

## OUR RESPONSE TO RON DU PREEZ

by

**Richard and Melody Drake**  
1777 S. Curtis Rd.  
Boise, ID 83705 U.S.A.  
[www.godsholidays.com](http://www.godsholidays.com)  
[rldrake78@gmail.com](mailto:rldrake78@gmail.com)  
877-820-1926

Many Seventh-day Adventist feast keepers are requesting that we write a response to Elder Ron du Preez' book in which he attacks feast keeping. We are currently working on writing this response in a book and have it partially done. Due to many feast keepers needing at least a partial response since everywhere they are now met with Elder Ron du Preez' attack against feast keepers, we decided to release what we have written so far. You are welcome to share what we have written so far, so long as you share it in its entirety, including our contact information as listed above. The reason for this is so that people who get this partial response can contact us to be on our list to get our full response when it is done. We start with with our outline of our overview of what we plan to include in our book followed by the first five chapters which we have written. This is just a rough draft and even what we have written so far is subject to change and revision. We welcome any suggestions or critiques from any of you. Blessings on all of you as study this most important subject. The authors, Richard and Melody Drake

### Overview Of What We Plan To Include In This Book

Why We Wrote This Book

Why The Feasts Are So Important

The Kelli Factor

Which Bible Version is the Most Accurate?

Rules of Biblical Interpretation

Exposing The Historical-Critical Method of Biblical Interpretation

Are You Worshipping the One True God In Heaven? Or Are You Worshipping Baal? Are You Sure?

Point by Point Through Du Preez' Book

1. Old Testament

2. New Testament
3. Ellen White

Appeal to SDA Church Leaders

Message to Du Preez

## Chapter 1

### Why We Wrote This Book

We were speakers at a gathering of feast-keeping Christians at the Feast of Tabernacles in northern California in the fall of the year 2010. We had been asked to present a series of lectures on natural health since Melody had successfully reversed her fibromyalgia by following the principles that we were going to present.

Shortly before we left for California we were informed by our hosts that a gentleman by the name of Ron du Preez was also coming to this festival. We knew that he had been on 3ABN presenting his position against the feasts and so we were curious as to why he would spend so much money to fly out from Michigan to meet with a small group of feast keepers in northern California. We wondered if it had anything to do with the fact that we had written two books promoting feast keeping-- *God's Holidays* and *Armageddon and the International Sunday Law*.

During the week we became acquainted with du Preez and found that he was a delightful gentleman to visit with. Du Preez was from South Africa and during the course of conversations talked about a friend of his that Richard had served with while working as a student missionary from Walla Walla College in Zambia, Africa. Du Preez said that any friend of X's was also a friend of his. We felt the same.

The night before du Preez left we asked him if he would like to know why we keep the feasts. He said that he would like that and quietly listened and took notes as we presented our findings and reasons to him. He said that what we presented to him was what he was looking for and that he had never heard the evidence and reasons that we presented. He told us that he would get back to us by the end of the year (2010) with his conclusions. We told him that no other SDA leader had ever replied to our evidence and questions for them and he replied that he did not think that they had the answers and that was probably why they had not replied, but that he would reply.

Our meeting with du Preez took place during September of 2010 and his promise was to get back with us by the end of that year. We waited, and waited, and waited. About 15 months later in December of 2011 we found out that du Preez had published a book entitled *Feast-Keeping and the Faithful* that came out about August of 2011. In addition we found that he had a sermon posted on You Tube that he had delivered to a number of pastors in the Idaho Conference against the observance of the feasts. He referred to our book and to us, but did not name either the book or our names. He did say that the authors were from their conference.

Since du Preez had not gotten back with us we decided to obtain his book and listen to what he had to say on You Tube. We have since done that and have spent many hours researching his positions to see if he has any merit in his positions. We also spent hundreds of dollars purchasing many of the books that he quotes from in order to see the context of the quotes that he used. What we found astounded us.

Every single argument that du Preez uses against the feasts has no merit. In a nutshell, du Preez quotes heavily from theologians, most of whom are outside our church, for his proof, instead of the Bible. When we looked up the quotes du Preez referred to in these theologians' books for his proof, we found that these theologians either had inadequate Biblical proof or no Biblical proof for their statements. We realized that the majority of people who read du Preez' book will not spend the hundreds of dollars it takes to obtain these books and look up these quotes to see if adequate proof is given; rather, most people will simply take du Preez' words for it. We wondered if du Preez also realized this and this was why he used these theologians so heavily instead of giving his proof from the Bible? After all, if these theologians did give adequate proof from the Bible, as du Preez claims in his book, why not just quote the Bible directly instead of using these theologians? We also found that du Preez frequently conflicted with himself; he would argue one way, then later on in the book he would argue the opposite way. We found some of these contradictions in our first reading of his book, but we found the majority of the contradictions when we did our second and third readings because now, when we would read a point, we would remember that much later on in the book, he would argue the opposite way. In our first reading of his book, not knowing what was coming, we didn't realize that later on he would conflict with himself on this point. We also realized that most people who read du Preez' book would only read it once and therefore miss a number of these contradictions, as we ourselves did on the first reading. We also realized that those who read du Preez' book, unless they already had a thorough knowledge of God's Festivals and spent hundreds of dollars buying the books that du Preez refers to, and then spent hundreds of hours researching through these books, comparing what they say with God's Word, as we did, that they will not see the errors that du Preez presents. For those who are largely ignorant of God's Festivals, a mere surface reading of du Preez' book will give the impression that du Preez is correct. We felt that these errors had to be addressed because this subject has huge implications, as we will shortly show.

As you read through this book, we urge you to do more than a cursory surface reading. We urge you to study this subject in depth. In short, we urge you to be good Bereans. The apostle Paul says of the Bereans, "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (Acts 17:11). In this text Paul is commending the laity for diligently searching the Bible to make sure that the preachers were preaching the truth to them. Why? Paul gives the answer. "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." (Acts 20:29) As you search to see who is speaking the truth, pray diligently, and if you are an honest seeker of truth, the Holy Spirit will show you the truth. We are not afraid of anyone honestly investigating any of our books and comparing what we wrote with what Ron du Preez wrote; in fact, we welcome it. Be good Bereans. Search diligently for yourself, for your salvation depends upon it.

Many church leaders, du Preez included, seem to think that the average Christian is not capable of correctly interpreting the Bible for themselves and therefore needs theologians to help them. We disagree. All one needs is an accurate translation of the Bible, a good concordance, and the Holy Spirit. "There are deep mysteries in the word of God, which will never be discovered by minds that are unaided by the Spirit of God." (*Testimonies*, Vol. 4, p. 444) "God can do more in one moment to convict people than we can do in a lifetime." (*Signs of the Times*, November 7, 1900) If a person has the Holy Spirit with them, the Holy Spirit will teach them the truth more accurately than all the theologians in the world put together. We do not need to go to theologians to accurately and correctly interpret the Bible.

"The people of God are directed to the Scriptures as their safeguard against the influence of false teachers and the delusive power of spirits of darkness." (*The Great Controversy* p. 593.) We are directed to go to the scriptures for our safeguard and not to the interpretation of some theologian.

"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. Satan is constantly endeavoring to attract attention to man in the place of God. He leads the people to look to bishops, to pastors, to professors of theology, as their guides, instead of searching the Scriptures to learn their duty for themselves. Then, by controlling the minds of these leaders, he can influence the multitudes according to his will." (*The Great Controversy* p. 595)

Interestingly, in his book against us, Ron never mentions us or our book by name. He gives the reason as the following in a footnote after quoting from our book. "Since these arguments are quite typical of the kind used by feast-keepers, though I am actually quoting directly from a feast promoting book, I will not be citing the source/s for such. More importantly, I prefer that the reader not become sidetracked by the names of these writers, or their materials, but rather to be focused upon the actual biblical materials being considered here in this book." (*Feast-Keeping and the Faithful*, p. 131) What is du Preez afraid of? Is he afraid that people, after reading his book, will want to obtain our book so they can compare and come to their own conclusion as to who is speaking the truth? Is he afraid that people will see the large volume of proof that we give from the Bible for what we say, along with much additional proof from Ellen White's writings? We welcome people reading both sides but du Preez clearly does not want you to be able to read both sides. We wonder if du Preez thinks that people are incapable of reading both sides and making an intelligent, godly decision regarding these matters? We also wonder if du Preez thinks that the clergy should do the thinking for the laity? If so, this is a Catholic doctrine, as this is what the Catholic church teaches—that the laity are incapable of correctly interpreting the Bible for themselves and therefore have to rely on the priests to do it for them. This belief goes contrary to what the Bible says. (Read Acts 17:11 and 2 Timothy 2:15) At any rate, it's obvious from du Preez's statement we quoted above that he does not want you to be able to read both sides of this issue; rather, he only wants you to read his side.

We invite you, the reader, to read our book *God's Holidays* for free on our website, [www.godsholidays.com](http://www.godsholidays.com) and to carefully compare it with Ron's book entitled *Feast-Keeping and the Faithful Should Christians Observe the Annual Feast Days?* which one may obtain by calling Omega Media at 517-599-3798. In this current treatise, our Response to Du Preez, we will address each argument that du Preez raises against the feasts and show clearly from the Word of God where du Preez goes wrong on each point. We will also include the Biblical Rules of Interpretation that we learned from the Seventh-day Adventist Church. These are the rules that we diligently followed when we wrote our book. When du Preez breaks a rule of interpretation, which he does in every argument he gives against the feasts, we will quote which rule of interpretation he is breaking and show how he is breaking this rule.

We will show you shocking proof that the majority of the Sunday-observant theologians that du Preez quotes from operate on the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation. We will explain this historical-critical method in great detail and prove that this method of Biblical interpretation is absolutely ungodly and that any study based on this method will come to false conclusions. We will also show that this historical-critical method is based on idolatry which is expressly forbidden in the first commandment, where it reads, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." (Exodus 20:3)

In addition, we will show that du Preez and the majority of the theologians he quotes are using ungodly modern versions of the Bible which significantly distort the truth of the Bible. In fact, we will prove that these modern versions are ungodly by specifically quoting multiple texts from these modern versions and showing clearly how they distort the clear Word of God in their translation, leading to

serious errors among God's people.

A number of years ago, a prominent Seventh-day Adventist theologian, Elder B.G. Wilkinson, who taught at Washington Missionary College from 1936 to 1946, wrote a book which was severely attacked by other church leaders. He wrote a response to these theologians. In the preface to his response he wrote the following words which we quote, because he expresses our sentiments exactly in our response to du Preez. "Perhaps a number of my hearers may think that this matter is receiving too much attention; to them it may appear like much ado about nothing. To all who may feel this way, I will say that if they will do me the honour to follow me attentively, I shall attempt to show them that it is of great importance. I trust that in all that I shall say on the subject, I shall avoid all unkindness, and if I say somethings which have that appearance, I hope that you will forgive me and remember that it was my intention to be charitable and kind. In the process of vindicating a matter, it is proper and obligatory,--if you would vindicate successfully—to not only state and quote those things that vindicate, but also it may be equally necessary to take away the foundations of opponents...But those who wrote the document, to which I now reply, were under obligation, since they called it a review, to be impartial and to present the good and strong side of my arguments as well as those phrases which seemed to them to be weak. This they notably failed to do...Therefore, their document is not a review, it is a reply; yet not a fair, square reply..." (*Our Authorized Bible Answers to Objections*, p. vii)hapter 2

## Chapter Two

### Why The Feasts Are So Important

Before we go any further, we need to explain why the feasts, as listed in Leviticus chapter 23, are so important. First, we will give a brief overview and then go into further explanation on each point. The feasts teach a correct, balanced, and in-depth view of the gospel, the sanctuary, righteousness by faith, and the three angels' messages. Each feast teaches a different aspect of each these subjects. The feasts also teach many more details about the prophecies in Daniel and Revelation. When you observe each feast, it gives you the opportunity and the time to investigate and study further into the meaning of that feast. Each year as you observe the feasts, you will study deeper and learn even more. This knowledge that you will acquire will deepen your relationship with God considerably. In short, the observance of the feasts will revitalize and deepen your knowledge of the Bible and your relationship with God. Over and over, when new feast keepers call us up, they are so excited about what they are learning and they exclaim, "The Bible is an entire new book to me. My relationship with God has deepened considerably. I am so thankful to have discovered this truth!" And indeed, we agree, for that is our testimony as well. In fact, just yesterday, we received the following statement in an email from a new feast keeper. "I can't learn enough, fast enough about God's feast days! How beautiful they are; how deep and full of meaning! How much I've missed out on all these years, not knowing or keeping the feasts! They are the complete opposite of legalism - they are joyful!" If you want to revitalize your spiritual life, the study and observance of the feasts will definitely do it.

Our number one reason for observing the feasts is because Jesus observed them and in 1 Peter 2:21 it says, "For even hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow His steps." The Bible doesn't say, "Follow Jesus' footsteps in everything except for the observance of the feasts." Rather, the Bible says to follow Jesus' footsteps in everything. Since Jesus observed the feasts, this means we should also observe the feasts. One SDA Pastor who challenged our belief in the feasts used to be an evangelist. We asked this pastor, "When you preached

as an evangelist, did you ever say to your congregation, ‘Jesus observed the Seventh-day Sabbath. The Bible says to follow Jesus’ example in all things, therefore, you should observe the Seventh-day Sabbath.’” This evangelist pastor replied, “I said that all the time!” We replied, “Well then, that’s why we observe the feasts. Jesus observed the feasts and the Bible says we should follow Jesus’ example in all things.” This pastor remained silent for he had no answer as he knew that we were right—Jesus did observe the feasts. In du Preez’ book he did not even address our number one reason for observing the feasts. We can only imagine why. There is no answer. The Bible is very clear. We are to follow in Jesus’ footsteps in everything. In his book du Preez calls us “anti-Christ” for observing the feasts. How can we possibly be anti-Christ for doing what Jesus Himself did and following in His footsteps? And if it’s anti-Christ to keep the feasts, then, the logical end conclusion of such a statement is that Jesus Himself was anti-Christ (against Himself) for observing the feasts! We were stunned that du Preez even said that feast-keeping is anti-Christ. Think it over carefully. In the Judgment Day, Jesus will be our Judge. Are you safer in the Judgment for having followed in Jesus’ footsteps in everything, or for not following in His footsteps in everything? Do you really think Jesus would say, “By the way, I’m going to have to keep you out of the kingdom for feast keeping. Yes, I know it was following in My footsteps, and I know that I never said in My Word that the feasts were abolished, but, nevertheless, you should have followed your church leaders instead of following My Example and My Word.” We don’t think so! You are definitely safer in the Judgment for having followed in Jesus’ footsteps than if you haven’t. You are also safer following the Bereans’ example of testing everything church leaders tell you by the Bible to make sure these church leaders are following the Bible. See Acts 17:11.

Here are some of the Bible texts and Ellen White quotes that show that Jesus observed the feasts. Luke 2:41, 42; Matthew 26:17-18; John 2:23; John 4:45; John 5:1; John 7:10, 14, 37; Luke 22:15-16. “Among the Jews the twelfth year was the dividing line between childhood and youth. On completing this year a Hebrew boy was called a son of the law, and also a son of God. He was given special opportunities for religious instruction, and **was expected to participate in the sacred feasts and observances. It was in accordance with this custom that Jesus in His boyhood made the Passover visit to Jerusalem.**” (*Desire of Ages*, p. 75) Notice that Jesus was expected to participate in the feasts starting at age twelve and so He did. Jesus was definitely at the age of accountability and knew what He was doing. In fact, it was at this Passover at age twelve when Jesus reasoned with the most learned men in the nation concerning the truths in the Scriptures.

“Jesus presented Himself as one thirsting for a knowledge of God. His questions were suggestive of deep truths which had long been obscured, yet which were vital to the salvation of souls. While showing how narrow and superficial was the wisdom of the wise men, every question put before them a divine lesson, and placed truth in a new aspect. The rabbis spoke of the wonderful elevation which the Messiah's coming would bring to the Jewish nation; but Jesus presented the prophecy of Isaiah, and asked them the meaning of those scriptures that point to the suffering and death of the Lamb of God. The doctors turned upon Him with questions, and they were amazed at His answers. With the humility of a child He repeated the words of Scripture, giving them a depth of meaning that the wise men had not conceived of. If followed, the lines of truth He pointed out would have worked a reformation in the religion of the day. A deep interest in spiritual things would have been awakened; and when Jesus began His ministry, many would have been prepared to receive Him.” (*Desire of Ages*, p. 78)

Yes, at age twelve Jesus already knew the Scriptures better than the rabbis. He was also observing the feasts. Why? Because He knew that the Bible commanded feast observance and He followed all of God’s commands. He also knew that He was to be our Example in all things.

Jesus also never observed the ceremonial law. “**Christ passed through all the experiences of His childhood, youth, and manhood without the observance of ceremonial temple worship.**” (*The Bible Echo*, October 31, 1898) The implications of this quote are huge. Jesus kept the feasts, but He did not

observe the ceremonial law, even in His childhood. This means that the feasts cannot be part of the ceremonial law, as our church leaders tell us. Du Preez tries to show in his book that the feasts are part of the ceremonial law, but these above quotes prove that they are not. The word “ceremonial” is not in the Bible; it is a word of man’s invention. We looked up every quote of Ellen White’s in which she used the word “ceremonial” to see how she defined this word and she defines it as the sacrificial system. She never includes the feasts as being part of the ceremonial law. She also never uses the term “ceremonial Sabbaths.” “Ceremonial sabbaths” are not found in either the Bible or Ellen White’s writings as it is an oxymoron. A day cannot be “ceremonial” as a day is simply time and a ceremony is something that is done. Yes, you can do ceremonies on a day, but a day cannot be a ceremony. If what one does on a day makes the day “ceremonial” then the Seventh-day Sabbath is also “ceremonial” because under the ceremonial law, lambs were sacrificed on the Seventh-day Sabbath (Numbers 28:9). We do agree that according to Daniel 9:27 the sacrificial system, which is the ceremonial system, ended at the cross. The church was able to separate the ceremonial system (sacrificial system) from the Seventh-day Sabbath and realize that when the sacrificial system ended at the cross, the observance of the Seventh-day Sabbath continued on, but they seem to have difficulty doing the same for the yearly Sabbaths. If the yearly Sabbaths are ceremonial because sacrifices were done on them, then the weekly Seventh-day Sabbath is also ceremonial because sacrifices were done on it. One simply cannot argue both ways as du Preez tries to do and be logical. God is a God of logic, order, and reason and He appeals to our logic (Isaiah 1:18).

Another reason why we observe the feasts is that the feasts teach the entire gospel. The feasts also explain the sanctuary since each part of the sanctuary also teaches a part of the gospel. The steps of salvation in the gospel are: justification, sanctification, purification, and glorification. Any gospel that eliminates out any of these steps or that emphasizes one step over the others, teaches a false balance of the gospel. In a nutshell, here is how the feasts further explain both the gospel and the sanctuary.

Passover teaches justification. When one entered the courtyard of the sanctuary, the first thing one saw was the altar of burnt offering. Before the cross, when a person sinned, they had to confess their sins over a lamb here at this altar, then slay the lamb, and offer it as a sacrifice on this altar. Now, after the cross, the first step to becoming a Christian is to accept Jesus the Passover Lamb into our lives and confess our sins. Jesus then freely pardons our sins. See 1 John 1:9. This step is justification, which is righteousness on the credit card principle. At this point Jesus covers our lives with His blood and counts us as if we are righteous, even though we have not actually become perfected yet. Should we die, as did the thief on the cross (See Luke 23:39-43), we are saved. This is the wonderful good news of the gospel! This is the message of Passover and it gives us great hope. Our part is to ask for forgiveness and God’s part is to forgive those who ask.

After passing the altar of burnt offering in the courtyard of the sanctuary, one came to the laver where the priests had to wash before entering the sanctuary. This laver represents baptism. As soon as we come to Jesus, we need to be baptized.

The very next day after Passover was the Feast of Unleavened Bread which lasted one week. During this week the leaven was to be removed from the home and not eaten. In the Bible leaven represents sin. The message of this feast is that we are to remove sin from our lives which is sanctification. Justification forgives us of our sin but the message of sanctification is that we are to stop the practice of sin. With God’s help we are to remove sin out of our lives just like the leaven was removed out of the house. God gives us strength to remove sin out of our lives as we spend time with Him in Bible study and prayer. After passing the laver in the courtyard of the sanctuary, one came to the entrance of the sanctuary. The first apartment of the sanctuary, the Holy Place, had three articles of furniture in it: the table of shewbread, the altar of incense, and the seven-branched golden candlestick. The bread on the table of showbread represents Jesus, the Bread of Life as well as His Word, the Bible. The incense rising from the altar of incense represents our prayers ascending to God, and the candlestick represents Jesus, the Light of the world. The oil in the candlestick represents the Holy Spirit. This is the part of the sanctuary that represents sanctification. As we

spend time with Jesus through Bible study and prayer, the Holy Spirit gives us strength to put sin out of our lives. This is the message of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. We are to be growing daily and yes, this growth is the work of a lifetime, so we should not be discouraged when we fail. We simply get back up, ask Jesus to forgive us, and carry on with the work of sanctification in our lives.

We heard the following story from a preacher. He told how he loved rock climbing. One day he attempted a difficult climb in which there was a slight overhang of the rock at the top. He said that in the rock there were hand and foot holds he could hang on to, to prevent falling. He also had a safety rope to save him if he did fall. He said that having the safety rope took away his fear and because of a lack of fear, he was able to climb to the very top without falling to his death. However, if he had not had the safety rope, he would have been so fearful of falling that he would most surely have fallen to his death due to sweaty palms and not being able to get a good grip on the rock. This story illustrates justification and sanctification. The rope represents grace and it is by God's grace and the blood of Jesus that we are justified. Climbing the rock represents sanctification. If he should have fallen, the rope of grace would have caught him and saved him. Because of that rope, he had no fear of falling (being lost) and so he was able to put all his concentration into climbing (growing in the ability to keep God's Law). In the same way, because of God's grace in justifying us, we have the joy of salvation, which removes fear (1 John 4:18), and therefore can concentrate on growing in our ability to keep God's Law. Notice that we kept the Law because we are already saved through Justification. We don't keep the Law to be saved. But we must be in the process of growing in our ability to keep the Law if we want to have the gift of perfection granted to us (See Hebrews 10:14). However, because our lives are covered by Jesus' blood through the gift of Justification, if at any time we die during the process of Sanctification, even if we have had only a short time to participate in Sanctification, we will be saved, as was the thief on the cross (Luke 23:39-43). That's the wonderful good news of the gospel!

During the Feast of Unleavened Bread was the day of Firstfruits. Firstfruits represents the Firstfruits of those who are saved and it also represents the resurrection. See 1 Corinthians 15:23. Firstfruits also represents giving God the first and best of everything in our lives: our time, our talents, and our money. See Numbers 18:12 and Leviticus 23:10.

The next feast is Pentecost, which came fifty days after Firstfruits. The fifty days represents a mini-Jubilee. A regular Jubilee consisted of fifty years. See Leviticus 25:8-22. At the Jubilee any land that had been sold was returned to the original owner, all debts were forgiven, and the slaves were released. This represents the fact that Jesus forgives all our debts of sin, releases us from the slavery of sin, and, at the end of the Millennium, will restore our land, this earth, to His people, the original rightful owners. See Isaiah 61:1-2 and Revelation 21:1-4. Pentecost represents the Holy Spirit coming into our lives through the early and latter rains of the Spirit, enabling us to grow in Sanctification so we are ready to be perfected. See Acts 2:1-4, Acts 3:19, Isaiah 44:3, Joel 2:23, Psalms 72:6, Hosea 6:3, Deuteronomy 11:14, Jeremiah 3:2-3, and Deuteronomy 32:2. "As we seek God for the Holy Spirit, it will work in us meekness, humbleness of mind, a conscious dependence upon God for the **perfecting latter rain**. If we pray for the blessing in faith, we shall receive it as God has promised." (*Testimonies to Ministers* p. 508) The oil in the candlestick in the Holy Place represented the Holy Spirit. The burning oil gave light, so the Holy Spirit in our lives will produce God's light in our lives enabling us to be a witness to the world.

The next feast was the Feast of Trumpets. On this feast the trumpets were sounded to remind everyone that only ten days remained until Judgment Day, the Day of Atonement. This represents God's last call to a dying world to repent. In Revelation chapters 8 and 9, the sounding of the seven trumpets is the fulfillment of the Feast of Trumpets. These trumpets sound in order to warn the world that the seven last plagues are coming and all those who don't repent will be lost for eternity and will have these plagues fall on them. (These plagues are justified because they fall on the wicked who have terribly persecuted and killed many of God's children.) These trumpets are judgments of mercy in order to wake up a world to get them to repent so they don't have the plagues fall on them. The fact that it takes judgments as severe as the seven

trumpets shows how hardened the world is; yet they show God's great mercy in that He is willing to go to any length in order to wake this world up to their danger so they will repent and be saved. Notice that these seven trumpets are sounded at the altar of incense, located within the Holy Place of the sanctuary. See Revelation 8:2-6. Each year when we celebrate the Feast of Trumpets, we remember that the ten days until the Day of Atonement represents one day for each of the Ten Commandments. During this time we review our lives to make sure we are following the Ten Commandments and that all sins are confessed. The Bible tells us that periodically we are to "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith." (2 Corinthians 13:5) The ten days between Trumpets and the Day of Atonement is a good time to do this.

The next feast is the Day of Atonement. The wonderful message of the Day of Atonement is that all those who have been growing in sanctification will have their characters perfected by God when they are judged. (Leviticus 16:30, Hebrews 10:14) What a message of hope! "Man may grow up into Christ, his living head. It is not the work of a moment, but that of a lifetime. By growing daily in the divine life, he will not attain to the full stature of a perfect man in Christ until his probation ceases." (*Testimonies*, Vol. 4, p. 367) Notice that this quote says that growing in Jesus (sanctification) is the work of a lifetime, but that when our probation closes (either when we die or when we are judged) is when we reach perfection. This is when our minds are perfected, because our minds contain our characters. This is also when we are sealed. This is the message of Zechariah chapter 3. It's also the message of Matthew 22:1-14. (For much more on this see our book *God's Holidays*.) Those who are sealed and perfected will be saved. The part of the sanctuary that represents this feast was the Most Holy Place which contained the ark of the covenant with the Law of God in it. The ark was covered with the mercy seat and the cherubim stood above the ark. This ark represents God's throne. The law being covered with the mercy seat represents God's mercy being extended to those who break His law if they repent. This Most Holy Place was entered only once a year by the High Priest, on the Day of Atonement; thus, the Most Holy Place represents our judgment, sealing, and perfecting.

The last feast of the year was the Feast of Tabernacles. The message of this feast is that God will dwell with those who are saved. The word "tabernacle" means "dwelling place" meaning that God will dwell with us. Jesus was born on the Feast of Tabernacles, the Second Coming will occur on the Feast of Tabernacles, and the New Jerusalem will come down from heaven to this earth on the Feast of Tabernacles. (For proof of this see our book, *God's Holidays*.) When we celebrate this feast we can rejoice, because we have participated in justification, sanctification, and purification, and are now ready for glorification. Our bodies will be perfected at the Second Coming, we will receive immortality, and we will be glorified. See 1 Corinthians 15:51-55. The part of the sanctuary that represents glorification is the white wall surrounding the courtyard of the sanctuary. White represents complete perfection.

Righteousness by faith occurs for us as we participate in these four steps to salvation: justification, sanctification, purification, and glorification. The first two steps involve things that we can do; but the last two steps are totally done by God for those who participate in the first two steps of salvation. This is the message of the three angels in Revelation 14:6-16. The first angel's message represents the part of the gospel that we have a part in, which is justification and sanctification. This message gets God's people ready to receive the second angel's message which is the announcement of the Judgment, which happens on the Day of Atonement and is when God's people are perfected. The third angel's message pronounces the punishment on those who do not receive the gospel represented by the first two angels. Verses 14-16 in this chapter represent the Second Coming, or glorification of God's people. Thus righteousness by faith, the three angels' messages, the sanctuary message, and the feasts are all teaching the same message, which is the gospel or the four steps to salvation.

Now for the punch line. Leviticus 23:4 says, "These are the feasts of the LORD, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons." The word "convocations" means "assembly" and "rehearsal." In other words, as we assemble with God's people on the feast days as we are commanded, we are rehearsing the entire gospel from start to finish every single year. For a play to be brought to performance, the actors

must do a lot of rehearsing. In this drama between God and Satan the earth is the stage and we are the actors. It's like God is saying, "If you want to be ready for what is coming, you must rehearse, and I am giving you the opportunity to rehearse the entire plan of salvation, every single year, through the observance of the feasts."

This thought leads us to a related reason, and in fact one of our biggest reasons for observing the feasts. The feasts are simply a gift from God to spend extra time with Him, developing our relationship with Him as we rehearse the entire gospel from year to year. Hebrews 10:25 says, "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching." In other words, God is saying that as we see the Second Coming approaching, spending time with God is even more important. That's what the feasts are all about—spending time with God. God knew that as evil intensified in this world that we would need more than one day a week to spend with Him; we also need an entire week of intensive time with Him each spring and each fall. Since God exhorts us to spend more time with Him as we approach the Second Coming, not less, does it make any sense at all that God would abolish time spent with Him? To us it doesn't make any sense at all.

In Matthew 22:1-14 and in Matthew 25:1-13, God teaches us more about salvation through the parable of the wedding feast. According to Jewish customs, when a young man proposed to a young lady, he would present to her a Ketubah. A Ketubah was simply his entire way of life, his likes and dislikes, and his rules of living, written down. She would read the Ketubah and if she decided to accept his proposal of marriage, she would drink from a cup of grape juice to signify that she accepted. They were then engaged to be married and the young man would go back to his father's home and begin building a home for his wife. She would go back to her parents' home and study the Ketubah and practice it so that when the time for the wedding arrived, she would be ready to follow her husband's wishes for their new life together. She did not know when her husband would come and get her for the wedding and so she had to be ready all the time.

When the home was sufficiently built, then it was the duty of the father of the groom to announce that it was time for the wedding. Then it was that the wedding party would go to get the bride and the wedding would commence. This is a beautiful parable of our salvation. The Ketubah is our Bible, we are the Bride, Jesus is the Groom, and God is the Heavenly Father. We have been engaged to Jesus. He has gone to heaven to prepare our home for us. (John 14:1-3) Meanwhile, we are to study our Ketubah, the Bible, and practice it diligently, so that when the time comes and Jesus comes to claim us as His Bride, we are ready.

When the Father determines that the house is ready for the Bride, then He announces the day and the hour of the wedding. (Mark 13:32) Concerning this verse in Mark 13:32, "An old English version of the passage reads, 'But that day and hour no man maketh known, neither the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' This is the correct reading according to several of the ablest critics of the same age." (*Word to the Little Flock*, p. 5) So it is our Heavenly Father who will announce the time of the Wedding, which is the Second Coming. These parables show that our duty now, as the Bride, is to diligently study His Word and rehearse it. We should be doing this on a daily basis, but the feasts give us that opportunity to spend intensive time with Him, learning and rehearsing His Word.

We could literally write a book about the deep spiritual meanings of the feasts, which is not the scope of this book. But we just wanted to give you an overview of the feasts so you can begin to see the wonderful spiritual lessons contained in the feasts in the hope that this will encourage you to celebrate the feasts from year to year and as you do so to study deeply for yourself into their meaning and thus grow in your knowledge of salvation. Growing in knowledge will also cause you to grow in your love for God as you learn to what great lengths He has gone to save you.

One last thought on this subject. If the church had been observing the feasts they would have been saved from a multitude of evils. For instance, when we were growing up in this church, the church was deep into legalism. The church was emphasizing Sanctification to the almost exclusion of Justification.

Yes, Sanctification does emphasize growing in one's ability to keep the Law. This is what we heard all the time. We remember it well, beginning as young as kindergarten at church, where we were told, "If

you want to be saved, you have to be good.” We weren’t told the wonderful good news of Justification; we were just told we had better be good (keep the Law perfectly) or we would be lost. Naturally, at our tender young ages, this caused us a lot of anxiety. How sad to put that kind of a burden on young people! As a result, the majority of our generation got weary of this message as they figured they would never be “good enough” and they left the church. We ourselves barely hung in there with this heavy burden nearly crushing us but thank goodness we did, until we found, as adults, the wonderful good news of the rest of the gospel that we just outlined for you in this chapter.

One text that caused us to hang in there as teenagers was Jeremiah 29:13, “And ye shall seek Me, and find Me, when ye shall search for Me with all your heart.” We were encouraged that if we just hung in there eventually we would find Him, attain peace, and be saved. We finally did that as adults, but we spent our entire childhood in a state of anxiety over our salvation.

If only the church had been observing the feasts from year to year and deeply studying into the meaning of the feasts, they would never have fallen off into legalism. Why? Passover (representing Justification) and Unleavened Bread (representing Sanctification) are two feasts that are back-to-back as Passover is immediately followed by Unleavened Bread for a total of eight days in a row. Because they are back-to-back they are like two sides of one coin. Without one side of a coin you don’t have the other side. Justification (Passover) without Sanctification (Unleavened Bread) is cheap grace. Sanctification without Justification is legalism. Without each other you have a false balance and a false gospel.

Sad to say, the church, due to being weary of the burden of legalism, has fallen off the road to the other side and are now into cheap grace, or Justification without Sanctification. Because Sanctification does involve keeping the law, now it is implied in the church, “Keeping the law is legalism.” Many times the church stops one step short of saying it, but we know that’s what they mean. Because the Law is being tossed out, many strange things have entered our beloved church and many standards have been dropped. We are in a severe state of apostasy as a result. Jesus said, “If ye love Me, keep My commandments.” (John 14:15) If we don’t keep the commandments we don’t truly love God. We heard one preacher put it this way. “The Law is loving instruction from a Father to His sons. We don’t have to keep the Law—we get to!” The Law is a hedge of protection about us, keeping us safe from many evils, and helping us to live a happy life. The commandments are the way to happiness. For instance, how happy is a murderer who is sitting on death row? Committing that murder led to a loss of the murderer’s happiness and liberty. Cheap grace gives people a false sense of security and if they don’t throw off this false security, they will find, too late, that they are lost. Observing the feasts from year to year while studying deeply into the meaning of the feasts, would have prevented the church from falling off to one side and then the other. It would have prevented us from being raised under a heavy burden when we were growing up; in short, it would have saved the church and many church members from a lot of grief and a lot of evil. So many people are going to be lost as a result of the church falling off into a false balance! All of this could have been prevented if only the church were following what the Bible says to do, and observing the feasts.

This leads us to our next point in this chapter. The Bible never abolishes the feasts. Never. You can search the entire Bible from start to finish and you will not find one text that says that the feasts have been abolished. This is why du Preez had to write an entire book, in which he does a lot of rationalizing while breaking many rules of Biblical interpretation (which we will prove later in this book), trying to get the Bible to say what it does not say--that the feasts have been abolished. If the Bible said it, du Preez would have only had to write one text instead of an entire book. Not only does the Bible not abolish the feasts, you can find the feasts in the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. The Bible does tell us plainly what was abolished at the cross, which was the sacrificial system. See Daniel 9:27. In ancient Israel, a Jew’s entire year revolved around the feasts. It was a major part of their life.

In fact, by the time they traveled by foot or on donkey to get to the feasts, celebrated the feasts, and then traveled back home, they would have spent about a month of their time. This was a month in the spring and a month in the fall—two months of their year devoted to the feasts! Their planting and harvesting of their crops also revolved around the feasts. Throughout the year they were instructed to save up their money so they could afford to attend the feasts. As a result, feast-keeping was deeply ingrained into them. With that in mind, don't you think it would be cruel of God to abolish the feasts and not tell His people? God is not that kind of a God!

In his book, du Preez tries to show that the early Christians didn't realize the feasts had been abolished until many years after the cross and this is why the early Christians and the apostle Paul observed the feasts. God is not that kind of a God to leave His people in darkness concerning His will! He tells us plainly in His Word what He expects of us. Furthermore, God gives a severe warning if we add to His Word or delete things from His Word without His permission. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." (Deuteronomy 4:2) "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." (Revelation 22:18-19) Expounding upon the story in 1 Kings 13:11-34, Ellen White writes, "**When the Lord gives a man a command such as He gave this messenger, He Himself must countermand the order.** Upon those who turn from the voice of God to listen to counter orders, the threatened evil will come." (*Manuscript 1*, 1912) What these texts and this quote is saying is that it is a salvational issue to say that something has been abolished out of God's Word unless God Himself tells us that this was abolished. Ellen White stresses that we must follow His Word until He Himself abolished His Word. Since God never says the feasts were abolished, it is a very serious matter to say that they were.

The final major reason that we observe the feasts is because they are all prophetic, pointing out the future. In the following quote, Ellen White calls the feasts "types" and points out that they point out not only what is going to happen in the future, but when. "The slaying of the Passover lamb was a shadow of the death of Christ. Says Paul: 'Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us.' 1 Corinthians 5:7. The sheaf of first fruits, which at the time of the Passover was waved before the Lord, was typical of the resurrection of Christ. Paul says, in speaking of the resurrection of the Lord and of all His people: 'Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming.' 1 Corinthians 15:23. Like the wave sheaf, which was the first ripe grain gathered before the harvest, Christ is the first fruits of that immortal harvest of redeemed ones that at the future resurrection shall be gathered into the garner of God. **These types were fulfilled, not only as to the event, but as to the time.** On the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month, the very day and month on which for fifteen long centuries the Passover lamb had been slain, Christ, having eaten the Passover with His disciples, instituted that feast which was to commemorate His own death as 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' That same night He was taken by wicked hands to be crucified and slain. And as the antitype of the wave sheaf our Lord was raised from the dead on the third day, 'the first fruits of them that slept,' a sample of all the resurrected just, whose 'vile body' shall be changed, and 'fashioned like unto His glorious body.' Verse 20; Philippians 3:21. **In like manner the types which relate to the second advent must be fulfilled at the time pointed out in the symbolic service.**" (*Great Controversy*, pp. 399-400)

What is being said here is that Passover pointed forward to Jesus' death and on the very day of Passover, Jesus died. Also, Firstfruits pointed forward to Jesus' resurrection, and on that very day He rose from the grave. Thus the feasts point out not only what is going to happen, but when it is going to happen, as the fulfillment is on the very day of the feast that pointed forward to the event. Next comes

the icing on the cake. In like manner, the feasts that point forward to the Second Coming will be fulfilled. In other words, the Second Coming will occur on a feast day. The Bible says the same. Daniel 8:19 says, "For at the time appointed the end shall be." The Hebrew word behind the word "appointed" in this text is "moed" which is the same word used for "feast" in Leviticus chapter 23, the chapter that speaks of the feasts. Paul also says the feasts point out the future. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: Which are a shadow of things to come." (Colossians 2:16-17) The word "holyday" in this text means feast days and Paul is saying that these feast days are a shadow pointing out yet future events.

We have found that most of the feast days have more than one fulfillment. For instance, Passover had a fulfillment when the destroying angel "passed over" all the Israelite homes who had the blood on their doorposts, and then the Israelites left Egypt to start their journey for Canaan. The next fulfillment of Passover was when Jesus died for our sins on Passover as the Passover Lamb. Jesus tells us of the next fulfillment of Passover which is yet future. "And He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Jesus is saying that Passover will not be fulfilled until we get to heaven, which is the Wedding Supper of Jesus and His Bride, which is His people. Firstfruits pointed forward to Jesus' resurrection, to the final resurrection at the Second Coming, and also to the 144,000, who are called "firstfruits." (1 Corinthians 15:22-23; Revelation 14:1-5) The Feast of Unleavened Bread points forward to God's people getting sin out of their lives, something that is still in the process of fulfillment. Pentecost points forward to the early and the latter rains of the Holy Spirit. The Feast of Trumpets points forward to the loud cry, under the influence of the latter rain, that will cover the earth with the gospel just before the Second Coming and also to the Trumpets of Revelation chapters eight and nine. The Feast of Tabernacles points forward to the Second Coming, the New Jerusalem descending down to this earth, and the earth being recreated at the end of the Millennium. All of these events will take place on the very feast day that pointed forward to this event, making the feast days prophetic in addition to teaching the gospel.

Now for a final thought about the feasts being prophetic. Since all the feasts, including Passover, according to Jesus Himself, have yet future fulfillments, that means that none of the feasts have been completely fulfilled. Jesus said in Matthew 5:17-18, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall I no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." The word "law" in this text comes from the Greek word "nomos" which means Mosaic Law or Torah. The Torah is the first five books of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. These books are known as the books of the law, or the Torah. In other words, what Jesus was saying was that not one word, not even the smallest part of a letter (the tittle) and the jot (which is the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet) would be abolished from the law, or Torah, until it had been completely fulfilled. Remember, the feasts are commanded in the Torah. Therefore there is absolutely no way that the feasts have been abolished at the present time, according to Jesus.

To recap, the feasts teach the complete gospel, the sanctuary, righteousness by faith, the three angels' messages, and prophecy. The feasts are rehearsals for Jesus' Bride (His people) of things to come, so that by rehearsing these events in advance we will be ready for these events when they arrive. We, the Bride of Jesus, have been instructed to study, follow and rehearse our Ketubah (the Bible), so we will be ready when Jesus (our Bridgroom), comes to take us to the wedding feast, which is the final fulfillment of Passover in heaven. The feasts are in nearly every book of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. According to Jesus, there is no possibility that the feasts could have been abolished because they all have yet future fulfillments and nothing is abolished unless it has been completely fulfilled.

We have merely given you a brief overview in this chapter. If you are interested in learning much more about the feasts, read our book *God's Holidays*, which you can download and read for free at [www.godsholidays.com](http://www.godsholidays.com). Perhaps now you are beginning to see why many people are so excited about learning about the feasts, how the feasts significantly enhance their relationship with God, and how this message helps people to understand the entire Bible so much better, making the Bible a new book all over for them to study.

We are convinced that even after all these years of celebrating the feasts that we are merely scratching the surface as to their meaning and that much more is yet to be discovered. When we discover the additional truths that the feasts have to offer we will be drawn into an even closer relationship with God as a result, and we will love Him more and more fervently as we realize the lengths and the depths that Jesus has gone to save us. We submit to you that most likely it will be those who are celebrating the feasts who will discover these additional truths. Why? Because if we aren't celebrating and rehearsing the feasts, we tend to forget they even exist. In all our years of growing up in the church, and going through the church school system clear through college, we never once heard a sermon about the feasts. It's not surprising. The church has forgotten about them and their beautiful messages, because the church is falsely teaching that the feasts were abolished at the cross. Consequently, many beautiful lessons are being missed. This is one crucial reason why God has instructed us to observe them and why they haven't been abolished. He doesn't want us to forget the lessons He is trying to teach us through them. We challenge you, dear readers, to study these feasts intensely and be among those who discover these deeper lessons that God is longing for us to find. May God richly bless you as you study is our prayer.

## Chapter 3

### The Kelli Factor

A number of years ago we purchased a home in California that came with a dog. Kellie was a beautiful dog that had a questionable heritage. In short she was a mutt, albeit a beautiful one in doggie terms. She looked like she could have had yellow lab and border collie in her gene pool, but we did not know for certain.

Kellie had some unusual characteristics that bordered on obsessive compulsive disorder, which is saying something for a dog. She would chase her tail to the left and then she would unwind by chasing her tail to the right. This behavior would go on for hours. We began to get concerned that something was going haywire in her brain when she started catching her tail and chewing on it. Her tail soon became a bloody mess and she finally chewed it off, which partially resolved her problem, but presented another problem. Her tail was now so short that she could not catch it no matter how fast her revolutions became! We have termed Kellie's behavior as the Kellie Factor, which we will refer to from time to time.

Circular reasoning is a form of the Kellie Factor that needs to be addressed at this point. When the topic comes around to the Festivals, most SDA preachers and theologians become masters of circular reasoning. Here is the definition and illustration of circular reasoning from Wikipedia. “**Circular reasoning**, or in other words, [paradoxical thinking](#), is a type of [formal logical fallacy](#) in which the [proposition](#) to be [proved](#) is assumed implicitly or explicitly in one of the [premises](#). For example: '*Only an untrustworthy person would run for office. The fact that politicians are untrustworthy is proof of this.*' Such an argument is fallacious, because it relies upon its own proposition — 'politicians are

untrustworthy' — in order to support its central premise. Essentially, the argument assumes that its central point is already proven, and uses this in support of itself."

Here is one example as to how this fallacious reasoning is used by many theologians and preachers. They say, "The feasts have been done away with. The fact that the ceremonial law has been done away with proves this." The proposition that the feasts have been done away with is assumed in the premise that the feasts are part of the ceremonial law. The only problem is that there is never any valid proof offered that the feasts are actually part of the ceremonial law, but we are expected to believe that this statement is indeed fact. The Kellie Factor is in play, round and round in circular reasoning. (In our book *God's Holidays* we present very strong proof that the feasts are part of the moral law and not the ceremonial law.)

In an attempt to prove his points, du Preez has gone to great lengths to find theologians and Bible versions that agree with his positions. In fact he lists 66 different versions that he has used. His views of these different versions are rather revealing. In his discussion regarding the word *moadim* (*moadim* means *feasts* in Hebrew) in Genesis 1:14 he states, "Before considering the conclusions of serious Hebrew scholars from different countries, it is instructive to recognize that it is only the more paraphrased, loosely interpreted versions that suggest that this plural *moadim* here refers to religious 'Festivals.' The formal, more literal translations of Scripture (including the ASV, ESV, JPS, KJV, NASB, NKJV, NRSV, RSV, and YLT) uniformly avoid such renderings of the term *moadim* here in Genesis, as given by the looser versions. All of the above formal, and hence more accurate, Bible versions use the word 'seasons,' not 'festivals.'" (*Feast-Keeping and the Faithful*, p. 36) Notice that du Preez puts the KJV (King James Version) in the class of versions that he asserts are more accurate.

Later, du Preez makes his view of the KJV clearly known. "The real problem lay with the fact that so many people are unfortunately misled by the antiquated and obsolete language, as well as additional problems of trying to understand the King James Version, a translation that was never intended to be used in the twenty-first century....Unfortunately, most feast promoters tenaciously cling to the KJV—a translation with misleading ancient language that seems on the surface to undergird their theories and ideas...In brief, the answer to the 'problem' text of Genesis 19:3 lay in giving up slavishly clinging to the KJV." (*Feast-Keeping and the Faithful*, p. 51)

"Slavishly clinging to the KJV?" Really! Remember that du Preez said in an earlier quote that the KJV was a "formal, more literal translation of Scripture... and hence more accurate." So are we to thumb through 66 versions to find the one that best meets our needs or desires? KJV is good here. KJV is bad there. Spin to the left. Now spin to the right. The Kellie Factor is alive and well.

Remember that the KJV is included in du Preez' list of formal and "hence more accurate" versions of the Bible. According to du Preez, the more "loosely interpreted versions" are the ones that translate the word *moadim* as festivals. The Jerusalem Bible says, "God said, 'Let there be lights in the vault of heaven to divide day from night, and let them indicate festivals, days and years.'" (Genesis 1:14) We would therefore assume that du Preez would consider the Jerusalem Bible a "loosely interpreted version." But wait and see what he says about Leviticus 23:37 in the Jerusalem Bible.

"The most accurate and clearest rendition of this passage can be seen in the Jerusalem Bible: 'These are the solemn festivals of Yahweh to which you are to summon the children of Israel, sacred assemblies for the purpose of offering burnt offerings.'" (*Feast-Keeping and the Faithful*, p. 90) We do recognize that different Bible versions interpret some texts more accurately and clearly than others, but to rely on doctrinal issues based on these non-KJV versions is indeed dangerous as we will show later in this book when we deal more extensively with the question of which Bible versions are the most accurate. Again, du Preez is spinning right and then spinning left.

We were amazed at the number of theologians that du Preez quoted in his book to attempt to prove his points. We were even more amazed when we saw who they were and where they were from. A

handful of them were SDA, including Herbert Douglas, Jacques Doukhan, Angel Rodriguez, Mario Veloso, Frank Holbrook, Ross Cole, and Richard Davidson. Most of the rest were non-SDA. Here is a partial list:

1. Alan F. Johnson Ph.D Professor at Dallas Theological Seminary
2. R. C. H. Lenski Lutheran Scholar
3. Simon Kistemaker N.T. Scholar at Reformed Theological Seminary
4. William Baker Ph.D Professor of N.T. At Cincinnati. Author of Evangelicalism and the Stone-Campbell Movement
5. Roy Ciampa Director of the Th.M program in Biblical studies—Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
6. Brian Rosner Senior Lecturer at Moore Theological College
7. J.W. MacGorman Professor at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
8. Richard Pratt American Reformed Theologian and author
9. D.R. DeLacey Ph.D University of Cambridge, England
10. W. Robertson Nicoll Scottish Free Church Minister
11. Jacob Milgrom Prominent American Jewish Bible Scholar and Conservative Rabbi
12. C.F. Keil Conservative German Lutheran Old Testament Commentator
13. Franz Delitzsch German Lutheran theologian and Hebraist
14. G. Aalders Dutch Theologian Professor of O.T. At the Free University of Amsterdam
15. Sherrill G. Stevens Baptist Pastor/theologian
16. Jack P. Lewis Professor at Harding Graduate School of Religion
17. Walter Bauer German Theologian and Scholar
18. O. Palmer Robertson Th.D Professor of O.T. At Knox Theological Seminary

We recognize that quoting non-biblical sources at times may be beneficial in substantiating a point, but using those resources as your primary basis for making your points is a mistake. Out of the 254 footnotes in the Old Testament Issues section and the 190 footnotes in the New Testament Concerns section of his book, du Preez only devotes a handful of footnotes in each section to the Scriptures themselves or to the Spirit of Prophecy. The rest are quotes from other theologians or further comments of his own. In short, without his non-biblical resources, duPreez would no longer have a book.

Interestingly, in his book, one of the primary reasons du Preez gives as to why Strong's Concordance is not reliable is because Strong's comes out in support of Sunday observance. Most, if not all, of the theologians listed above observe Sunday instead of the Sabbath, yet du Preez uses their quotes heavily in his book against feast-keeping. Arguing one way this time and the direct opposite another time, whichever way serves his interests the best, causes du Preez to lose a lot of credibility.

Du Preez makes some rather amazing assertions regarding Strong's. "Lamentably, while virtually all feast-keepers depend very heavily on Strong's none of them seems to be aware that they are employing one of the most problematic Bible study tools available for anyone who seeks to do thorough contextual scriptural investigation." P. 29. "If one does not understand the actual Hebrew language, but merely assumes that all one needs to do in order to really grasp the meaning of the original is to simply go to Strong's as alleged by the feast-keepers (in the above quote), then Genesis 1:1 will be understood to say: "In [the] beginning he created God..." In other words, to simply rely on Strong's will bring the reader to the conclusion that God was not the creator, but that some other being actually created God!"

du Preez puts footnote 14 right after the word 'God' in the previous sentence. Footnote 14 states "By the way, the rules of Hebrew grammar include the fact that the verb (which involves a "person," "gender," and "number," which in the above example is the second person, masculine, singular) generally appear before the subject (i.e., the person doing the action). Hence, all translations rightly render the clause essentially as, "In the beginning God created..."

If we follow du Preez's example given above, the verb 'created' comes before the subject 'God' in the Hebrew, which gives us the rendering of "In the beginning created God the..." There is no misunderstanding in Strong's that would cause anybody to understand the verse to say "In the beginning he created God..." as alleged by du Preez. DuPreez simply created a straw man to try to prove an invalid point. Our copy of the Interlinear Bible uses Strong's numbers over the Hebrew and the English translation under the Hebrew word and it does not do what du Preez alleges might happen when using Strong's. In fact the word bara (Strong's 1254) simply means "to create"--not 'he create' as du Preez suggests.

On page 31 du Preez states, "Frankly, if we were to use Strong's we would have to abandon being 'Seventh-day Adventists' and need to become 'First-day Adventists'! Why? Because, according to my New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, the Christian is 'freed from' the 'Law of Moses,' 'Given at Sinai...Ex. 20:1-26).' Also, because the anti-Sabbath Strong's Concordance claims that the Sabbath was merely the 'seventh day during the Old Testament;' and then instructs the reader to, 'See First day of the week.' And, this is what it then alleges: The 'first day of the week—Sunday,' is the 'Day of worship,' which is 'called 'the Lord's day.'"

We could not substantiate any of du Preez's claims regarding Strong's treatment of the Sabbath mentioned above. We looked in our old Strong's and then ordered the latest edition and could not find it there either. Du Preez claims that Strong's "instructs the reader to, "See First day of the week." We have a problem with this alleged instruction because Strong's only identifies single words at a time so how can anyone look up ' First day of the week' in any case? We tried, but simply could not find anything. We looked up sabbath in the old testament and in the new testament and no reference was made to the first day of the week or to Sunday. We even looked up Revelation 1:10 that says "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." 'Lord's' is listed as Strong's 2960 and is defined as "--Belonging to the Lord (Jehovah or Jesus):--Lord's." There was no Sunday reference here either. We even looked up 'day' in this verse, but no luck there either.

We admit that we could be blind and overlooked the reference that du Preez is alleging exists, but we do not think so. Short of being shown that we are wrong, we are left with a couple of possibilities. Either du Preez was quoting someone else that was mistaken, or he is dishonest with his claims. In either case he is woefully misleading his readers into believing something that is simply not true.

Having pointed out the fallacy of du Preez's claim, we will play the devil's advocate and assume for a moment that he was correct in his charges against Strong's. Strong's only gives definitions to the words found in the Bible and that is what we are using to help us in our studies—definitions of words. It is

true that the context of the text will often determine the definition of the word that should be used and that is the reason that all Bible study should begin with a prayer asking for heavenly understanding in the study.

We will readily concede that probably most, if not all, of the people that worked on Strong's Concordance worship on Sunday and that their bias will be bent in that direction. However, most of du Preez's quotes from other resources outside of the SDA 'circle' will come from men that are also of the Sunday persuasion. In fact du Preez is studying for another doctorate under a Sunday-keeping professor at a non-SDA university. He is in essence being influenced by a professor that believes in Sunday observance. If in fact Strong's is discarded over the Sunday issue, then du Preez's testimony should also be discarded due to where he is receiving his education. We do not automatically find fault with that, but we do urge caution in using these sources that go beyond simply supplying definitions of words.

The following are some examples as to why we should not rely on theologians for our beliefs. Du Preez quotes a fellow by the name of G. Aalders on page 37 of his book to comment about the *moadim* referring to fixed times. "Essentially concurring with the above, G. Aalders notes: 'It is far more reasonable to think of these designations in a more general way as referring to seedtime and harvest time, which were, of course, determined by the heavenly bodies.'" The problem with using Aalders to support his position is that Aalders did not believe in a literal 24 hour creation day as evidenced by the following quote: "There have been many attempts to measure the creation day which God first established in terms of our standard of measuring time. There are still those today who are convinced that the creation days were simply 24-hour days. This is certainly without any substantiation in Scripture.... It will always remain an idle effort to measure the length of the creation days. It behooves us to humbly limit ourselves to the data given in the text of scripture." (Source: Book - G. H. Aalders, "Genesis" Translation by W. Heynen Zondervan Publishing. 1981 p. 58-59)

Can you see why it is important to carefully consider who you are quoting for your support and what they believe? The evidence becomes even more damning. Aalders continues: "It would be difficult to conceive of this 'seventh day' as an ordinary 24-hour day, as many claim, or as a day from sunup to sundown. This immediately raises the problem of whether God's rest continued for only one 24-hour day. Certainly, we must consider the possibility that this rest of God still continues. For us humans a day of rest is always followed by another series of work days. But this is not the case with God's creation days. With Him we have six days of creation and then one day of rest. But His day of rest is then not followed by more days of creation work. Our attention should also be called to the omission of any reference to 'evening' and 'morning' with respect to this day of rest. In the light of what has been said above, this is understandable. This seventh day began with a morning but it had no evening because it still continues." (Source: Book - G. H. Aalders, "Genesis" Translation by W. Heynen Zondervan Publishing, 1981 p. 75-76)

Amazing! Do you see the importance of what Aalders just said? He stated that we are still living in the seventh-day which effectively wipes out the seventh-day as a worship day. This is precisely what Satan is trying to do and we believe that he is altogether too successful in accomplishing his purposes through these so-called theologians that are wiping out the true meanings of scripture. The reason why Aalders came to such inaccurate conclusions is because he was using the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation. In his book, on p. 12, du Preez states that the use of the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation is "unacceptable to Adventists," yet du Preez then quotes from a number of theologians who use this very method. We will also show that this historical-critical method is based on idolatry which is expressly forbidden in the first commandment, where it reads, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." (Exodus 20:3) Again, the Kelli Factor has come into play as du Preez spins to the right, then spins to the left.

Here is another example as to why we should not rely on theologians for our beliefs. Du Preez liberally quotes a fellow by the name of Jacob Milgrom who is apparently a Jewish theologian who believes that the Sabbath is not a moed as the rest of the feasts are.

First, we need to explain what “moed” is. “Moed” is the Hebrew word for “feasts” or “appointed times” in Leviticus chapter 23, the chapter that introduces each of the feasts. This chapter tells us when these feasts are during the year and how to celebrate them. God begins Leviticus chapter 23 by saying, “And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, say unto them, concerning the feasts of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are My feasts (moed]) Six days shall work be done: but the seventh day is the sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein; it is the sabbath of the LORD in all your dwellings.”

(Parentheses inserted) The rest of the chapter speaks of the remaining yearly feast days. Notice that in this chapter God says, “These are My feast days,” and then He immediately gives us the every first feast day which is the Seventh-day Sabbath. Feast-keepers maintain that the Seventh-day Sabbath is a feast day because of this passage. However, du Preez does not want to admit that the Seventh-day Sabbath is a feast day, because to do so puts the Seventh-day Sabbath in the same category as the yearly feast days and would mean that if one observes the Seventh-day Sabbath, then one should also observe the rest of the moeds, or the yearly feast days. Du Preez wants to prove that these verses that begin Leviticus chapter 23 do not say what it clearly says—which is that the Seventh-day Sabbath is a “moed” or feast day. Again, this is an important distinction for SDA's to make because if the Sabbath and the rest of the feasts are all moeds (appointed times) then what is done for the Sabbath must also be done for the feasts. Evangelicals say that the Sabbath and the feasts are tied together and that they therefore fall together. Adventists separate them so that they keep the Sabbath, but discard the feasts and that is the reason that du Preez finds this point so important.

Now back to Milgrom. Milgrom does not believe that the Sabbath is a moed and that is the reason that du Preez quotes him in his book. However, on page 1953 of Milgrom's book *Leviticus 23-27*, listed as footnote 117 by du Preez in his book, Milgrom makes some rather amazing comments. He begins on page 1952 by putting Leviticus 23:1-2 in what he calls an introverted structure with each line having a letter assigned to it (A-E and X). Then this is what Milgrom says.

“By dint of the threefold repetition of miqra' qodes (BxB), this structure declares that the sabbath is a “sacred occasion,” which is sabbat, a day of rest for YHWH (D'), and a sabbat sabbaton 'a complete day of rest' for Israel (X). **It is also a moed 'a fixed time' (ACA'), namely, 'each seventh day' (X).**” Milgrom quotes a couple of scriptures and then states, “**Both changes, I submit, betray the author's time and place—in the Babylonian Exile...Similarly, as the following exegesis will substantiate, he desired to declare the sabbath a moed,** which it is not, and a miqra qodes, which it is not (see below).”

Milgrom admits that the author of Leviticus 23: 1-2 believed that the Sabbath was a moed. Milgrom does not believe that it was a moed and so he therefore says that this passage must have been written by some author who lived during the Babylonian exile. That removes Moses as the author. Think about the implications of this! We have been taught that God told Moses what to write in the Torah and that Moses did as he was told. Now we are being told that the author of this passage screwed up by thinking that the Sabbath was a moed. Therefore the author is not Moses, but rather some ignorant exile living in Babylon. The implication is that God is not the author of this passage! If you also believe that God is not the author of this passage (and others as well) then you can agree with du Preez that the Sabbath is not a moed with the rest of the feasts. To come up with this interpretation that God is not the author of Leviticus chapter 23, Milgrom is obviously using the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation which is a false method of interpretation. (See chapter five in this book for an in depth analysis of the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation.) On p. 12 of his book, du Preez

condemns the historical-critical method of interpretation, but then he quotes heavily from theologians who use this method. In his book on p. 73, du Preez states, "Milgrom plainly and repeatedly points out that 'the sabbath is not a moed.'" However, du Preez never tells you that on the same page that Milgrom says that the Sabbath is not a moed, he also says that the author of Leviticus chapter 23 obviously believed that the Seventh-day Sabbath was a moed. By not telling you, the reader of his book this critical information, du Preez is either a poor scholar because he didn't read the context of this quote, or he is dishonest by not sharing with you that Milgrom admits that the author of Leviticus chapter 23 believed that the Seventh-day Sabbath is a moed. We happen to believe that God is the author of Leviticus chapter 23 and we are sure that you do too. In fact, we have come in contact with several Jewish Messianic rabbis who know Hebrew fairly well and who all believe that the Seventh-day Sabbath is a moed. In fact, they believe that the Seventh-day Sabbath is the crown jewel of the moeds because of its frequency on a weekly basis in contrast to the rest of the feasts which are on a yearly basis.

Again, the Kelli Factor is at play here. Du Preez condemns the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation but then quotes from theologians that use this method. Du Preez quotes from a Jewish theologian who says the Seventh-day Sabbath is not a moed, but then fails to tell you that the same theologian admits that whoever wrote Leviticus chapter 23 believed the Seventh-day Sabbath is a moed. Circle to the right, then circle to the left, whichever way promotes du Preez' logic the best. This is what du Preez does over and over in his book.

We were only able to find out about the heresy that Milgrom is promoting because we spent \$45.00 on Amazon to purchase a used copy of his book. How many of you have purchased books to check out references quoted in a supposedly safe, approved book? We usually do not do that ourselves, but when we came across du Preez's quotes from Milgrom we were inspired to dig deeper than what we usually would do. This is one of the reasons that Ellen White says, "Before accepting any doctrine or precept, we should demand a plain "Thus saith the Lord" in its support. Satan is constantly endeavoring to attract attention to man in the place of God. He leads the people to look to bishops, to pastors, to professors of theology, as their guides, instead of searching the Scriptures to learn their duty for themselves. Then, by controlling the minds of these leaders, he can influence the multitudes according to his will." (*The Great Controversy* p. 595)

We will include one more short example why it is so important to follow the Bible and not other men. Du Preez has included in his book, beginning on page 264, a short article entitled "What About Easter" by George W. Reid, Phd who was the former director of the Biblical Research Institute. On page 265 Mr. Reid states, "The point is that the early Christians gave no attention to commemorating the resurrection day of Christ. If they had been serious they would be observing the 17<sup>th</sup> day of the Jewish month, Nisan, which begins with the first new moon following the spring solstice." Jesus was resurrected on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of the month, not the 17<sup>th</sup>, and there is no such thing as a spring solstice. There is a winter solstice and a spring equinox, but no spring solstice. We have all made silly mistakes like these ones, but in this case du Preez made the mistake of quoting a mistake made by George Reid from the BRI. Just because someone has lots of letters behind their name or has been director of some important organization does not automatically qualify them to lead a flock that is blindly following them. In fact they are human and make mistakes like the rest of mankind and their words should line up with scripture and not the other way around. The examples that we have shown back up the reason for the quote made by Ellen White that we have already included above.

We were, quite frankly, rather surprised at the way du Preez has described those of us that observe the feasts and how we study the scriptures. He calls us "prolific feast keepers" p. 82. We are not sure what that means. "Radical theories from a hasty surface reading of the KJV's mistranslated ancient English renderings." p. 82. He obviously does not like the King James Version. "Biblically

unsupportable and totally false claim.” p. 82. “Vain bid to bolster beliefs, random and non-biblical process.” p. 39. “Unwilling to accept the plain teachings of scripture.” p. 42. “Unwittingly depending upon unreliable study tools and subjective techniques, have simplistically concluded...” p. 70. Apparently du Preez believes that we are simple minded people that are being led to our false conclusions at least in part by studying the KJV and using unreliable study tools. “Implicit trust and slavish reliance upon Strong's Concordance, that inadequate and misleading research tool...randomly insert their own subjectively-selected out-of-context meanings.” p. 99-100. “Unbiblically spiritualizing away of scripture.” p.136. Out of context abuse of the word of God.” p. 137. “Vainly attempt.” p. 137. “Haphazard textual inventions.” p. 100. “Haphazard and inaccurate methods of interpreting certain passages and relying on loosely rendered Bible versions..” p. 103. “Festal calendar enthusiasts.” p. 107. “Randomly excise verse 16 from its context.” p. 109. “Desperate attempt to retain their unbiblical practices.” p. 209. Now for the most stunning quote of them all.

“Those who are fervently fostering the festal calendar are attempting to inject into scriptural Christianity what the inspired apostles rightly and roundly rejected as a spiritually-intoxicating Judaizing doctrine—ultimately, an actual *anti-Christ* movement.” p. 251. The words *anti-Christ* are italicized by du Preez to give extra emphasis.

Think about the implications of du Preez's last quote. An *anti-Christ* movement is by definition a satanic movement. We would like to show you a few of the people after the cross who have been involved in this movement and then let you decide if you think that du Preez is correct in calling this an *anti-Christ* movement.

We will now take a look and see if du Preez du Preez's position is supportable from scripture, Ellen White's writings, and from history. The following historical quote is found in the SDA Bible Commentary, Volume 9, page 362. It is a letter from Polycrates (one of the early Christians) to Victor, Bishop of Rome and is quoted here as written in the Commentary.

“Therefore we keep the day undeviatingly, neither adding nor taking away, for in Asia [Minor] great luminaries sleep, and they will rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he shall come with glory from heaven and seek out all the saints. Such were Philip...and two of his daughters....[p.507] There is also John, who lay on the Lord's breast....And there is also Polycarp at Smyrna, both bishop and martyr, and Thraseas, both bishop and martyr, from Eumeneae....[Also] Sagaris,...Papius,...and Melito....All these kept the fourteenth day of the passover according to the gospel, never swerving, but following according to the rule of the faith. And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, live according to the tradition of my kinsmen, and some of them have I followed. For seven of my family were bishops and I am the eighth, and my kinsmen ever kept the day when the people put away the leaven.”

According to what du Preez du Preez stated above, all of these men belonged to “an actual anti-Christ movement” because they kept passover long after the cross. Please note also that even the Apostle John always kept the feast according to Polycrates. Are we to believe that John the Revelator also belonged to “an actual anti-Christ movement” because he kept passover long after the cross? We do not think so. Therefore we believe that du Preez du Preez's conclusion is faulty based on the historical record.

Consider the following scriptural evidence that Paul kept the feasts and taught his converts to keep the feasts long after the cross.

Act 18:19 And he came to Ephesus, and left them there: but he himself entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews.

Act 18:20 When they desired *him* to tarry longer time with them, he consented not;

Act 18:21 But bade them farewell, saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem: but I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus.

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

1Co 5:8 Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened *bread* of sincerity and truth.

Ellen White makes some interesting comments about the following verse. Act 20:6 And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days.

“At Philippi Paul tarried to keep the Passover. Only Luke remained with him, the other members of the company passing on to Troas to await him there. The Philippians were the most loving and truehearted of the apostle's converts, and during the eight days of the feast he enjoyed peaceful and happy communion with them.” Acts of the Apostles pp. 390-391

Think about what Ellen White has just said. She obviously did not equate keeping the feast as being part of an anti-Christ movement otherwise she would not have spoken in such glowing terms about Paul's experience in keeping the feasts in Philippi. Also this feast was not kept in Jerusalem and no sacrifices were involved. Therefore, to assert that a person must be in Jerusalem and offer a sacrifice in order to keep a feast is simply not true, which is another assertion that du Preez makes.

According to du Preez's definition, the Apostle Paul also belonged to “an actual anti-Christ movement” because he kept the Passover long after the crucifixion. Ellen White says that Paul had a wonderful time with his converts in Phillippi during the eight days of the feast. The historical, scriptural, and Spirit of Prophecy evidence does not support du Preez's position.

Ellen White states that, “Jesus is our example in all things.” *Fundamentals of Christian Education* p. 50. Jesus kept the feasts, but He did not participate in the sacrificial system. Why would we be told to do as Jesus did, but that we would be part of an anti-Christ movement if we followed His example in keeping the feasts?

Under the chapter in which we analyze every point that du Preez makes against the feasts, we will show many more instances in which du Preez uses the Kelli Factor.

## Chapter Four

### Which Bible Version Is The Most Accurate

During the Dark Ages Satan set out to destroy the effectiveness of God's Word and he was very nearly successful. The Bible was written in a language that the average person could not understand (Latin) and was often chained to the church pulpit. Only the priests were allowed to read the Bible and they were to interpret what it said to the people. People were burned at the stake if they were found to have any portion of the Bible in their possession.

We look with horror on the barbaric way that the Scriptures were kept from the common people during those difficult years. It is easy for us to forget that Satan is as opposed to God's Word today as he was during the Dark Ages. With the advent of the printing press and now the electronic media it is impossible to limit access to God's word in the same way that Satan did during the Dark Ages so Satan has changed his tactics. If you cannot destroy the book then change what is written in the book and the results will be the same. Plenty of books have been written on this subject and so we will only provide a brief overview and will offer some examples of how the Bible has been changed with the so-called Modern Versions. In 1930 B. G. Wilkinson wrote the book *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* in support of the King James Version. B. G. Wilkinson was an eminent theologian of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and also president of a Seventh-day Adventist college for several years.

Wilkinson had this book challenged and so he then wrote another book entitled *Our Authorized Bible Answers to Objections* in which he thoroughly shows that his opponents were wrong. He is an amazing and accurate scholar as one can see by reading his writings. More recently Gail Riplinger's book *New Age Bible Versions* was also written in support of the King James Version. Both books are still available at [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com) if you are interested in some very interesting reading. We strongly encourage you to read these books to see for yourself the truth about what we are saying in this chapter.

Historically there are two streams of manuscripts that were saved through the centuries from which all of our Bibles come from. About a thousand ancient manuscripts from different parts of the world have been discovered that are in agreement throughout the entire manuscript. One thousand witnesses saying the same thing. It was from this stream that the Waldenses got their Bible that they preserved through the centuries. The Waldenses were Protestants in Italy who trace their heritage back to the Apostle John and who existed until the nineteenth century. The Waldenses are responsible for preserving the Protestants' version of the Bible. This is where the Textus Receptus comes from that the King James Version is based on and that most Protestants, until recently, have relied on.

The second stream of manuscripts comes from less than 1% of all the manuscripts that have been found. The Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Latin Vulgate, and the Jesuit Bible of 1582 are in this line of manuscripts. This was the line of manuscripts that the Catholic Church preserved. Interestingly, these few manuscripts differ in many major areas from the Textus Receptus line of manuscripts, but it is from these few manuscripts that nearly all of the modern versions come from. There are literally thousands of differences between these two lines of manuscripts so we will only show a few different texts that are representative of some of the differences.

Two Jesuits by the names of Westcott and Hort were involved in the late 1800's in a major revision of the Bible. B.G Wilkinson in his book *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, page 175, makes the following observation. "Even the jots and tittles of the Bible are important. God has pronounced terrible woes upon the man who adds to or takes away from the volume of Inspiration. The Revisers apparently felt no constraint on this point, for they made 36,000 changes in the English of the King James Version, and very nearly 6,000 in the Greek Text. Dr. Ellicott, in submitting the Revised Version to the Southern Convocation in 1881, declared that they had made between eight and nine changes in every five verses, and in about every ten verses three of these were made for critical purposes. And for the most of these changes the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts are responsible." We will now take a look at some of those changes.

The Lord's prayer found in Luke 11: 2-4 is an excellent example to begin with.

"And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil." (*King James Version*) Note that the underlined words in this passage are missing from the following versions.

"And he said to them, "When you pray, say: "Father, hallowed be your name. Your kingdom come. Give us each day our daily bread, and forgive us our sins, for we ourselves forgive everyone who is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation." English Standard Version  
"And He said to them, " When you pray, say: Father, hallowed be Your name. Your kingdom come. 'Give us each day our daily bread. 'And forgive us our sins, For we ourselves also

forgive everyone who is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation.” (*New American Standard Bible*)

He said to them, “When you pray, say: “Father, your kingdom come. Give us each day our daily bread. Forgive us our sins, for we also forgive everyone who sins against us. And lead us not into temptation.”” (*New International Version*)

Do you think that it is important to know which Father we are praying to? The Kings James Version states that we are praying to our Father in heaven, but the modern versions eliminate the words “in heaven.” According to the modern versions it is not clear whose father we are praying to. We could be praying to anyone’s father such as our Father in heaven, to our Father here on earth, or as Jesus said, “Your father the devil.” Is it important that we ask that God the Father’s will be done and that we ask Him to deliver us from evil? We think so, but we recognize that Satan does not think so and that is why Satan eliminated those words out of the Lord’s Prayer.

Most of the new versions completely leave out the following texts. Think of it! The following entire texts are completely missing from the modern versions. If fasting is a prerequisite for overcoming the devil, wouldn't you expect him to remove that condition from the Bible? Of course! Not surprisingly the word “fasting” has been completely eliminated from most of the new versions.

Mat 17:21 “Howbeit this kind (the devil, see vs. 18) goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.” (*King James Version*, parentheses inserted)

Mat 23:14 “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.” (*King James Version*) Since this entire verse is eliminated in the modern translations we can conclude that Satan wants the widows’ houses devoured. Satan also wants Christians to pray pretentious long prayers in order to make a mockery of prayer.

According to the new versions, we do not need to worry about keeping the commandments. Check out Revelation 22:14.

“Blessed *are* they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.” (*King James Version*)

“Blessed are those who wash their robes, that they may have the right to the tree of life and may go through the gates into the city.” (*New International Version*)

“Blessed are those who wash their robes, so that they may have the right to the tree of life, and may enter by the gates into the city.” (*New American Standard Bible*)

Is it any wonder that much of Christianity is no longer worried about keeping the commandments? After all, all they need to do is to wash their robes and they will enter heaven and have the right to the tree of life.

Conversion involves repentance, but goes beyond that. To be truly converted means that one is also growing daily in one’s Christian walk with God, or sanctification, in addition to repentance. The

modern versions change conversion to simply “repentance” or “change.” It is therefore no surprise that most Christians participate in repentance but neglect the sanctification element of true conversion. Matthew 18:3 illustrates this issue.

“And said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.” (*King James Version*)

“And said, Truly I say to you, unless you repent and become like little children, you can never enter the kingdom of heaven.” (*Amplified Bible*)

We have also found that in many places in the modern versions that Jesus has been brought down from being the Son of God to being just another good and holy man. Satan certainly wants to lower Jesus from His exalted position and he is masterfully doing that through these new translations. John 6:69 provides a good example.

“And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.” (*King James Version*)

“We have come to believe and to know that you are the Holy One of God.” (*New International Version*)

In 1 Timothy 3:16 God becomes “He” in the new versions but does not explain who “He” is. The reader is left guessing as to who “He” is since even the context of this verse in the modern versions does not tell you.

“And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.” (*King James Version*)

“Beyond all question, the mystery from which true godliness springs is great: He appeared in the flesh, was vindicated by the Spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the nations, was believed on in the world, was taken up in glory.” (*New International Version*)

“And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh, Justified in the spirit, Seen of angels, Preached among the nations, Believed on in the world, Received up in glory.” (*American Standard Version*)

Daniel 3:25 is also another good example of Jesus being removed from His exalted position as the Son of God. He simply becomes a “son of the gods.” Notice the word “gods” is not even capitalized. In the English language, when the word “god” is not capitalized it is referring to false gods. Thus the modern versions make Jesus out to be the son of false gods instead of the Son of the one true God.

“He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.” (*King James Version*)

“He said, ‘Look! I see four men walking around in the fire, unbound and unharmed, and the fourth looks like a son of the gods.’” (*New International Version*)

In Ephesians 3:14 the new versions drop out the fact that God is the Father of Jesus.

“For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,” (*King James Version*)

“For this reason I kneel before the Father,” (*New International Version*)

Joseph becomes the father of Jesus in Luke 2:33 in the new translations which is a false doctrine as the King James Version tells us that God the Father is the Father of Jesus and not Joseph. If Joseph is

indeed the father of Jesus then Jesus is not God and certainly not of divine origin. In other words, according to these modern versions, Jesus is a mortal just like any other man and not of divine origin because He had an earthly father and mother.

“And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.” (*King James Version*)

“The child’s father and mother marveled at what was said about him.” (*New International Version*)

In John 2:11 'miracles' become 'signs' in the new versions, which also supports the texts that Jesus was just a good or holy man as pointed out earlier. Only the true God can do a supernatural miracle whereas any human being can invent a sign.

“This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.” (*King James Version*)

“What Jesus did here in Cana of Galilee was the first of the signs through which he revealed his glory; and his disciples believed in him.” (*New International Version*)

Sometimes the new versions simply change the tense of the verbs, which changes the meanings. Colossians 2:17 is a good example.

“Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ.” (*King James Version*) Note the future tense in this text.

“These are a shadow of the things that were to come; the reality, however, is found in Christ.” (*New International Version*) Note the past tense.

Sometimes the new versions directly refute the King James Version as seen in Hosea 11:12. Note that the King James Version says that Judah rules with God and is faithful. The New International Version says that Judah is unruly against God and that God is faithful, not Judah.

“Ephraim compasseth me about with lies, and the house of Israel with deceit: but Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints.” (*King James Version*)

“Ephraim has surrounded me with lies, Israel with deceit. And Judah is unruly against God, even against the faithful Holy One.” (*New International Version*)

It is sad to note that it is these new versions that surround us with lies. Isaiah 14:12 is another good example.

“How you have fallen from heaven, morning star, son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations!” (*New International Version*)

If you are a new Christian and come across this text, you are left to wonder who the morning star is, especially if you are reading the New American Standard Bible. Our copy of the New American Standard Bible footnotes “morning star” to Revelation 22:16 which says that Jesus is the bright and morning star. You are led to believe that Jesus was cast down to the earth rather than Satan. Let us now look at the King James Version account of this verse in Isaiah 14:12.

“How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! *how* art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!” (*King James Version*)

Over and over we have found that the King James Version does not confuse people as to who Jesus is but the new translations do. We could give hundreds of other examples of how Satan is destroying

the meaning in the Scriptures through these new versions but we will limit ourselves to these few examples. We have already directed you to two good books (there are others as well) which will give you many more examples as to how the modern versions have changed the Bible. We strongly encourage you to read these books. We have concluded that if you rely on the modern version your faith will be seriously compromised, which is, of course, what Satan wants.

God does not take changing His Word very lightly. In fact, changing His Word is a salvational issue, according to the following verses.

“Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you.” (Deuteronomy 4:2)

“If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.” (Revelation 22:18-19)

According to these Bible texts, those who wrote these modern versions of the Bible will lose their salvation, unless they repent. Anyone who promotes these modern versions after knowing that these translators have changed the Bible in thousands of places, is also in danger of losing their salvation.

Now that we have shown a few examples of the ways that Satan has used to discredit Jesus and the Bible through the new translations that are based on the manuscripts preserved by the Catholic church, we will repeat what du Preez has said on this subject. “The real problem lay with the fact that so many people are unfortunately misled by the antiquated and obsolete language, as well as additional problems of trying to understand the King James Version, a translation that was never intended to be used in the twenty-first century....Unfortunately, most feast promoters tenaciously cling to the KJV—a translation with misleading ancient language that seems on the surface to undergird their theories and ideas...In brief, the answer to the ‘problem’ text of Genesis 19:3 lay in giving up slavishly clinging to the KJV.” P. 51

Du Preez’ position in regard to the King James Version is truly amazing! He says that “many people are unfortunately misled by the antiquated and obsolete language... a translation that was never intended to be used in the twenty-first century.” Do you clearly see what du Preez is doing? Du Preez is coming out against the version of the Bible preserved by the Protestant Waldenses and is instead promoting the versions of the Bible that come through the Catholic Church—versions that have been proven to have changed the Bible in thousands of places, which will cause them to lose their salvation. It is interesting to note that the Seventh-day Adventist pioneers primarily depended on the King James Version to help them as they hammered out the doctrines that eventually became part of the Seventh-day Adventist church. Were these doctrines incorrect? Du Preez is saying that if you rely on the King James Version, a version that is “antiquated and obsolete,” that you will come to incorrect conclusions. Take that to its logical end conclusion, and du Preez is saying that our church pioneers used an “antiquated and obsolete” version of the Bible; therefore, the doctrines they hammered out have to be defective. Du Preez is in effect subtly undermining the entire foundation and doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventist church by trashing the King James Version. Du Preez’ position is outright dangerous because he is supporting versions that seriously compromise Jesus as the Son of God and therefore compromise the foundation of our faith.

Du Preez attempts to “prove” that modern versions are perfectly fine because Ellen White quoted from a few of them. B. G. Wilkinson addresses this very point in his book *Our Authorized Bible Answers to Objections*, pp. 114-121, from which we have quoted enough excerpts to give you an

excellent idea as to what Wilkinson is trying to say. As you read what he says, remember that Wilkinson has already proved in his book, in many more instances than what we have given in this short chapter, the truth that the modern versions are corrupted by carefully comparing them with the King James Version in text after text and with many specific examples. In these books when Wilkinson says “Authorized Version” he means the King James Version. When he writes about the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus he is writing about the Bible that the Catholics preserved. Here is what he says:

“In the Index to the Writings of Mrs. E. G. White, I find that in the 28 volumes of her works that are there listed, that she is credited with making 15,117 references to the Bible. Of there, more than 95 out of every 100 are from the AV (KJV), and therefore less than 5 in 100 are from the Revised Version and all other versions combined. Less than 14 are from the Noyes’, Leesers’, and Rotherhams’s Versions... My Reviewers have stated that Sister White quoted the Revised Version as the Word of God. I answer that when the Revised Version or any other version translates a particular text clearly without error or untruth, that ONE special reference is surely the Word of God, wherever it is found in any version. Many statements may be quoted from the Douay Version that express the same truth as the Authorized Version, which agrees with the text which came through the uncorrupted manuscripts kept by the Waldenses and endorsed by the Spirit of Prophecy as the true Word of God. But a text in the Douay Version which teaches the worship of images or the worship of Mary, cannot be the true Word of God. Therefore she could never quote the Douay Version as the authoritative, complete Word of God... Certainly Sister White quoted the Revised and several other versions. The question is not, did she quote the Revised Version but what part of it did she quote? Did she ever quote any text from the Revised Version, which is entirely omitted in the Authorized Version? There is no true scripture which is not found in the Authorized Version. It is a complete, perfect, authoritative Bible. But did she ever quote any scripture as the true Word of God from the Authorized Version which is not found in the Revised? Certainly she did. Then which is the complete authoritative word of God? Mathematically, we must say “YES”, the Authorized and NOT the Revised. In other words, the Revised Version is not the complete, authoritative WORD of God because, first, it is not all there, and secondly, because it is not all there straight. When Sister White quotes as the Word of God texts which the Reviewers regard as spurious, to that extent, to that degree, they teach that the writings of Sister White are spurious. This is the logic of the Revised Version and those who accept it as authority. The omissions and many of the changes in the Revised are spurious or many of the AV quotations of Sister White are spurious. There is no middle ground...The Revised Version is guilty of adding to, changing and omitting the precious words of God. The Vatican and the Sinatic MSS, with more than 1,000 omissions and changes each, the Westcott and Hort text, the foundation of the Revised Version, are thus each and all weighed in the balances and found wanting...God foresaw that the last glorious third angel’s message would originate in the United States. He knew that it would first be proclaimed in the English language. He foresaw that the pioneers would use as their supreme authority the King James Version of 1611. Would the all-wise, all-foreseeing Author and Planner of the last appeal to fallen man, permit the translators of the Authorized Version of 1611 to give us an inferior version? Was the message which was endorsed and sealed by the Spirit of Prophecy, ever based upon and crystallized around a faulty translation? Was not the great last message preached as fully in its purity by Elder James White and other pioneers from 1844 to 1881, (or 1901, when the American Revised edition appeared), as it has been since those dates? Did the Message start wrong? Did the Message have to wait until the Revised Version appeared before it could be perfect? To every Seventh-day Adventist, the divine foreknowledge of God in this matter is an unanswerable argument for the truly superior authority of the Authorized Version...She (Ellen White) states that the manuscripts and texts that the Waldenses preserved as the Word of God were ‘uncorrupted’ and ‘unadulterated’...When the Holy Spirit, through God’s appointed prophet, endorsed

the MSS of the Waldenses as uncorrupted and unadulterated, then they are the “BEST ATTESTED MANUSCRIPTS”, and not the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus as my Reviewers told you. On this authority I rest, as final and decisive. To a Seventh-day Adventist, there is no appeal from this authority. On this rock, brethren, we may all build for eternity and ‘the gates of hell’ shall not prevail against it.” (*Our Authorized Bible Answers to Objections*, pp. 114-121)

Wilkinson develops the thought that the Waldenses preserved the true and accurate version of God’s Word through the ages in the following statement. “The philosophy of the Revisers and the Reviewers seems to be that the church of Rome was the real guardian of the true Word of God; while the Waldenses held only inferior manuscripts. This is squarely contradictory to the Spirit of Prophecy. I quote from the “Great Controversy” (p. 64), ‘The church in the wilderness, and not the proud hierarchy enthroned in the world’s great capital, was the true church of Christ, the guardian of the treasures of truth which God has committed to His people to be given to the world.’ The Vaticanus MS was preserved in the Vatican Library; the Sinaiticus was preserved in a Catholic monastery. Both of these MSS were thus kept and guarded by ‘the proud hierarchy enthroned in the world’s great capital.’ **But Sister White says the church in the Wilderness, and not this proud hierarchy was ‘the guardian of the treasures of truth’, or as she states above, ‘the written Word of God’. What is this but equivalent to saying that the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus are not the treasures of truth, the written Word of God.** The church in the wilderness did not preserve the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS, but those which agreed with the Received Text. The Sinaiticus and the Vatican MSS kept by the Roman Catholic Church then could not be the true word of God, if Great Controversy states the truth. The Spirit of Prophecy is God’s last word to His Church in this final crisis, when Rome has regained temporal sovereignty and is fast climbing into the throne of world dominion again, determined to use her fearful power to destroy the truth and reign triumphant just before the coming of Christ. I raise my voice, in my book, in protest against this teaching that the Waldenses kept only inferior manuscripts; and that the church of Rome ‘who wore out the saints of the most high,’ the great destroyer, that this power controlled by Satan preserved the true word of God.” (*Our Authorized Bible Vindicated Answers to Objections*, p. 113)

Remember that ALL modern versions are based on the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus preserved by the Catholic Church while the King James Version is based on the version preserved by the Waldenses. Ellen White says that the Waldenses preserved the truth, not the Catholic Church. Therefore, anyone who knows this and still comes out in support of the modern versions against the King James Version is a wolf in sheep’s clothing. Since the SDA Church’s pioneers used the King James Version to hone out the doctrines of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church, anyone who downgrades the King James Version in favor of modern versions which seriously corrupt our faith is undermining the very foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This is what du Preez does in his book.

To recap, was Jesus just the son of Joseph and not the Son of God? Can we forget about keeping the commandments and just keep our robes clean? Did Jesus really not do any supernatural miracles but instead did signs to impress the people? If so, then He really was not the Son of God as He claimed, but just another good man with some extraordinary talents as Satan claims. This is what the modern versions would have you believe—versions which seriously compromise and corrupt the Christian’s faith. According to Gail Riplinger’s book *New Age Bible Versions*, the modern versions have eliminated over 60,000 words from the King James Version. These words are not “thee’s, and’s, and thou’s.” Rather, these 60,000 words that have been eliminated are major words. Even entire verses have been eliminated as shown earlier in this chapter. Truly Satan has succeeded in significantly watering down the truth and even changing the truth in the Bible. The Bible version that you use will change the

gospel that you follow which will ultimately affect your salvation. If we are being misled by studying the King James Version as du Preez claims, then the whole foundation of the SDA church is at risk because the SDA pioneers also used the King James Version as their primary study Bible.

The only way du Preez can attempt to effectively refute our book *God's Holidays* is by denigrating and trashing the foundation of our book which is the King James Version of the Bible. That is exactly what he has attempted to do.

The Kellie factor rises again. We can chase these modern Bible versions around and around, but eventually our relationship with Jesus will be seriously compromised if we persist in following these modern versions rather than the King James Version as one can easily see from the examples given in this chapter. Satan has just as effectively destroyed the Bible from within as if he had burned it from without. "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour. (1 Peter 5:8)

## Chapter 5

### **Many Of The Theologians Quoted by du Preez Use An Incorrect Method of Biblical Interpretation**

Du Preez says in his book that he is against the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation and then he turns right around and quotes theologian after theologian who use the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation to come up with his conclusions. In order to prove this to you we must first give you a brief overview of exactly what the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation is. As we studied this issue out we found that the majority of theologians today use the historical-critical method but they do not want the laity of the church to know that they use this method because they know the storm of protest that would rain down upon them. Therefore they cleverly disguise their use of the historical-critical method. However, the Bible says, "Ye shall know them by their fruits." (Matthew 7:16) These theologians always reveal themselves by their fruits.

We are convinced that the historical-critical method is the greatest enemy of the Christian faith because this method believes that the Bible is not the inspired Word of God. We were absolutely stunned when we found this out. Amazing! The majority of theologians today do not believe that the Bible is God's inspired word; rather, these theologians say, the Bible was written by a group of men who were writing what they believed was the truth, but which was not necessarily truth that comes from God. This method began in the 1700's when intellectualism known as The Enlightenment, the Age of Reason, or humanism began. This philosophy believes that one can only believe that which can be proven scientifically or by human reasoning. It was this philosophy that led to the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation. Edgar Krentz, in *The Historical Critical Method*, p. 63, says that since the second World War historical criticism is taken for granted by theologians and that today it is so firmly established that it can no longer "be dislodged by any attack." As a result, the majority of books published today by theologians use the historical-critical method. Du Preez quotes heavily from these theologians in his book in order to refute our book, *God's Holidays*. Our question is, "Why does du Preez have to use these theologians in order to refute our book? If what du Preez says is the truth,

why can't he simply use the Bible to refute us?" In trying to answer these questions ourselves, we can come up with no good answer other than du Preez is unable to refute our book using the Bible alone therefore he has to call on the aid of many theologians who use a false method of Biblical interpretation. The idea behind this is if your argument is weak, then call on multiple theologians with inadequate proof from the Bible, and if enough of these theologians emphasize what they say by pounding their ideas hard on the podium, then someone is going to believe what they say. This is what du Preez has done in his book, which we will show as we go point by point through his book in a later chapter.

The historical-critical method sits in judgment on the Bible. The basic premise is that erring human beings wrote the Bible, therefore not everything in the Bible is to be trusted as true. The theologians, after their critical examination, decide which portions of the Bible they think are true and which are not. The problem with this has led to great confusion, for one theologian will say a certain part of the Bible is correct and another part incorrect. Then yet another theologian comes along with the opposite opinion and says that the part of the Bible the last theologian said was incorrect is really correct and what he said was correct is really incorrect. According to "The Historical-Critical Method of Bible Interpretation" by Siegbert W. Becker, "This vacillation in scholarly opinion is accepted as normal. It is a common view among theologians today that the only thing we can be certain about is that nothing is certain. But if they are so sure that nothing is certain one is inclined to wonder how they can be so sure of this that nothing is certain." This method sets human beings up as being judge over the Bible. The end result is that these theologians think they are wiser and smarter than God Himself. In other words, they have set themselves up as God. This makes the historical-critical method a form of idolatry. Rudolf Bultmann, one of the eminent modern theologians who has advanced the historical-critical method, shows his fruit when he says, "Man's knowledge and mastery of the world have advanced to such an extent through science and technology that it is no longer possible for anyone seriously to hold the New Testament view the world—in fact, there is no one who does." (*Kerygma and Myth*, p. 4) Even Jesus is not immune to their criticism. C.H. Dodd wrote, "Jesus, as He is represented, shared the views of His contemporaries regarding the authorship of books of the Old Testament, or the phenomena of 'demon-possession'-views which we could not accept without violence to our sense of truth." (*The Authority of the Bible*, p. 237) These theologians question the divinity of Jesus which has led some of them to say that Jesus was a human being who could make mistakes. Nothing in the Bible is immune from their criticism, including the divinity of Jesus. Since someone being raised from the dead cannot be scientifically verified, therefore these theologians question the resurrection of Jesus as well. Paul the apostle said, "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and our faith is also vain." (1 Corinthians 15:13, 14) The end result of the historical-critical method is the total destruction of the Christian's faith. The strange thing is that these very theologians claim to be guarding the faith. This sounds to us like the tale of the fox guarding the hen house.

The historical-critical method carefully analyzes each section of the Bible and if they feel that literarily there is a change in style of writing, then they declare that this denotes a different original author. By this method they have decided that Moses really didn't write the first five books of the Old Testament; rather, Moses simply copied from thirteen different sources. However, these theologians don't know who these sources are, so they label them with different letters. For instance, they say that D wrote the majority of Deuteronomy. P is the priestly writer who wrote the parts of the Mosaic Law that have to do with Levitical worship. Others known as R1, R2, RJE, J, E, etc., wrote the rest of the Mosaic Law, or Torah. None of these sources have ever been discovered, yet these theologians speak of these so called "people" as if they really existed. However, no proof has ever been found that these "people" exist except in the minds of these theologians. What this also does is make Moses out to be a

liar as the Bible is clear that Moses claims authorship of these books. Jesus agrees and also calls Moses the author (see John 5:46-47). The logical end conclusion is that then Jesus is also either a liar or, at the very least, incorrect, by saying that Moses also wrote the Mosaic Law. However, when one remembers that these theologians believe that Jesus was just a mere fallible human being then this is not surprising. These theologians have done the same with the gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John) in the New Testament. They insist that by carefully studying the literary styles of these books that Matthew and Luke copied from Mark and some of them throw John out as being an unreliable book. They say that since Matthew, Mark, and Luke copied from the same source, they have named this source as Q. The end result of this that Matthew, Mark, and Luke were not eyewitnesses of Jesus' life, as they claim. Without an eyewitness account, then everything they write about Jesus is suspect and may or may not have been true. In fact, the amount of work these theologians expend in dissecting the Bible often puts to shame the zeal of those who confess to believe in the Bible as the reliable and true Word of God.

These theologians also say that many of the stories in the Bible were passed from person to person in ancient society, and as these stories were passed around by word of mouth, changes were made to the stories and then these stories were eventually written into the Bible and are therefore not reliable and accurate. However, they say, what was written into the Bible was the belief of the church at that time in history. Notice they do not say that this was the belief of God but rather, of the church at that time.

These theologians also do not believe in miracles, since miracles cannot be proven by science and reason cannot account for them. Therefore, all the miracles that Jesus did, the virgin birth of Jesus, the transfiguration, the feeding of the five thousand, His resurrection, and ascension are all myths. They rationalize away Jesus' healing of the sick by saying that He merely cured psychosomatic illnesses; in other words, these people weren't really physically sick, they just had psychological problems and thought they were sick. Since reason cannot account for prophecy, the part of the Bible that predicts the future must have been written after the account happened and not before, as the Bible claims. Therefore these theologians throw out all prophecy in the Bible. These theologians also deny the literal six-day creation week, saying instead that they believe in theistic evolution where the earth was created by God over thousands of years. The problem with this belief, however, is that then death was occurring long before the fall of man, making the Bible out to be wrong when it says that death is a result of sin (see Romans 6:23). These theologians also deny the sinless state of man before the fall and the Biblical account of Noah's flood. They also say that homosexuality is not a sin, although the Bible clearly defines it as a sin in both the Old and New Testaments.

In the 1980's a German theologian by the name of Eta Linnemann created shock waves throughout the theological community when she renounced the historical-critical method as heresy. She had studied under the prominent historical critical theologian Rudolf Bultmann, completed the requirements to become a university professor, and was promoted to high positions including honorary professor of the New Testament at Philipps University in Marburg, West Germany. However, she had a personal crisis and shortly after that came in contact with Christians who led her into a conversion and relationship with Jesus. Her conversion led her to renounce all that she had previously written, including two books, she gave up her position at Philipps University, and became a missionary in Indonesia. She since has written another book explaining why she turned against the historical-critical method entitled *Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology: Reflections of a Bultmannian Turned Evangelical*. If you wish to study this further we suggest that you obtain this book.

We have been warned about the dangers of false interpretations of the Bible. "Infidelity prevails to an alarming extent, not in the world only, but in the church. Many have come to deny doctrines which are the very pillars of the Christian faith. The great facts of creation as presented by the inspired

writers, the fall of man, the atonement, the perpetuity of the law—these all are practically rejected by a large share of the professedly Christian world. Thousands who pride themselves on their knowledge regard it as an evidence of weakness to place implicit confidence in the Bible, and a proof of learning to cavil at the Scriptures and to spiritualize and explain away their most important truths. (*Prophets and Kings*, p. 625) “The widespread iniquity prevalent today may in a great degree be attributed to a failure to study and obey the Scriptures, for when the word of God is set aside, its power to restrain the evil passions of the natural heart is rejected.” (*Prophets and Kings*, p. 624) “The truths most plainly revealed in the Bible have been involved in doubt and darkness by learned men, who, with a pretense of great wisdom, teach that the Scriptures have a mystical, a secret, spiritual meaning no apparent in the language employed. These men are false teachers.” (*Great Controversy*, p. 598) “All who value their eternal interests should be on their guard against the inroads of skepticism. The very pillars of truth will be assailed. It is impossible to keep beyond the reach of the sarcasms and sophisms, the insidious and pestilent teachings, of modern infidelity. Satan adapts his temptations to all classes. He assails the illiterate with a jest or sneer, while he meets the educated with scientific objections and philosophical reasoning, alike calculated to excite distrust or contempt of the Scriptures. Even youth of little experience presume to insinuate doubts concerning the fundamental principles of Christianity. And this youthful infidelity, shallow as it is, has its influence. Many are thus led to jest at the faith of their fathers and to do despite to the Spirit of grace. Hebrews 10:29. Many a life that promised to be an honor to God and a blessing to the world has been blighted by the foul breath of infidelity. All who trust to the boastful decisions of human reason and imagine that they can explain divine mysteries and arrive at truth unaided by the wisdom of God are entangled in the snare of Satan. (*Great Controversy*, pp. 600, 601)

No doubt many will say that these errors promoted by the historical-critical method have not invaded our church. Yet, back in the 1970’s, in the class on the Harmony of the Gospels at Walla Walla College, we were taught that Q was the one who wrote the majority of the gospels, not Matthew, Mark, and Luke. One of our children, at the same college, was in a class by their major professor in which this professor stated that he believed in theistic evolution and not a literal six-day creation. Another friend of ours, who struggled with homosexuality, was told by a theology professor at another one of our universities that homosexuality is not a sin and that Jonathan and David in the Bible had a homosexual relationship. These errors that are taught by the historical-critical method are indeed invading our beloved church.

As we go point by point through du Preez’ book against the feasts, we will show that many of the theologians that du Preez quotes from use the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation which is strange, when one considers that in this same book du Preez states that he is against the historical-critical method. The Kelli Factor is again at play.

## Chapter 6

### **Are You Worshipping the One True God In Heaven? Or Are You Worshipping Baal? Are You Sure?**

Several thousand years ago, the prophet Elijah had a big show-down on the top of Mount Carmel with 450 of the the prophets of Baal. You can read all about it in 1 Kings chapter 18. Think about it. One true prophet of God, Elijah, against 450 of the prophets of Baal. Elijah was definitely outnumbered. The issue at stake was, “Who are you going to worship? The one true God of Heaven, or Baal?”

Most people today know very little about Baal worship. Amazingly, Baal worship is alive and well today, having been cleverly disguised and re-packaged by the enemy, Satan. Most Christians today are involved in Baal worship and don't even know it. They have been deceived the enemy.

To educate yourself about how Baal worship pervades modern Christianity, we suggest that you peruse the website [www.toolong.com](http://www.toolong.com) which contains a lot of free information on this subject. If you want to study this subject out for yourself, we suggest that you start by ordering the book *Too Long In the Sun* from this website. When you are done with this book, then order some of the other materials such as the DVD series *Time Is The Ally Of Deceit*. The author of this website, with documented proof, shows that many of our modern holidays, but especially Christmas and Easter, come straight out of ancient Baal worship. The Catholic Church, in order to bring the pagans into the church, at the Council of Niceae in A.D. 325, abolished God's feast days and instead, brought the pagan feast days into the church and proclaimed these pagan feasts as God's feasts. (See elsewhere in this book where we quote the Catholic Church where they admit that they abolished the Jewish feast days.) Indeed, Satan has carried out his promise, in Isaiah 14:13, to replace God's feasts with his own feast days and by so doing, replaced the worship of the one true God with the worship of himself, disguised as Baal. Easter is the conception date of Baal and Christmas is the birthdate of Baal and not the birthdate of Jesus, as we have been told. How clever of Satan to do this! The Bible never abolishes the feast days, but history certainly tells us who did. The Catholic Church did. All of this is proven on this website [www.toolong.com](http://www.toolong.com) and in the books and DVD's you can buy on this website.

Now back to Elijah on Mount Carmel facing the 450 prophets of Baal. The issue then was, "Are you going to worship the one true God of Heaven on His worship days? Or are you going to worship Baal on his worship days? Are you going to worship on Sabbath, God's weekly worship day, or are you going to worship on Sunday, which is Baal's weekly worship day? Are you going to keep Baal's feast day of Easter or are you going to observe God's feast day of Passover and Unleavened Bread? Are you going to observe God's Day of Atonement or are you going to observe Baal's feast day of St. Valentine's Day? Are you going to observe the God's Feast of Tabernacles or are you going to observe Baal's feast day of Christmas?" That was the issue on Mount Carmel. Satan's tactics haven't changed, although he has gotten more clever at disguising his tactics. The issue is the same today. "Who are you going to worship? The true God of Heaven? Or Baal?"

Elijah said to all the people on Mount Carmel, "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the LORD be God, follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him." (1 Kings 18:21) Here is our answer. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve...but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD." (Joshua 24:15) What is your answer?

## Chapter 7

### 1. RULES OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION

At the beginning of our book, *God's Holidays*, we list out the same rules of Biblical interpretation that we do in this chapter. We have never had any theologian able to find fault with any of our rules of Biblical interpretation. We noticed that not once did du Preez, in his book, try to refute any of our rules. Du Preez did list out his rules of Biblical interpretation also at the beginning of his book and we do not find any fault with any of his rules either. We find that du Preez frequently breaks some of the Biblical Rules of Interpretation. Throughout our response, we will point out where du Preez breaks these rules. Indeed, we have found that every time someone tries to refute the feasts that they have to break some of the Biblical Rules of Interpretation in order to do so. When these rules are broken, you may be assured that truth is not arrived at. Here are the rules that we have followed in all of our writings, including this book:

1. 1. With a good concordance, search out everything the Bible says on the subject before coming to a conclusion. “For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little.” (Isaiah 28:10) One can pull out a Bible text to prove just about anything, but when one first looks at all the Bible texts on a certain subject, then a pattern of truth will emerge.
2. 2. All conclusions should be based upon the weight of evidence and must make logical sense. God created us with minds to think and He appeals to our intellect. “Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord.” (Isaiah 1:18)
3. 3. Each passage of Scripture should be carefully considered in its context. What does the Bible say before and after the passage? First we must consider the immediate passage, then the chapter, book, other books by the same author, and finally other writers of the Bible.
4. 4. A literal interpretation of the Bible should be given unless the context clearly shows that the verses under consideration are symbolic. When the interpretation is symbolic, the Bible will tell us the meaning of the symbol either in that passage or elsewhere. The Bible must always interpret itself. “The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed...If men would but take the Bible as it reads, if there were no false teachers to mislead and confuse their minds, a work would be accomplished that would make angels glad and that would bring into the fold of Christ thousands upon thousands who are now wandering in error.” (*Great Controversy*, p. 599) Read the whole chapter from which this quote is taken.
5. 5. One text of the Bible must not undo another text. The Bible never conflicts with itself. “One saying of the Saviour must not be made to destroy another.” (*Great Controversy*, p. 371)  
Sometimes Bible texts, at first glance, can appear to contradict with other texts, but upon a deeper study, the contradiction will disappear. For instance, one can find Bible texts that appear to support works in order to obtain salvation. Elsewhere, the Bible states that faith obtains salvation. On the surface these texts appear to be contradicting each other, but upon deeper study one finds that works and faith are the flip sides of the same coin. Without one the other does not exist. Sometimes the Bible will give us a harmonizing text and sometimes it will not, leaving us to do the harmonizing.  
Here is a harmonizing text. “Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works.” (James 2:18)
6. 6. All words should be accurately defined and understood. A good dictionary and concordance will aid in this. Since, over time, language changes, sometimes we have to search a word through a prophet’s writings to see how they define that word so we can correctly understand what they are saying.
7. 7. We cannot conclude more or less than the evidence allows. “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you.” (Deuteronomy 4:2) “If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.” (Revelation 22:18-19) These are serious words not to be taken lightly.
8. 8. Consider the words of the text in the original languages. We do not need to be scholars studying Greek and Hebrew in order to do this. Using *Strong’s Concordance* one can easily find the original meaning of a word. As in English, some words in Greek and Hebrew have multiple meanings. Sometimes a contradiction may appear because the wrong definition of the word was used. However, by carefully considering all texts on a subject, one can determine the correct definition. For instance, in the parable of the talents in Matthew 25:24 we read, “Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed.”

Elsewhere in the Bible, God is portrayed as a loving master. At first glance, one could say that the Bible is contradicting itself. However, *Strong's Concordance* gives several definitions for the word *knew* in this verse. One definition is the word *perceive*. The word *perceive* should have been used by the translator because the text would then read that this servant is stating his definition of what he thinks or perceives God's character to be like, which, according to other Bible verses, is not true.

9. Each prophecy in the Bible has a beginning and ending point in time, and the elements within this prophecy occur in chronological order. Daniel chapter 2 gives us a model. In this chapter the head of the image, which represents Babylon, comes before the chest, which represents Medo-Persia, which comes before the belly, which represents Greece, etc. Also, when God sets up a pattern, He never breaks this pattern. At times the Bible clearly sets out the beginning of a pattern. By following this pattern one can then determine the rest of the pattern and discover wonderful truths. For example, here is a pattern: three, six, nine. Once we see this pattern the next number is easy to determine. Our Heavenly Father is a God of logic and order.
10. Pray that the Holy Spirit will guide your mind before beginning to study because without the Holy Spirit one cannot obtain truth. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Corinthians 2:14) We need to pray for spiritual discernment. "There are deep mysteries in the word of God, which will never be discovered by minds that are unaided by the Spirit of God." (*Testimonies*, Vol. 4, p. 444) "God can do more in one moment to convict people than we can do in a lifetime." (*Signs of the Times*, November 7, 1900)

William Miller was a great evangelist during a mighty spiritual revival that took place worldwide in the early 1800's. The following quote states how he studied the Bible. "Endeavoring to lay aside all preconceived opinions, and dispensing with commentaries, he compared scripture with scripture by the aid of the marginal references and the concordance...When he found anything obscure, it was his custom to compare it with every other text which seemed to have any reference to the matter under consideration... Thus whenever he met with a passage hard to be understood he found an explanation in some other portion of the Scriptures. As he studied with earnest prayer for divine enlightenment, that which had before appeared dark to his understanding was made clear...He saw that the prophecies, so far as they had been fulfilled, had been fulfilled literally; that all the various figures, metaphors, parables, similitudes, etc., were either explained in their immediate connection, or the terms in which they were expressed were defined in other scriptures, and when thus explained, were to be literally understood...Angels of heaven were guiding his mind and opening the Scriptures to his understanding." (*Great Controversy*, p. 320)

**We need to know the milk of the Word (see 1 Peter 2:2), which is how to have a relationship with God. However those who wish to advance beyond being babes in Christ will desire to study deeply into the meat of the Word. See Hebrews 5:13-14. "Whom shall He teach knowledge? And whom shall He make to understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts. For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little." (Isaiah 28:9-10) This text is saying that those who wish to advance beyond the milk of the Word of God must study the Bible deeply, and the method of Bible study is by combining all the texts on the subject and putting them together. We have found from personal experience that this method of Bible study does indeed yield rich mines of truth from the Word of God.**

## Chapter 8

### Point By Point Through the Old Testament

In writing this response to du Preez, we were faced with a dilemma which is that du Preez goes down so many rabbit holes, some of which can take several pages to adequately show to be false, which would cause our book to be so long that few would read it. The majority of du Preez' proof is other theologians. When we ordered these theologians' books and looked up the quotes that du Preez had quoted, no one time did we find that they gave adequate Biblical proof for their position. Most of the time they merely quoted other theologians themselves or made their assertion without any proof. Not once did we find that any of these theologians were able to prove their point, that du Preez was quoting, from the Word of God. We are not interested in what other theologians say; rather, we are interested in what God has to say. We believe that you, our readers, are of the same position. In Chapter Five we did deal with some of what these other theologians had to say and we also showed that the majority of these theologians use the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation, which is a false method. Therefore we decided that from here on we will address only those points for which du Preez gives Biblical or Ellen White proof. Du Preez writes his book in question and answer form and so the readers of this book can clearly see what question is being answered, we will begin each point with the question that du Preez asks.

**“Shouldn't we be referring to these appointed seasons as 'Yahweh's feasts,' since He set them up and claims them as His own?” (Feast-Keeping and the Faithful, p. 25)**

Du Preez begins this section on the Old Testament on p. 25 by trying to prove that the feasts should be called Jewish festivals instead of being called God's festivals. We find it rather incredible that he would even make this assertion, but nonetheless, he does. This comes across as blatant anti-Semitism. After all, God is the one who gave all of this instruction to the Israelites so naturally, they would be God's feasts, which He entrusted to the Israelites, who were then supposed to share this instruction with the world. The majority of Isaiah chapter 56 is dedicated to this theme that the Israelites were supposed to share what God entrusted to them with the world. Here are representative texts from this chapter. “Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the LORD, to serve Him, and to love the name of the LORD, to be His servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of My covenant; Even them will I bring to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in My house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon Mine altar; **for Mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.**” This chapter makes it quite clear that the Israelites were to share their knowledge that God had entrusted to them, with the world, and their sanctuary was to be regarded as the sanctuary for the entire world, not just Jews.

Ellen White agrees. “It is impossible to enumerate the advantages the Lord prepared for the world in making the Jewish nation the repository of His rich treasures of knowledge. They were the subjects of His special favor. As a people who knew and worshipped the true God, they were to communicate the principles of His kingdom...Their feasts, the Passover, the Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, and the ceremonies attending these gatherings, were to proclaim the truths that God had entrusted to His people.” (*The Upward Look*, p. 232) Notice in this quote that Ellen White makes a distinction between the ceremonies (which we know to be the sacrificial system and which ended at the cross according to Daniel 9:27) and the feasts. If the feasts are part of the ceremonial system, as the church says, then she would have simply said, “Their ceremonies were to proclaim the truths...” But she didn't. She listed out the feasts and the ceremonies separately. The ceremonies have ended, but the feasts remain. She says that these feasts were to be used for evangelistic purposes, to proclaim the truth to the world. How

much opportunity in evangelism the SDA church is missing out on by not celebrating the feasts today! Many people, both within and outside of our church are waking up to the fact that the feasts, including the Seventh-day Sabbath, are important. The Holy Spirit is agitating this in a huge way right now. Where are the people outside of our church going? We have asked some of them. Here's what a number of them said. They said, "We first went to the SDA Church because we knew they kept the Sabbath, but when we found out they threw out the Mosaic Law and the feasts, we left and went to the Messianic Jews." How sad! Indeed, we are missing out on a huge evangelistic tool. Sad to say, the SDA Church is either disfellowshipping or freezing out many SDA feast keepers at the present time, simply because they are following the example of Jesus in the observance of the feasts. If Jesus and the apostles were present on earth today, I guess they would be frozen out too, because Jesus and the apostles all kept the feasts as we have already proven.

"And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, Concerning the feasts of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are **My feasts.**" (Leviticus 23:1-2) Isn't it interesting, that in the chapter where God presents all of His feasts, that the first thing God says is to assert that these are His feasts. Yes, as du Preez points out, elsewhere, as in Numbers 29:39, God does say to the Israelites that these are their feasts, but that is because God has given them as a gift to the Israelites, which they were to share with the world. Du Preez also quotes other Bible texts that call the feasts "Jewish" such as John 2:13; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2; 11:55. Du Preez then concludes by saying, ""Therefore, since the Holy Spirit has inspired the beloved apostle John, who was closest to Jesus during His earthly ministry, to select and utilize the term 'Jewish feast' or 'Jewish festival' when referring specifically to the pilgrim feasts, whenever one or more of these pilgrim festivals (i.e. Passover/Unleavened Bread, Pentecost, and Tabernacles) is being discussed, this book mayh copy the language of Scripture, and thus employ the completely appropriate terms of 'Jewish feast(s)' or 'Jewish festivals(s).'" The question begs asking, "Why does du Preez make this such a big issue? As one reads what du Preez wrote, he obviously downplays God saying that these are His feasts and instead plays up that these are "Jewish" feasts. Why does du Preez do this? It appears to us, that du Preez is trying to distance the feasts from the Christian faith and make them "Jewish" and therefore, not "Christian." The implication is then, that since they are not "Christian" we no longer need to observe the feasts. Here du Preez breaks a critical rule of Biblical Interpretation which is that to arrive at truth one must carefully consider all the texts on a subject and then harmonize them. Du Preez does not harmonize them; rather, he appears to put God saying these are "His feasts" (Leviticus 23:1-2) in direct opposition to where John the apostle says that these are "Jewish feasts." These texts need to be harmonized. And when they are, then we know that we have arrived at truth.

According to the Bible, the true Israelite, or Jew, is God's true people, and not the literal nation of Israel. (Yes, God hoped that all of literal Israel would choose to among His true people, but the majority of them apostasized from the faith.) Paul makes this quite clear. "For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel; Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." (Romans 9:6-8) "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: fo rye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Galatians 3:28-29) These texts make it quite clear that the true Israel is God's true people.

Ellen White repeatedly calls God's people "Israel." Here's a representative quote. "The sky opened and shut and was in commotion. The mountains shook like a reed in the wind and cast out ragged rocks all around. The sea boiled like a pot and cast out stones upon the land. And as God spoke the day and the hour of Jesus' coming and delivered the everlasting covenant to His people, He spoke one sentence, and then paused, while the words were rolling through the earth. **The Israel of God** stood with their

eyes fixed upward, listening to the words as they came from the mouth of Jehovah and rolled through the earth like peals of loudest thunder. (*Early Writings*, p. 285)

On p. 27 du Preez asserts that “the gospel of John is widely considered to be the last written book of the New Testament, produced somewhere between A.D. 95 and 100” and that “John never refers to the annual set times as 'Christian' celebrations; rather, he labels them 'Jewish' feasts and that repeatedly...” In other words, what du Preez is trying to have you believe is that many years after the cross, the early Christians finally got it right and admitted that these feasts were Jewish and not Christian and therefore the early Christians stopped observing the festivals. Not so, according to a famous letter written about A.D. 150 by Polycrates, a Christian bishop. This letter was reprinted in the *SDA Bible Commentary* in Vol. 9, p. 362. We also found this same letter quoted on the internet by the Catholic Church. This letter was written by this Christian bishop to the Pope in Rome protesting the fact that Rome was trying to change the celebration of Passover to a different day, the pagan day of Easter. The source the *SDA Commentary* used for this quote is *Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History*. "Source: Polycrates, Letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, quoted in *Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History* v. 24. 2-8; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 505, 507, 509. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. Here's the letter:

"[p. 505] **Therefore we keep the day undeviatingly, neither adding nor taking away**, for in Asia [Minor] great luminaries sleep, and they will rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he shall come with glory from heaven and seek out all the saints. **Such were Phillip. . . and two of his daughters. . . [p. 507] There is also John who lay on the Lord's breast. . .** And there is also Polycarp at Smyrna, both bishop and martyr, and Thraseas, both bishop and martyr, from Eumeneae. . . [Also] Sagaris,. . . Papirius,. . . and Melito. . . **all of these kept the fourteenth day of the Passover according to the gospel, never swerving, but following according to the rule of the faith.** And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, live according to the tradition of my kinsmen, and some of them have I followed. For seven of my family were bishops and I am the eighth, and my kinsmen ever kept the day when the people put away the leaven. Therefore, brethren, I who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord and conversed with brethren from every country, and have studied all holy Scripture am not afraid of threats, for they have said, who were greater than I, 'It is better to obey God rather than men.'"

Note that Polycrates says that John the Revelator, who wrote both the book of John and the book of Revelation, and who is the same apostle John that du Preez is referring to above, observed Passover, never swerving, as long as they lived. Du Preez states that John wrote his gospel in which he referred to the feasts as the Jews' feasts, about A.D. 95 to A.D. 100 and Polycrates, writing this about A.D. 150, states that he is sixty-five years old. This means that Polycrates was most likely a young boy when John wrote these words and could have met the apostle John in person. At the very least, Polycrates lived very close to the time of John and would have known what John did. John always observed the Passover, as long as he lived. Note also that Polycrates said that he was “not afraid of threats” for “It is better to obey God rather than men.” Yes, they were receiving threats for observing Passover on the Biblical day of Passover and they were obviously ready to suffer persecution for their belief rather than give up their celebration of Passover. Think about the implications of this! The early Christians had not given up observing the feasts as du Preez would have you believe; rather, they were prepared to suffer persecution and even death rather than give up their celebrations of the feasts.

So why did John call the feasts the Jews' feasts? We are not told, but we are going to make an educated guess. Because John considered himself to be a Jew. He was identifying with his own people. Here's an interesting thought that most Christians seem to have never thought of. Jesus did not come to start a new religion. Note that His entire life, Jesus attended the Jewish synagogues and taught in the Jewish temple. He never made an effort to start a new church. The disciples also never made an effort to start a new church until they were put out of the synagogues at which time they were forced to start a new church, but not because they wanted to.

Actually, the early Christian church considered themselves to be “Israel.” Paul makes this very clear in Romans chapter 11. He compares Israel to an olive tree (vs 24) Paul starts this chapter by saying, “I say then, Hath God cast away His people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin (vs. 1). Note how Paul identifies himself with the Israelites. Paul then tells the story of Elijah and how Elijah thought he was the only person left in Israel who was faithful still to the true God, but that God tells Elijah that there are seven thousand in Israel who haven't bowed to Baal. Paul continues, “Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. (vs. 5) “What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded. (vs. 7) Paul here is saying that the majority in Israel didn't obtain salvation but the elect within Israel have. Then in verse 17 Paul says that some of the branches of this olive tree (representing Israel) have been broken off (meaning the false within Israel) but that you, the Gentiles, have been grafted into this olive tree, because of your faith. (vs. 20) Then Paul says that the part of Israel that was cut off the olive tree because of their unbelief could yet, if they believed, be grafted in again as well and be saved (vs 23, 24). Next in verse 26 Paul says, “And so all Israel shall be saved.” Obviously, Paul considers “Israel” to be only those who are true and faithful to God because only those who are faithful are saved. In answer to du Preez here, the early Christian church did not consider themselves to be a new church, but rather, they considered themselves to be the true Israel. So when du Preez says, on p. 27 that “John never refers to the annual set times as 'Christian' celebrations; rather, he labels them 'Jewish' feasts, that is correct, because the early Christian church still identified themselves as being Jewish, or as being the true Israel.

At that time the word “Christian” was considered to be a derogatory term invented by the enemies of the faith. The word “Christian” is only mentioned three times in the NT in Acts 11:26, Acts 26:28, and 1 Peter 4:16. Although it was originally considered a derogatory term, the early Christians embraced it as a badge of honor that they were suffering for Jesus, but they really considered themselves to be the true Israel, as shown in the previous paragraph. So this is most likely why the early Christians never said the feasts were “Christian” as du Preez seems to think they should have done if they were still observing the feasts. Rather, since the early Christians considered themselves to be the true Israel, or the true Jews, it's much more likely that they would have said these were the feasts of the Jews or the feasts of Israel, which is precisely what the apostle John did.

**“Since the basic Hebrew term moed, which is often used for the annual seasons, first appears in the Creation account in Genesis 1:14, doesn't this conclusively prove that these annual set times are a creation ordinance established by God even before sin entered the world?”** (Feast-Keeping and the Faithful, p. 33)

Du Preez makes the point that the Hebrew word, “moed” which is the Hebrew word behind “feasts” in Leviticus chapter 23, the chapter that speaks about the feasts, can also have other meanings. Just like many words in our language have different meanings, so can the word “moed” have different meanings. In looking up every “moed” word in the Bible, we concede that most likely, du Preez is correct on this point. However, du Preez believes that the majority of the time that “moed” is used it is not meaning “God's appointed times” or “yearly feasts.” We disagree and we will shortly show why. We believe that the many of the times this word is used in the Bible that the “feasts” are what the original writer intended this word to mean. According to Strong's Concordance, the word “moed” has been translated into the following English words in the King James Version: feast, time, appointed, season, assembly, congregation, sign, solemn, set, and synagogue. These are all appropriate words for describing the feasts. The feasts are at a certain “time” of year, they are “appointed times” by God, they are at the spring and falls “seasons,” the “congregation” meets for an “assembly” at those times, the feasts are one of God's “signs,” one feast (the Day of Atonement) is “solemn,” they are at “set” times of the year, and the congregation goes to the “synagogue” (our modern counterpart would be our local church) to meet together for celebrating these feast days.

One reason why we use Strong's Concordance is so that we can go back to the different Hebrew definitions

of a word so we can see if we agree with the translators' choice of which definition to use. We find that sometimes we disagree with the translators as to what definition they used. One has to be careful because most of the translators did not observe the Seventh-day Sabbath or the feasts and sometimes they pick definitions which fit their religious beliefs but which are not the correct definition.

In examining each text that contains this word "moed," how do we know which definition should be used? Nearly always, the context will tell us. It's not difficult to figure out. Sometimes, the context does not tell us and sometimes, in those cases, knowing Hebrew culture helps to determine the correct definition, which is why we have studied into Hebrew culture. And sometimes, neither the context nor knowing the culture helps, so yes, in those cases, we do not know for sure which definition should be used. However, those times are few. The majority of the time we can figure it out through study and prayer.

Now we will go through some of the "moed" texts that du Preez insists are not "feasts" but which we believe are. The first is Genesis 1:14. The texts read, "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years." The one word in this text that just doesn't seem to fit is the word "seasons." The reason why is because, according to Creation scientists whose works we have read and whose DVD's we have watched, before the flood there were no "seasons." The Creation scientists believe that since Genesis 1:6 says, "Let there be a firmament (air) in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters" that God had a canopy of water around this earth, above our atmosphere which created a greenhouse effect. This meant that the earth was tropical over the entire earth. There was no polar ice caps. For additional proof, these same scientists tell us that the petrified trees they have found from before the flood have no rings, meaning that the trees grew all year long. What causes the rings is when the tree stops growing during the winter. So before the flood, there were no seasons. This is why we believe that the translators chose the wrong English word here. The Hebrew word behind this word "seasons" is "moed." Does the context of this text warrant changing the English translation of this word "moed" to "feast days?" It absolutely does.

Genesis 1:14 says that the lights in the heavens (sun, moon, and stars) were for "signs, seasons, days, and years." Do either the sun, moon, or stars have anything to do with feast days? Yes. According to Leviticus chapter 23 the sun and the moon determine when the feast days begin. The Jewish months were determined by the moon. In fact the word "moon" means "month" in Hebrew. When the Israelites saw the first sliver of the moon after the several nights of no moon being present, then that first sliver determined the first day of the month. Leviticus 23:5 says that on the fourteenth day of the month (or fourteen days after the new moon) was Passover. Likewise, this chapter goes on to tell us which day of the month each feast day was to begin on. Psalm 104:19 says, "He appointed the moon for seasons." Again, this word "seasons" is "moed" and should be translated as "feast days" because yes, the moon does determine when the feast days are. Psalm 81: 3 says, "Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, in the time appointed, on our solemn feast day."

There is one feast day, according to Leviticus 23:24, which landed on the new moon day and that is the Feast of Trumpets. So Psalm 81:3 is speaking of this feast. The sun also helped to determine when the feast days occur. How do we know which new moon to go by to determine the first feast of Passover?

According to Leviticus 23:10, on the second day of Unleavened Bread, which was two days after Passover, the Israelites were to bring a sheaf of the firstfruits, or the first of their harvest, to give as a special offering to God before they could eat of this new crop (vs 14). Since "firstfruits" denotes the "first of the harvest" the Israelites also could not harvest their crop until the firstfruits had been presented. The only crop ready at this time of year was barley. The sun determines when the crops are harvest ready and the barley was usually ripe either in late March or early April. Josephus, a Jewish historian who lived close to the time of Jesus, confirms that this is what was done.

"The feast of unleavened bread succeeds that of Passover, and falls on the fifteenth day of the month, and continues seven days, wherein they feed on unleavened bread...But on the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month, they first partake of the fruits of the earth, for before that day they do not touch them. And while they suppose it proper to honor God, from whom they obtain this plentiful

provision, in the first place, they offer the first-fruits of their barley, and that in the manner following: They take a handful of the ears, and dry them, then beat them small, and purge the barley from the bran; they then bring one tenth deal to the altar, to God; and, casting one handful of it upon the fire, they leave the rest for the use of the priest. And after this it is that they may publicly or privately reap their harvest.” (*Antiquities of the Jews*, p. 93, by Josephus)

Ellen White confirms the same. “The Passover was followed by the seven day's feast of unleavened bread. The first and the seventh day were days of holy convocation, when no servile work was to be performed. On the second day of the feast, the first fruits of the year's harvest were presented before God. Barley was the earliest grain in Palestine, and at the opening of the feast it was beginning to ripen. A sheaf of this grain was waved by the priest before the altar of God, as an acknowledgment that all was His. Not until this ceremony had been performed was the harvest to be gathered.” (*Patriarchs and Prophets* p. 540)

Now back to Genesis 1:14. From what we have presented it is clear that indeed, the sun and the moon determine when the feast days occur, so because of the context and because of other Bible texts presented, we can safely conclude that the word “seasons” in this text should have been translated as “feast days” or as “festivals.” We found in some literature written by Messianic Jews who agreed with us on this. Messianic Jews are Christian Jews who believe that Jesus was the Messiah. They know Hebrew and Jewish customs a lot better than we do and they concur with us. Some of the translators of some of the modern versions agree with us. Although, as presented earlier, we find that most of the time the King James’ Version is the most accurate, occasionally a modern translation does come up with a better translation for a word or a verse. Before we accept a modern translations’ rendering of a certain passage, we do our own study into the context of the passage, the Hebrew definitions for the key words of the passage, and we examine Hebrew customs. So we don’t accept what modern translations say without careful research because modern translations have so many serious errors in them, as stated in a previous chapter.

On p. 34 du Preez quotes *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament?* as saying that the word “moed” occurs 223 times in the Old Testament and that it can mean “the time for the birth of a child (Gen 17:21; 18:14;21:2), the coming of a plague (Ex 9:5t), the season of a bird’s migration (Jer 8:7), an appointed time [i.e. to simply meet someone] (1 Sam 13:8; 20:35), the time for which a vision is intended (Hab 2:30, the times of the end (Dan 8:19), or the time for the festivals (Lev 23:2) and solemnities (Deut 31:10).” Du Preez believes that only the final two, the festivals and the solemnities, are the feast days. Remember that du Preez is getting this opinion from a book written by theologians who most likely don’t believe in the Seventh-day Sabbath or the yearly feast days. So we must carefully and prayerfully do our own analysis of each text.

The first texts are the ones for the birth of a child (Gen 17:21); 18:14; 21:2). These texts are all about the birth of Isaac. Due to extensive research about the feasts, we have learned that God does all of His greatest acts on the feast days, both in the past and in the future. (For further proof of this read our book *God’s Holidays* and also Chapter Two of this book about why the feast days are so important.) The birth of Isaac was the beginning of the great nation of Israel so, based on the pattern that God Himself set up, which is that all of His greatest acts occur on the feast days, wouldn’t it be very likely that God did have Isaac born on a feast day? It cannot be absolutely proven from the context of these texts, but interestingly, the Messianic Jews believe that Isaac was indeed born on a feast day both because this word is “moed” and because God does His greatest acts on the feast days.

The next text, Exodus 9:5, we can tell from the context that this is not a feast day. The word “set” in this text is “moed” and it’s speaking about the time that God “set” for the plague in Egypt when the cattle died. Just a short time later, in Exodus 12:2 God tells Moses that this is the first month of the year and fourteen days after that Passover occurs. So the plague of the cattle dying occurred before the feast days began for that year. Exactly how long before we are not told, but since it was before the feast days for that year, it most likely was not on a feast day. The only way it could have been would be if God had stretched out the time for the plagues over many months and this was on the fall feast days of the before but this is not very

likely.

The next text is Jeremiah 8:7 and is speaking about when birds migrate. Since the feasts are in the spring and fall, which is about the same times that birds do migrate, this text could also be about the feast days. However, from the context it's not conclusive.

1 Samuel 13:8 was about Samuel setting a time to meet with Saul over a period of seven days. The spring feasts do last for one week so it is possible that this is the time that Samuel was meeting with Saul; however the context does not give us enough information to know for sure so this may or may not be referring to the feasts.

1 Samuel 20:35 could not be referring to the feasts as this occurred two days after the new moon and there is no feast at that time, so this "moed" is simply referring to an appointment.

Habakkuk 2:3 and Daniel 8:19 are definitely referring to yearly feast days. Both of these texts are speaking about end time events and all major end time events occur on feast days. See again Chapter Two and our book *God's Holidays* for more on this subject. Daniel 8:19 says, "For at the time appointed, the end shall be." William Miller had this text painted on the wall behind his pulpit at the chapel he had built on his farm. The Millerites knew that the Second Coming would occur on a feast day from their Bible studies and they picked the Day of Atonement. However, they were wrong about which feast day as the Second Coming will occur on the Feast of Tabernacles. The word "Tabernacles" means a "dwelling place." God's use of this word "tabernacle" shows that the meaning of this feast is "God dwelling with us." Matthew 1:23 says, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." For this reason, most likely Jesus was born on the first day of the Feasts of Tabernacles and was circumcised on the eighth day, or the Last Great Day of the Feast of Tabernacles. Additional proof for this is that Jesus entered His ministry when He was thirty years old, His ministry lasted for 3 ½ years, which meant He was 33 ½ years old when He died on the cross on Passover. Back up 33 ½ years and you will end up at the Feast of Tabernacles for His birth. The Messianic Jews arrive at the same time for the birth of Jesus by calculating His birth according to the time frame that John the Baptist's father served in the temple since we know that Jesus was born six months after John the Baptist. For a discussion of this go to <http://heartofwisdom.com/biblicalholidays/2012/09/28/birth-of-christ-feast-of-tabernacles>. Since the meaning of the Feast of Tabernacles is "God dwelling with us" this is the most logical feast for the Second Coming to occur on.

Ellen White tells us that the Second Coming will occur on a feast day in *Great Controversy*, pp. 399-400. In these pages she calls the feast days "types" and states that in the past the fulfillments of the feast days occurred on the very day of the feast that pointed forward to it. She gives examples of the fact that Jesus died on Passover, on the very day and hour that the Passover lamb had been slain for 15 long centuries. She points out that Jesus was resurrected on Firstfruits, the very day that pointed forward to the resurrection. Then she says, "In like manner the types (feasts) which relate to the second advent must be fulfilled at the time pointed out in the symbolic service." (parentheses inserted for clarification)

The Feast of Tabernacles is also called the Feast of Harvest because it comes just after the fall harvest has ended. Jesus said, in the parable of the wheat and the tares, "The harvest is the end of the world." (Matthew 13:39) The end of the world is the Second Coming. The Feast of Tabernacles, or the Feast of Harvest, comes at the time of harvest. Jesus is saying here that the Second Coming will occur at the Feast of Tabernacles.

Ellen White concurs. "The Feast of Tabernacles was not only commemorative but typical (pointing forward). It not only pointed back to the wilderness sojourn, but, as the feast of harvest, it celebrated the ingathering of the fruits of the earth, and pointed forward to the great day of final ingathering, when the Lord of the harvest shall send forth His reapers to gather the tares together in bundles for the fire, and to gather the wheat into His garner. **At that time (Feast of Tabernacles) the wicked will all be destroyed.**" [Emphasis and parentheses added] (*Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 541) In the book *The Cross and Its Shadow*, pp. 239-244, Haskell states the same. The wicked are destroyed at the Second Coming (Revelation 19:11-

21, Matthew 13:39-42), are resurrected at the end of the millennium to receive their final punishment, and destroyed again (Revelation 20:5-10). Both of these destructions of the wicked will be at the Feast of Tabernacles with exactly one thousand years between them. From this we know that the New Jerusalem will descend to this earth at the Feast of Tabernacles, which is the final fulfillment of “God dwelling with man” because now God will make His permanent dwelling place with man on this earth.

Back to Daniel 8:19 which says, “For at the time appointed, the end shall be.” The word “appointed” is “moed.” This “moed,” as we have just proved, is definitely a feast day. The end of this world will be on the Feast of Tabernacles. We are not time-setting, however, because we do not know which year this will be.

In our book *God's Holidays* every time we interpret the word “moed” in a text to mean “feast days” we did so only after very carefully studying the text involved, the context of the text, and any other Bible passages or Ellen White quotes that relate to this text. We are fully confident that we have never used a “moed” text out of context.

Here's another example of a key “moed” text that we use. Isaiah 14:13,14 states, “For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.” In this text the word “congregation” is “moed.” Satan is speaking these words and here he is vowing that he is going to take over God's throne and he is going to sit upon the “mount of the congregation” or “mount of the feast days.” In other words, Satan is going to invent his own feast days, or worship days, in opposition to God's feast days. Satan never invents anything; rather, he only counterfeits God's truth and mixes truth with error in order to make it much more deceptive. Did Satan invent his own feast days in opposition to God's feast days? Absolutely. Read the book *Too Long In The Sun* which you can obtain from [www.toolong.com](http://www.toolong.com). This book documents very well the fact that Christmas and Easter come from the ancient Babylonian religion which worshiped Baal and Tammuz. Easter is the conception date for Baal and Christmas is the birth date for Baal. The Catholic Church, because she wanted to bring the pagans into the church and make them feel comfortable, brought these pagan holidays into the church and then “baptized” them, making them celebrations of Jesus instead of Baal. In this way the Catholic Church managed to unite Christians and pagans. The Catholic Church's religion is indeed a strange mixture of paganism and Christianity. Instead of Passover/Unleavened Bread, Satan invented Easter. Instead of the Day of Atonement, Satan invented Valentine's Day. Instead of the Feast of Tabernacles Satan invented Christmas. Instead of Sabbath, Satan invented Sunday. Interestingly, the Catholic Church does call all of these holidays “feast days.” Furthermore, the Catholic Church outright claims that she abolished all of the Jewish feast days and instituted her own feast days. Here's the proof.

Seventh-day Adventists frequently quote the following letter from T. Enright, C.S.S.R., Bishop of St. Alphonsus Church, St. Louis, Missouri, June, 1905, offering \$1000 “To any one who can prove to me from Bible alone that I am bound, under grievous sin, to keep Sunday holy.” Here is the entire letter. “Dear Friend, I have offered and still offer \$1000 to any one who can prove to me from the Bible alone that I am bound, under grievous sin to keep Sunday holy. It was the Catholic Church which made the law obliging us to keep Sunday holy. The church made this law long after the Bible was written. Hence said law is not in the Bible. Christ, our Lord empowered his church to make laws binding in conscience. He said to his apostles and their lawful successors in the priesthood “Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be binding in heaven.” Mth. 16:19. Mth. 18:17. Luke 16:19. The Cath. Church abolished not only the Sabbath, but all the other Jewish festivals. Pray and study. I shall be always glad to help you as long as you honestly seek the truth. Respectfully, T. Enright CSSR.” (You can see a copy of the original letter in our book *God's Holidays*.)

We have given proof that indeed, Satan did invent his own feast days in direct opposition to God's feast days in an effort to get people to forget God and His worship days and instead, to get people to worship Satan through his feast days. This is incontrovertible proof that Satan did do what he said he was going to

do in Isaiah 14:13, 14 and is thus proof that the word “moed” in these verses is indeed “feast days.”

Here’s additional proof. The *SDA Commentary*, Vol. 4, p. 171, states that the words *mount of the congregation* comes from the Hebrew word *har moed*. *Har* means *mountain* and *moed* means *assembly*. (God’s people “assemble” at feast times.) The word *Armageddon* means *mount of the moed* which is the same meaning as *mount of the congregation* in Isaiah 14:13. Both mean *mount of the feasts*. The word *Armageddon* appears only one time in the Bible in Revelation 16:16. Armageddon is correctly understood by all to mean Satan’s Last Battle against God. The *SDA Bible Commentary*, Vol. 7, p. 846, states that the first part of the word comes from the Hebrew word *har*, which means mountain. The second part of the word *mageddon* has been interpreted two different ways, the first being as Megiddo, which was an ancient city, and the second as coming from the Hebrew word *moed*, which means feasts, congregation, assembly. God’s people congregate to have a feast or assembly as described in Leviticus chapter 23. The commentary tells us that people who believe in the second interpretation as being *moed* are those who “understand the second derivation, *har moed*, figuratively also, on the basis of its use in Isaiah 14:13, in terms of the great contest between Christ and Satan.” Thus Armageddon is a battle over whose feast days are you going to keep? Are you going to keep Sabbath or Sunday? Passover and Unleavened Bread or Easter? The Day of Atonement or Valentine’s Day? The Feast of Tabernacles or Christmas? This is what the final battle of this earth will be over.

Now back to what Du Preez says about the “moeds.” About Genesis 1:14 he quotes several non-SDA theologians (who use the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation) as saying that the “moed” in this text does not refer to the feasts days but rather to “seedtime and harvest” and “seasons.” Interestingly, the “seedtime and harvest” occurred at the feast times because God had the feasts coincide with agricultural cycles in order to teach us spiritual lessons derived from agriculture. And, as shown earlier, “seasons” did not occur before the flood. These theologians show their ignorance by making such statements. Again, in our book on the feasts we carefully researched every text we used that contained the word “moed” to make sure that these texts were definitely speaking about the feasts.

**“When, why, how, by whom, and for whom were these annual appointed seasons established?”** (*Feast-Keeping and the Faithful*, p. 39) In answer to this question du Preez insists that the feasts were instituted at Sinai. For proof he quotes modern versions of Hebrews 11:28 which state that Moses instituted the Passover. (The KJV states that Moses kept the Passover.) Du Preez then quotes an Ellen White quote in which she states that “The observance of Passover began with the birth of the Hebrew nation.” (*Desire of Ages*, p. 76) The context of this quote is speaking of the first Passover recorded in the Bible which was when the Israelites left Egypt after putting the blood on their doorposts so the destroying angel would “pass over” their home and not kill their firstborn.

We concede that most likely du Preez is correct here in that Passover was instituted when the Israelites left Egypt. One rule of Biblical interpretation is that all quotes must harmonize to arrive at truth. Under the last question, we showed that the feasts were in heaven before the creation of this earth, otherwise Satan would not have said he was going to counterfeit the feasts in Isaiah 14:13 as there would have been no feasts to counterfeit. Satan made this statement in Isaiah 14:13 when he fell in heaven, before the creation of this world. We also showed that the feasts were instituted in Eden in Genesis 1:14. In our book, *God’s Holidays*, we give very strong proof that the feasts are part of the moral law and not the ceremonial law. At the end of this book in the Appendix we have an article entitled “Are The Feasts Part Of The Moral Law Or The Ceremonial Law?” Please read this article now so you can follow our line of reasoning. In this article we give incontrovertible proof that the feasts are part of the moral law. The moral law has always existed and will always exist, unlike the ceremonial law which God instituted to meet sin when man sinned in the Garden of Eden and which was abolished at the cross. (See Daniel 9:27)

It is dangerous to throw out some quotes because we can’t make them harmonize with other quotes. For instance, the Jewish religious leaders of Jesus’ day ended up rejecting Jesus because they only accepted the OT texts that spoke of a conquering Messiah while they rejected the texts that spoke of a suffering Messiah.

Jesus came the first time as suffering Messiah and not as a conquering Messiah. These religious leaders could not harmonize these texts and so they accepted the ones they liked, which the texts about the conquering Messiah, and they threw out the texts they didn't like which were the ones about the suffering Messiah. As a result, they rejected Jesus because He didn't fit their expectations of the Messiah. So you can see the danger of tossing out any quotes or texts.

So how do we harmonize what we have presented about the feasts being part of the moral law and therefore they have always existed and will always exist, with du Preez' quotes that Passover began when the Israelites left Egypt? This is where much prayer and study have to occur. Here are some harmonizing quotes. "After the transgression of Adam the principles of the law were not changed, but were definitely arranged and expressed to meet man in his fallen condition. Christ, in counsel with His Father, instituted the system of sacrificial offerings; (*Signs of the Times*, March 14, 1878) "The principles of the ten commandments existed before the fall, and were of a character suited to the condition of a holy order of beings. After the fall, the principles of those precepts were not changed, but additional precepts were given to meet man in his fallen state." (*Spiritual Gifts*, Vol. 3, p. 295) These quotes are saying that at the fall of man the principles of the Ten Commandments were not changed but were arranged and expressed to meet man in his fallen condition. In addition, the sacrificial system was added at the fall of man.

Ellen White is saying in these two quotes that before the fall, Ten Commandments were in a form that was suited to holy beings, but after the fall, the Ten Commandments were "arranged and expressed to meet man in his fallen condition." God, as the Author of these Commandments, has the right to add meanings to these Commandments any time He wants to. Here is an Ellen White quote that gives an example of how God added a new meaning to the Seventh-day Sabbath at the fall of man.

"From the pillar of cloud Christ declared concerning the Sabbath: "Verily My Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Exodus 31:13. The Sabbath given to the world as the sign of God as the Creator is also the sign of Him as the Sanctifier. The power that created all things is the power that re-creates the soul in His own likeness. To those who keep holy the Sabbath day it is the sign of sanctification. True sanctification is harmony with God, oneness with Him in character. It is received through obedience to those principles that are the transcript of His character. And the Sabbath is the sign of obedience. He who from the heart obeys the fourth commandment will obey the whole law. He is sanctified through obedience." {CCh 261.4} In this quote Ellen White quotes Exodus 31:3 that says that the Sabbath is a sign that God sanctifies us. According to the dictionary, "sanctification" is "the state of growing in divine grace as a result of Christian commitment after baptism or conversion." This shows that one meaning that God added to the Seventh-day Sabbath at the fall of man was that now the Sabbath represents the ability of God to help us grow in our ability to keep the Commandments and to become more like Him. Obviously this meaning for the Sabbath was not present before the fall of man because before the fall man already fully reflected the image of God and was perfect.

Since God added new meanings to the Seventh-day Sabbath at the fall of man, there is a good chance that He did the same with the feasts. We have already covered the fact that, according to Isaiah 14:13, the feasts existed before the creation of this world. We have also covered the fact that each of the feasts represents a different aspect of the gospel. One charge against the existence of the feasts before creation is that since the feasts each represent a different aspect of the gospel, and since before creation there was no sin in heaven, that there would have been no need for the feasts in heaven and therefore they must have existed at that time. The Bible does not tell us what the feasts represented before this world was created, so it would be pure speculation to guess at what their meaning would have been. However, our guess is that the feast days were special days for the entire universe to gather together to worship God. If you were God, wouldn't you delight at getting the entire universe together for a heavenly choir and for special worship? It would be like an amazing camp meeting, where we could see all our friends from the far-flung reaches of the universe at once, where we could have special fellowship together, and a wonderful spiritual feast all at

the same time! Then, when sin entered this world, God attached the gospel to the meaning of the feasts, just like He attached sanctification to the Seventh-day Sabbath.

Now back to Passover since du Preez specifically uses a quote about Passover to try and prove that the feasts did not exist before the Israelites left Egypt. Passover is not a sabbath as it was not forbidden to work on this day. The feast days do contain seven days within them that are called “sabbaths” and work was forbidden on these days. These yearly sabbaths are: the first and last days of Unleavened Bread, Pentecost, the Feast of Trumpets, the Day of Atonement, and the first and last days of the Feast of Tabernacles. As you can see, there are seven of these yearly sabbaths. In our book *God's Holidays*, we show that these yearly sabbaths are intimately connected with the Seventh-day Sabbath and are therefore part of the moral law and not the ceremonial law. Since they are part of the moral law they have always existed throughout eternity past and will always exist throughout eternity future. The main event around which Passover swirled before the cross was the sacrifice of the lamb and then eating this lamb. At the cross the sacrificial system ended (Daniel 9:27) and therefore, on Passover, we no longer sacrifice and eat a lamb. It is our educated guess that since the main meaning of Passover is about the death of our Messiah on the cross, that God added this feast day on to the rest of the feast days at Sinai. This is the only way one can harmonize Isaiah 14:13, which states that the feasts existed before the creation of this world, and Genesis 1:14, which states that the feasts were given to mankind at the creation of this world, with the text and Ellen White quote that du Preez uses to say that Passover began at Sinai. Remember that one rule of Biblical interpretation is that all quotes must harmonize and only then do we arrive at truth. Often, there is only one way to harmonize quotes. In this situation, this is the only way to harmonize all of these texts and quotes.

In addition to Isaiah 14:13 and Genesis 1:14, there is another text that clearly shows the feasts existed before the Israelites left Egypt and that the Israelites knew about the feasts. This text is Exodus 5:1 and says, “And afterward Moses and Aaron went in, and told Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto Me in the wilderness.” This is before the Passover was given to the Israelites in Exodus chapter 12. The original Hebrew word behind “feast” in this text is “chagag” and not “moed.” “Chagag” is another Hebrew word that refers to the yearly feasts. For instance, For instance, the word “feast” in Exodus 12:14, which is speaking of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, is “chagag.” The same with Exodus 13:6; 23:14-16 and many other texts in the Old Testament. Lest those who are against the feasts say that this text in Genesis 5:1 simply means a special worship time with God and not the yearly feasts, let us ask the question, “When the Israelites left Egypt and went into the wilderness, did they celebrate the yearly feasts? The answer is “Yes.” They left Egypt at midnight on the first day of Unleavened Bread, after just celebrating their first Passover. So indeed, they left Egypt just in time to celebrate the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the wilderness, just like they stated they were going to do in Exodus 5:1. So the Israelites did know about the feasts before they left Egypt. This gives additional proof to the fact that the feasts were given to mankind at creation and that is why the Israelites were familiar with them. Another text that gives evidence, but no absolute proof, that God’s people knew about the feasts before the Exodus is Genesis 19:3. This is the story of Lot when Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed.

This text says that Lot gave the angels who came to rescue him unleavened bread. We are aware that du Preez says this text is not about the feasts and we agree that it cannot absolutely be proven either way from the context. However, the Messianic Jews do emphatically insist that this shows that the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah occurred during the Feast of Unleavened Bread and this is why Lot gave the angels unleavened bread. In the Middle East and in Bible times, bread is and was a staple that everyone kept in their home all the time. So if this were not the Feast of Unleavened Bread time, Lot most likely would have had regular bread already in his home and would not have needed to give the angels unleavened bread.

Remember, as stated earlier, God always does His greatest acts on the feast days? Therefore, most likely God did destroy Sodom and Gomorrah at a feast time. Unleavened Bread represents being sanctified. The inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah were rejecting God’s offer of sanctification, so it seems likely that God destroyed them at this time because they went too far in sin. God only allows sinful man to go so far and then He says, “Enough” and He stops them.

Under this section du Preez also quotes Deuteronomy 16:16 which says that we must keep the feast of Unleavened Bread, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles at “the place which the LORD shall choose.” Later on in the Bible, God chose Jerusalem. Du Preez then states that since the Tabernacle in Jerusalem no longer exists, we can no longer go to Jerusalem to celebrate the feasts and therefore the feasts ended at the cross. Du Preez asserts that feast-keepers try to sidestep this issue. We most certainly do not. Here is our answer. The Holy Spirit used Paul to write the majority of the New Testament. Furthermore, Paul himself states right after his conversion, he went to the desert of Arabia and there Jesus taught him all his doctrines. (Galatians 1:11,12, 17,18). Ellen White concurs. “During his sojourn in Arabia, he emptied his soul of the prejudices and traditions that had shaped his life, and received instruction from the Source of truth. Jesus communed with him, and established him in his faith, bestowing upon him a rich measure of divine wisdom and grace.” (*Advent Review & Sabbath Herald*, March 30, 1911) So Paul would have have his doctrines correct because Jesus Himself established Paul in his faith. If not, then we are charging Jesus with being a poor teacher or we are charging Paul with being a poor student. Either charge is false given the fact that the Holy Spirit chose Paul to write a major portion of the New Testament. So, did Paul feel that one could only celebrate the feasts at Jerusalem? What did Paul do by his example? Here is Ellen White’s comments on Acts 20:6 which states, “And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread.” “At Philippi Paul tarried to **keep** the Passover. Only Luke remained with him, the other members of the company passing on to Troas to await him there. The Philippians were the most loving and truehearted of the apostle's converts, and during the eight days of the feast he enjoyed peaceful and happy communion with them.” (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 390-391) So here we have Paul observing the feasts with his Gentile converts away from Jerusalem and without doing sacrifices. Remember, Paul was established in his faith by Jesus Himself, and so Paul, by his example, was teaching that the feasts had not ended at the cross, but that after the cross we can celebrate the feasts anywhere and not necessarily at Jerusalem, and that we should celebrate the feasts without the sacrificial system because that did end at the cross (Daniel 9:27).

Jesus also made it clear that we could celebrate the feasts anywhere. The woman at the well brought up this very issue as to where we should celebrate the feasts when she said, “Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.” (John 4:19-20) To understand what this woman at the well was saying, we need to understand the history behind this statement. “When the temple was rebuilt at Jerusalem, the Samaritans wished to join the Jews in its erection. This privilege was refused them, and, in consequence, a bitter animosity sprang up between the two people, which resulted in the Samaritans building a rival temple on Mount Gerizim, where they worshiped according to the ceremonies that God gave unto Moses, but mingled with their worship the taint of idolatry...The Samaritans would not respect the temple of worship at Jerusalem, and refused to admit that it was the true place of worship.” (*Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 2, p. 143) When did the Israelites go to Jerusalem to worship? They only went at feast times. The rest of the time they worshipped on Sabbath in their local synagogue in their own town. This proves that the controversy which this woman at the well brought up to Jesus was “Where do we celebrate the feasts? On Mount Gerizim or in Jerusalem?” This is the issue that this woman brought up to Jesus. Jesus answered, “Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him.” (John 4:21, 23) Jesus is very clear that His followers no longer needed to go to Mount Gerizim or to Jerusalem to celebrate the feasts. And, that is why Paul celebrated the feasts in Philippi with his Gentile converts. Du Preez says that feast keepers “spiritualize” away the truth with this answer about the woman at the well. We are not spiritualizing away anything. Jesus was very clear in his answer and He outright said to the woman at the well that we no longer need to go to Jerusalem. Since the issue was where we celebrate the feasts, notice that this would have been the perfect opportunity for Jesus, if the feasts were shortly going to be abolished at the cross, to say to this woman, “Shortly the feasts will be abolished and so they won’t be an issue any longer.” Notice that Jesus did not say this, giving further proof that the feasts have never been abolished.

Next, on p. 45, du Preez states that, according to Exodus 12:43-50, the feasts could only be celebrated by those who were circumcised and since circumcision was abolished at the cross, this means the feasts were abolished as well. Circumcision was one of the main issues decided by the council in Acts chapter 15. Here's the proof. "With great assurance these Judaizing teachers asserted that in order to be saved, one must be circumcised and must keep the entire ceremonial law...They insisted that the Jewish laws and ceremonies should be incorporated into the rites of the Christian religion. They were slow to discern that all of the sacrificial offerings had but prefigured the death of the Son of God, in which type met antitype, and after which the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic dispensation were no longer binding." (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 188-189) According to Ellen White, the two main issues to be decided were circumcision and the ceremonial law, which she again, in this quote, defines as the "sacrificial system." The council decided that the Gentiles did not have to be circumcised and they did not have to participate in the sacrificial system. Some say that this was for the Gentiles only. God does not have one set of laws for Gentile Christians and another for Jewish Christians. We all have to follow the same Commandments to enter the kingdom. Paul made it clear in Romans chapter 11 that the Gentiles are grafted into the tree of Israel and we are all part of the same tree, or the same fellowship; thus, we all follow the same Commandments. Thus, this council in Acts 15 affirmed that circumcision and the ceremonial law, which is the sacrificial system, ended at the cross. Now, notice when this conference in Acts chapter 15 was held. "**There they were to meet delegates from the different churches and those who had come to Jerusalem to attend the approaching festivals.**" [Emphasis added] (*Acts of the Apostles*, p. 190) This conference was held at a feast time. Why? Because the delegates for this conference were already coming to Jerusalem to celebrate a feast, and so since they were already gathered in Jerusalem, this was a convenient time to have this conference. So by their words at the conference, they upheld circumcision and the sacrificial system ending at the cross, but by their actions, they upheld the fact that the feasts did not end at the cross. Remember, Paul was one of the leaders of the Christian Church at that time, and Paul was taught the correct doctrine by Jesus Himself, and Paul observed the feasts himself and taught his converts to do so as well. Since Paul taught his Gentile converts to keep the feasts, but at the same time, because of the conclusions of the conference in Acts 15, they did not require the Gentiles to be circumcised, this shows that Paul separated the feasts from circumcision and that one could keep the feasts after the cross and not be circumcised, contrary to what du Preez would have you to believe.

On p. 47 du Preez states that the Jubilee "presupposes the observance of the cycle of Sabbatical Years" and "is proclaimed by the blowing of a trumpet on the Day of Atonement" that "since the Day of Atonement has been fulfilled at the Cross, neither the Jubilee nor the Sabbatical Years have any continued universal applicability." For proof of this conclusion du Preez merely quotes from theologians and not from the Bible. As stated under Chapter Two, the Day of Atonement, contrary to what du Preez says, had absolutely no fulfillment at the Cross. The first fulfillment of the Day of Atonement began in 1844 with beginning of the Judgment of the Dead. The amazing thing about du Preez' statement that the Day of Atonement was fulfilled at the Cross is that this contradicts what we have always been taught by the SDA Church which is that the Judgment of the Dead which began in 1844 is the fulfillment of the Day of Atonement. Now that feast keepers have pointed out that this fulfillment is way after the Cross, now we see du Preez reversing what the SDA Church has always taught on this point. If, as du Preez states, the Day of Atonement was fulfilled at the Cross, then October 22, 1844, has absolutely no validity at all and the SDA Church has been wrong on this point. The SDA Church was founded as a result of October 22, 1844. Thus, du Preez, with a stroke of his pen, totally eliminates the foundation of the SDA Church. We are quite stunned that he would do this. The Day of Atonement points forward to both the Judgment of the Dead and the Judgment of the Living. The Judgment of the Dead began in 1844 and has not yet ended. The Judgment of the Living is yet future. There was no fulfillment at all of the Day of Atonement at the cross. We are currently living in fulfillment of the Day of Atonement as the Judgment is currently going on in heaven but has not yet ended. Ellen White agrees that we are now living in the fulfillment of the Day of Atonement. "We are now living

in the great day of atonement. In the typical service, while the high priest was making the atonement for Israel, all were required to afflict their souls by repentance of sin and humiliation before the Lord, lest they be cut off from among the people. In like manner, all who would have their names retained in the book of life should now, in the few remaining days of their probation, afflict their souls before God by sorrow for sin and true repentance. There must be deep, faithful searching of heart. The light, frivolous spirit indulged by so many professed Christians must be put away. There is earnest warfare before all who would subdue the evil tendencies that strive for the mastery. The work of preparation is an individual work." (*Great Controversy*, pp. 489-490). Again, du Preez asserting that the Day of Atonement ended at the cross goes against the Bible, against the teaching of Ellen White, against the foundation of the SDA Church, and against the teaching of the SDA Church.

The Day of Atonement had absolutely no fulfillment at the Cross. Furthermore, none of the fall feasts had any fulfillment at all at the First Advent of Jesus. This was written by O.R.L. Crosier in an article printed in the *Day-Star* in February, 1846. Ellen White has a very interesting statement regarding this very article. "The Lord shew me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, &c; and that it was his will, that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord, to recommend that *Extra*, to every saint." (*Word to the Little Flock*, p. 12) To our knowledge, this is the only article written by man that Ellen White was told in vision by God Himself was the truth. Here is what Crosier wrote regarding the Day of Atonement. "That the significance of the Law reaches beyond the first advent is evident from these considerations: 1. The cleansing of the sanctuary formed a part of the legal service, (Lev. 16:20: 33) and its antitype was not to be cleansed till the end of the 2300 days; Dan. 8:14. 2. The Sabbaths under the Law typify the great Sabbath, the seventh millennium; Heb. 4:3. 3. The Jubilee typifies the release and return to their possessions of all captive Israel; this cannot be fulfilled till the resurrection of the just. **4. The autumnal types were none of them fulfilled at the first advent. 5. The legal tenth day atonement was not, neither could it be fulfilled at that time.** Although he blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; yet, after his resurrection, both he and his apostles made use of the Law in proof of his Messiahship. **He was buried and arose, and shed down the Holy Ghost in direct fulfillment of the types, which would not have been the case if the significance of the Law had terminated at the cross. In fact his anointing and crucifixion were only the beginning of its fulfillment,** as being the beginning of that great system of redemption whose shadows were contained in the Law. All will admit that some of the types have been fulfilled and that others have not as they are yet to be fulfilled, it becomes us to remember and study the Law to learn their nature and import." (*Day-Star, Extra* February 7, 1846) Note that Crosier calls the feasts "types" in this statement and that he says that none of the fall feasts had any type of fulfillment at the First Advent, including the Day of Atonement. Under #1 Crosier, in this statement, says that the cleansing of the sanctuary (which occurred on the Day of Atonement according to Leviticus chapter 16) could not happen until the end of the 2300 days in Daniel 8:14. We know these 2300 days ended on October 22, 1844. Then Crosier states that Jesus' crucifixion was only the beginning of the fulfillment of even the spring feasts. This is exactly our position. See more about this under Chapter Two.

Now that we have shown that the Day of Atonement had absolutely no fulfillment at the Cross, let's move on to du Preez' assertion that the Sabbatical Years ended at the Cross. We contend that these Sabbatical Years did not end at the Cross. In Leviticus chapter 25 God presents the Sabbatical Years in verses 1-7. Then in Leviticus chapter 26 God says what He is going to do if God's people break His law. Here's what He says about the Sabbatical Years. "And I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you; and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste. Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth desolate, and ye be in our enemies' land; even then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths." In other words, if God's people did not let the land have its sabbath rest every seven years as God outlined in Leviticus chapter 25, then God would take the land away from His people so that the land would get its sabbath rest. 2 Chronicles 36:21 makes it clear that the reason why the Israelites were taken

captive away to Babylon for seventy years was because they had not let the land have its sabbath rest and so God was fulfilling His threat that if they didn't let the land rest, then He would take the land away from His people the land got its Sabbath rest. 2 Chronicles 36:20, 21 says, "And them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon; where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia: To fulfill the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths; for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfill threescore and ten years." God took the land away from the Israelites for threescore and ten years, which is seventy years, because for 490 years the Israelites had not let the land have its Sabbath rest. Since the land was to rest one year during every seven years, the Israelites had let the land miss seventy years' worth of sabbath rest during this 490-year time frame. This was the the reason for the length of time that the Israelites spent in Babylon.

Now for the proof that the Sabbatical Years did not end at the Cross. God follows His own law and the reason why we have to spend a Millennium in heaven while this earth is desolate is so that God's rule for the sabbath rest for the land can be followed. We will spend the Seventh Millennium in heaven while the earth enjoys her sabbath rest. After 6000 years of sin on this earth, the earth is due to have an entire millennium of sabbath rests. This point was made by the SDA Church in their book *Bible Readings for the Home*, 1963 version. Here's the quote. "The millennium is a great sabbath of rest, both for the earth and for God's people. For six thousand years the earth and its inhabitants have been groaning under the curse of sin. The millennium, the seventh thousand, will be a sabbath of rest and release; for, says the prophet concerning the land, 'as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath.' 2 Chronicles 36:21. 'There remaineth therefore a rest [margin, 'keeping of a sabbath'] to the people of God.' Hebrews 4:9. This precedes the new-earth state."

Ellen White is also clear that we go to heaven after 6000 years on this earth. She has a number of quotes about the time of sin being 6000 years on this earth which the reader can look up. Here is a representative quote. "The great plan of redemption results in fully bringing back the world into God's favor. All that was lost by sin is restored. Not only man but the earth is redeemed, to be the eternal abode of the obedient. For six thousand years Satan has struggled to maintain possession of the earth. Now God's original purpose in its creation is accomplished. 'The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.'" (*Adventist Home*, pp. 539-540)

This shows that the time for the Millennium in heaven is not just a number that God just arbitrarily picked; rather, God picked the length of time for the Millennium because He is following His own law regarding the sabbath rest for the land. If God is following this law two thousand years after the Cross, this shows that this law was not abolished at the Cross as du Preez asserts.

The next point that du Preez makes in an attempt to abolish the feasts is about Passover and he quotes the following Ellen White quote. "While the institution of the passover was pointing backward to the miraculous deliverance of the Hebrews, it likewise pointed forward, showing the death of the Son of God before it transpired. In the last passover our Lord observed with his disciples, he instituted the Lord's supper in place of the passover, to be observed in memory of his death. No longer had they need of the passover, for he, the great antitypical Lamb, was ready to be sacrificed for the sins of the world. Type met antitype in the death of Christ." (*Youth's Instructor*, May 1, 1873)

Here's another representative quote of Ellen White's on this subject. "As He [Jesus] ate the Passover with His disciples, He instituted in its place the service that was to be the memorial of His great sacrifice. The national festival of the Jews was to pass away forever. The service which Christ established was to be observed by His followers in all lands and through all ages." (*Desire of Ages*, p. 652)

In order to rightly interpret these quotes of Ellen White's we need to correctly apply the Biblical Rules of Interpretation in Chapter Seven. Notice that Rule #1 is to carefully consider everything God's Word says on a subject before coming to any conclusions because, according to Rule #2, all conclusions should be based on the weight of evidence. Rule #5 is that one part of God's Word never conflicts with another part of God's Word. If our interpretation causes a conflict, then we may know that we have not arrived at truth because

God never conflicts with Himself. In Malachi 3:6 God says, "I change not." God is not going to say something in one place in His Word and then say something conflicting in another part of His Word. All Bible texts and Ellen White quotes must harmonize in order to arrive at truth. With these rules in mind, let's consider the evidence.

I believe that we all agree that it was the ceremonial law that ended at the cross. So the question is this. "Are the feasts part of the ceremonial law?"

In the following quote Ellen White says that there are only two laws, moral and ceremonial. "There are two distinct laws brought to view. One is the law of types and shadows, which reached to the time of Christ, and ceased when type met antitype in his death. The other is the law of Jehovah, and is as abiding and changeless as his eternal throne. **After the crucifixion, it was a denial of Christ for the Jews to continue to offer the burnt offerings and sacrifices which were typical of His death.** It was saying to the world that they looked for a Redeemer to come, and had no faith in Him who had given his life for the sins of the world. **Hence the ceremonial law ceased to be of force at the death of Christ.**" [Emphasis added] (*Signs of the Times*, July 29, 1886) Notice that Ellen White says that to observe the ceremonial law after the death of Jesus is a denial of Him (in other words, a sin).

Ellen White furthermore states that Jesus never observed the ceremonial law. The ceremonial law consisted of slaying a lamb when someone sinned in order to obtain forgiveness for that sin. This law was instituted when Adam and Eve sinned and ended at the cross, because Jesus was the Lamb of God slain for our sins. Since Jesus never sinned, He did not need to partake of the ceremonial law. Here is Ellen White's quote saying that Jesus never observed the ceremonial law. "**Christ passed through all the experiences of His childhood, youth, and manhood without the observance of ceremonial temple worship.**" (*The Bible Echo*, October 31, 1898)

However, Jesus did observe the feasts. John chapter 7 records Jesus' observance of the Feast of Tabernacles. Here is Ellen White's comment on His observance of the Feast of Tabernacles. "Jesus traveled up and down the breadth of the land, giving his invitation to the feast. When the sun illuminated the landscape, Jesus said to the vast throng: "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. He took the opportunity of presenting himself to the people during the feast-days, when they gathered at Jerusalem." (*Advent Review & Sabbath Herald*, July 7, 1896) The following quote shows that Jesus also observed Passover. "Among the Jews the twelfth year was the dividing line between childhood and youth. On completing this year a Hebrew boy was called a son of the law, and also a son of God. He was given special opportunities for religious instruction, and **was expected to participate in the sacred feasts and observances. It was in accordance with this custom that Jesus in His boyhood made the Passover visit to Jerusalem.**" (*Desire of Ages*, p. 75) Luke chapter 22:15-16 records Jesus observing Passover with His disciples and in these verses Jesus states that Passover is not fulfilled until heaven. Here are Bible texts that show that Jesus observed the feasts. Luke 2:41, 42; Matthew 26:17-18; John 2:23; John 4:45; John 5:1; John 7:10, 14, 37; Luke 22:15-16.

Since Jesus never observed the ceremonial law, but yet He observed the feasts, and since there are only two laws, moral and ceremonial, under which law did Jesus put the feasts? The answer is obvious.

In the following quotes Ellen White tells us that Paul also did not observe the ceremonial law after the cross and he never taught his converts to observe the ceremonial law. "Paul did not bind himself nor his converts to the ceremonies and customs of the Jews, with their varied forms, types, and sacrifices; for he recognized that the perfect and final offering had been made in the death of the Son of God." (*Sketches From the Life of Paul*, p. 105) "Factions also were beginning to rise through the influence of Judaizing teachers, who urged that the converts to Christianity should observe the ceremonial law in the matter of circumcision... They vindicated their position, which was in opposition to that of Paul." (*Sketches From the Life of Paul*, p. 121)

However, Paul observed the feasts himself and he also observed them with his converts. Here are the quotes. "But bade them farewell, saying, I must by all means **keep** this feast in Jerusalem." (Acts 18:21)

Ellen White comments on this text. "After leaving Corinth, Paul's next scene of labor was Ephesus. He was on his way to Jerusalem to attend an approaching festival, and his stay at Ephesus was necessarily brief." (*Acts of the Apostles*, p. 269) Paul did not make it to Jerusalem in time, so he kept this feast with the Philippians (Gentile converts). "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread." (Acts 20:6) "At Philippi Paul tarried to **keep** the Passover. Only Luke remained with him, the other members of the company passing on to Troas to await him there. The Philippians were the most loving and truehearted of the apostle's converts, and during the eight days of the feast he enjoyed peaceful and happy communion with them." (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 390-391) (The eight days of the feast Ellen White referred to in this quote are Passover and Unleavened Bread.) "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us **keep** the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." (1 Corinthians 5:7-8)

Since Ellen White tells us that Paul did not observe the ceremonial law and did not teach his converts to do so, but yet he observed the feasts with his converts, what law is Paul putting the feasts under? Moral or ceremonial?

Our own SDA Commentary tells us that John the Revelator and many other early Christians observed Passover after the cross also. This quote is from the SDA Commentary, Vol. 9, p. 362, and is quoting from an early Christian's letter, written about 150 A.D. "[p. 505] Therefore we keep the day undeviatingly, neither adding nor taking away, for in Asia [Minor] great luminaries sleep, and they will rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he shall come with glory from heaven and seek out all the saints. Such were Phillip. . . and two of his daughters. . . .[p. 507] There is also **John who lay on the Lord's breast**. . . .And there is also Polycarp at Smyrna, both bishop and martyr, and Thraseas, both bishop and martyr, from Eumeneae. . . .[Also] Sagaris,. . . .Papirius,. . . .and Melito. . . . **all of these kept the fourteenth day of the Passover according to the gospel, never swerving, but following according to the rule of the faith**. And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, live according to the tradition of my kinsmen, and some of them have I followed. For seven of my family were bishops and I am the eighth, and my kinsmen ever kept the day when the people put away the leaven. Therefore, brethren, I who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord and conversed with brethren from every country, and have studied all holy Scripture am not afraid of threats, for they have said, who were greater than I, 'It is better to obey God rather than men.'"

**"After the crucifixion, it was a denial of Christ for the Jews to continue to offer the burnt offerings and sacrifices which were typical of His death.** It was saying to the world that they looked for a Redeemer to come, and had no faith in Him who had given his life for the sins of the world. **Hence the ceremonial law ceased to be of force at the death of Christ.**" [Emphasis added] (*Signs of the Times*, July 29, 1886) Since it was a denial of Jesus to observe the ceremonial law after the cross, if the feasts are part of the ceremonial law, then Paul, John the Revelator, and many other Christians were denying Jesus. Paul and John the Revelator wrote the majority of the NT. Do you think the Holy Spirit would use anyone who is denying Jesus to write a major portion of the NT?

So, are the feasts part of the moral law or the ceremonial law? The answer is obvious. The feasts are part of the moral law. Since they are part of the moral law this means that the feasts will be observed forever. And indeed, the Bible does confirm that we will be observing the feasts in heaven. "And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year, to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to **keep** the Feast of Tabernacles." (Zechariah 14:16) Zechariah chapter 14 is speaking of the same event as Revelation 22:7-9. By putting these verses in Revelation with Zechariah chapter 14 we see a more complete picture. First, Jesus descends from heaven the Mount of Olives which splits in half (Zechariah 14:4. Then, the New Jerusalem descends down (Rev 21:2). Then the wicked are raised and come against the New Jerusalem. (Zechariah 14:16 and Rev 22:9), at which time the wicked will all be destroyed (Zechariah 14:12, 17-18 and Rev 22:9). Interestingly, both the Bible and Ellen White tell us that the wicked are destroyed at the Feast of Tabernacles (Zechariah 14:18 and

*Patriarchs and Prophets* p. 541, last paragraph). Lastly, the Bible tells us that after all the wicked are destroyed, in the New Earth we will be celebrating the Feast of Tabernacles from year to year (Zechariah 14:16). We will be keeping the Feast of Tabernacles forever in heaven, just as Leviticus chapter 23 tells us to, where God says four times that we are to keep His feast days forever.

Look up all of Ellen White's ceremonial law quotes to see that she only defines "ceremonial" as being the sacrificial system. And indeed, Daniel 9:27 tells us that it was the sacrificial system that ended at the cross. The ceremonial law is the sacrificial system.

Now back to Ellen White's quote stating that Passover passed away forever. Remember, we have to harmonize this quote with all of the above quotes in order to arrive at truth and there is only one way to do that. On Passover, the sacrificial lamb was slain and then eaten. The sacrificing and eating of the lamb was the main part of Passover and this part of Passover did pass away forever, but the rest of Passover remains. Here's the proof.

We would not want this quote of Ellen White's to conflict with what Jesus said, would we? In Luke 22:15-16, Jesus said about Passover, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it (Passover) be fulfilled in the kingdom of heaven." (Parentheses inserted by the authors so the readers will understand that "it" is "Passover.")

In Matthew 5:17-18 Jesus said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." In these verses the word "law" comes from the Greek word "nomos" which comes from the Hebrew word "Torah." So Jesus is saying that the tiniest little stroke of a letter of any word in the Torah will not pass away until it is fulfilled. In Luke 22:15-16 Jesus said that Passover isn't fulfilled until heaven; therefore, Passover cannot pass away until heaven.

Since Passover remains, but the sacrificial system has does not, that means that we now celebrate Passover without sacrificing a lamb, following Jesus' example at the Last Supper, which Jesus Himself called "Passover." Note that at this last Passover meal, there is no mention of sacrificing or eating a lamb. Thus, in this last Passover Supper that Jesus celebrated with His disciples, He dropped off the lamb but retained the unleavened bread and grape juice part of Passover. We call this Communion, but Communion is really Passover without the lamb. By Jesus' own Example, He showed us how to continue celebrating Passover.

In our churches today, we do celebrate Communion which is Passover without the lamb. The problem is that at church we do this on any day of the year without any regard to also celebrating Communion on Passover. Jesus said "as oft as ye do this" indicating that the Passover Communion could be celebrated more often than once a year, but don't you think we should also follow the original Bible command and also celebrate Communion on Passover since Passover isn't fulfilled until heaven? Remember, Jesus is our Example in all things (1 Peter 2:21) and this is what Jesus Himself did at the Last Supper, to give us an example of how He wanted us to continue to celebrate Passover. He celebrated Communion on Passover. And that is what we do today and why we celebrate Passover and and the rest of the feasts.

To Be Continued. Showing where du Preez is wrong takes a terrific lot of time and study. As we have time we will continue our response and work through du Preez' book point-by-point. Check back periodically to this website to get the latest update.

The Authors

(See the next page for the Appendixes)

## APPENDIX I

### ARE THE FEASTS PART OF THE MORAL LAW OR THE CEREMONIAL LAW?

In the following quote Ellen White says that there are only two laws, moral and ceremonial. "There are two distinct laws brought to view. One is the law of types and shadows, which reached to the time of Christ, and ceased when type met antitype in his death. The other is the law of Jehovah, and is as abiding and changeless as his eternal throne. **After the crucifixion, it was a denial of Christ for the Jews to continue to offer the burnt offerings and sacrifices which were typical of His death.** It was saying to the world that they looked for a Redeemer to come, and had no faith in Him who had given his life for the sins of the world. **Hence the ceremonial law ceased to be of force at the death of Christ.**" [Emphasis added] (*Signs of the Times*, July 29, 1886) Notice that Ellen White says that to observe the ceremonial law after the death of Jesus is a denial of Him (in other words, a sin).

Ellen White furthermore states that Jesus never observed the ceremonial law. The ceremonial law consisted of slaying a lamb when someone sinned in order to obtain forgiveness for that sin. This law was instituted when Adam and Eve sinned and ended at the cross, because Jesus was the Lamb of God slain for our sins. Since Jesus never sinned, He did not need to partake of the ceremonial law. Here is Ellen White's quote saying that Jesus never observed the ceremonial law. "**Christ passed through all the experiences of His childhood, youth, and manhood without the observance of ceremonial temple worship.**" (*The Bible Echo*, October 31, 1898)

However, Jesus did observe the feasts. John chapter 7 records Jesus' observance of the Feast of Tabernacles. Here is Ellen White's comment on His observance of the Feast of Tabernacles. "Jesus traveled up and down the breadth of the land, giving his invitation to the feast. When the sun illuminated the landscape, Jesus said to the vast throng: "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. He took the opportunity of presenting himself to the people during the feast-days, when they gathered at Jerusalem." (*Advent Review & Sabbath Herald*, July 7, 1896) The following quote shows that Jesus also observed Passover. "Among the Jews the twelfth year was the dividing line between childhood and youth. On completing this year a Hebrew boy was called a son of the law, and also a son of God. He was given special opportunities for religious instruction, and **was expected to participate in the sacred feasts and observances. It was in accordance with this custom that Jesus in His boyhood made the Passover visit to Jerusalem.**" (*Desire of Ages*, p. 75) Luke chapter 22:15-16 records Jesus observing Passover with His disciples and in these verses Jesus states that Passover is not fulfilled until heaven. Here are Bible texts that show that Jesus observed the feasts. Luke 2:41, 42; Matthew 26:17-18; John 2:23; John 4:45; John 5:1; John 7:10, 14, 37; Luke 22:15-16.

Since Jesus never observed the ceremonial law, but yet He observed the feasts, and since there are only two laws, moral and ceremonial, under which law did Jesus put the feasts? The answer is obvious.

In the following quotes Ellen White tells us that Paul also did not observe the ceremonial law after the cross and he never taught his converts to observe the ceremonial law. "Paul did not bind himself nor his converts to the ceremonies and customs of the Jews, with their varied forms, types, and sacrifices; for he recognized that the perfect and final offering had been made in the death of the Son of God." (*Sketches From the Life of Paul*, p. 105) "Factions also were beginning to rise through the influence of Judaizing teachers, who urged that the converts to Christianity should observe the ceremonial law in the matter of circumcision... They vindicated their position, which was in opposition to that of Paul." (*Sketches From the Life of Paul*, p. 121)

However, Paul observed the feasts himself and he also observed them with his converts. Here are the quotes. "But bade them farewell, saying, I must by all means **keep** this feast in Jerusalem." (Acts 18:21) Ellen White comments on this text. "After leaving Corinth, Paul's next scene of labor was Ephesus. He was on his way to Jerusalem to attend an approaching festival, and his stay at Ephesus was necessarily brief." (*Acts of the Apostles*, p. 269) Paul did not make it to Jerusalem in time, so he kept this feast with the Philippians (Gentile converts). "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread." (Acts 20:6) "At Philippi Paul tarried to **keep** the Passover. Only Luke remained with him, the other members of the company passing on to Troas to await him there. The Philippians were the most loving and truehearted of the apostle's converts, and during the eight days of the feast he enjoyed peaceful and happy communion with them." (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 390-391) (The eight days of the feast Ellen White referred to in this quote are Passover and Unleavened Bread.) "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us **keep** the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." (1 Corinthians 5:7-8)

Since Ellen White tells us that Paul did not observe the ceremonial law and did not teach his converts to do so, but yet he observed the feasts with his converts, what law is Paul putting the feasts under? Moral or ceremonial?

Our own SDA Commentary tells us that John the Revelator and many other early Christians observed Passover after the cross also. This quote is from the SDA Commentary, Vol. 9, p. 362, and is quoting from an early Christian's letter, written about 150 A.D. "[p. 505] Therefore we keep the day undeviatingly, neither adding nor taking away, for in Asia [Minor] great luminaries sleep, and they will rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he shall come with glory from heaven and seek out all the saints. Such were Phillip. . . and two of his daughters. . . [p. 507] There is also **John who lay on the Lord's breast**. . . And there is also Polycarp at Smyrna, both bishop and martyr, and Thraseas, both bishop and martyr, from Eumenaea. . . [Also] Sagaris, . . . Papirius, . . . and Melito. . . **all of these kept the fourteenth day of the Passover according to the gospel, never swerving, but following according to the rule of the faith**. And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, live according to the tradition of my kinsmen, and some of them have I followed. For seven of my family were bishops and I am the eighth, and my kinsmen ever kept the day when the people put away the leaven. Therefore, brethren, I who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord and conversed with brethren from every country, and have studied all holy Scripture am not afraid of threats, for they have said, who were greater than I, 'It is better to obey God rather than men.'"

**"After the crucifixion, it was a denial of Christ for the Jews to continue to offer the burnt offerings and sacrifices which were typical of His death.** It was saying to the world that they looked for a Redeemer to come, and had no faith in Him who had given his life for the sins of the world. **Hence the ceremonial law ceased to be of force at the death of Christ.**" [Emphasis added] (*Signs of the Times*, July 29, 1886) Since it was a denial of Jesus to observe the ceremonial law after the cross, if the feasts are part of the ceremonial law, then Paul, John the Revelator, and many other Christians were denying Jesus. Paul and John the Revelator wrote the majority of the NT. Do you think the Holy Spirit would use anyone who is denying Jesus to write a major portion of the NT?

"Anciently the Lord instructed His people to assemble three times a year for His worship. To these holy convocations the children of Israel came, bringing to the house of God their tithes, their sin offerings, and their offerings of gratitude. They met to recount God's mercies, to make known His wonderful works, and to offer praise and thanksgiving to His name. And they were to unite in the sacrificial service, which pointed to Christ as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Thus they were to be preserved

from the corrupting power of worldliness and idolatry. Faith and love and gratitude were to be kept alive in their hearts, and through their association together in this sacred service they were to be bound closer to God and to one another...**if the children of Israel needed the benefit of these holy convocations in their time, how much more do we need them in these last days of peril and conflict!** And if the people of the world then needed the light which God had committed to His church, how much more do they need it now!" [Emphasis added] (*Testimonies*, Vol. 6, pp. 39-40)

“Well would it be for the people of God at the present time to have a Feast of Tabernacles--a joyous commemoration of the blessings of God to them. As the children of Israel celebrated the deliverance that God had wrought for their fathers, and His miraculous preservation of them during their journeyings from Egypt, so should we gratefully call to mind the various ways He has devised for bringing us out from the world, and from the darkness of error, into the precious light of His grace and truth.” (*Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 540-541) (Note that the context of this quote is the feasts, for this quote comes out of Ellen White’s chapter on the feasts. We recommend that you read this chapter.)

Ellen White is recommending that we observe the Feasts. Since she also says that it is a denial of Jesus to observe the ceremonial law after the cross, if Ellen White considered the feasts to be part of the ceremonial law, then she would be sinning for recommending that we observe the feasts.

So, are the feasts part of the moral law or the ceremonial law? The answer is obvious. The feasts are part of the moral law. Since they are part of the moral law this means that the feasts will be observed forever. And indeed, the Bible does confirm that we will be observing the feasts in heaven. “And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year, to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to **keep** the Feast of Tabernacles.” (Zechariah 14:16) Zechariah chapter 14 is speaking of the same event as Revelation 22:7-9. By putting these verses in Revelation with Zechariah chapter 14 we see a more complete picture. First, Jesus descends from heaven the Mount of Olives which splits in half (Zechariah 14:4. Then, the New Jerusalem descends down (Rev 21:2). Then the wicked are raised and come against the New Jerusalem. (Zechariah 14:16 and Rev 22:9), at which time the wicked will all be destroyed (Zechariah 14:12, 17-18 and Rev 22:9). Interestingly, both the Bible and Ellen White tell us that the wicked are destroyed at the Feast of Tabernacles (Zechariah 14:18 and *Patriarchs and Prophets* p. 541, last paragraph). Lastly, the Bible tells us that after all the wicked are destroyed, in the New Earth we will be celebrating the Feast of Tabernacles from year to year (Zechariah 14:16). We will be keeping the Feast of Tabernacles forever in heaven, just as Leviticus chapter 23 tells us to, where God says four times that we are to keep His feast days forever.