

– Additional Comments on a Wednesday Crucifixion –
by Gerald Brown, Ed.D & Bob De La Torre

Regarding the Writings (EGW)

Dear Friends,

The following set of e-mails will help to illustrate the position that many find themselves in today in regards to the Spirit of Prophecy and where it should stand as we study scripture.

It will undeniably show that we are to put the Word of God, the Bible, as the rule by which we live and the beliefs we hold. It is not my purpose to put the Writings down, but rather to show where they should stand.

This is not of anyone's design, but God's. The facts that are presented in these e-mails and articles cannot be refuted. You can try, but if you are honest, you will concede that this is the way God meant it to be, for our edification. We can accept it or deny it, it's your choice, but the evidences presented here are as basic and solid as our beliefs that Christ is coming soon and that the Sabbath will be the final test.

The fact that the Spirit of Prophecy does not seem to agree with these findings may cause great concern and clamors of heresy in our midst, but before taking that giant leap, read some of the evidence in the articles and allow your curiosity to wander. You will discover why there is an apparent discrepancy between the Spirit of Prophecy and Scripture. It is NOT an apparent discrepancy, they outright do not agree! But, there is a reason for this and Ellen White readily admits it.

Among some of the questions that you will need to come to a conclusion on are:

1. Why does the traditional view ignore Christ's role as the antitype in the sacrificial services, such as the selection of the lamb on the 10th day of Nisan and slain on the 14th day, if Passover is always on the 15th?
2. Why does the traditional view have Christ's Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, if John 12:1 says Christ entered Bethany six days before Passover and even Ellen White states that He entered Bethany on Friday to spend the Sabbath hours with Lazarus and his sisters?
3. Why does the traditional view have Christ in the tomb for approximately 36 hours when Christ Himself, tells us in Matthew 12:40 – "For as Jonas was three days **AND** three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days **AND** three nights in the heart of the earth." [emphasis mine]
4. Why is there is much controversy regarding the three days and three nights period? Does the Bible really mean "ON the third day" of "AFTER the third day"?
5. Why does Ellen White appear to follow the traditional view if the Bible says otherwise?

There are literally dozens of other critical facts that are overlooked by the traditional view that Christ was crucified on Friday and resurrected on Sunday morning. (Please read Matthew 24 if you have forgotten what Christ says about being deceived). These and many other questions are scripturally answered in these articles. You will wonder why the scholars have been so remiss or should I use the word, ignorant?

Brothers and Sisters, is this just a Side Issue? If you really believe so, then you have a choice to make. I only wish the answer to this was as simple as the question. For most the choice is easy... Don't rock the boat and don't be accused of "making the testimonies of none effect".

This is not of my design nor of the articles writer's design. This is the way God designed it to be and I am frankly too ignorant to know why it is this way, except that it has made those that take the time to study this, better Bible students.

As important as the Spirit of Prophecy is, it is NOT Scripture, nor will it ever replace it, and I think this was God's intent from the beginning.

If this is going to shake your faith in any way, then I must tell you that you never had a faith that Christ could rely on from the start.

I am literally amazed at the number of supposedly intelligent people that put the Writings equal to or above the Bible. No matter how often they are shown her admonitions that her Writings are to be the 'Lesser Light' which points to the 'Greater Light', they are memorized by the Writings and go as far as making Scripture adhere to the Writings by their skewed interpretations of Scripture.

I am going to qualify my statements by saying that at least in the area of Christ's last days on this earth before His crucifixion, this is the Truth, not maybe the truth...but IS the truth. I invite ANYONE to prove these findings false from Scripture. This website is called Adventist4Truth for a reason.

“But God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrines and the basis of all reforms. The opinions of learned men, the deductions of science, the creeds or decisions of ecclesiastical councils, as numerous and discordant as are the churches which they represent, the voice of the majority--not one nor all of these should be regarded as evidence for or against any point of religious faith. Before accepting any doctrine or precept, we should demand a plain “Thus saith the Lord” in its support.” *Great Controversy*, p. 595.01

May God give you the wisdom to discern between Truth and Deception

Bob De La Torre
Adventist4Truth.com

Subject: ON WEDNESDAY CRUCIFIXION

July 1, 2005

My dear brother Bob:

With much love in my heart for you and with the prayer that the Lord will give me the right words to say I must pen this letter to you at this time. I have looked at your arguments for a Wednesday crucifixion and must admit that I cannot accept your reasoning, especially in the light of so many plain and clear statements to the contrary in the Spirit of Prophecy, as will be shown.

One thing I found was that the word “commandment” in “...and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment...” refers to a “precept,” in other words the law of God, not to an ordinance, a feast or a ceremonial decree. Also the word the word for “preparation” in Mark 15:42 and Luke 23:54 in Greek is paraskue, which to this day in modern Greek is still the name for Friday!

That being said let me share some definite statements from the Spirit of Prophecy, which I MUST accept over any other reasoning. Over time I have found that this course of action has always been the safest road to follow, especially in light of the fact that ever since my initial separation from the apostate structure I have seen winds of doctrine of all sorts presented, from the God does not destroy heresy, to the Feast days, the Yahweh, the Holy Ghost, etc, etc--always with a mass of Scripture and SOP allegedly supporting their view, and which becomes the all-consuming, essential, salvational issue. These things certainly lead one to study and search out the truth, and I have done the same with your presentation. Let me compare that with words from the servant of the Lord. We read:

1. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested." Gen. 2:1-3. The death of Christ was designed to be at the very time in which it took place. It was in God's plan that the work which Christ had engaged to do should be completed on a Friday, and that on the Sabbath He should rest in the tomb, even as the Father and Son had rested after completing Their creative work. The hour of Christ's apparent defeat was the hour of His victory. The great plan, devised before the foundations of the earth were laid, was successfully carried out.—Ms 25, 1898, pp. 3, 4. ("The Man of Sorrows," typed, February 24, 1898.)

2. "At last Jesus was at rest. The long day of shame and torture was ended. As the last rays of the setting sun ushered in the Sabbath, the Son of God lay in quietude in Joseph's tomb. His work completed, His hands folded in peace. He rested through the sacred hours of the Sabbath day. In the beginning the Father and the Son had rested upon the Sabbath after Their work of creation. When "the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them" (Gen. 2:1), the Creator and all heavenly beings rejoiced in contemplation of the glorious scene. "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Job 38:7. Now Jesus rested from the work of redemption; and though there was grief among those who loved Him on earth, yet there was joy in heaven." DA: 769

3. "They returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56. The Saviour was buried on Friday, the sixth day of the week. The women prepared spices and ointments with which to embalm their Lord, and laid them aside, until the Sabbath was past. Not even the work of embalming the body of Jesus would they do upon the Sabbath day. "And when the Sabbath was past, . . . very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun." Markthe garden, they were surprised to see the heavens beautifully lighted up, and to feel the earth trembling beneath their feet. They hastened to the tomb and were still more astonished to find that the stone was rolled away, and that the Roman guard was not there." *Story of Jesus*: 157

4. "That was a never-to-be-forgotten Sabbath to the sorrowing disciples, and also to the priests, rulers, scribes, and people. At the setting of the sun on the evening of the preparation day the trumpets sounded, signifying that the Sabbath had begun. The Passover was observed as it had been for centuries, while He to whom it pointed had been slain by wicked hands, and lay in Joseph's tomb. On the Sabbath the courts of the temple were filled with worshipers. The high priest from Golgotha was there, splendidly robed in his sacerdotal garments. White-turbaned priests, full of activity, performed their duties. But some present were not at rest as the blood of bulls and goats was offered for sin. They were not conscious that type had met antitype, that an infinite sacrifice had been made for the sins of the world. They knew not that there was no further value in the performance of the ritual service. But never before had that service been witnessed with such conflicting feelings. The trumpets and musical instruments and the voices of the singers were as loud and clear as usual. But a sense of strangeness pervaded everything... They could rest little upon the Sabbath. Though they would not step over a Gentile's threshold for fear of defilement, yet they held a council concerning the body of Christ. Death and the grave must hold Him whom they had crucified. "The chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while He was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest His disciples come by night, and steal Him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can." DA 777, 778

5. "The women who had stood by the cross of Christ waited and watched for the hours of the Sabbath to pass. On the first day of the week, very early, they made their way to the tomb, taking with them precious spices to anoint the Saviour's body. They did not think about His rising from the dead. The sun of their hope had set, and night had settled down on their hearts. As they walked, they recounted Christ's works of mercy and His words of comfort. But they remembered not His words, "I will see you again." DA: 788

6. "In the beginning the Father and the Son had rested upon the Sabbath after Their work of creation. When "the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them" (Gen. 2:1)... the day on which Jesus lay at rest in Joseph's tomb, will still be a day of rest and rejoicing. Heaven and earth will unite in praise, as "from one Sabbath to another" (Isa. 66:23) the nations of the saved shall bow in joyful worship to God and the Lamb." MARANATHA: 371

7. "Christ rested in the tomb on the Sabbath day, and when holy beings of both Heaven and earth were astir on the morning of the first day of the week, he rose from the grave to renew his work of teaching his disciples. But this fact does not consecrate the first day of the week, and make it a Sabbath.. Jesus, prior to his death, established a memorial of the breaking of his body and the spilling of his blood for the sins of the world, in the ordinance of the Lord's supper, saying "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." And the repentant believer, who takes the steps required in conversion, commemorates in his baptism the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. He goes down into the water in the likeness of Christ's death and burial, and he is raised out of the water in the likeness of his resurrection--not to take up the old life of sin, but to live a new life in Christ Jesus." 3SP 204

8. "They laid the body of the Saviour in Joseph's sepulcher, and set a watch that none should steal him away. Christ rested on the Sabbath day in the tomb. But on the morning of the third day the Roman watch behold a light stream from heaven, and the angel of God descend. The mighty angel

comes to the tomb of the Son of God, and rolling away the stone, bids Jesus come forth. The Roman guard see Him come forth to life, and hear him proclaim over the rent sepulcher of Joseph, "I am the resurrection, and the life." 9RH 01-14-09

My dear brother, we have started getting calls on your emphatic insistence on this matter and at this time may I offer the following inspired counsel, especially in view of the fact that this is causing unnecessary discord which WILL eventually reflect not only on your work, but on all the ministries and material posted on your website--and as you are well aware, much of what is on your site is already controversial, but we know that it can be supported by the Scriptures and the Spirit of Prophecy.

"Brethren should not feel that it is a virtue to stand apart because they do not see all minor points in exactly the same light. If they agree on fundamental truths, they should not differ and dispute about matters of little real importance. To dwell on perplexing questions, that after all are of no vital consequence, tends to call the mind away from truths vital to the saving of the soul. Brethren should be very modest in urging these side-issues, which often they do not themselves understand, points that they do not know to be truth, and that are not essential to salvation. When there is difference of opinion on such points, the less prominence you give to them the better it will be for your own spirituality and for the peace and unity of the church." 3MR 28

Perhaps you may believe that this issue IS of vital consequence, IS essential, but as I stated before, you will meet strong opposition from most, if not all of the brethren if you insist of maintaining your

position which flies directly in the face of inspiration. So in closing, let me share this final inspired word of counsel: "In a special sense Seventh-day Adventists have been set in the world have been set in the world as watchmen and light bearers. To them has been entrusted the last warning for a perishing world. On them is shining wonderful light from the word of God. They have been given a work of the most solemn import--the proclamation of the first, second, and third angels' messages. There is no other work of so great importance. They are to allow nothing else to absorb their attention." 9T: 19 I will let you place the emphasis where you believe it should be placed.

Let us seek then for the peace and unity of the church. Your loving brother in Christ,

C.

July 1, 2005

Dear brother C.

I appreciate your efforts to bring my attention to this matter. I do not presume to know more than others in any way, but I do know that in the last days new light will be made evident to shine upon truths that have been there all alone.

I hope you will excuse my scarcity of quotes to support what I believe as you have done, but I was surprised that you did not deal with one single issue that questions the validity of a Friday crucifixion. Because you quoted almost exclusively from the Spirit of Prophecy, I will just quote two statements that Sister White made in case you missed these in the articles: 4BIO 384.5 & 3BIO 338.4 (You can find them included near the bottom of this letter)

I think that among the most glaring omissions is not explaining how Matt. 12:39, 40 is to be taken, especially when we see that the same thought is reiterated in Luke 11:29-32, please compare with Jonah 1:17. Please note, Brother C., that Christ is speaking and He does not say “three days and nights”, but “three days AND THREE nights”. Tell me, please, if there is an equal emphasis on the nights as there is on the days? What is the obvious conclusion otherwise? That both Christ and His Holy Father are LIARS? Please forgive the capitals, but since I use Text Mode and not HTML, I cannot use Bold nor Italics.

You mentioned the Passover. Do you believe that the Passover occurred on a specific weekly day each year? I think that is the assumption that is being given. In other words, was the Passover determined by the day of the week or by the date on the calendar in accordance with the phases of the moon?

You repeatedly mentioned Christ resting in death on the Sabbath. I don't believe there is any controversy there except in how Sister White interjects Friday evening into this. Sufficient evidence is given in the articles to show that all Sabbaths whether on the weekly cycle or on a festival day, had a preparation day prior to it. The Gospels ALL show that the Marys went to the tomb at DUSK, not at dawn, check with your Strong's.

In light of what Sister White wrote to Marian Davis, as mentioned above, it makes me very nervous when I hear a brother say that he basically upholds her writings above what Scripture says. I know that for many, putting any doubt on Sister White's writings would be detrimental to their spiritual faith, but let's be honest with ourselves brother, can we take her for her word when she says that she was not given any light on the sequence of events during Passion Week? That she had to research this for herself and that she wrote according to the prevailing wisdom of her day? Is this too implausible to accept?

Are we also to believe that the Little horn power (Satan) would not try to deceive even the very elect to believe that Christ arose on Sunday morning? Is he only limited to changing the day of worship in the accepted traditionally held way? What is the number one reason that people give for keeping SUNDAY?? Is this a basic pillar of truth that is being dismantled before your very eyes and you do not recognize it?

Brother C., in a very loving way, I wish to point out to you some counsel from Sister White in how to use her writings. You will read those words in 13MR 192-207. You didn't really follow her instructions in your letter to me today. I would like Bible answers to explain the questions above, because that is the way she said it should be done and because that is how we learn to defend our faith to those that do not know the truth... “A Thus saith the Lord” ... as you are often quoted repeating.

Did you read this far in the articles to catch this point before you sat down to write to me? I do not find that Ellen White makes any hint regarding which day of the week the supper took place in the upper room. She makes one statement that seems quite odd at first impression when she writes:

“He Himself was the true paschal lamb, and on the day the Passover was eaten he was to be sacrificed.”

This needs an explanation. This statement taken at its face is contrary to the instructions in Exodus 12. The paschal lamb is killed on the day before the Passover is eaten. The lamb is NOT eaten on the same day it is killed. The lamb is killed on the 14th of the month and eaten that night. In scripture the day changes at sunset, so “that night” would be the next day and the 15th of the month.

But I would like to presume that there is some sense in which her statement is true. The only way I can think of to interpret her statement as true is that the Passover meal He was eating with His disciples was being eaten on the day He was to be sacrificed. This is literally what she wrote and it is true only in this limited sense. It would have been easier to understand if she had written, “...and on the day He ate the Passover with His disciples He was to be sacrificed.”

What day was this supper on? It was on the evening that began the fourth day of the week - the same day He was crucified. Here’s how to figure it out. Jesus was resurrected at the close of Sabbath just after sunset. Counting backwards three days and three nights brings us to sunset that ends the fourth day of the week. The fifth day of the week (roughly what we call Thursday) was the Passover - the 15th of the month. The day before (roughly what we call Wednesday) was the preparation day - the 14th of the month. The Lord’s Supper was eaten after sunset on what we would call Tuesday night, which would be the 14th of the month. Midnight begins what we call Wednesday which is the day on which He was arrested, tried, and crucified. This is why it is referred to as the Wednesday crucifixion.

I was looking earlier today for the info on Marian Davis and found it. I was looking for it today because on Sabbath, the SS teacher stated several times that he was following Mrs. White’s chronology in the description of the events of Passion Week. I only wish that were true. By her own admission, she had a poor sense of the sequence of the events of the life of Christ and did not receive any special revelation regarding it. When she was writing the manuscript for the “Life of Christ” which became the Desire of Ages, she requested that her literary assistant, Marian Davis, find some histories of the Bible that would help her understand the order of events. Ten years later, she was still struggling with the sequence of events. Following are two quotes in support of this:

“Tell her I have just one minute ago read the letters in which she has specified the improvements to be made in articles for volume 1. I thank her. Tell her that she has a point about Zedekiah’s having his eyes put out. That needs to be more carefully worded. Also the rock, when the water flowed—something in reference to this. I think I can make the articles [chapters] specified more full, and as I am famous for moralizing, this will be no cross. Tell her to write to me, as I prize her letters as if she were my own child. . . . Tell Mary [Marian] to find me some histories of the Bible that would give me the order of events. I have nothing and can find nothing in the library here. It is getting dark and I am resolved not to use my eyes or brain by candlelight.”—Ibid. {3BIO 338.4}

“The Sequence of Events”As the materials were assembled and arranged into chapters, careful attention had to be given to the sequence of the events in the Saviour’s life. To what extent and

in what detail visions provided the sequence in ministry and miracles in Christ's life and work is not [385] known. It is known that a decade earlier she made a significant request: "Tell Mary to find me some histories of the Bible that would give me the order of events."—Letter 38, 1885. The Gospel writers in their accounts did not help much in the point of sequence. In the absence of direct instruction from Ellen White, or clues in the materials themselves, Miss Davis consulted carefully prepared harmonies of the Gospels, and as the work progressed made considerable use of S. J. Andrews' *Life of Our Lord Upon the Earth*, which as noted on the title page took into account "Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations."“ {4BIO 384.5}

Notice that Mrs. White said she has nothing and can find nothing on the sequence of events of the life of Christ. From this I hope one can see that the chronology of Mrs. White is not a revelation given her in vision, but an understanding developed from careful study of scripture itself and trusted writers. She gives us no indication that she received any special revelation on the issues of the sequence of the events of Passion Week when she started her project on the Life of Christ, nor ten years later when she was finishing it. Neither did she have any Greek-English lexicons or Interlinear Bibles to turn to for help. We probably mislead others when we tell them that we rely on her understanding of these events, which implies that she did have some special revelation regarding these events when she did not.

Those who present the traditional teaching of the events of Passion Week while claiming to follow Mrs. White's chronology, fail to point out that she places the context of John 12:1 on Friday and the feast at Simon's house on Friday evening. Here are her words from Chapter 62 of *Desire of Ages*, entitled "The Feast at Simon's House," page 557, par. 3:

"The Saviour had reached Bethany only six days before the Passover, and according to His custom had sought rest at the home of Lazarus. The crowds of travelers who passed on to the city spread the tidings that He was on His way to Jerusalem, and that He would rest over the Sabbath at Bethany. Among the people there was great enthusiasm. Many flocked to Bethany, some out of sympathy with Jesus, and others from curiosity to see one who had been raised from the dead."

Obviously, if Jesus was going to spend Sabbath in Bethany, He had to get there before Sabbath. As I illustrated on my chart for Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the New Testament, Jesus' arrival in Bethany on Friday afternoon is a perfect match for John 12:1 which states that He arrived there six days before Passover. Passover is the 15th of the month every year and six days before the 15th would be the 9th. That evening, on what we call Friday evening and now the seventh day of the week and 10th day of the month, is when the feast at Simon's house was held. This is a typical Jewish Erev Shabbat meal which begins the Sabbath celebration with the woman of the house lighting the candles at the dinner table moments before sunset and the recitation of traditional prayers while standing around the dinner table. The next day, still the seventh day of the week and 10th day of the month, is when the triumphal entry took place. According to Exodus 12, the Passover lamb was required to be selected on the 10th of the month and Jesus was selected right on time. He was anointed by Mary at Simon's house and Jesus recognized that she had done this for His burial. The crowds recognized Jesus as their Saviour at the triumphal entry. Jesus was selected both privately and publicly, just as kings Saul and David had been anointed privately and publicly. We can

easily calculate that, according to Mrs. White, the triumphal entry was on Sabbath, not Sunday. It

appears that she came to understand the time of Jesus' arrival in Bethany on Friday by her own careful study and that of her assistant Marian. We should do the same.

I believe it is an injustice to both Mrs. White and our readers/listeners to present the events of Passion Week according to the traditional view while claiming to rely on Mrs. White. However, anyone who relies on the traditional view does this is in good company as the entire world has followed the traditional pattern, including the SS quarterly and the SDA BC. Unfortunately, the whole world is following the message of the Little Horn in teaching these changed times." (The above could be found in the Additional Notes article)

Brother C., if you can shed some light from Scripture that would answer even one question that has been posed above, then we can surely say we are making some headway towards a fuller understanding of God's Word. Sending me a veiled threat was not a way that Christ would support, even when backed up by the SOP, especially when based on the lack of understanding on your part and the those of most in Adventism today. I exhort you to prove all things as you exhorted the brother in Pennsylvania. You have only just begun to understand Daniel and Revelation in the way that God wishes us to know it. Do you assume to have a full grasp on ALL the scriptures that support a Wednesday Crucifixion when studied in an unbiased and careful manner?

In closing, I want to make sure that you understand that in no way do I wish to undermine the SOP and if I said something that would raise your eyebrows, that I did not intend to say that. What I do say is that in the area of this issue, we must rely solely on Scripture based on Sister White's own admissions. I am also aware of what a letter such as you have written and I have responded to can do to a friendship. I beg of you that before any further damage is done that you prayerfully study ALL the articles with your BIBLE in your hands.

Your brother in Christ
Bob

PS I will forward your letter and my response to Brother Gerald brown to see if he can shed better light on this subject. But, I fear that his response will be that you did not really read ALL the articles and immediately started thinking of what Sister White had written.

"When a man who is honestly mistaken hears the truth, he will either quit being mistaken or cease to be honest!"

Hello Jerry,

I've spent a little while this afternoon answering a dear friend of mine's letter. I don't know if you can shed any more light, but I know you have a simple and loving way of stating things which I sometimes lack. If there is anything that I left out that would be helpful, please let me know.

Bob

Bob,

You gave a most excellent answer. I don't know how much of the material I've written your friend has read, but it is important to examine all of it in determining the truth. I am to the point where I can say with confidence that the single most important reason for the traditional view of the triumphal entry on Palm Sunday, the crucifixion of Good Friday, and the resurrection on Easter Sunday morning is to create the appearance for the validity of Sunday sacredness. Nothing in scripture supports the sequence of events as presented by modern Christianity. Scripture is clear that the lamb is selected on the 10th of the month and sacrificed four days later on the 14th of the month. If Jesus was selected on Palm Sunday as the lamb of God slain from the foundation of the Earth, then His crucifixion must be four days later on (let's see, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, yes!) Thursday – the day before the Passover on Friday. But the traditional view doesn't follow scripture. Of course, if Jesus were crucified on Thursday, then he would have been in the tomb only two days and two nights. That doesn't match the traditional view or anything Jesus said about Himself. It should be obvious that this is all wrong.

A couple of weeks ago Ken Hart made the statement as part of a private discussion before we started our video program Word Pictures that Jesus arrived in Bethany on the Sabbath and that the six days of John 12:1 is no problem because Sabbath plus six days gets us back to the Sabbath again. Following is my letter in response to his statement.

Hi Ken,

I've tried counting the six days before Passover of John 12:1 the way you suggested last night and I cannot get the two facts required by the traditional view to turn out right. The two facts are the Triumphal Entry on Palm Sunday and Passover on the following weekly Sabbath. You stated that Jesus arrived in Bethany on Sabbath. Based on that presumption and recognizing that the day of eating the Passover meal is always on the 15th of the month, here is the count:

9th Sabbath 6 days before Passover
10th Palm Sunday 5 days before Passover
11th Monday 4 days before Passover
12th Tuesday 3 days before Passover
13th Wednesday 2 days before Passover
14th Thursday 1 day before Passover
15th Friday = Passover.

Can you find that I made any mistakes? If not, then the conclusion is this: if Jesus arrived in Bethany on Sabbath six days before Passover, then Passover that year must have been on Friday. This, of course, does not match the traditional view. It seems that the traditional view requires us to read John 12:1 to mean that Jesus arrived in Bethany the day before six days before Passover.

If I counted correctly, this obviously does not match what you were trying to say last night. Your reckoning (the reckoning of the traditional view) is one day short of supporting both the Triumphal Entry on Palm Sunday and Passover on the weekly Sabbath.

It doesn't seem to work any better if I set Passover to coincide with the weekly Sabbath and count backwards. Here is what I get in that case.

9th Palm Sunday 6 days before Passover
10th Monday 5 days before Passover
11th Tuesday 4 days before Passover

12th Wednesday 3 days before Passover

13th Thursday 2 days before Passover

14th Friday 1 day before Passover

15th Sabbath = Passover

In this arrangement Jesus arrives in Bethany on the first day of the week on what we generally call Sunday. But this arrangement has a different fatal flaw which we need to examine. It has to do with the sequence of days established for the spring festival through Moses. How much of the Passover tradition given by God to Moses is typological? Specifically, why did God tell Moses to have the people select the Passover lamb on the 10th day of the month? Can you find any reason in the Old Testament for the 10th to have significance other than the fact that this was God's instruction to do it this way? If so, please share it with me as I have not found any significance for this requirement in the Old Testament. Why weren't they told to select the lamb on the 9th, or 8th, or 1st, or 11th, or 12th, etc.? Is there any reason in the Old Testament for the 10th as the selection day?

I believe the sequence of days for Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread -- the selection of the lamb on the 10th, preparation of the lamb on the 14th, eating the Passover lamb on the 15th, the day of first fruits on the morrow after the Sabbath -- are all typological, and the anti-type must be seen in the New Testament fulfillment of this festival. Thus, Jesus must be selected as the typological lamb slain from the foundation of the world on the 10th day of the month. If Passover coincides with the weekly Sabbath, then the 10th is the 2nd day of the week, on what we generally call Monday, and that is the day Jesus had to be selected in this scenario. Is there any event in the life of Jesus during these days leading up to the crucifixion that qualifies as the selection more than the Triumphal Entry?

Certainly the anointing of Jesus by Mary at Simon's private dinner party the night before is a type of private selection. Jesus told those who criticized her to leave her alone because what she had done was for His burial. Jesus tied her act of anointing to his burial -- exactly the right kind of typological selection. But if Mary's anointing of Jesus was a type of private selection, then the Triumphal Entry was a type of public selection of Jesus as the Messiah. And both of these events happen on the same biblical day. This day must be the 10th of the month in order for the type to meet anti-type. But in this arrangement, the Triumphal Entry cannot be on Sunday because that is the 9th day of the month.

This is a serious problem because, if this is true, then God incorrectly predicted to Moses and the people of Israel that the Messiah, as the lamb slain from the foundation of the world, would be selected on the 10th day of the month, when it actually happened, according to this rendering of the traditional view, on the 9th day of the month. From this we can conclude with confidence that God cannot accurately predict the future. Isn't accurate prediction of the future one of the things God alone is supposed to be able to do? The traditional view supports the argument that God cannot accurately predict the future. This is a much more serious problem than the problems which result from the first scenario.

It seems to me that no matter which end of the week I start with, the traditional view is one day short of having enough days to actually support the understanding that the Triumphal Entry was on Palm Sunday and Passover was on the weekly Sabbath. Neither of these arrangements matches scripture.

Help me understand my mistakes.

Cordially,

Jerry

When we recognize that Jesus arrived in Bethany on Friday six days before Passover as John 12:1 states, and that the dinner party at Simon's was that evening as an erev Shabbat dinner to begin the Sabbath with family and friends, Jesus' arrived in Bethany on the 9th and was selected as the lamb of God on the 10th which was the weekly Sabbath. If we understand that all of the temple services had a typological aspect and that those typologies were met with the anti-type in the reality of the events of the life of Jesus, then we also have to recognize that there were four days from his selection to His crucifixion. The four days are from Sabbath to Wednesday.

The traditional view has changed this to be five days from Sunday to Friday. Most of Christianity rejects the very words of Jesus as He gave us the sign of the Messiah to be the three days and three nights that He would be in the heart of the Earth. The four days from Sabbath to Wednesday plus the three days and three nights that Jesus said He would be in the heart of the Earth brings us back to Sabbath as the last day Jesus was in the tomb. The women arrived at the tomb just after sunset on the first of the week to see that the stone was rolled away and the tomb was empty. But the traditional view changes this to be just one and one-half days in order to accommodate the resurrection on Sunday morning.

The traditional view does not care that Jesus is made to be a liar, that God's nature is diminished to be that of a mistaken prognosticator, and that the sequence of events must be altered to promote Sunday sacredness. Scripture must be splintered by the Little Horn. The clues in scripture are not important so long as we have our traditions to rely on. Those who rely on the traditions of men in preference to the holy scriptures of God will be captive to their theories and will reject the God of heaven.

Your friend, like so many in the Seventh-day Adventist church, place Ellen White on a very high pedestal. They are in danger of using her words and writings to supercede scripture. Are the words and writings of Ellen White always to be trusted? She claimed that she was a lesser light that was given to bring attention to the greater light. When we weigh these two sources, which are God's people to place more trust in? Notice this statement:

“Relationship of E. G. White Writings to Bible--The Lesser Light.--Little heed is given to the Bible, and the Lord has given a lesser light to lead men and women to the greater light.--The Review and Herald, Jan. 20, 1903. (Quoted in Colporteur Ministry, p. 125.) {3SM 30.4} This statement has been printed in several places. Notice in particular that she states that “Little heed is given to the Bible...” That is exactly what your friend did.

Now let me broach a much more serious topic. What do we do with the words of God's prophet when the prophet says and writes things that he or she has not been authorized by the Lord to say or write? Jeremiah lamented that there were many prophets of the Lord in his day that were saying things that the Lord had not authorized them to say and they were misleading the people of God. Lamentations 2:14. Make sure you understand that these are prophets of the Lord and not prophets of Baal that Jeremiah is talking about. Read also 1 Kings 13 about the prophet of the Lord who lied. Read also Jeremiah 6:13; 14:14 & 23:11. Has Ellen White ever written anything that might fall into this category? The following statement is one that even she came to recognize was not inspired by the Lord nor the angel of the Lord. Yet it appears in her published works. There are two other statements that are close to this, but this is the one that is the most offensive.

“Every species of animal which God had created were preserved in the ark. The confused species which God did not create, which were the result of amalgamation, were destroyed by the flood. Since the flood there has been amalgamation of man and beast, as may be seen in the almost endless varieties of species of animals, and in certain races of men.” {3SG 75.2}

Here she identifies that the amalgamation of man and beast took place after the flood and that it resulted, in part, in certain races of men. This is very close to the degrading notion promoted by many Southerners in her day and for many years after that the Negro race was not fully human as it came into being by just this process. Her son identifies in 3SM 452.3-5 that it was Ellen White herself who decided that these statements should not be published in her later books. Curiously, he explains that “she had many times direct instruction from the angel of the Lord regarding what should be omitted and what should be added in new editions.” This statement is clearly intended to mislead people into believing that Ellen White's published statements are entirely the result of divine counsel. This is a totally irresponsible sentiment regardless of how much we might want to esteem Ellen White as the prophet of the Lord. If the angel of the Lord informed Ellen White regarding what should be omitted or added, why did she write these statements in the first place? Obviously, these statements were never inspired by the Lord as they are contrary to God's design of nature. She knew nothing regarding the process of meiosis and the role of DNA in the reproduction of offspring, the discovery of DNA having been made by James Watson and Francis Crick in February 1953, which was more than 37 years after her death in 1915. The discovery of DNA verifies that there can be no amalgamation between man and beast . There can be no viable offspring even though there might be an attempt between

man and beast to mate. The various human races are strictly the result of variation built into the DNA molecular code and are the result of human reproduction only. It is completely appropriate that these statements not be published any more since they are so totally contrary to God's design for reproduction.

Yet, they serve as a reminder that we must always be vigilant in our reading and what we accept from the prophets of the Lord. Scripture must always take precedence over the testimony of anyone who claims to represent God. Neither must we allow anyone to make claims on behalf of a messenger that are contrary to scripture. God's people are safe in rejecting the testimony of anyone, even when that person claims to be a messenger of the Lord, when the testimony is contrary to scripture. Scripture is our safe haven. Unfortunately, your friend is in danger of taking sides with the Little Horn.

Does your friend think that Ellen White made a mistake when she decided to eliminate these statements from her later publications? Perhaps he believes, as I'm afraid far too many do, that once the Holy Spirit blesses a person with inspiration, that everything a person says or writes is from that moment forward to be taken as the message from the Lord. In light of the problems Jeremiah encountered with many of the other prophets of the Lord in his day, that is certainly NOT how inspiration works.

It is most unfortunate that Ellen White did not go to the Lord in prayer over the sequence of events of Passion Week when she realized she did not understand them. On the other hand, or if she did go to the Lord in prayer, why wasn't she given a special revelation regarding them? But then, why would God give her a special revelation when the facts are already recorded in scripture? All one has to do is study diligently. Instead, she and her assistant turned to the writings of a Sunday keeping preacher for assistance. Based on the presumptions and the twisted message of the Little Horn, she makes her statements about the crucifixion on the sixth day of the week and the resurrection on Sunday morning. Scripture does not support either.

When one takes the time to study the details of the stories that make up Passion Week, scripture is clear that the traditional view is a twisted misrepresentation of what actually took place. The quotes of Ellen White provided by your friend regarding the time of the crucifixion, the time of resting in the tomb, and the resurrection must be understood in this light. Will there be strong resistance to this teaching and lots of rejection? Of course. But I remember the words of Jesus recorded in Matthew 19:29-30:

"Also everyone who has left houses or brother or sisters of father or mother (KJV includes wife here) or children of fields on account of My name, will receive a hundred times over and will inherit eternal life. But many now first will be last, and the last will be first."

Mark 10:29-30 has it:

"Jesus said, 'I assure you, there is no one who has left home or brothers or sister or mother or father (KJV included wife here) or children or fields on account of Me and the gospel, but will receive a hundred times over now in this life homes and brother and mothers and children and fields, along with persecutions, and in the future age eternal life. But many that are first will be last, and the last first.'" In this world we might have to give up all of these in maintaining our faithfulness to the Lord.

Regarding your friend's letter: When he states that he "cannot accept your reasoning, especially in the light of so many plain and clear statements to the contrary in the Spirit of Prophecy," he is really saying that he rejects the Bible and the testimony of Jesus in reaching his understanding of these events. Everything I've written is based on the words of scripture and simple 1st and 2nd grade arithmetic. Ellen White is not authorized to cancel the words and message of scripture.

Regarding your friend's reference to "paraskue" being Friday, if paraskue has an exclusive application to Friday because it is the present day Greek word for Friday, then what is the Greek word for the preparation day before a festival or an annual Sabbath?

Regarding the “commandment”, read Exodus 34 to see that the Feast of Unleavened Bread is part of the Sabbath commandment. The English word that best captures the meaning of “Sabbath” in Hebrew is the word “intermission”. The Sabbath, whether it be the weekly Sabbath or an annual Sabbath is to be an intermission in the routine of our busy days. Scripture knows nothing of a ceremonial festival or ceremonial Sabbath.

My hope is that your friend will decide to study the evidence in scripture regarding all these things and will come to recognize where the truth actually is.

Cordially,
Jerry

Additional Notes

Bob,

Here is an analogy that I think fits the way many Adventists rely on Ellen White.

People come to a crossroads with several roads intersecting. They are confused by the intersection because all the roads look inviting, yet most know that only one road leads to the Kingdom of God. Ellen White is standing by the intersection telling people which road to take. They ask her how she knows that the road she recommends is the correct road. She sounds trustworthy. They begin down the road she has pointed them to, but as they travel down that road, her voice becomes faint. They stop to listen for her words. Many decide to back track to the intersection so they can drink in her words and be refreshed. Her descriptions of God sound so wonderful that they become transfixed by her. They come to rely on her rather than scripture. Even God can be superceded by the comforting familiarity of Ellen White. Her writings are given to lead men and women to the greater light of scripture. Her writings are not given to cancel the words and message of scripture. To use her writings for the purpose of diminishing the words or message of scripture is an inappropriate use of the Spirit of Prophecy. This is where many Adventists are in comparison with where they should be regarding Bible study. In the case of my study of the events of Passion Week, people are so accustomed to hearing the traditional view that they get upset when confronted with the facts of the Bible because they haven't studied scripture enough to see how the details reveal that the traditional view is totally wrong. All I'm doing is bringing the details of the story to their attention.

Shabbat Shalom,

Jerry

Bob,

The quotes from 8 Greek-English Lexicons are found in my chapter entitled “The Day of His Death.” Feel free to forward this to your friend. I would encourage him to read the entire chapter, but for a quick view of the issue of what paraskue means, that is found on page 6 of this chapter. It is important to remember that modern day Greek is not the language of scripture. It may be interesting that a modern word has a particular meaning today, but that is not evidence that the modern meaning is identical with or even related to the Koina Greek of the Second Temple Period.

I deal with the issue of the Greek prepositions in the chapter entitled “The Issue of Three Days in the Tomb.”

There is no problem with the prepositions in the Greek, it's the prepositions in the English that get us running down the wrong road. Not once do any of the Bible writers use words that require us to understand that the resurrection was ON the third day. In every case, Greek words are used that mean AFTER the third day. It's the English that gets us in trouble.

Your friend has correctly counted the days involved in the Cornelius story. But the Cornelius story does not involve complete days. The time for beginning the counting is not at sunset as in the case of how long Jesus said He would be in the tomb, but is from the 9th hour (3 PM) when the angel appeared to Cornelius. Most of the first day is already spent and is not part of the story. The servants are sent to Joppa, arrive the following day, visit with Simon the Tanner and Simon Peter the rest of that day, begin the trip back on the third day, and arrive in Caesarea on the fourth day at about the 9th hour. There is no reference to this being four complete days. This is actually three complete days. The Good News Bible actually translates Acts 10:30 "Cornelius said, 'It was about this time three days ago that I was praying in my house at three o'clock in the afternoon.'" This is the correct time element, but the Greek actually says "from fourth day until this hour I was the ninth praying in the house of me..." In other words, the Greek acknowledges that these events span a total of four days.

However, that is not the same as saying that four total days are involved. Four total days would be 96 hours and the story would have to begin and end at sunset, whereas the time involved in the Cornelius story is 72 hours and begins and ends at the 9th hour.

Jerry

Bob,

In my last post to you I quoted from the Good News Bible. Add these quotes from Edgar J. Goodspeed, James Moffatt, and William F. Beck after that and before the literal rendering of the Greek words in English.

Edgar J. Goodspeed renders it, "Cornelius answered, "Three days ago, just at this time of day, I was praying in my house about three o'clock, when a man in dazzling clothing stood before me and said..." James Moffatt has it read this way: "Three days ago," said Cornelius, "at this very hour I was praying in my house at three o'clock in the afternoon, when a man stood before me in shining dress, saying..." William F. Beck translates it "Three days ago," Cornelius answered, "I was at home praying till this hour, at three in the afternoon, when a man in shining clothes stood in front of me."

Thanks.

Jerry

Inclusive Reckoning

September 27, 2004

Hi Bob,

Not at all. One must remember that there are two systems of counting the beginning and ending of days, the biblical method and the secular method. I make that statement to make sure the reader understands the connection as to which day it is in our secular method of counting days. This does not nullify the biblical method of counting days in any way. The midnight

that was the beginning of Wednesday would also be the midnight of the fourth day of the week. Hope this helps.

Jerry

----- Original Message -----

Hi again Jerry,

This short statement can be found in your Conclusion paragraph of the Sign of Jonah article.

"Jesus would have been arrested at midnight which began Wednesday,"

That would go against the whole premise of the complete day being define as from evening to evening...which you presented earlier.

Bob

Regarding Wednesday Crucifixion

September 27, 2004

Hi Bob,

None of the issues you raise are difficult to answer. I do not write for a study group. All of my research was done to answer two questions: (1) What does scripture say about the time the women went to the tomb and found it empty? and (2) What did Jesus mean when He told the scribes and Pharisees to look for the sign of Jonah as evidence that He was sent from heaven?

I am familiar with Garner Ted's essay on the "72 hours" Jesus was in the tomb. My study is much more detailed than his as I've gone into the Greek text to see what it says as well as done extensive research in the Old Testament which established all the principles that apply to the events in the gospels. I do not know what is meant by your comment that "the Spirit of Prophecy does not agree with this position". I have found substantial agreement between what EGW has written about when Jesus arrived in Bethany on Friday six days before Passover (John 12:1 & 12-14, *Desire of Ages*, 557) and had the dinner at Simon's home that evening. EGW does not agree with the *SDA Bible Commentary* on this as they say Simon's Feast was on Saturday night. See *SDA Bible Commentary*, Vol 5, p. 233. I can show you a ton of places where the *SDA Bible Commentary* is in conflict with scripture. When EGW [Ellen G. White] says that Jesus made the triumphal entry on the first day of the week (*Desire of Ages*, 569), she is merely repeating the traditional teaching that was commonly accepted as true.

EGW was not infallible. She did not claim to have had any visions from God on these events. She did not have the Greek-English Lexicons and other research tools available in her day that we have today and she merely wrote what she understood.

The problem for her is that she can't have the dinner at Simon's home on Friday night (5 days before Passover) and have the triumphal entry on Sunday when John says explicitly that the triumphal entry was "the next day." The next day would be Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, not the first day of the week.

Either she contradicts her own writing or she contradicts scripture. Either way, there is error in her writing. While she never uses the word "Friday" in connection with the day of crucifixion, she does take the traditional teaching that Jesus was resurrected on Sunday morning. Again, she read scripture in English, and every English translation I've seen (some 900

different translations) has failed to translate the Greek according to what it says. Jesus was resurrected at the close of Sabbath --at twilight.

I'm working on an article now entitled "Finding the Empty Tomb" that will explain every significant Greek word in the resurrection story for each of the gospels and show that the overwhelming evidence is that Jesus was resurrected in the evening and not at sunrise. Give me 3 or 4 weeks.

Finally, if the Spirit of Prophecy is at odds with scripture, what are one's choices? EGW has made numerous errors in her writing. This shows that she was human. I consider her to be a prophet in the sense that she spoke on God's behalf, but not in the sense that the SDA church holds out that she never said anything that is in error. That position is provably false and actually places her above scripture. I can point to at least one point where Matthew wrote something that is historically in error. If Matthew can make a mistake, so can Ellen. Its no big deal for me. It does not make her a wicked person. I believe she did the very best she knew how with the information and tools she had available.

There is no such concept of "inclusive reckoning" in scripture, neither is one implied. I address the issue of how the Hebrew people were instructed to count consecutive days in paragraph #9 on page 3. "Inclusive reckoning" might be a helpful concept when comparing the length of rulership for kings from different countries and reconciling the apparent differences related to that, but it does not apply to counting a series of days. Unfortunately, mainline theologians have jumped on the inclusive reckoning bandwagon without checking to see if there is any other principle of counting that might apply. There is. Once you understand how Jewish thought patterns differ from Western thought patterns, the Cornelius story goes away.

Enjoy!

Jerry

December 21, 2004

Hi Bob,

Nice to hear from you again. It is interesting that truth is considered radical in this sin saturated society. I'm glad to hear that you have some in your area who are willing to examine the evidence without fear. I am sometimes known by my peers as the "resident heretic." Just stay true to the evidence and what can be proven.

Few Christians notice that Matthew appears to have made a mistake at chapter 23:35 when he quoted Jesus as saying "...Zechariah the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar." This is a reference to 2 Chronicles 24:20-22 which states "Then the Spirit of God came on Zechariah son of Jehoiada the priest..." and goes on to describe the murder of Zechariah. The footnote in my Bible for Matthew 23:35 states "Doubtless Jehoiada was Zechariah's grandfather, whereas Barachiah was his father."

However, Zechariah the son of Barachiah was the son (Zechariah would be the grandson) of Iddo (Zechariah 1:1) and was the prophet for whom the book of Zechariah was written. This Zechariah the son of Barachiah was a prophet who lived shortly before the time of Esther and was not murdered in the temple. Was the mistake in Matthew 23:35 an editorial error on Matthew's part? If not, did Jesus Himself have a memory lapse and say it wrong? Which would be worse?

Could it be possible that there might be two famous individuals with the name "Zechariah the son of Barachiah"? It seems unbelievable that Jesus would have cited a different person from the one we know from scripture, and we can see that it doesn't match the most famous Zechariah.

The name Zechariah was a common Hebrew name in Old Testament times and is found 40 times in scripture. In addition to the two mentioned above, Zechariah is specifically mentioned as the son of the following men:

Meshelemiah 1 Chronicles 9:21

Hosah 1 Chronicles 26:11

Shelemiah 1 Chronicles 26:14

Benaiah 2 Chronicles 20:14

Jehoshaphat 2 Chronicles 21:2

Bebai Ezra 8:11

Elam Ezra 10:26

Amariah Nehemiah 11:5

Shiloni Nehemiah 11:12

Mattanish Nehemiah 12:35

Jeberechiah Isaiah 8:2

None of these were murdered in the temple. The Zechariah who was murdered in the temple was the son of Jehoiada and not the son of Barachiah. The only reasonable conclusion I can make of this is that Matthew wrote it wrong. But I don't

discredit the book of Matthew (or worse yet, the entire Bible) because Matthew made a mistake. This merely proves to me that he was human and his writings are subject to the same problems all of us have from time to time. Unfortunately, we tend to forget that the Bible writers didn't set out to write scripture. Moses was just writing out Hebrew history and the law as he wrote the books that became the Pentateuch. Ezra and others were just making a record of their history. The Gospel writers were just telling the story of the most amazing parts of the life of Jesus. Paul was just writing letters to the various congregations where he had ministered.

If Matthew could write such a verifiable mistake as part of what has become canonized as scripture, is it not conceivable that Ellen White could also have made a few mistakes? She is well known for advising people not to quote her. See the attached letter I wrote to Ken Hart on this with her quotes. Is Ellen White more perfect than the Bible writers? Nonsense! We're all human and every one of us makes mistakes.

A couple years ago a friend gave me a couple statements by Ellen White that she had written to the brethren to get clarification regarding the time of the various events on the closing scenes of the life of Jesus. She admits in her statement to her assistant, Marion, that she was having difficulty understanding the time of all these events. She was never given a response from the brethren. I believe she was struggling with the very same sequence of events that I've struggled with and had some success at unraveling. I'm sorry I don't have those quotes in front of me, but if I find them I'll send them on to you.

I hope this helps.

Cordially,

Jerry

Don't Quote Sister White

Recently a portion of Manuscript Releases, Vol. 13, pages 192-207, Manuscript Release #1028 entitled A Call to Reconsecrate, Reorganize, and Advance by Ellen White was brought to my attention. I wanted to see the context of the quote, so I went to the White Estate vault today and copied the entire document. This manuscript represents a talk presented by Ellen White in the Healdsburg College library on April 1, 1901. There are several themes in her presentation which intertwine with each other throughout her talk which I loosely outline as follows:

1. The urgency for individuals to enter new fields of work.
2. The need for those in position of responsibility to get fresh experience in the field.
3. The necessity of connecting the medical and evangelistic efforts as one work.
4. The importance of the health reform work and self-denial.
5. The importance of trusting in God, being united in our work, and being tenderhearted.
6. The importance of relying on scripture, and not herself, as the word from God.

The quote sent to me has to do with this last item where she specifically instructs those in the audience to not quote her as if she is to have the last word on these issues. While these quotes do not represent the bulk of her speech, she makes several significant statements about how her words are not to be used.

page 192:

Over and over again men have said, "The voice of the conference is the voice of God; therefore everything must be referred to the conference. The conference must permit or restrict in the various lines of work." As the matter has been presented to me, there is a narrow compass, and within this narrow compass, all the entrances to which are locked, are those who would like to exercise kingly power. But the work carried on all over the field demands an entirely different course of action. There is need of the laying of a foundation different from the foundation which has been laid in the past.

page 196:

We need men who will stand as true to principle as the needle to the pole. God will test the men who are given responsibilities in His work, and unless they show that they have a true idea of what Christlike principles are, He will remove them and put others in their place. God wants us to know what it means to work on the principles of heaven. He wants those in the office to know what it means for everyone to stand in his lot and place, obeying the words, "Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity" [2 Peter 1:5-7].

page 199:

We should be filled with joy and gladness to think that God has given us the privilege of being co-laborers with Him. We may have all the power which God has pledged Himself to give us when we consecrate ourselves to Him. In heaven the pledge was made that all the facilities and riches of heaven would be imparted to every sincere, faithful worker who feels his entire dependence upon God.

page 200:

How can the Lord bless those who manifest a spirit of "I don't care," a spirit which leads them to walk contrary to the light which the Lord has given them? But I do not ask you to take my words. Lay Sister White to one side. Do not quote my words again as long as you live until you can obey the Bible. When you make the Bible your food, your meat and your drink, when you make its principles the elements of your character, you will know better how to receive counsel from God. I exalt the precious Word before you today. Do not repeat what I have said, saying, "Sister White said this," and "Sister White said that." Find out what the Lord God of Israel says, and then to what He commands. Christ said, "I must work the works of Him that sent Me."

page 203:

Do not refer to what Sister White has said. I do not ask you to do this. God has told me that my testimony must be borne to this conference, and that I must not try to make men believe it. My work is to leave the truth with the people, and those who appreciate the light from heaven will accept the truth. God wants you to make straight paths for your feet, lest the lame shall be turned out of the way.

page 207:

May God help you all and help me. I want help and strength and power. But do not quote Sister White till you stand on vantage ground, where you know what you are doing. Take the Word of God. It is full of meat and drink. Study the Bible, and you will know more of God than you do now. You will have something fresh to impart to others. You will not go over the same ground again and again. You will realize that there is a world to save. I ask you to put on the whole armor, and be sure that your feet are shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace.

Clearly she is emphasizing that God's Word is to be the evidence we rely on and our rule of faith must rest on that and not

her words. She specifically instructs those in the audience to not quote her as if she is to have the last word on health reform, the work in new fields, and other issues. I take this to be a principle that applies beyond the specific issues she dealt with in her talk and has a rightful application in other areas of understanding. Her instruction to not quote her or rely on what she has said seems particularly appropriate where we find on close examination that her words in one place are unwittingly contradictory to what she has written in another place. It seems to me to be even more important to lay Sister White aside when her writing is contrary to scripture as I have shown her statement on page 667 of *Desire of Ages* regarding prayer to be contrary to Jesus' statement in John 16:26.

When she says that "We should be filled with joy and gladness to think that God has given us the privilege of being co-laborers with Him", she is exalting our position with God without the need to rely on her words as an interpreter of His Word. We are not to place Ellen White in the position of a "Virgin Mother Mary" so that everything we understand about the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ must be filtered through her lens. We are to gain understanding directly from the Father and Holy Spirit as a result of our prayerful study of scripture. Where we find a discrepancy between her words and the evidence of scripture, I believe that, based on the sentiment expressed in her talk quoted above, she would be the first to request that her words be laid aside.

Please take this into consideration as you study the apparently contradictory statements on page 557.3 of *Desire of Ages* that Jesus arrived in Bethany on Friday which was six days before Passover, which places Passover no later than Thursday of Passion Week, which would indicate a Wednesday crucifixion, and other statements on pages 769.1 and 794.2 that indicate that He was crucified on the sixth day of the week. These statements do not appear to be compatible with each other. At least some portion of the words of Ellen White must be laid aside. I intend to lay aside that portion that does not agree with scripture. If anyone can explain how they are compatible, I'd like to hear the explanation.

Considering the pattern for the observance of Passover established by Jesus in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, it is not possible to have the Passover on Thursday and the crucifixion on Friday. The Pascal lamb is to be slain and roasted before it is eaten. If Passover is Thursday, but Jesus is crucified on Friday, then the lamb is eaten alive and then slain and roasted after it is eaten. Such a concept is nonsense! As I've said before, a Friday crucifixion is not possible. Teaching a Friday crucifixion and Sunday morning resurrection where Jesus is in the tomb only for one and one-half days is the basis for the promotion of Sunday as the Lord's Day and is the basis for man thinking that he can change God's appointed times. Man can no more change God's appointed times than he can change gravity.

Thanks for reading.

Cordially,

Jerry

----- Original Message -----

Hi Jerry,

I hope that this season finds you in good health and spirits. The articles that you gave me have made me few friends....I think most people tend to want to move away from such radical ideas. But there have been a few that have looked at it and are agreeing after careful study.

I think the greatest obstacle for most is to be told that Ellen White made a mistake. Most cannot accept that.

You once mentioned that there was a historical error found in Matthew, would you elaborate on this. Perhaps people would be better able to see and understand that man, even under inspiration can make mistakes. I'm not sure if I put that write but I think you know what I mean.

If you could elaborate a little on this it might be helpful as well. And if you have any updates or changes that you have made

to your documents, please pass them on to me.

God's blessings to you and yours during this season.

Bob

December 23, 2004

Hi Bob,

Our recent SS studies on Daniel 7 and the message of the Little Horn has got me making more connections with these time issues in Passion Week. The reason the Little Horn is condemned is because he thinks to change times and laws. Daniel 7:11, 25. The law he wants to change is God's law.

Theologians of the SDA church have explained the "times" he wants to change as the Sabbath to Sunday issue. That certainly is one of the time changes the Roman Church has bragged about. See *The Faith of Our Fathers* by James Cardinal Gibbons, (1876) pages 72-73, and *The Faith of Millions* by Rev. John A. O'Brien, (1974) pages 400-401.

But, the Aramaic word in Daniel 7:25 is "zemnim" and literally means "appointment times". This includes all the time God asks us to reserve as time for Him all the festivals of the Lord expressed in Leviticus 23. In a broader sense, it would apply to any appointment time.

Did Jesus have an appointment with death? Certainly! Did He have an appointment with the resurrection? Certainly! Has the Little Horn been actively promoting different times than what actually happened so he can deceive the very elect? Certainly! We would be foolish to think otherwise.

Some 400 years before Jesus was born the pagan religion of Ashtoreth began the Easter Sunday morning sunrise service in celebration of the mythical resurrection of Tammuz complete with Easter lilies. Every year Tammuz would die in the fall and be resurrected in the spring. See Ezekiel 8:14. Early in the second century the Roman Church stopped celebrating the Lord's Day in connection with Passover and began keeping it in connection with the pagan festival of Easter. (The Lord's Day was the annual celebration of the resurrection of Jesus on the Day of First Fruits.) See *The History of the Church* by Eusebius, pages 170-174 for some of the arguments.

In A.D. 190 Victor became Bishop of Rome and demanded of Polycrates, the Bishop of Smyrna, that the Christians in Asia stop celebrating the Lord's Day in connection with Passover and start keeping it in connection with Easter or be excommunicated.

Scripture is clear that Jesus was resurrected after the close of Sabbath -- in the evening, the first available moment at the beginning of the week. The Little Horn has switched that teaching to match the pagan traditions of Easter that Jesus was resurrected on Sunday morning -- the first available moment to worship the sun at the beginning of the week. The Little Horn then uses that as the basis for changing the worship of God on His Sabbath to their Sunday and to completely abandon the celebration of the other festivals of the Lord. And all Christianity has followed him including the SDA church for a major part of the Little Horn's argument.

What an incredible deception! By twisting a few words and ignoring a few key facts, the entire story is changed to support the overall change in the appointed time Jesus died and was resurrected, and the weekly and annual times God wants us to reserve for Him. Think of how many sincere Christians are promoting the message of the Little Horn. The deception is incredible!

Keep searching and sharing.

Jerry

Was a "High Day" Always on a Weekly Sabbath?

December 26, 2004

Hi Bob,

That is a comment that often comes up, but Scripture doesn't define a "high day". The SDA church promotes the understanding you expressed, but it is based entirely on speculation. I haven't found the expression in any Jewish writing. Jews commonly refer to the Feast of Trumpets and Yom Kippur as the "high holy days", but these festivals are more than six months after the Passover season when Jesus was crucified.

Unfortunately, there is not a Jewish commentary on the gospels, so far as I am aware. The expression "high day" is not found in the Old Testament in connection with a Sabbath.

The words "high day" are found in Genesis 29:7, but it is a reference to noontime in that passage and not a Sabbath. I am not aware of any authoritative source of information on this. This appears to be one of those things that must be understood by faith.

I believe the term "high day" of John 19:31 was used as a reference to the Sabbaths that began and ended the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the spring and the Feast of Tabernacles in the autumn. These feasts were 7 days and 8 days respectively and the entire set of days were to be reserved as time for the Lord. Most of these days were not Sabbath days, but work days. The Sabbaths that began and ended these festivals were "high days" because (1) they were part of the annual festival when all males were required to go to Jerusalem, but also because (2) the Lord set them aside as holy convocation days. It would be a special day as part of one of the three annual festivals required to be celebrated in Jerusalem, and a "high day" because it was a Sabbath *kodesh mikrah* that occurred only once a year as part of the festival.

I came to this conclusion before reading Batya Ruth Wooten's book *Israel's Feasts and Their Fullness*, wherein she identifies the "High Sabbath" a *Shalosh Regalim* as being associated with the three annual festivals for which all males were required to visit Jerusalem. p. 186. She does not suggest that the "High Sabbath" occurs when an annual Sabbath falls on a weekly Sabbath. Her writing is the closest to my understanding that I've found, although she doesn't give the detail that I understand.

Sorry I don't have any more information on this.

Jerry

Additional Information

February 17, 2005

When Ellen White made those statements that Jesus died on the sixth day of the week and was resurrected on the morning of the first day of the week, I believe she wrote those words with all the best intentions. But we know by her own admission that she did not have a clear grasp on the sequence of events of the life of Jesus, neither did she have any special revelation regarding these events. Did she write these things when she was not authorized to write them? Perhaps. In AA, Ellen White states that Paul had not been authorized to yield as much to the leaders in Jerusalem as they requested. Here are her words:

“Paul realized that so long as many of the leading members of the church at Jerusalem should continue to cherish prejudice against him, they would work constantly to counteract his influence. He felt that if by any reasonable concession he could win them to the truth he would remove a great obstacle to the success of the gospel in other places. But he was not authorized of God to concede as much as they asked.” {AA 405.1}

If she could identify that Paul was not authorized to go to the Temple as he did with the best of intentions, can we not also conclude that she was not authorized to write things that are contrary to these facts of scripture that are provable even though she had the best of intentions? It is easy to understand that she wrote these things about the sixth day of the week and the morning of the first day because that is all that was known at the time. She did not have the Greek-English and Hebrew-English lexicons and many other tools at her fingertips in her day. She could not do the research that is so relatively

easy for us to do today. For whatever reason, God did not lead her to uncover every gem of truth that had been hidden by centuries of corruption by the substitute system of worship. She told us that some of that would be left to us. The task of those who disagree with what I've written is to demonstrate from scripture that I have failed to tell the truth. If my writing is contrary to scripture, then scripture will be the source of correction for my error.

Here is a rewritten section all from scripture.

High Day

Those who promote the traditional view of a Friday crucifixion cite John 19:31 as evidence that the first annual Sabbath of the Feast of Unleavened Bread coincided with the weekly Sabbath that year resulting in a double Sabbath which is why this is called a high day. A review of the Greek words for this text will reveal whether the meaning of high in this verse derives from the concept of things that overlap or are in some sense doubled. Here is the KJV rendering of this verse.

The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and [that] they might be taken away.

The words in question are part of the parenthetical phrase “for that sabbath was an high day.” The context of all these events of Passion Week is the Feast of Unleavened Bread which begins on the 15th of the month, so the word Sabbath in this verse has an unmistakable application to the first annual Sabbath of the feast. The real question is: does the combination of an annual Sabbath with a weekly Sabbath produce a high day?

There is only one other place in scripture where the words high day occur together (Genesis 29:7), but that verse is talking about an event at noon or high day. This is certainly not a parallel for the words in John 19:31 and provides no help in understanding these words.

What is really needed is to understand how the word high modifies the word day in the Greek. A review of this Greek word should reveal the meaning of the word high, and that should lead to other applications and texts where the word is used. From that it should be possible to understand what is meant by a high day in John 19:31.

The word high is translated from the Greek word μέγας (megas) and appears over 190 times in the New Testament. By a wide margin it is translated to be great or greatest, but it is also translated as loud (32 times), large (2 times), high (2 times), and one time each as strong, to years, and mighty. The two places where it is translated high are John 19:31 and Hebrews 10:21. A look at Hebrews 10:21-22 demonstrates what the translators understood it to mean there.

21 “And [having] an **high priest** over the house of God; 22 Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.” [**Bold added**]

Should we understand this to be a double priest as some encourage us to take John 19:31 to mean a double Sabbath? Of course not. This reference to the high priest simply signifies the chief priest or most important priest in the sanctuary system. There is no hint that there is any kind of overlap or combination that would result in this high priest. This is a reference to the one person who is the most important priest and in this verse it is a reference to Jesus.

There is one other verse where μέγας (megas) is used in connection with a day. John 7:37 states, in the context of the Feast of Tabernacles, that “On the final and greatest day of the feast...” The Greek word for greatest in this verse is μέγας (megas) and the greatest day has exactly the same meaning in this verse as the high day has in John 19:31. It is clear from John 7:37 that the greatest day is the final day of the festival which is one of the annual Sabbaths set out in Leviticus 23:36-39. The first and eighth days of this festival, the days that begin and end the festival, are Sabbaths. There is no hint, not the slightest evidence, that this has anything to do with the weekly Sabbath, but is a reference only to the annual Sabbath that ended the festival. Because the word μέγας (megas) in John 7:37 and 19:31 modifies day in exactly the same way, it

obviously has the same meaning in both places. This demonstrates that a high day is not the result of an annual Sabbath coinciding with a weekly Sabbath and the high day of John 19:31 did not result from the combination of an annual Sabbath with a weekly Sabbath, but is merely the first Sabbath of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

A brief review of some of the principles of the Lord's annual festivals might be helpful at this point. The entire festival season, from the first day through the last day, is part of the sacred appointment time (Heb.moedim) of the Lord (Leviticus 23:4) and all of those days are to be observed in honor of Him. The first and last days of the feast are especially important because they are days on which no strenuous work is to be done and the people are to assemble for worship. This implies that work could be done on some of the days during the festival even though there would be many activities going on during those days. But the first and last days are Sabbaths. They are more important than the other days of the festival because the Lord has set them as markers to begin and end the festival season which is sacred to the Lord. Thus, the Sabbath that begins or ends any festival is a high day.

That is all that is meant in John 19:31 by a high day. It is one of the two most important days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread — in this case, the day that begins the festival season. The day in question in John 19:31 is also the day the Passover meal is eaten. It should be noticed that, according to Leviticus 23, all the Lord's *kodesh mikra* (holy convocation) days have exactly the same degree of holiness. The weekly Sabbath is not more holy than the annual Sabbaths. All the days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread from the 15th through the 21st are part of the Lord's festival season, but the days that begin and end the festivals are Sabbaths. The high day mentioned in John 19:31 is the annual Sabbath that begins the festival and has nothing to do with the weekly Sabbath. Notice the wording of John 19:31. The pertinent part states "(for that Sabbath day was an high day,)". It does not say "high Sabbath". This should tell us that this day in question is not the weekly Sabbath, but is a high day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

Another interesting place where μέγας (megas) is found is in Hebrews 4:14 which reads "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast [our] profession." In this verse the word μέγας (megas) is translated great and the words high priest come from the word ἀρχιερεύς (archiereus). Taken together, do these words mean that Jesus is a double high priest? Of course not. Here Jesus is identified as the greatest or most important high priest. The word μέγας (megas) does not imply a double.

While the high day of John 19:31 is not the day of His death, it is the day following His death. Knowing that the high day is a reference to the day that began the festival and not a reference to the weekly Sabbath helps to establish that the preparation day mentioned in so many places throughout the crucifixion story is a reference to the preparation day for Passover and is not a reference to the sixth day of the week.

Cordially,

Jerry

----- Original Message -----

Hi again Jerry,

I had another comment made to me today that shows that in John 19:31 Christ was crucified on the day prior to the sabbath was a "high day".

"The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away."

He comments that he thought a "high sabbath" occurred when the festival sabbath fell on the weekly Sabbath.

Is that the correct conclusion? It doesn't fit with our thinking that the Passover or the feast of Unleavened Bread fell on Saturday.

Thanks!

Bob

Is This Topic A Salvational Issue?

January 28, 2005

Direct your friends to read the book of Malachi to see how God wants us to respond to Him. We are to always give Him our best, never cheat or cut corners on Him, cheat or cut corners on each other, etc. Is bringing a lame or blind lamb for sacrifice a salvation issue? The Jews of the Second Temple period didn't think so. Is divorce a salvation issue? Is tithing a salvation issue? Is a wrong belief in the state of the dead a salvation issue? These are all issues in the book of Malachi where the book of Remembrance is mentioned. If your name is not written in the book of Remembrance, what will be your fate?

In a broad sense Micah 6:8 captures the essence of the salvation issue: What does the Lord require of you but to do justice, show mercy, and walk humbly with God. For those who love justice, they will always want to do what is right and righteous. For those who love mercy, they will be generous with what God gives them. For those who walk humbly with God, they show a teachable spirit. These three elements must be part of a person's life if there is any hope of salvation.

It is always a salvation issue when our hearts are not right with God. Do we spend our time defending a tradition that is contrary to the words of Jesus? Or do we spend our time trying to figure out the real meaning of a passage so we exonerate the words of Jesus and are in harmony with Him?

Attached is the chapter I've just finished writing today on the Sign of the Prophet Jonah. I've been working on this for several months and have probably sent you a few bits and pieces of it already. You are welcome to post it on your site. Eventually I will write a chapter that shows that the traditional teaching of the Friday afternoon burial and Sunday morning resurrection is the basis for a system of worship on Sunday that is contrary to the Lord's system of worship. Is our system of worship a salvation issue? Do we look to Jesus or the Little Horn for salvation?

Jerry

----- Original Message -----

How are you doing Jerry?

I have had people tell me that the Wednesday Crucifixion topic is not a 'salvational issue' ... and then I ran across this statement...

Take good care brother,

May God richly bless you

Bob

John 16:26 vs. Desire of Ages p. 667.3

February 2, 2005

Hi Bob,

In John 16, Jesus is walking with His disciples from the upper room to the Garden of Gethsemane and He's telling them a few last things about His crucifixion and resurrection, as well as a few things about the Father. In verse 22 He assures them that He will see them again. He fulfilled this after the resurrection. In verse 23, He tells them to ask the Father in His name. In verse 24, He tells them that if they ask, they will receive to make their joy complete. In verse 25, He tells them that He has spoken in figures of speech, but will no longer use figures of speech, but will tell them plainly about the Father. In verse 26, He tells them that they are to pray directly to the Father, that He will NOT make requests on their behalf to the Father because the Father loves them Himself. All of this addresses the character of the Father in comparison with the character of the Son.

The message Jesus is trying to teach us is that, so far as the holiness and love of God is concerned, there is no difference between Jesus and the Father. The Father is not holier than Jesus. The Father is just as approachable as Jesus. The Father is not more reserved than Jesus. The Father knows us just as thoroughly as Jesus and is just as gracious toward us as Jesus. The Father does not need to be persuaded by Jesus to grant favors to suppliants contrary to His better judgment.

The Catholic church has long promoted the concept that God the Father is not approachable -- that He is too holy for common people. Even Jesus is not very approachable except through His Mother Mary. The Catholic church teaches that the faithful are to pray to Mother Mary, that she will take the prayer to Jesus to petition His favor. Jesus, in turn, may take the prayer request to the Father to beg the Father to grant the request. This makes the Father more distant and less interested in our lives. The implication is that the Father must be talked into granting favors for our lives, that He wouldn't ordinarily grant these requests unless they are presented by Jesus with the claim that His blood and death are the basis for the request.

Even among Protestant churches who don't pray to Mother Mary, language developed long ago among religious people that revealed this bias that somehow the prayers of the penitent would ascend to Jesus when prayed in His name, and He would present them to the Father who is too reserved for mere mortals. This Catholic bias is contrary to the very words of Jesus in John 16:26 that we are to pray directly to the Father because the Father loves us Himself. But Jesus does not present any prayers to the Father to get Him to do something against His better judgment.

About this time I imagine you're going to quote 1 John 2:1 which states "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous:"

Please notice that this verse does NOT say that Jesus is petitioning the Father, but that He and the Father are working together on behalf of the penitent. The key word is "with". "With" does not mean "against" or "contrary to." If you are walking down the sidewalk with someone, that does not mean nor even imply that you are walking against that person. "With" means to be in unison. Jesus and the Father are working together to advocate on our behalf for our protection against Satan who seeks to destroy us. See Zechariah 3:1-2 to see that the Lord rebukes Satan. The Father and Jesus work together to set limitations on Satan as he desires to destroy people. Moreover the Greek word for "advocate" is *paraklētos* (par-ak'-lay-tos) which is often translated to be "An intercessor, consoler", but which is the word for "medic." A medic is one who brings healing to an injured person. In this sense, God offers healing from the damage caused by sin when we turn to Him for guidance in our lives.

Take a look at another verse along these lines. Hebrews 7:25 which states that "He is able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through Him, because He always lives to intercede for them." The intercession has a double meaning here. First, Jesus and the Father intercede with us to get us to live our lives without sin. We need Their counsel, advice, encouragement, nurture, etc., to live to a high standard. This is what scripture is all about. Second, Jesus and the Father intercede against Satan on our behalf setting limitations on what he can do. We know from the story of Job that Satanic attacks are allowed against God's people, but not above what one can withstand. But Jesus does not take the words of our prayers and go to the Father on our behalf to present a different set of words to the Father than what we ourselves use.

In Jonah 1, God had compassion on the people of Nineveh because of the great wickedness of the people of that city. Where there is great wickedness, there will be many victims and God heard the cries of each of these. These were pagan people who had no interest in knowing Elohim, the God of creation. How much more does the Father hear the cries of those who do love Him? It is contrary to all of scripture that the Father loves us less than Jesus.

Unfortunately, the Catholic bias against the gracious character of both Jesus and the Father lingers in most Christian denominations and we see it reflected in EG White's description on page 667.3 of DA. She writes:

"He would be present before the Father to make request for them. The prayer of the humble suppliant He presents as His own desire in that soul's behalf. Every sincere prayer is heard in heaven. It may not be fluently expressed; but if the heart is in it, it will ascend to the sanctuary where Jesus ministers, and He will present it to the Father without one awkward, stammering word, beautiful and fragrant with the incense of His own perfection."

This statement is full of Catholic sentiment and is clearly contrary to the words of Jesus Himself in John 16:26. Too often people skip over the word NOT in this verse and fall into the rut of promoting Catholic theology. Neither Jesus nor the Father are offended by any awkward, stammering words of their children. They both know the heart and the desire of an individual and are more than willing to accept their prayers. Jesus does not beg the Father to be more gracious than He is already naturally inclined to be. The Father is just as interested in our lives and just as accepting of us as is Jesus. 1 John 1:3 reminds us that our fellowship is with both the Father and Jesus.

This is how I see it. Hope this helps.

Jerry

----- Original Message -----

Hi again Jerry,

I was studying these texts and comparing with what you wrote regarding Matthew's Mistake.

But as I look at the quotes in *The Desire of Ages*, p. 667 and compare them to John 16:26...I don't see a connection, instead I see her elaborating on Christ's words in verses 23-24. Then it appears that in verses 25-26 Christ is pointing to a future time, different than in verses 23-24. Could they be referring to the time after Probation closes??

Please look at it again and see what you think on this.

Thanks so much, I appreciate so much the depth and scope that you have gone into to open these issues up.

Bob

February 8, 2005

Hi Bob,

I do not find that Ellen White makes any hint regarding which day of the week the supper took place in the upper room. She makes one statement that seems quite odd at first impression when she writes: "He Himself was the true paschal lamb, and on the day the Passover was eaten he was to be sacrificed." This needs an explanation.

This statement taken at its face is contrary to the instructions in Exodus 12. The paschal lamb is killed on the day before the Passover is eaten. The lamb is NOT eaten on the same day it is killed. The lamb is killed on the 14th of the month and eaten that night. In scripture the day changes at sunset, so "that night" would be the next day and the 15th of the month.

But I would like to presume that there is some sense in which her statement is true. The only way I can think of to interpret her statement as true is that the Passover meal He was eating with His disciples was being eaten on the day He was to be sacrificed. This is literally what she wrote and it is true only in this limited sense. It would have been easier to understand if she had written, "...and on the day He ate the Passover with His disciples He was to be sacrificed."

What day was this supper on? It was on the evening that began the fourth day of the week – the same day He was crucified. Here's how to figure it out. Jesus was resurrected at the close of Sabbath just after sunset. Counting backwards three days and three nights brings us to sunset that ends the fourth day of the week. The fifth day of the week (roughly what we call Thursday) was the Passover -- the 15th of the month. The day before (roughly what we call Wednesday) was the preparation day – the 14th of the month. The Lord's Supper was eaten after sunset on what we would call Tuesday night, which would be the 14th of the month. Midnight begins what we call Wednesday which is the day on which He was arrested, tried, and crucified. This is why it is referred to as the Wednesday crucifixion.

I was looking earlier today for the info on Marian Davis and found it. I was looking for it today because on Sabbath, the SS teacher stated several times that he was following Mrs. White's chronology in the description of the events of Passion Week. I only wish that were true. By her own admission, she had a poor sense of the sequence of the events of the life of Christ and did not receive any special revelation regarding it. When she was writing the manuscript for the "Life of Christ" which became the *Desire of Ages*, she requested that her literary assistant, Marian Davis, find some histories of the Bible that would help her understand the order of events. Ten years later, she was still struggling with the sequence of events. Following are two quotes in support of this:

"Tell her I have just one minute ago read the letters in which she has specified the improvements to be made in articles for volume 1. I thank her. Tell her that she has a point about Zedekiah's having his eyes put out. That needs to be more carefully worded. Also the rock, when the water flowed--something in reference to this. I think I can make the articles [chapters] specified more full, and as I am famous for moralizing, this will be no cross. Tell her to write to me, as I prize her letters as if she were my own child. . . . Tell Mary [Marian] to find me some histories of the Bible that would give me the order of events. I have nothing and can find nothing in the library here. It is getting dark and I am resolved not to use my eyes or brain by candlelight."—Ibid. {3BIO 338.4}

"The Sequence of Events" As the materials were assembled and arranged into chapters, careful attention had to be given to the sequence of the events in the Saviour's life. To what extent and in what detail visions provided the sequence in ministry and miracles in Christ's life and work is not [385] known. It is

known that a decade earlier she made a significant request: "Tell Mary to find me some histories of the Bible that would give me the order of events."--Letter 38, 1885. The Gospel writers in their accounts did not help much in the point of sequence. In the absence of direct instruction from Ellen White, or clues in the materials themselves, Miss Davis consulted carefully prepared harmonies of the Gospels, and as the work progressed made considerable use of S. J. Andrews' *Life of Our Lord Upon the Earth*, which as noted on the title page took into account "Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations." {4BIO 384.5}

Notice that Mrs. White said she has nothing and can find nothing on the sequence of events of the life of Christ. From this I hope one can see that the chronology of Mrs. White is not a revelation given her in vision, but an understanding developed from careful study of scripture itself and trusted writers. She gives us no indication that she received any special revelation on the issues of the sequence of the events of Passion Week when she started her project on the *Life of Christ*, nor ten years later when she was finishing it. Neither did she have any Greek-English lexicons or Interlinear Bibles to turn to for help. We probably mislead others when we tell them that we rely on her understanding of these events, which implies that she did have some special revelation regarding these events when she did not.

Those who present the traditional teaching of the events of Passion Week while claiming to follow Mrs. White's chronology, fail to point out that she places the context of John 12:1 on Friday and the feast at Simon's house on Friday evening. Here are her words from Chapter 62 of *Desire of Ages*, entitled "The Feast at Simon's House," page 557, par. 3:

"The Saviour had reached Bethany only six days before the Passover, and according to His custom had sought rest at the home of Lazarus. The crowds of travelers who passed on to the city spread the tidings that He was on His way to Jerusalem, and that He would rest over the Sabbath at Bethany. Among the people there was great enthusiasm. Many flocked to Bethany, some out of sympathy with Jesus, and others from curiosity to see one who had been raised from the dead."

Obviously, if Jesus was going to spend Sabbath in Bethany, He had to get there before Sabbath. As I illustrated on my chart for Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the New Testament, Jesus' arrival in Bethany on Friday afternoon is a perfect match for John 12:1 which states that He arrived there six days before Passover. Passover is the 15th of the month every year and six days before the 15th would be the 9th. That evening, on what we call Friday evening and now the seventh day of the week and 10th day of the month, is when the feast at Simon's house was held. This is a typical Jewish Erev Shabbat meal which begins the Sabbath celebration with the woman of the house lighting the candles at the dinner table moments before sunset and the recitation of traditional prayers while standing around the dinner table. The next day, still the seventh day of the week and 10th day of the month, is when the triumphal entry took place. According to Exodus 12, the Passover lamb was required to be selected on the 10th of the month and Jesus was selected right on time. He was anointed by Mary at Simon's house and Jesus recognized that she had done this for His burial. The crowds recognized Jesus as their Saviour at the triumphal entry. Jesus was selected both privately and publicly, just as kings Saul and David had been anointed privately and publicly. We can easily calculate that, according to Mrs. White, the triumphal entry was on Sabbath, not Sunday. It appears that she came to understand the time of Jesus' arrival in Bethany on Friday by her own careful study and that of her assistant Marian. We should do the same.

I believe it is an injustice to both Mrs. White and our readers/listeners to present the events of Passion Week according to the traditional view while claiming to rely on Mrs. White. However, anyone who relies on the traditional view does this in good company as the entire world has followed the traditional pattern, including the SS quarterly and the SDA BC. Unfortunately, the whole world is following the message of the Little Horn in teaching these changed times.

This is how I see it. Hope this helps.

Cordially,

Jerry

----- Original Message -----

Hi Jerry,

I have been doing some editing work on the comments that you have sent me and I can only say that they have been most helpful. If you are working on a book, these comments may come in to good use.

I have rearranged the articles on my site and put them in an order that makes sense to me. If you have a moment, take a look and see if you agree or have another suggestion: www.A4t.org > Sermons & Articles > Miscellaneous Authors > Gerald Brown

I was reading *Desire of Ages*, Chapter 71 this morning and I just wanted to make sure that as the first paragraph indicates, the Passover Supper was eaten on Wednesday evening. Previously, I had been thinking that it was eaten on Thursday evening, partly due to what that old guy had written... He must have rattled my brain with his nonsense...

Have you ever found that quote you mentioned one day? The one that has EGW contemplating the time-lines of Passion Week and her comment to Marian Davis?

Without doing the research that you are doing for the application of the "Little Horn" into this scenario...it seems to me to be the most grievous and appalling deceptions ever devised, one which makes the whole world wonder after this beast...

Take good care & God bless

Bob

Luke 24:21 – The Walk to Emmaus

February 10, 2005

Hi Bob,

Fortunately, I've already done the research on this. Here is my analysis from about a year ago. Some parts are fairly complicated and you might need to read it slowly or more than once. Enjoy! I have two versions of the Greek-English Interlinear in book form: *The Interlinear KJV Parallel New Testament in Greek and English* based on the *Textus Receptus with Lexicon and Synonyms* by George Ricker Berry and the *Interlinear KJV-NIV Parallel New Testament in Greek and English Interlinear Translation* by Alfred Marshall. I rely a lot on e-sword to identify Strong's numbers for both the Greek and Hebrew words. These are lots of other resources one can use to analyze scripture. I have only a few of them.

This post is another little piece in my continuing study dealing with the issues of Passion Week. One of the issues between the traditional understanding of a Friday crucifixion with Jesus in the tomb 1.5 days and the Wednesday crucifixion with Jesus in the tomb for 3 full days is the various references to the "three days" or the "third day" in various places in the Gospels. Luke 24:21 is central to this issue in that the standard translations (KJV & NIV in particular) seem to state that the walk to Emmaus was on the third day from when

the death of Jesus was accomplished. But if Jesus was crucified on Wednesday and in the tomb for the next three days and nights, then the walk to Emmaus must have been after the three days had passed. That is the focus of this missive.

The time element of "three days" is a key part in understanding how long Jesus was in the tomb. One of those texts is Luke 24:21 where Jesus meets the two disciples on the road to Emmaus and opens to them the prophecies concerning Himself in all the scriptures. Here is a quick look at the Greek in Luke 24:21. I present first the Nestle's Greek, which is the Greek the New International Version (NIV) is based on and is considered one of the most reliable available today, followed by the English Interlinear for the NIV, followed by the NIV itself.

24:21 ημεις δε ηλπιζομεν οτι αυτος εστιν ο μελλων λυτρουσθαι τον ισραηλ αλλα γε και συν πασιν τουτοις τριτην ταυτην ημεραν αγει αφ ου ταυτα εγενετο

*

24:21 But we were hoping that he it is(was) the one being about to redeem Israel; but also with all these things third this day (this is the third day) it leads since these things happened.

*

24:21 but we had hoped that he was the one who was going to redeem Israel. And what is more, it is the third day since all this took place.

Because the King James Version (KJV) was translated so many years before our modern translations way back in 1611, that translation probably had at least a subconscious influence on the understanding and bias of many of those who have translated our modern versions. Here is the same verse from the Greek Textus Receptus which is the Greek version relied on by the committee that translated the KJV, followed by the Interlinear for the KJV, then the KJV itself.

24:1 ημεις δε ηλπιζομεν οτι αυτος εστιν ο μελλων λυτρουσθαι τον ισραηλ αλλα γε συν πασιν τουτοις τριτην ταυτην ημεραν αγει σημερον αφ ου ταυτα εγενετο

*

24:21 But we were hoping he it is who is about to redeem Israel. But then with all these things third this day brings to-day since these things came to pass.

*

24:21 But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done.

There are two differences in this verse between Nestle's Greek and the Textus Receptus versions. First, Nestle's Greek includes the word **και** (and) at the beginning of the second sentence of the verse which the Textus Receptus lacks. Second, the Textus Receptus includes the word **σημερον** (this (very) day) which Nestle's Greek lacks. Thayer's Greek-English lexicon identifies the meanings of **σημερον** as (1) this (very) day, and (2) what has happened today. Additionally, Strong's Concordance identifies that **σημερον** is presumed to be the compound of the article **η / με / ρα** (the) (**ημερα**) which means this day or night current or just past. The primary meaning is related to "the day, used of the natural day, or the interval between sunrise and sunset, as distinguished from and contrasted with the night." The meaning of "the third day" in Luke 24:21 seems to refer to three full days as Jesus suggested in Matthew 12:38-40 rather than one full day and parts of two days on either side of that day as explained by the concept of inclusive reckoning where any part of a day counts as a full day. Interestingly,

neither of these variations seem to make any difference in the final wording of either the N.V. or KJV translations.

One other difference in the transliterated versions is how each renders the word **αγει**. It is translated to mean "it leads" in Nestle's Greek text and "brings" in the Textus Receptus. Notice the difference in the interlinear translations:

NIV: **ΤΟΥΤΟΙΣ ΤΡΙΤΗΝ ΤΑΥΤΗΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ ΑΓΕΙ ΑΦ ΟΥ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ** third this day (this is the third day) it leads since these things happened.

KJV: **ΤΡΙΤΗΝ ΤΑΥΤΗΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ ΑΓΕΙ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΑΦ ΟΥ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ** third this day brings to-day since these things came to pass.

Both translations seem to incorporate the concept for **αγει** into the prior phrase **ΤΡΙΤΗΝ ΤΑΥΤΗΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ** (third this day is) and render this portion of the text as "this is the third day since these things were done." Thus, **αγει** seems to be the key action word in this sentence.

Relying on the KJV, Strong's Concordance identifies the word "is" in the phrase "to day is the third day" to have the root word **αγω** which is identified as follows: "A primary verb; properly to lead; by implication to bring, drive, (reflexively) go, pass (time), or (figuratively) induce:—be, bring (forth), carry (let) go, keep, lead away, be open." It should be noted from this that the meaning closest to a time value for the root word for **αγει** in this list of descriptive terms is to "pass". The "pass" here does not imply something in the past, but something that is passing or that has just passed.

Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon identifies that **αγε** is an interjection and is in the imperative form, such as go to, come! or come now!

The meaning closest to the time frame aspect of the word **αγει**, then, would not be that this is the third day since these things happened, but that three days have passed since these things happened. This is significant in that it tells us when the counting of the three days should begin and end. If "this is the third day since these things were done" and this is the first day of the week as stated in Luke 24:1, then today (the first day of the week) is the third day, yesterday (the seventh day of the week, the weekly Sabbath) was the second day in the sequence, and Friday was the first day in the sequence. However, if "three days have passed since all these things were done" and this is the first day of the week as stated in Luke 24:1, then yesterday (the seventh day of the week, the weekly Sabbath) was the third day in the sequence, Friday was the second day in the sequence, and Thursday was the first day in the sequence. This latter understanding is supported by the definition of **σημερον** in Luke 24:21 to mean either current or just passed.

The meanings of Greek words are often determined by the context, so it is important to note the setting of this discussion. The events under discussion in Luke 24:21—the arrest, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus—were not completed on this day, but were completed in the just completed past. A careful reading of Luke 24 shows that the disciples on the road to Emmaus understood that three days had passed since the crucifixion took place. Luke 24:22-23 makes it clear that they know about the resurrection, but they place the resurrection after the reference to the "three days". Thus, the words **αγει σημερον** in the Textus Receptus taken together must mean that the time factor under discussion for the crucifixion of Jesus has definitely been just recently completed three days ago.

The Modern Language Bible/New Berkeley Version (MLB/NBV) seems to have captured the essence of the time element better than either the KJV or N.V. in this passage. Here is how that version reads:

"Moreover, three days have already passed since all those events occurred." Luke 24:21, MLB/NBV

Thus, the disciples on the road to Emmaus identify that three days have already passed since Jesus was arrested,

tried, and crucified, and they are now into the fourth day counting from the day Jesus died. This is in perfect agreement with what Jesus said in Matthew 12:38-40 that He would be in the heart of the Earth three days and three nights just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale. Moreover, this is in perfect harmony with the Wednesday crucifixion and the resurrection at the close of the weekly Sabbath rather than the traditional teaching of a Sunday morning resurrection.

That's how I see it. Hope this helps.

Cordially,

Jerry

----- Original Message -----

Luke 24:21

Hi Jerry,

Another innocent if not loaded question for you.

How do you deal with Luke 24:21? Could it be that the translators also changed the words a little when compared to the original Greek?

I wish I had some of your resource materials. I have e-Sword, but I can't seem to bring up the Interlinear text feature that I thought it had.

Anyway, hopefully you can give me your take on this.

Thanks

Bob

Passover vs. Last Supper

February 10, 2005

Bob,

Yes, the Last Supper is the Passover meal for Jesus and the disciples. For the parallel passages see Matthew 26:17-29 and Mark 14:12-26. However, Jesus has to celebrate the Passover that year one day ahead of the normal time for celebrating it because He has to institute the emblems of the wine and bread that represent his blood and body. He also gives them the promise that He will celebrate this meal with them in heaven. Matthew 26:29. But the most important reason He has to celebrate the meal one day ahead of the normal time is because He has the appointment with death on the day the lamb must be slain. He cannot eat the meal after He dies. Look at the question you posed:

“She is asking if the Last Supper represents the Passover and why is Christ celebrating the Passover before He has been sacrificed?

Could Jesus celebrate the Passover after He has been sacrificed?”

Of course not. We know from John 18:28 that the day of His trial was the preparation day and not the Passover day itself because the Jews were looking forward to eating the Passover. The Passover is always eaten on the evening that begins the 15th of the month. If Jesus was arrested, tried, and crucified on the 15th, then the Jews would have already eaten the Passover. It was not possible for Jesus to eat the Passover on the 15th that year because He was dead before sunset that began the 15th that year.

The Lord had instructed the people through Moses in Numbers 9:9-13 that the Passover must always be celebrated on the 14th of the first month and not at any other time, except in the event that a person had become unclean or was on a trip. In that event, the Passover was to be celebrated on the 14th day of the second month. If both of these days were missed, the individual had to wait until the next year to celebrate the Passover. Remember, the 14th is the preparation day when the lamb is killed and the meal prepared, and the 15th is the day the Passover is eaten. Passover involves two days. It is not possible to eat the meal on the 15th without preparing it on the 14th. The Lord gave this instruction to strictly observe the Passover at the specified time because He did not want His people to invent their own religion. Inventing one's religion results in paganism. Read Deuteronomy 10:16-18 to see what His people were to do with the Cananites. But to see how wicked they were, turn back to Deuteronomy 18:9-13 to see that what was obnoxious about their behavior is that they were practicing divination, soothsaying, observing omens, applying sorcery, listening to a charmer, a medium, a wizard, or a necromancer (zodiac). All of these things are human inventions on how to play God. What is so wicked about all of them is that they pretend to be in the role of God when all they rely on is their own human imagination. It is deceptive. Satan is the father of lies and all of that is directly from him. This is the result of making up one's own religion and rejecting the Lord's leading. This is why God is so strict with His people -- it is for our protection. Sin leads to death.

Paul has some significant things to say about celebrating the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 11:17-34. This is the only passage outside of the gospels that discusses the Lord's Supper. The people in Corinth were not celebrating it correctly and Paul reproved them.

I suggest that this passage takes on a much larger importance regarding our understanding of the proper observance of the LORD's Supper in modern times and needs to be examined more carefully in the context of the observance of the LORD's Supper as a substitute for the Passover meal. We know from 1 Corinthians 5:8 that Paul has just complimented the Corinthians for keeping the Feast of Unleavened Bread and encourages them to continue keeping the feast. Passover is clearly part of the celebration of the Feast of Unleavened Bread as the first holy convocation day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread falls on the 15th of the first month which is the same day as the Passover Sabbath. It appears that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 11:17-28, is chastising the Corinthians for improperly keeping the LORD's Supper which was to be kept in the place of the Passover meal. Yes, it is to be a meal and not just a sip from a common cup or a sliver of unleavened bread followed by a thimble full of grape juice. Everyone in the church is to participate equally in this meal. While no one is to become a glutton or drunk at this meal, neither is anyone to go away hungry. Moreover, if the LORD's Supper has now taken the place of the Passover meal, it is to be celebrated once each year and not otherwise. The phrase "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup" is a reference to the annual celebration of the LORD's Supper and not to eating and drinking to the glory of God in a general, daily sense. To deny that this is a discussion regarding the proper observance of the LORD's Supper is to minimize our understanding of Paul's advice to them.

Ellen White agrees that the LORD's Supper was substituted into the place of the Passover meal. She states in *Desire of Ages* page 652:

“As He ate the Passover with His disciples, He instituted in its place the service that was to be the memorial of His great sacrifice.”

Surely, the service that is the memorial of His great sacrifice is the LORD's Supper. What other possibility could there be? If the LORD's Supper is to be celebrated in the place of the Passover meal, what justification is there for celebrating communion every week as is common in some traditional churches or four times a year as the SDA

church does? Throughout scripture God is clear that His people are to worship Him according to His instructions and are not to make up their own rules for how they worship Him. Whenever the people made up their own rules for worshipping God, it was displeasing to Him. Moses was very explicit that the annual festivals were to be celebrated once each year at the LORD's appointed times and not otherwise unless one was on a journey or ritually unclean in which case Passover could be celebrated one month late. Exodus 12:3-20, Numbers 9:5 & 11. Are we to assume that the rest of the requirements of this annual festival of the LORD have been abolished when He told His prophets that His people are to keep it for all time and in all places? Leviticus 23:14, 2 Chronicles 2:4, Isaiah 24:5; 55:3; Jeremiah 32:40; Ezekiel 16:60; 37:26. Without an explicit instruction in scripture that the annual festivals of the LORD have been abolished, we disobey the voice of God by not keeping all the LORD's festivals just as we teach that the rest of Christianity disobeys the voice of God by not keeping the weekly Sabbath. Where is that explicit instruction in scripture that the LORD's annual festivals have been abolished? I can't find one.

That's how I see it. Hope it helps.

Cordially,

Jerry

---- Original Message ----

Hi Jerry,

I was talking on the phone with a friend who lives in Ireland...She says this is the chapter where the Eucharist is derived from.

Reference is made to the Feast of Unleavened Bread and killing of the Passover lamb. She is asking if the Last Supper represents the Passover and why is Christ celebrating the Passover before He has been sacrificed?

Bob

For What It's Worth

The Desire of Ages, page 571, paragraph 2

Chapter Title: "Thy King Cometh" [Chapter 63]

"Never before in His earthly life had Jesus permitted such a demonstration. He clearly foresaw the result. It would bring Him to the cross. But it was His purpose thus publicly to present Himself as the Redeemer. He desired to call attention to the sacrifice that was to crown His mission to a fallen world. While the people were assembling at Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover, He, the antitypical Lamb, by a voluntary act set Himself apart as an oblation. It would be needful for His church in all succeeding ages to make His death for the sins of the world a subject of deep thought and study. Every fact connected with it should be verified beyond a doubt. It was necessary, then, that the eyes of all people should now be directed to Him; the events which preceded His great sacrifice must be such as to call attention to the sacrifice itself. After such a demonstration as that attending His entry into Jerusalem, all eyes would follow His rapid progress to the final scene."