chose to put it at the beginning of the 14th, to look forward throughout that day, not to do your work, and then in the late afternoon, shortly before the holy day begins, to come together on the afternoon of the 14th, and then to go home and then to observe a holy day, that he didn't do. What we have is something very important to understand. The New Testament Passover ceremony and service. With respect to the unleavened bread and wine, commemorates not merely the sacrifice of the Passover lamb, but all that was not duplicated in history, that could not have been duplicated in the Old Testament ceremony because it would have been inappropriate to torture lambs and kids of goats in that manner. This New Testament ceremony has nothing whatsoever to do with the eating of a roasted lamb. That is very important to understand. Because it had wine, the symbol of the blood, and it had flesh, and Jesus didn't say that you will not, let's say, live forever unless you eat my roasted flesh. He said, you must eat this flesh and drink this blood. And he's talking about the flesh before it was roasted and he placed that part of the discussion before the blood even there. And he is pointing out that we are dependent on what Christ suffered throughout the 14th and commemorate in this ceremony in the appropriate order. So once we were able to have it clearly in mind, when a day officially begins and when holy time should be observed, once we were able to clearly differentiate in written form, what the New Testament ceremony is meant to duplicate or to, let's say, act as a

fulfillment of and what was not possible to have prefigured in Old Testament times, once we knew that the Passover of the New Testament represented what preceded and ended with the slaying of the lamb, then we are not dealing with the question of whether the New Testament ceremony should have been in the beginning of the 15th century at all. That is simply irrelevant. It had no merit, it does not now, and it never will. Mr. Armstrong understood that it had no merit when examining the New Testament, but he therefore assumed that the meal must have been eaten on the eve in the evening after nightfall of the 14th in order to try to reconcile all of that. But now it didn't have to be at all. So we carefully note here what Mr. Jakocz wrote. This is why the Christians observance is held on the 14th the same day as Jesus died, the middle of page one, the last of the issue that I have mentioned. It is not the same observance as the Passover meal that the Jews commemorate on the 15th. So Mr. Jakocz proposed formally and publicly in his office as pastor general of the church to make it clear that what we observe as the Passover on the 14th is not equivalent to the Passover meal that the Jews commemorate on the 15th. This is not in some supplement, this is in the pastor general's report in his official letter. Jesus was the Lamb of God bottom of the page who was killed for our sins on the 14th of Nisan. Therefore it is not accurate to say that Jesus kept the Passover a day early. It is another statement which you should have clearly in mind. Since the Passover was observed by the Jews and the Lamb of God was slain on the afternoon of the 14th, it would be incorrect to say that Jesus was trying to keep the Passover meal of the 15th, which is what the Jews do. They call it that, so they have no Lamb now.

And that he in fact was observing a Passover meal with a Lamb one day early on the 14th.

That is not a correct statement. It is an inaccurate statement. But Jesus did the disciples the night before he was crucified. The night of the 14th was not to eat a meal consisting of the Passover lamb. It was indeed a Passover meal that the Lamb and the, pardon me, because the Lamb, capital L of God was present. But it was not the Passover meal of the roasted lamb, which the Jews traditionally would have observed the following evening. It was a Passover meal, and we will comment on that a little further later. But I want you to note where Mr. Tkach introduced this information step by step so you have it as a historic presentation in the church. We are dealing now with something that was made clear in the month of May in 1990 and written for him in a letter by him. The Lamb of God was present at that particular ceremonial occasion, and therefore it had a Passover character. Further, in the second new paragraph on page 2, to rehearse, the eating of the Passover meal always took place on the 15th. Mr. Tkach is not asking you to demand of him that he explain historically why we draw this conclusion. He's merely summarizing it. The remainder would be in the two items in the support material. We all know today, as you can know from any book written by any Jew or any Christian on the topic who actually examines the evidence. The eating of the Passover meal always took place on the 15th, a few hours after the lambs were slain, which I would say, but not written here, on the late hours of the 14th. What Christians observe is a memorial of the death of the Lamb of God who was killed on the 14th, but the Jews eat today is a memorial of the meal that always took place on the 15th. This meal serves as a memorial of the Israelites' deliverance from the death angel who killed the first born of the Egyptians, which took place on the 15th. That was a meal in which all the Jews could assemble in the other tribes of Israel when they were obedient to commemorate the wonderful events that night of their deliverance. And it was a ceremony because it was a meal, it was a roasted lamb.

It was not something for which they should be sorrowful. If there was a time to be sorrowful is when the lamb was being slain, when you no longer had this live kid or goat that you loved for the past weeks or months. But now there was a great celebration of deliverance.

It is called the feast. The feast is the 15th. You see, the church also never examined the remarkable statement of Leviticus 23. On the 14th day is the Passover and on the 15th is the feast, a feast that is never otherwise defined in Scripture. Fritz was always a problem.

How are we to understand it if it is not in context? But if the slaying occurred at dusk on the 14th, then the festival, the feast, was not a problem at all. It was the eating of the Passover lamb that had been slain on the late hours of the previous day. Some might ask, why did Matthew, Mark, and Luke call the meal, Jesus, 8, with his disciples the Passover? Is there a discrepancy between Derrick Counts and that of John, who clearly had the Jews eating the Passover on the night after Jesus died? There is no discrepancy.

Now, Jesus ate with the disciples was indeed the Passover. But it was not the meal consisting of a lamb slain on the 14th toward its close and eaten on the 15th by the Jews. It was the Passover because the lamb of God was present. And it was a ceremony. He was present at other meals, further may have been lamb's. But when something like this that is a ceremony occurs on the 14th of the first month and the lamb of God is present, it necessarily takes on a Passover character because the lamb of God was the Passover lamb. And because it is the disciples after their meal with Jesus, symbolically ate of his flesh and drank of his blood, it was designed to commemorate Jesus' death, which took place later on that day, the 14th. By the time the 15th came, Jesus was already dead. And for the Christians eating a slain lamb on that day had become quite irrelevant.

Why didn't, but didn't the Israelites originally kill the Passover between the evenings? Ben Ha Arbaim, between the evenings at the beginning of the 14th as the church had explained it for decades. Part of the explanation lies in understanding the meaning of the term as even, meaning evening a short form of it, dusk or twilight, which is not given in the text here, or between the evenings. This term denotes a period of time at the end of the day, but a remarkable statement because the church had in fact had the opposite view.

It refers to the period in its shortened form, I say shortened because often there is a narrow view and later a broader view. A day has not a day, 12 hours or a day, 24 if you want to go further. And then in our day, we mean what? We might mean some part of this century, or it could be some other term. So some terms in any language may have a narrow or a broader view. That this term denotes a period of time at the end of the day was something we could not prove to Mr. Armstrong for years until we settled the question of when a day begins and when the Sabbath should be observed and to note the distinction. And until that distinction was made, it was never possible to explain this argument because Mr. Armstrong would have clearly said, if between the two evenings begins a day, a natural day, then it is impossible to have the Passover lamb eaten at any other time than the beginning of the day. And that's where the argument would have rested. Mr. Dikach does not ask of you to demand of him to give the evidence. I just want you to know that. He asks that you read the rest of the material for the evidence which he here has summarized. It refers to the period from sunset to dark, which of course Mr. Armstrong knew. We all should have known it, but we didn't know which day to attach it to. It's dusk, twilight. The Jews later took it to refer to a period from noon to nightfall with about three to five p.m. as its midpoint. Now in a sense, there was an evening from early times that, in fact, ended at sunset. And that's when there was an evening that began with nightfall. We know the latter in the Bible from Genesis chapter one, don't we? And it was the evening and the morning. Now the evening God called night, didn't He? So there is an evening that begins with nightfall. Then there is by custom the evening that becomes visual when the sun is set. The evening that certainly wouldn't begin before noon, but begins after noon with a space between after and noon. And it would conclude at sunset. And so between the two evenings was an old term in the Hebrew language for people who live out in the desert. And that is a desert in that area where

sunset has significance. But if you can see the sun sets in a desert, unless it's a hum scene that's blowing, you know these great sandstorms. And yet nightfall has great significance because you can do things after sunset and the daylight is still dominant but the orb is visually over the horizon. But when nightfall begins to set in, you should be in your tent. And so the evening that begins with nightfall and the evening that closes at sunset was separated by a term called between these evenings, dusk or twilight, or itself was called even or evening. Because in another verse it says you sacrifice the path over lamb at evening.

That means a twilight. In that context, we wouldn't know it meant twilight, but it means that the word evening was appropriate to refer to it, but technically it was introduced as between the two evenings when Exodus 12 is given to us.

There is an item here I would just like to read, because one of the simplest explanations of what did take place in the Jewish custom.

This is from a work that you should never bother to look for. You won't find it.

Perhaps a Jewish calendar for 50 years published in 1854. I happened to have found it in a Jewish bookshop in New York many years ago. It was published in Canada for the Jewish community.

It has marvelous things and in those days the calendar was a book. The calendar was a book.

The calendar is given here, for those of you who might be interested, and what is on this calendar is probably 10 to 20-fold what is on any Jewish published calendar today. It is like saying all the things associated throughout the year with the calendar were then included.

Today the Jews are in business instead. That's what's happened. And these things simply get in the way. Now, between the two evenings, it says, the first of these is explained to have commenced at noon with a footnote defining it and the latter at sunset, including thus the interval between midday and sunset. Now, this definition is interesting.

Because over a period of time the Jews moved away from the narrow view and took another definition of evening and made one evening from noon to sunset and the other from sunset to sunrise without using the term in a narrow sense beginning with sunset and ending with darkness. Now, by the New Testament time, this is the case. By the New Testament time, this is the case. And for that matter, even in Joshua's and Moses' day they used the word evening for between the two evenings. But one evening was always understood to end at sunset. The other might have begun with nightfall based on Genesis 1 and the tradition throughout the Middle East or with sunset. And if between the two evenings was taken with the second evening beginning at sunset, what the Jews later did was to give priority in between the two evenings to that period of time somewhere between 3 and 5 o'clock.

Now, in the Exodus event, this was not applicable. But you remember in the event at the Exodus every head of household, which meant there were about 10 people to a household, every head of household flew a lamb or a kid. So it was all slain, each one was slain at the same time. Is that clear? The same head of household didn't have to slay lambs for every other head of household in the whole neighborhood. Each head of household flew the lamb. Therefore the event could take place in minutes. That's all. Hence, dusk was perfectly satisfactory.

When Moses is addressing the future in the book for another generation, the book of the Deuteronomy, he said, now you'll all do this at one place. Now once you do it at one place, you'll begin to have constraints. And finally, you'll also recognize what God surely must know looking down

at all of you. He would not want to trust Passover lambs to your knife and skill in some cases. Are you all prepared to butcher all the meat you eat? Now I know some are. Finally, God allowed, and for that matter, I think you will see the wisdom of it, when people get off the farm and live in towns, when they no longer butcher their animals that buy the meat, you simply have to know how to slay a lamb or you should not try to do it. Therefore, this is just practical. It came to be the custom of the priesthood to do it in one place. First at Shiloh, and so the people had to bring the lambs to Shiloh.

And once that occurs and you have a constrained area and later Jerusalem, then it was not possible for all the lambs for the nation to be slain in the few moments of time, usually something like 25 to 28 minutes, that's all, would have been dusk. In the spring of the year, generally speaking, a Jewish tradition can back this up, I don't have to, experience, you can go out every evening if you want to and test it out, if you know when the sun sets. By approximately 25 to 30 minutes, in our zone here in which we live, Southern California, which is Mediterranean zone, between the two evenings is simply approximately 28 minutes, somewhere between 25 and 30. And then you have so many people coming up to the festival, it necessarily would take more time. Was it proper, therefore, to observe the Passover no longer between the two evenings in its narrow sense, but in the larger sense. Now if the first evening began after noon, and the second began after nightfall, in any case, between those two could have been seen as between the end of one and the beginning of the other, or as between the beginning of one and the beginning of the other, that is between the beginning of one, noon, just afternoon, and the beginning of the other, either at nightfall or at sunset. Now once a holy day, customarily is observed with sunset, then the second evening, customarily, would have been understood as beginning with sunset and not nightfall. Did you hear that clearly for your note? That once the custom rose of observing, with a large community, you have to have some decisions of observing a holy day beginning at sunset, the fifteenth was a holy day, it was common then to begin the second evening with sunset, with that day, because the beginning of that day was construed to be sunset. So between noon on the fourteenth and sunset at the close of the fourteenth was between the beginning of the two evenings. And so this interval of time was ultimately associated with a period between three and five o'clock, and that was sufficient for the purpose. A religious act required to be performed between the two evenings must be carefully performed before sunset under the practice that the new holy day is to begin to be hallowed with sunset, lest it be counted to the following day, even though it still might have been a part of the natural fourteenth day. In the evening when the sun goes down, that is, it's declining westward, is another way the Jews came to define it, and Moses used that term. In the evening when the sun goes down, Deuteronomy 16.6. The first evening according to some then would not have been before three o'clock, and the latter evening would not have been before five. That's a very minor point, it just happened to read it here for you. In other words, the Jews felt between, somewhere between three and five was an appropriate time in order to get everything done, because if you had to sacrifice it at the temple, and then go home, and not have all the work of traveling with the lamb before sunset, you don't want the lamb, the final people going through the temple, where the priests were slaying the lamb, such that you had to do the work of tearing the lamb home for a half an hour after the holy day began. That would have been inappropriate.

So practice led to the conclusion that somewhere after three and by approximately five o'clock the lambs were slaying in New Testament times. What is remarkable is, did this authoritative decision in a sense have a historic fulfillment to show that God approved this adjustment in the administration of the slaying of the lamb, and the answer is yes, for Christ himself died shortly after 3 p.m. on the 14th when the lambs began to be slaying. We have to make adjustments, and once God told Moses, now I know what's going to happen, therefore I want everything done in one place, and once it is to be done in one place, and not that the nations should become divided, this necessarily required

certain adjustments, and those adjustments are already made so that when Moses addresses Deuteronomy 16.6, he is in fact addressing the question to another generation in terms of having a single place of worship. Not that every home throughout the country would do this, but that the lambs hereafter would be slain, and they would be slain when the sun is going down. In the evening when the sun goes down, that is declining westward, which is what we would call the late, later, or late afternoon. And traditionally that came to be centered by New Testament times between 3 and 5. So Moses is giving an adjustment furthermore, whereas the ancient Israelites had to be prepared to leave that very night when they were eating, afterward the Jews regarded reclining as appropriate because they were no longer having to flee. So the changes were made in the practice, the customs surrounding the Old Testament ceremony.

Mr. DeKoch, in the large paragraph near the bottom of page 2, says, Once the tabernacle was built and the slaying of the Passover lambs came to be done by the priests at the temple, the priests had to begin the sacrifices earlier in the afternoon before dusk in order to finish before dark. And in this case I would say it was more than before dark, it still had to be before sunset in order that the people, and sufficiently before, that they would not have to be carrying a needless burden on the beginning of a holy day. We always correctly understood dark to mark the end of between the evenings. That is said in parentheses, and that of course is correct. The question is to which day did it pertain. It pertained to the close of the 14th, which part of the day I should have said. So it was toward the end of the 14th, as Mr. DeKoch defines it here for the church.

The Passover meal eaten by the Jews, next paragraph, on the 15th was never designed to commemorate the death of the lambs. It was designed to commemorate the Israelites' deliverance and departure from Egypt. The eating of the Passover meal, and we all would understand that, was not designed to commemorate the death of the lambs. And if not the death of the lambs, then not the death of the lamb. Capital L. It was designed to commemorate the Israelites' deliverance and departure from Egypt. This also points up the fact that the 24-hour day does not technically begin and end at sunset, but at dark. Between the evenings is, in its narrower definition, the period from sunset to dark at the end of the day. Top of page 3, the natural day ends with nightfall at the end of dusk. That is, what you discover, it's interesting to go out. You know, we're so used to sitting in an office, I come in sometimes early in the morning, in the winter, late autumn, early winter, when the days are short, it's dark. And if I stay till five o'clock at this time and I go out, it's dark. And I have a strange feeling that it's been like this all day long if I don't leave the building. It actually is psychologically good to get out, otherwise you feel as if you're imprisoned, even though you voluntarily stayed in the office. So it is interesting to note the feel of what it's like when a day truly begins and how much light there still is when sunset comes and sunset is meant to tell us that our work should have been done.

So we are prepared. We are together. We are dressed. We are ready for every Sabbath or holy day that comes. And hence the custom of observing holy time beginning earlier than the natural day would normally begin. The Jews built a margin of safety around the Sabbath.

By beginning its observance a few minutes before sunset, they went further. And ending it a few minutes after dark, nothing like being safe. They were trying to regulate everything to prevent you from error. So we even add that so you understand. It's long been the practice and still is the church of God to observe the Sabbath beginning sunset. Now, for your information, at one time in the century though, last century, Adventists in the church of God 7th day observed the Sabbath from 6 p.m. to 6 p.m. because they didn't know what to do. They simply had never gone to the Jewish community to ask the question. This you may find in 7th day Adventist literature, by the way.

Next comes the Passover of the Exodus. Now this appears in Reviews You Can Use. Reviews you can use is supplementary material. It is not meant to have the same authority. It may have the same accuracy, but it was not meant to have the same authority because sometimes we want to quote authors in Reviews You Can Use, authors who are not in the church, but we want to inform you of what other people are thinking or saying. So this material now called the Passover of the Exodus, Reviews You Can Use, made June 1990, beginning page two. It is very important for you to carefully read. I will make some comments about the verses in certain areas that might seem appropriate. The disciples inquired about preparations for the Passover. Since you will have this copy in front of you, I will not cite all the verses. All of you should have this material in your files. If you do not, you should check with church administration to ask that it be made available to you, but we will not expand comments further than necessary with the film because you will have access to the Bible and you should have, of course, if the film is being seen in your home again here.

You should have this material in front of you. You can always stop the video and take a look at the verse and examine it. That is the advantage of having a lecture that you can break up and not having one that continues even as you get behind in your notes. There was a reference to the Passover in Mark. A preparation or the Passover was prepared.

And the Jesus acknowledged this was indeed a Passover in Luke. These are sometimes seen as dilemmas. The celebration instituted by Christ was indeed a Passover. It was indeed the Passover. How should we understand it? The root of the problem. First of all, Dr.

Stavranidis goes through material to make it clear that indeed there are certain steps that may be examined through the scripture. He has them given point by point so you can know what an evening means and what a day means. And you can also know what morning means in this context. The afternoon is part of the day as indicated in such expressions as the cool of the day. And this would be, of course, the late afternoon if you're in the desert because it suddenly begins to get cool as the day closes. It can be quite warm till late in the day. So he expounds on the question of twilight. I have covered most of this, which I felt was appropriate to comment on with respect to Mr. Tkach's letter, not the material here. This material, in a sense, will in fact summarize what I have given as commentary. The light of the sun determines the end of the calendrical day. It's a statement that is made on page three just before the first subhead. Now, what happens is this. Since the commanded time of sacrifice, known as between the two evenings, came, the original definition, came after sunset and before dark, it was the end of the Passover day and not its beginning. Now, the Passover lamb, top of the second column, page three, was selected on the tenth of Nisan and killed as the fourteenth was drawing to a close. I want to make a comment unrelated to this that I think is very important the church had never focused on before the Passover. And it's not, it's easy to comment on it. And I never thought of it for a long time, but I had wondered about it. You know, of course, when Palm Sunday occurred. It was Sunday. That's why it's called Palm Sunday. And you know the crucifixion for those who observe Palm Sunday was Friday. Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. And nine, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. The ninth day, Palm Sunday. No, they meant the tenth. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. That meant that when they thought of Palm Sunday as the tenth, they thought of Friday, the day of the crucifixion, as a holy day, the fifteenth. That was of course a flaw. A clear flaw. Because many, especially Baptists, and I don't say that I'll do, but many Baptists and others who have studied it know that it refers to the fourteenth. The church of God knows that it refers to the fourteenth. Now look what happens if the crucifixion is on a Wednesday the fourteenth. Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. You see what I'm doing? Christ, the Passover lamb, accepted on the tenth day of the month, a Friday. No. Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. So Saturday was the tenth. Wednesday was the fourteenth and Thursday was the fifteenth. But Christ, if you were to draw the analogy between Palm Sunday and the crucifixion, 10 and 15 was incorrect. 9 and 14 was correct. But there's no reason to have Palm Sunday or the symbolism of choosing the Passover lamb on a Sunday the ninth. If he died on the fourteenth, see. What happens when the tenth day of the month is a Sabbath? Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

That's what happened in 8031. The answer is, when the tenth day of the month falls, it did fall on a Sabbath. The lamb was not selected on the tenth day. It was selected on the ninth day. Before the tenth would begin, because that was not appropriate for the tenth day.

Now you can understand why it is possible to read it as Christians always have and correctly.

Events that they assign on Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday took place on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. And that means you're starting with the ninth day. That, in fact, is remarkable because that's an added proof that I never thought of for years that the crucifixion occurred in a year when the tenth day of the month was a Saturday. And therefore, yes, and the crucifixion occurred on a Wednesday.

And therefore Jesus had all these things presented in front of him on Friday afternoon and the ninth day. And you remember he came to the temple. And as the ninth day drew to a close and the tenth day began, he looked around and left. He read it carefully. And the controversies had followed, followed that event. So in the year of the crucifixion, the Passover lamb was not selected on the tenth but the ninth, and that corresponds to what the Christians call Palm Sunday. They thought it was the tenth and the fifteenth.

They have no reason to put it on the ninth and the fourteenth because it wasn't on a holy day. It was on a Sunday. Just a passing thought. So toward, let me go further through a section here. The Cleaning and Preparation of the Lamb, Column 2, Page 3 of the May, June 1990 issue. Followed by the slow roasting would have brought the Passover meal close to midnight of the fifteenth of Nisan about the time God smote the firstborn of the Egyptians.

Slow roasting. Some of you like the darker meat. You might roast it a little faster.

A Greek wrote this and thinks of eating it as Greek stew. It probably would taste very good. Nevertheless, it might have been a little earlier depending on how the family would have prepared it.

Pharaoh rose up in the night, sent word to Moses to leave Egypt with his people and their belongings. Toward dawn, while it was still dark, on the fifteenth of Nisan the Israelites took the dough they had prepared for the next day's bread, even though they had not yet leavened it, and began to march out of Egypt. The fifteenth of Nisan is therefore described as a night to be much observed for the many events that transpired that evening.

The only night that I can say you were justified staying up after midnight. Because it marks the historical departure of the Israelites from the land of Egypt.

Toward dawn, footnote 10, the command was for the Israelites to stay in their houses until the morning. If you carefully examine the New Testament, you will discover, along with the Old Testament, that just as an evening begins afternoon, after and a space and noon, so also morning begins after the middle of the night, or midnight. And so the Israelites would normally have, if nothing had happened, stayed until enough light would have begun to break, there's no reason to go out earlier, and then to burn the remains. They were told to stay until the morning. But after

midnight, morning would have begun. It was still dark, it was still night, but it was toward dawn. And we read, of course, in a number of occasions, Jesus got up and went out to pray early in the morning, very early in the morning, while it was yet dark. Now, if you'd like to think of it, for those of you who are morning people, I'm a morning person. I try to get the bulk of my work done. I like to draw my work to a close, by rather early in the evening. I get up and do a lot of my editing any time after 12.45, 1.45, 2.45, because then if I get it all done in time, I can go back to bed and go to sleep again. 3.45 this morning, well, yesterday I did my work at 2.45 on, this morning at 4.45 on, and I got everything done. I had a good night's sleep this morning.

I wanted to at least seem to be alert today. So I finished it by about 6.15, something like that. That way, I am free to do sometimes some things during the day, because if I can get some of my work done before 8 in the morning, then others can proceed with it. But if I have to go to work and they're waiting, then they are having to do something else while I'm working, and they lose their time. So it's much better for me to put my time early.

Now when you're up early in the morning, you don't call this the evening. It's either still night, still dark, or it is toward dawn, or early in the morning, or very early in the morning. So the use of the term morning is not a proof one way or another, simply not a proof one way or another. Just as the word evening is insufficient as a proof one way or another, evening is too broad a term, morning is too broad a term to define the whole doctrine. We draw that to your attention. It was still night, Pharaoh wasted no time.

You should, of course, carefully read the material here. Let us draw attention to one more thing. Mr. Armstrong read on one occasion that the Samaritans killed the Passover lamb on the day before the Jews did, and he drew the conclusion that therefore it was their custom to kill it at the beginning of the 14th since he assumed they all had the same calendar. He didn't realize that the Jews had a calendar that was not the same as the Samaritans. It was based on the same basic principles, but it is administered differently.

There is a different authority between the Samaritans and the Jewish community. In that year, the 15th day of the month described in the National Geographic that Mr. Armstrong referred to occurred one day earlier on the Samaritan calendar than it did on the Hebrew calendar. The one most likely went by observation based on some kind of calculation, and the other has been set in motion based on calculation ever since the days of Hillel II and III and 8359. Let us now look at the bottom of page 4, column 1. The sacrifice of the Passover lamb at the end of the 14th was a different event from the eating of the Passover lamb during the feast night of the 15th. In turn, what Christ instituted was a ceremony that commemorated the fulfillment of the sacrifice of the 14th. As Paul explained to the Corinthians, the coming together for the church was not to eat the Lord's supper, but to commemorate something else, his death, till he come. When we do what we do, we do it to commemorate the Lord's death. The death of the lamb took place on the 14th, not the 15th. That is also clear because the Passover lamb was to be slain on the 14th. There is nothing to indicate that it was slain on the 15th. All this confusion need not have arisen in the literature if people had in fact carefully examined the material and understood the distinction between the New Testament ceremony, which commemorated the death of Messiah, as distinct from the eating of the paschal lamb as a part of the festive occasion beginning on Leavenbread.

Next, May, June issue, 1990, Christ and the Passover, page 5. The word of Jesus Christ The word until is discussed. The word until does not have to have the narrow view. It could have a narrow view, but doesn't have to have a narrow view. The word is a general term. Until the 14th doesn't have to mean until the 14th began, but no later. It simply a term that means you normally arrive on that day when

the lamb is killed. And having arrived on that day, it does not tell you when on that day it is to be slain. You keep it up until the 10th day, the same thing applies. It is a general term. It can no more determine the doctrine than the word morning determines the doctrine or the simple word evening determines the doctrine. Now something important. The disciples were told to prepare the Passover, whatever that might have been in their minds. Jesus said later, column 1, page 5, with fervent desire, I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer. Whatever this Passover was, was clearly something that he ate before he suffered, and it was eaten the night before.

And since the Jews ate to Passover only the night after he suffered, this Passover was something different. And it was different enough that another comment later will be important.

Christ did not introduce flesh as a Passover or sacrificial lamb. He didn't say of the flesh of a lamb, this is my body. Had this been the Passover meal of eating the lamb, it would have been very difficult to imagine him not saying so. But then it would not have represented his flesh broken before he died. It would be something that happened to the lamb after the death. So the whole thing doesn't fit the story at all when you carefully examined events. He didn't give the flesh of the sacrificial lamb that had been roasted. He said of bread, take, eat, this is my body. Christians after that time would need a sacrificial lamb.

In order to get to Christ, no, they simply already had the lamb of God, was spelled with the capital L. So we can see here that had that been the case and the lamb been used, then we would have expected the lamb to be used again. That does not make any sense and would reduce the New Testament ceremony to simply some new form of the biblical priesthood activity. So he didn't introduce the flesh of the roasted lamb and say this is my body.

He took bread. I want you to notice that. He took bread. He makes no reference to the meal as a Passover meal what he had been eating. He makes a reference to the Passover when he introduces the unleavened bread and wine. We'll move along to another page.

Six. First column. There are a number of indications in terms of Christ's celebration that we should have in mind. I'll read point number two. The disciples made preparation for the Passover. This was normally done by the Jews, beginning the night before the fourteenth.

I want to collect that. Before the fifteenth. That was a slip of the tongue. The text says fifteenth here. Yes, they did it already the night before so that the whole day that area could be considered clean and ready for any Passover utensils or otherwise that might be brought. It was to be clean by the beginning of the day that was the day of the preparation, which was the fourteenth for the sacrifice late that afternoon in the meal to follow in the fifteenth. Such preparations included cleaning and removal of leaven. This would not have been required of every other area, but where the Passover meal would have been eaten, it was the Jewish custom to do it early and that's exactly what the disciples did in the place where Jesus said I want to eat the Passover with my disciples. So the occasion was not an evening meal. The evening meal was eaten late in the afternoon. This is another point. Christ's celebration was at night certainly after 8 p.m. is my term. In the Middle East it's quite common to consider a morning meal and the evening meal taking place in the late afternoon, especially when you realize that many of these people had very little light to work by. The Passover included breaking bread after the entry of the bitter herbs.

This breaking of bread was not the beginning of Christ's Supper. That took place after it. There was wine. We do not read of four cups as is custom in Jewish tradition, but a communal cup. So there were many characteristics of a Passover, but many variations to say that this was not the traditional Passover that the Jews observed merely transferred one day earlier. Now, I won't go through all the

other statements, but it shows you that whatever we do has pascal character. It is not the Lord's Supper. A Supper occurred, but what Jesus refers to is indeed something that had a pascal character. That he said, I have wanted to eat this with you before I died. I will not do it again until I do so with you new in the kingdom of God. And he didn't mean that until I eat the Passover lamb again in the kingdom of God. A point on page seven. The celebration of Christ, middle of column one, that he had with his disciples, isolated the sacrifice. The bread and the wine are symbols of his own sacrifice. There the Greek word is given in the sense of it, which is being shed. That is what Christ was saying is that he was already then offering himself on that day. The continuous tense being shed connotes the consecration of the sacrificial lamb of God. We would not note these things in English terminology, but someone speaking Greek would note refinements. Greek grammar is not concerned so much with time as English grammar is with respect to the verb. We speak of verb tense, verb time. The Greeks were concerned with the nature of action and hence whether it is ongoing, whether it occurs on singular occasions and so forth. The lamb of God was being consecrated for the great sacrifice to come later that day, following down the paragraph. The Passover that Jesus instituted is the fulfillment of the entire Passover of Exodus and a memorial of the offering of the lamb of God. We are referring therefore to the story of the Passover in association with the 14th day of the month. By participating in this celebration, the Christian proclaims the Lord's death until he comes. In fact, we proclaim more. Paul implied there was more, his suffering and his death, because he describes all of that as well.

The Christian does not crucify Jesus Christ annually. He merely commemorates the sacrifice.

Therefore, the use of unleavened bread and wine is not a new form of sacrifice. The renewal sacrifice of the Passover lamb. New Testament ministers do not re-sacrifice Christ on the altar in this ceremony every year. We never do it. It happened once for all. You understand that in the Catholic Mass the Christ is sacrificed again because the bread is what covers the actual flesh and blood, transubstantiation, so that a priest in the Catholic church and in some other churches is regarded as having the power to re-sacrifice Christ every time and therefore he is a sacerdote and not merely a presbyter. You know that the word priest comes from presbyter, but the function of a priest in Christian tradition over the centuries came to be equivalent to sacerdote or a sacrificing person, even though his term is, he has a sacerdotal office, but he is called a presbyter. In other words, presbyters, teachers, elders came to offer sacrifices and so the sacrifice of Christ is what occurs on the altar. We do not have that. Therefore, we say the body and the blood are represented. Not that the unleavened bread is in fact Christ's body re-sacrificed or his blood shed again.

Middle of the end of this section on page 8, first column. Christ's call was to a life guided by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is to guide the church into all truth. One of these truths is the theology of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that the Christian is not called to kill the Passover on the 14th. He died once for all. Neither to engage in a physical feast using bread and wine on the 15th. By partaking of bread and wine, the Christian renews the same covenant Jesus ratified on the 14th of Nisan when he verbalized the nature of the covenant to the disciples, I am adding, and ultimately ratified it with his blood when he died. That's set in motion what we call appropriately the New Testament. The Greek has one word, the *ateke*, one word that you hear, but it has two separate meanings, a covenant and a testament, and that testament came in force then.

Your attention to Pastor General's report, March 20, 1991, the several meanings of Passover.

There's some very good material in this area in the Pastor General's report from church administration. I want to call your attention, the bulk of it is a rehearsal, but it is a good rehearsal and you should in fact take time to reread the whole thing. Now let me show you something very

significant that is found in the sequence so that we understand clearly what is involved. For I tell you that I will not eat it, I will not eat it.

This Passover until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God. Whatever Passover Jesus asked the disciples to prepare, and whatever Passover he meant when he said, I want to eat this Passover with my disciples at your house. Whatever this is, this Passover is one that he said, I would not eat this Passover it again until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God, and in other places he said until I eat it new with you in the kingdom of God. Now that clearly indicates that Jesus had in mind, not Matthew, not Mark, it wasn't there, not John, Peter and the rest. They wondered, what do you mean going to die today? I couldn't imagine that.

It never occurred to them that he was going to be dead by the following afternoon. But Jesus had this New Testament Passover in mind, the one that is going to be commemorated even in the kingdom of God. There is not going to be the reintroduction of a paschal lamb sacrificed.

We now know that Jesus had in mind what the disciples did not, but when Matthew, Mark and Luke referred to the Passover, they are writing anywhere from 10 to 15, 20, 25 years, let us say, after the event. Planet became custom in the New Testament Church to use the word Passover for this symbol, this ceremony. We therefore in the Church use the term Passover in an entirely different sense than the Jews do when we refer to our ceremony. We use it in the same sense when we refer to their ceremony. We have to recognize also something very significant, not in English and not in German, but in Dutch, Portuguese, French, Spanish, Italian, Romanian, I presume, Romance, but I don't know, all those Latin languages and in Greek. And who knows how many others in the Middle East where I simply can't give you any comment because I've never checked it. The word that Christians in the Germanic world, that is the Anglo-Saxon and German world, Scandinavian in part because I think some Scandinavians also use the term Passover.

The word Passover is used for the Eucharistic ceremony, Passover being whatever it sounds like in the language that is spoken in the Latin world. It is interesting therefore that in the Greek world and in the Latin languages, in the Dutch and I think at least one Scandinavian language, you have the remarkable thing that the word Passover is applied to the use of unleavened bread and wine or communion. So you cannot distinguish it in the literature. If Jesus or if the disciples later would refer to the term Passover, it might just as well refer to the New Testament and not the Old. And remember, when supper was over, Jesus instituted this, he referred to this Passover and then when he offers it, what does he do? He offers unleavened bread and wine, not the leg of the lamb. The material is complete with that in this section. I don't want to add unnecessary matter. I only draw attention, I just brought up again the April 14, 1991, Pastor General's report, Joseph Tkach Jr., where he reiterated the following. The Passover lamb column one near the top, second paragraph, the sacrifice between the two evenings and it was commemorated and it was demonstrated at an earlier time, the previous year, that this time period was at the close of the day, still a part of the 14th of Nisan when it was originally sacrificed in the days of Moses.

The conclusion is that Nisan 15 did not start at sunset, therefore the 15th started at dark, technically, see, although the observation of holy time came to begin with sunset. So he poses the question unrelated to our lecture here, should we consider keeping weekly and annual holy days as starting at dark rather than sunset and the answer, of course, we would take to be appropriately no. The custom is that we should be prepared and be observing it such that we are, in fact, in the spirit and ready in that period that is dusk or twilight and we are not simply laying down our tools and having to get ready for the Sabbath during the time and always these things take more time that we plan and therefore work continues into the beginning of the Sabbath. The tradition of the Jews, the tradition

of the churches of God, the Adventists also, who at least understood basically the Sabbath, is to recognize today when holy time should be observed, but we must not misunderstand that, in fact, a day technically begins and ends with darkness and therefore the twilight is the close of the day, not properly the beginning of the day. Even when the Jews discuss twilight, they always speak of the between the two evenings or the twilight that, in fact, followed sunset when the observation of the first holy day began. In their literature, they will still define it with clarity. That is, after sunset, the twilight between the two evenings, that, listen carefully, that pertains to the fourteenth.

But it took us many years to sort it out because we never ever dreamed that, in fact, there would be a different way of looking at the beginning of the day, any day as a whole, and how we ought to consider approaching holy time. I want to thank Mr. Tkach in church administration in general, Dr. Stavronidis and others for having written the material. I did have the privilege of acting as one of the various editors with all the copy, so I am quite familiar with it. I knew all along, of course, that the church would conclude without any question that its practice at the beginning of the fourteenth was correct, albeit its explanations were not always valid. And happily, I think that it is possible now to freely read material and have a marvelous discussion pertaining to the first holy day of Unleavened Bread to be able to distinguish the events and to recognize that there is something very important in the nature of the Exodus to come and our Exodus from sin that we associate with the fifteenth and our not being held guilty and being forgiven when it comes to the fourteenth.

That we take note of what Christ suffered, what he endured, and how we may come through repentance and the mercy of God on that day to him and to commemorate all the tragedies that the Jews will sooner or later understand. But on the fifteenth, we commemorate many things pertaining to ourselves.

Our own departure from sin, our departure from the sinful world around us, the deliverance of an ancient nation and, in fact, a congregation or church, the congregation of Israel, so that they might, in fact, have been separated from the world sufficiently to preserve this book and this history that we call the Bible.

Copyright © OSHO International Foundation