

Count to Pentecost IV

How to Critique “Doctrinal” Papers

Fred R. Coulter

We’re going to approach this Sabbath a little differently. I want to do is to read to you from the Introduction of the Preface from *The Compendium of World History*, which Dr. Herman Hoeh wrote years ago having to do with how historians record things. It is also true on how religionists present doctrines. This is really interesting.

The Compendium of World History by Dr.

Herman Hoeh: (<http://lcmn.com/wp-content/uploads/Herman%20Hoeh%20-%20Compendium%20of%20World%20History%20Vol.%201.pdf>)

Chapter One: The Modern Interpretation of History

By what authority have historians left God and the Bible out of history?

We could ask the same thing concerning doctrine. By what authority have theologians left God and Truth out of Bible study?

This question may come as a surprise. Many are unaware that a radically new interpretation of history is being taught in schools and colleges today....

This statement is even more so true today than when he wrote this many years ago. The Constitution is really not being taught in the schools.

How many remember the flap when there was this history book that was going to be accepted by the California schools, but it talked about quoting someone in the 1800s who was writing about a quotation about blacks and saying that they were like little ‘pickaninnies.’ The ‘Honorable’ Willie Brown got all upset and got it all cancelled. That book, outside of that one quotation is one of the absolutely best books on the Constitution that you would ever want.

The way that they’re going to change the Constitution, which they’re going to do, sooner or later, is that they’ll have a Constitutional Convention. They’re only two states away from ratifying it and there’s an argument that if a state votes for it and then rescinds the vote for it, they can’t take away their ‘yes’ vote at any time. They may force that upon them. The way that they’re going to get a new Constitution in—you wait and see, there will be—is that they are changing the way that history is taught:

- they don’t teach that the Puritans never observed Christmas
- they don’t teach that the Puritans, when they first came here, were seventh-day Sabbath-keepers

There’re so much history that is lost!

...It is a history of the world in which God and the supernatural are rejected.

How are they bringing back supernatural? *By this paraphenomenal psychology, which is getting into demonism and witchcraft!* You get God out and then you bring in Satan. It’s always going to happen.

It is impossible to believe BOTH this history AND the Bible. Both cannot be right.

The modern interpretation of world history stands in open conflict with Scripture. How did this conflict arise? When did history forget God and become confused? Why are historians so sharply divided into opposing schools over the chronological events of the ancient world?

I’m not going to get into how bad and how silly that carbon-dating and argon-dating is, and what would happen if they would do it honestly, they would have to admit that what they are saying is a lie.

For example, this Professor Leakey. He was quite a guy. He stumbled over what looked like a skull/head, the top of the skull. He said, ‘Oh boy! This thing is millions and millions of years old!’ Upon a finer scrutiny of it, it turned out to be an elephant’s kneecap.

A Radical New View: What many do not realize is that the modern world-view of history without God is a radically new interpretation of human experience. Almost no one today, it seems, has ever questioned whether this new interpretation is right. It is merely assumed to be right.

If you have the opportunity, by all means, see if you can get a full set of McGuffey readers. Have you ever seen McGuffey readers? We have a full set at home. He has one section on the Sabbath that will absolutely ‘blow your mind.’ He says that any nation that does away with the Sabbath—in his mind that was Sunday—looses contact with God and when you loose contact with God, that nation goes into corruption. *Absolutely true!*

Students in particular -- and the public in general—have been led to believe that archaeologists, historians, scientists and theologians live with full assurance and in absolute conviction that this new interpretation of HISTORY WITHOUT GOD is correct. Nothing could be farther from the truth!

One would be shocked to hear the candid admissions and private confessions of learned scholars. These men appear to write and speak with confidence. They are assumed to know the answers to history's greatest questions: how did man originate? why is man here? where is man going?

No one can tell you that, yet. Just as an aside: When Satan told Adam and Eve that if they ate of this Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, they would become like God. I think that in order for them to understand that statement, God must have discussed with them His plan for what He was going to do. That's just a thought. Think on that! That's not doctrine. I'm saying, 'Here's a thought. If it might fit into that, it might be worth considering when we study it. If it doesn't, then we'll cast it out.'

But they do not know. They have no scientific way of discovering the answers. They are only guessing! One famous historian—Hendrik Van Loon—dared to confess this in his book “Story of Mankind.” Here are his candid words: “We live under the shadow of a gigantic question mark. What are we? Where did we come from? Whither are we bound?”

And his answer: “We still know very little but we have reached the point where (with a fair degree of accuracy) we can guess at many things.”

That's a shocking quote and a statement! However, I want you to understand how much of that has been done in this Passover thing and the Pentecost thing. How much is guessing, because they start out with the wrong basis to begin with.

Astounding -- but true! Yet these guesses are masquerading today as authoritative interpretations of history!

How History Is Written: Casual readers would be shocked to learn how history books are prepared. It is usually assumed that history is solely a matter of collecting factual material, judiciously evaluating it, and recording it for posterity. “Nothing could be farther from the truth,” warns C. W. Ceram in “Secret of the Hittites,” p. 119. A historian is not a scribe, but a JUDGE of the evidence that is brought before him....

Notice this in newspaper writing. This applies also to newspaper articles that are written. The writer is not presenting the facts. He is presenting his biased view of the facts. Remember, that is the way that it is in everything.

We'll just use an example here, since it's baseball season. We now have the Oakland A's who are in first place and it looks like that they are going to absolutely wipe out the rest of the league. We're told that their greatest challenger is the Kansas City Royals. In order for them to tie with the A's at the end of the season, 142 games from now, they would have to go 21 games over 500 ball and the A's would only have to play 500 ball, that is, win 71 and lose 71, to tie for the final championship of the American League West. On the other hand, the Giants are at the bottom. They're at the cellar.

- Would you get an A's fan to accurately portray the Giants?
- Would you get a Giants fan to accurately portray the A's, especially considering how they are 17 and 2 of the last 19 games that they have played? *No!*
- Could you get a Republican to accurately and fairly give a historical account or writing about the Democrats?
- How about the Democrats about the Republicans? *No!*

You need to keep that in mind!

He is his own final authority. He is not judged by, but sits in judgment of, history. **Whatever evidence does not conform to the commonly accepted beliefs of the age or community in which he lives he summarily rejects!**

That's exactly what happens!

History, in other words, is based only on that part of evidence which agrees with the prevailing opinions of the society in which a historian lives....

If those are not profound words, I don't know what are!

...These may be shocking evaluations, but they are true. World-history texts prove it. Historians admit it!

“The SELECTION of sources still rests upon the discretion of the individual historian. What he chooses as relevant depends upon his conception of the period he is studying....”

This is literally true!

I find this all the time in doing real estate and real estate loans. People buying real estate or getting loans before they understand the process, only reveal the good side. That's why there are credit reports, because that reveals the not so good side, if it's not so good. This is part of human nature.

I remember one time my sister and I lived in a downstairs apartment and the manager lived right

above us. We had had one 'knock down drag out' of a fight. We were shouting, yelling and screaming. She was crying and chasing me around the apartment with a broom. I was doing something else. All of a sudden came the knock, knock, knock on the door.

What happened? *Dead silence!* What do you do? *You dry your tears and try and look as refreshed as you can!* Knock, knock, knock, again. How long can you delay him? *You can't delay him too long!* You go open the door and guess who is standing at the door? *The manager from upstairs!* He said, 'Is everything all right? Is there anything wrong?' 'No, everything's just fine!'

It's part of the way that we function. I have yet, in visiting anyone, if you had a fight just before I come, open the door and say, 'Guess what? We had the most miserable knock-down fight just before you came!' No way!

"What he chooses as relevant depends upon his conception of the period he is studying....

Or the story he is telling!

...In this the historian is limited by his own temperament and guided by the spirit of his age." So writes C. W. Ceram in the previously mentioned volume, on page 119.

Is there any wonder that different nations and peoples have divergent histories of the same events?

Not Without Bias

Take as an example the history of the Second World War. Communist historians write only those facts about the war that can be shaped to suit the aims of the Communist Party....

One thing they forgot to tell all the Soviet people, was about all the aid that the Americans gave them.

...Japanese historians view the episode at Pearl Harbor quite differently from Americans. Even in America there are two or more versions about the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor incident—depending upon the political party with which one is affiliated!

Today many German historians are united in a conspiracy to hide the truth about the Hitler regime from the younger generation. The Nazi period is glossed over almost as if it did not exist!

And how did historians handle the events of the First World War? In the same manner. The French historians' account of

the Versailles Treaty at the end of the war was diametrically opposed to the German version. Each nation chose to accept only those facts which would lend historical support to its selfish motives.

Sounds a little bit like Vietnam or the Korean War.

The reconstruction and interpretation of history to suit political, social, economic, religious or race prejudices is a practice of scientific historians of all nations. Much of this prejudice the writers themselves are unaware of. It is so natural to human nature that they are often convinced that their prejudices do not exist!....

You will never get anyone to admit that he or she has prejudices. Do you have prejudices? You don't know? I do! *I'm totally prejudice for God's way. That makes me prejudice!*

This suppression of part of the truth is the primary reason the world has never learned the lessons of history. The secondary reason, of course, is that most individuals do not want to believe the truth of history even when it is told them.

A Case History

A remarkable episode occurred in America in 1954 when the highest court of the land was confronted with a major social issue. A noted historian had become involved in the legal aspects of the case. Here is what happened, in his own words, told to fellow historians:

"The problem we faced was not the historian's discovery of the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; the problem instead was the formulation of an adequate gloss....

That's what we're dealing with, with this doctrine of Pentecost written by William F. Dankenbring. We are not concerned in this paper with the whole truth, the truth and nothing but the truth, as presented in the Scriptures. We are confronted with a preconceived notion of doctrine, whereby the paper is set out to justify that preconceived notion. Of course, that's violating several rules of Bible study.

"...It was not that we were engaged in formulating lies; there was nothing as crude and naive as that. But we were using facts, emphasizing facts, bearing down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts and, above all, interpreting facts in a way to...'get by....'"

We're going to see that exact same thing in this paper by Dankenbring. He goes on to say that the evidence accepted in the 1954 case was really a

reinterpretation of history to justify the Supreme Court in granting that judgment that they did. Was that not done with *Roe v. Wade* for abortion?

- they selected one case
- they bore down on facts
- they eased up on facts
- they changed facts
- they maneuvered it so they developed a case so that they would get abortion as the law of the land

That's exactly what happened, precisely what happened. I think when the resurrection comes and we're going to know the real truth of history, we are going to be absolutely amazed.

With what I just read in mind, let's take the paper, What is the Correct Day to Observe Pentecost? by William F. Dankenbring. It says: Astounding New Truth. What is 'astounding new truth'? *I would say it would be astounding new truth if it were something like they just claimed!*

In the newspaper it said that for the very first time, they were able to take human brain cells and cause them to replicate in the test tube. That is astounding new truth; it's never been done before. They hailed this a great advance, and so forth.

When you say, Astounding New Truth, we're going to have to, in this paper, see something which has never been before. Otherwise, it is not *new truth*. Is he headlining his paper? *Yes, through sensationalism!*

What Is the Correct Day to Observe Pentecost? by William F. Dankenbring

What is the correct day to observe Pentecost?

We'll read through several of the first paragraphs, here and then we'll get in on the inside part of it. I'll just cover certain sections of it. I don't want to go through this one word for word like I did the other one. I just want to point out some very important facts.

What is the correct method to count or calculate the day of Pentecost? From just which Sabbath are we to count 50 days? The Worldwide Church of God has been in shocking error on this matter. Here for the first time revealed is the astounding proof.

Whenever someone says, "...for the first time revealed..." and it has been there before, it is not the first time revealed. When they say it is the truth, it should be the truth *rather than their interpretation* of the evidence. Now you know why I went over this calendar thing so thoroughly, so that you really understood what it was.

Amazing but true, once human beings begin a pattern of error, it is exceedingly difficult to correct the error and to come to the truth. Nevertheless, Herbert W. Armstrong wrote several years ago, "We are all human. We are all fallible. I have been wrong. I've made mistakes the same is true of all of those God is using in His work. God says, 'Prove all things.'"

Recently, new evidence has come to my attention that proves beyond any doubt that the Church of God has still been observing the Day of Pentecost on the wrong day.

'New evidence' would constitute:

- something that has never been discovered before
- something that had never been written before
- something that no one had never been observed before

Is that what he presented? *No, not in the slightest!*

Nevertheless, the facts prove that beyond any shadow of doubt the Church of God has been in error on the day of Pentecost from the time the work began in 1934 until 1987, or over 50 years.

Let me insert one little bit of historical truth that many people do not know. When Herbert Armstrong first began keeping Pentecost, way back when, guess which day he observed it on? *The very first Pentecost that Herbert Armstrong and his little group kept, was the Jewish day, the 6th of Sivan!* So, that statement is incorrect. Dankenbring doesn't know what he's writing about. You have to be careful when you make statements like that.

I want to point something out that is clear. Bill Dankenbring is a very prolific and productive writer. He can write, write, write! This kind of thinking and this kind of sensationalism caused problems with Worldwide. When he was a writer, there, he was a prolific writer for them and he was a cause of the problems in Worldwide, because of his writings. Now, he has no one to govern or check what he does and obviously, we end up with things like this.

Which Sabbath Do We Count From?

Some believe that the Sabbath intended, is the regular weekly Sabbath. However, others believe that the Sabbath in question is plainly the first High Holy Day Sabbath of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. In verse seven of this chapter, God plainly shows that the first day of the Feast of

Unleavened Bread was ordained as a Sabbath.

As we showed in part 3 of this series, God did not. He said it was a ‘Holy convocation.’

‘No servile work was to be done therein.’ It was to be a Holy convocation. Immediately following this commandment, God introduces the offering of the sheaf of the firstfruits, following verse ten.

No! It doesn’t immediately follow that because you have day seven in between the first day and v 10, as we pointed out.

It is obvious that the context itself, proves that this Sabbath is the first Holy Day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread...

Let’s go to Lev. 23, just to refresh our memories, so we’ll have it right here in this sermon. If you read Lev. 23:7-11, there is nothing which proves that it is ‘obvious’ that it is the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. If it were meant to be a Holy Day, the only *obvious* conclusion that you come to from any context is, it would have to be the seventh day, the last Holy Day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

You will notice very carefully in Leviticus 23:11: “And he shall wave the sheaf before the LORD to be accepted for you. On the next day after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it.”

If God intended it to be the first Holy Day, what would we find here? ‘*And you shall wave the sheaf on the day after the first Holy Day!*’ I’m going to show you that the Septuagint indeed says that, but there’s a little tell-tell evidence that they were ‘fiddling’ with the text, because the Hebrew does not say or refer to a Holy Day at all, but a Sabbath. That is universally translated ‘Sabbath’ throughout the entire Bible, not ‘week.’

...otherwise, confusion would have set in. If God meant the regular weekly Sabbath and thus changed the thought, He would have said, “Weekly Sabbath”...

That’s exactly what God said. He said, ‘shabbat.’

...in order to distinguish it from the annual Sabbath, which He had just ordained in verse seven of this chapter.

We find his reasoning is not following along correctly!

How Did the Pharisees Count It?

In the days of Christ, there were two leading, religious sects in Israel—the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The Pharisees were very conservative in doctrine,

whereas the Sadducees became very liberal.

Immediately, what are the two ‘buzz words’ from modern reporting that we pick up? I want to show you how to be aware of the prejudices of the writer and what the writer is trying to do. We have two ‘buzz words’ here: *Conservative*, which, if you believe in the Bible, fundamentally is good, *vs liberal*, which if you believe in the Bible, fundamentally is bad and evil. Brethren, *grace* is liberal. You think about that.

Dankenbring makes an error:

Notice now, the story flow and sequence of events during this pivotal springtime festival of seven days. First the Passover was observed on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, symbolizing Jesus Christ our Passover Lamb.

Please understand, to observe the Passover is not just the killing:

- it’s the killing
- it is the cooking
- it is the eating when it referred to when they had the lamb

Then the first day of Unleavened Bread was observed as an annual Sabbath with a Holy meeting. Then, the following day is an integral part of the spring festival. ‘On the morrow’ after that Sabbath, the very next morning, the Wave Sheaf Offering was performed by the priest. This event was an integral part of the spring festival. It was not delayed until ‘the morrow’ after the weekly Sabbath.

As we pointed out in part three, there are times when that occurs. So, his statement is incorrect.

If the weekly Sabbath was the same as the first and last Holy Days of Unleavened Bread, by coincidence then, those who claim it is the correct day, claim the Wave Sheaf Offering then came *after* the seven-day festival.

Let me clarify it: If you have a situation where the first Holy Day is on a Sunday, you obviously have the Passover on the 14th; but you see you have a problem if you believe in a 15th Passover, because you have *no day after the Sabbath*. This is another proof that the Passover is on the 14th, not the 15th. Whenever you have 8 days, you are always guaranteed that there is a Sabbath during the Feast of Unleavened Bread and Passover. What you do, Passover becomes the Sabbath. The first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, being a Sunday, also becomes the Wave Sheaf Offering Day, because it is

to be done *during* the Days of Unleavened Bread and not *outside* of the Days of Unleavened Bread.

This also shows another thing. This is why God did not have the crucifixion fall in a year when the Passover was on a Sabbath, because Jesus would not have been in the grave three days and three nights.

What we have done, we have seen in this that Dankenbring's thinking is geared—since he believes in a 15th Passover—to where he does not count that Sabbath where there is a Passover, as the regular weekly Sabbath during the Passover and Days of Unleavened Bread, because he would have the Passover the next day. When you go to a 15th Passover and you stand by that, then you have to make other changes and adjustments to make things work. It's like a con man who starts out with one lie:

- he's got to live a lie
- he's got to support lies
- he has to manufacture lies

Watch the newest Mission Impossible. It's interesting and it's clever, but whatever they do is based upon deception to deliberately deceive and they must construct and reconstruct everything to fit the scenario. That's what he has to do in order to justify his 15th Passover. He's got to come back with this kind of statement.

How Did the Pharisees Count It?

In the days of Christ there were two leading religious sects in Israel—the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The Pharisees were very conservative in doctrine, whereas the Sadducees became very liberal; the difference between them were very great. The Church historian, Luke, wrote, quote: “For the Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither angel or spirit. But the Pharisees confess both” (Acts 23:8). Jesus, Himself, had to deal with a question posed to Him by the Sadducees who say that there is no resurrection. The Pharisees later heard how He had put the Sadducees to silence.

- How many Scriptures are quoted in this section of the paper? *Two and part of one!*
- Should you make any doctrinal conclusions based upon 2½ partial Scriptures?

Notice the next sentence at the beginning of the paragraph:

It should be obvious, that neither Christ nor the apostles went along with the Sadducees in their doctrines.

A great leap of interpretation! Where is it obvious?

Matthew 16:11: “How is it that you do not understand that I was not speaking of bread *when I told* you to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees?’.... [both were wrong] ...Then they understood that He did not say to beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees... [whose doctrine comes first, a little different than what he's trying to present] ...and Sadducees” (vs 11-12).

It should be obvious that neither Christ nor the apostles went along with the Sadducees and their doctrines. In fact, when Paul defended himself before a court of Pharisees and Sadducees, he claimed boldly, “Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee and of the hope and the resurrection of the dead am I called into question.”

Did he do that because he was still a Pharisee? *or* Did he do it as a part of his own defense in front of them? Paul himself had been a Pharisee all of his life, until his conversion.

The Sadducees had gone very far astray in doctrine but the Pharisees were very conservative guardians of the Law and traditions of the fathers (Gal. 1:13-14).

What is missing? *Proof!* He gives no proof! It is a statement. He is *bearing down* on a fact. He is *easing up* on a fact, and notice the conclusion that he's coming to now. We'll get to the thing about Paul and the Pharisees. We're going to leave no stone unturned. We're not going to take giant leaps of creative doctrinal generation as Mr. Dankenbring has done here.

Jesus said of the Pharisees, “The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat.” Jesus, Himself, therefore, acknowledged the authority of the Pharisees as holding authority from God. Although they were abusing and misusing it, He said to His disciples, “All, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.”

You can check this out in a *New American Standard Version* if you would like. It seems rather strange that Jesus would so roundly condemn the Pharisees. Oops! Forgot one thing:

- Who did we leave out? *The scribes!*
- What about the scribes?
- Who is placed before the Pharisees? *The scribes!*

He says nothing about the authority of the scribes in his paper.

Matthew 23:1: “Then Jesus spoke to the multitudes and to His disciples, saying, ‘The scribes

and the Pharisees have sat down on Moses' seat *as judges*" (vs 1-2).

Verse 2 (*New American Standard Version*): "...have seated themselves in Moses' seat..." which is born out by the Greek. They usurped that authority:

- Why?
- Who were the Pharisees?
- Paul was a Pharisee
- What did he claim himself to be as to what tribe he came from? *Benjamin—'of the Hebrew of Hebrews, an Israelite of Israelites of the tribe of Benjamin!'*

Benjamin was not of the tribe of Levi. Only the Levites could properly sit in Moses' seat. The Pharisees and the scribes who were *not* of Levi, or Levitical blood, placed themselves—usurped the authority—and sat in Moses' seat, but Jesus said:

Verse 3: "Therefore, every judgment that they tell you to observe, observe and do...." That can only refer to just the reading of the Scriptures of what God says. It couldn't refer to anything else, as we covered before.

(go to the next track)

It has to mean that whatever they bid you to do from the Scriptures, which are the writings of Moses, 'that you do and observe':

"...But do not do according to their works..." (vs 3). If that weren't the case, then He would not have denounced them so severely. There is no place in all of the Bible that so roundly and soundly denounces anybody as Matt. 23 does of the scribes and the Pharisees.

If the Sadducees were so bad, which they probably were, why are they missing in this group of denunciations? They're never addressed. You can take and twist this any way you want to. The scribes are put in first place before the Pharisees. Nothing is said of the scribes later. Scribes, I will have to say, were of both political parties, both of Sadducees and Pharisees.

The reason I point that out is because Dankenbring has not done enough work to really understand that they seated themselves. He just made the assumption that Jesus acknowledged their authority. He said, 'don't go after their works,' because they would read the Scriptures and then go do their traditions, that's why. In doing their traditions, they would deny the Word of God, they would reject the commandments of God and then, all the denunciations that are there, you go through and read it and that is strong. You talk about a 'tell off.' You talk about a 'put down.' That's why Jesus says, "But do not do according to their works..." They

read the Scriptures and turn around and do the opposite.

(Continuing with Dankenbring paper):

Jesus Himself, therefore, acknowledged the authority of the Pharisees as holding authority from God.

No, He didn't, because the Greek gives the implication that they seated themselves. They usurped, took it, although they were abusing and misusing it.

How did the Sadducees and Pharisees decide this matter of counting Pentecost?

Then it goes on with the account of *Josephus*. Josephus was a Pharisee. What do historians do? *We just read it!*

- they bear down on facts
- they ease up on facts
- they emphasize facts

What Josephus did was to give the *Pharisaical way* of counting Pentecost, from the day after the first Holy Day during the Days of Unleavened Bread.

The *Jamison Fausset and Brown Commentary* says about the sheaf of the firstfruits:

The offering described in this passage was made on the 16th of the first month, Abib or Nissan, the day following **the first Passover Sabbath**, which was on the 15th, and the second day of the festival, the 16th of the month.

This authority...

Is *Jamison Fausset and Brown* an absolute authority? *No, but that lends credence to what Dankenbring is saying!*

"You shall count from the morrow after the Sabbath," i.e.: after the first day of the Passover week which is observed as a Sabbath. Next, Adam Clarke in his **authoritative** commentary...

But Adam Clarke also believed in Sunday. Let's be honest here:

- Are we bearing down on facts?
- Are we easing up on facts?
- Are we emphasizing facts? *Yes, indeed!*

...says of Leviticus 15...

It says the same thing.

The Source of the Pentecost Error

The error can be traced back to the liberal sect of the Sadducees.

This kind of writing has absolutely no place for proving doctrine. This is an emotional 'buzz word' to prove his point. We'll go through and see every

place in Matt., Mark, Luke, and John who were the ones in control of the temple. That is the key thing in this: **Who were the ones in control of the temple?** We're going to see that it wasn't the Pharisees—*period!* I can prove it from Scripture.

We can trace this back to the liberal sect of the Sadducees. The Sadducees celebrated it on the 50th day, inclusive reckoning, from the first Sunday after Passover, taking the Sabbath of Lev. 23:15 to be the weekly Sabbath. The Pharisees, however, interpreted the Sabbath of Lev. 23:15 as the Festival of Unleavened Bread and their reckoning became the normative in Judaism **after 70_{A.D.}**

It's always true. You're going to slip up if you're not being honest. You're going to slip up and you're going to let a little something come in there that will condemn you—after 70_{A.D.} not before. When did Josephus—a Pharisee—write? *After 70_{A.D.}!*

The interpretations of the Sadducees placed Pentecost on a Sunday the day of the sun, or sun-god. God never intended His festivals to coincide every year with the day of the sun-god, Baal.

He doesn't realize what he's doing with this. By making that day inherently pagan, he is giving power to Baal. Think about it for a minute. If God created all the time that there is, God didn't taint any of the time and make it bad. It was all good; there's nothing wrong with God's creation of time. If you say Baal, then you're actually elevating Baal, because, then, Baal has some consequence with this day. Is God greater than Baal? *Yes, He is!*

Unger's Bible Dictionary points out: "The Jews, at least as early as the days of Jesus, connected with the Passover and commemorated on the 6th of Sivan, the giving of the Decalogue."

Decalogue. That is a word for the Ten Commandments. 'Deca' means *ten*.

Unger says, "The precise meaning of the word 'Shabbat' in this connection, or Sabbath, which determines the date for celebrating the festival, has been from time immemorial a matter of dispute."

I want you to go back and read the first three words at the top of the page, 'Astounding New Truth.' How can it be 'astounding new truth' if he writes in the middle of it here, that it 'has been a matter of dispute from time immemorial'?

The Boethusians and the Sadducees in the time of the second temple and the Karaites, since the 8th century of the Christian era, have taken Sabbath in the sense of the

seventh day of the week and have maintained that the omer was offered on the day following the weekly Sabbath, which might happen to fall within the seven days of Passover.

That really should be eight days of Passover if you count Passover and seven Days of Unleavened Bread. You always have a Sabbath within. You always have the day after the Sabbath within.

This would make Pentecost always come on the first day of the week. "Yes, right on the day of Baal and Mithra, the pagan sun god.

Unger continues: "Against this many arguments are presented showing that such an opinion involves many arbitrary and improbable arrangements."

Commenting on Leviticus 23:15-22, *K & D* say that Sabbaths, in verse 15, signifies weeks.

Who is '*K & D*'? Please give your sources! I wouldn't be so upset about it, or somewhat cynical about it, from the way he's writing, but he's undoing the faith of brethren. He's overturning the faith of those who believe the Bible.

Who Were the Sadducees?

The Sadducees held that the written Word of God alone was binding.

Furthermore, I'll inject here, they did not accept anything but the first five books of Moses. Why? *Because they were the bloodline of the Levites!*

- they were the priests
- they were to offer at the temple
- they had charge of the temple

If they are so liberal the Sadducees held that the written Law of God alone was binding and were very severe in the administration of justice.

If they're very severe in the administration of justice, how can you be liberal? *A contradiction of terms!*

They not only denied the resurrection of the body...

In the first five books of the Bible, there's nothing about a resurrection. Did you know that the Pharisees believed in demonism and they believed in people going to heaven and people going to hell. He doesn't tell you that.

...in an after life, but they did not believe in the existence of angels or demons and did believe in rewards or punishment in the next life, the way that the Pharisees did.

The Pharisee way of heaven and hell was strictly Catholic or Stoic.

This Jewish sect had strayed far from the Word of God and Divine revelation. John the Baptist called them, along with the Pharisees, “a generation of vipers.”

Dankenbring condemned the ones he tried to uphold. *Come on!* If you’re going to ease up on the facts, go a little easier. If you’re not, admit they’re both ‘snakes in the grass.’ *Come on!* Even a high school senior could do that good in logic, it would seem to me.

It talks about Joshua 5 here. Remember what we learned on the calendar in part three: There are times when the 16th of Nisan, in fact, does become the proper day to wave the Wave Sheaf Offering. What does this do to the proof of Jos. 5? *It doesn’t change Jos. 5 at all!* Jos. 5 cannot be relied upon as absolute, dogmatic proof in stating that it has to be on the day after the first Holy Day. It could very well have been in Jos. 5. Notice what Dankenbring does. He trips himself up on it. We won’t turn there.

Turn over to Joshua 5. Notice: “And the children of Israel encamped at Gilgal and kept the Passover on the 14th day of the month at even, in the plain of Jericho. And they did eat of the old corn...”

Not the new harvest!

...of the land on the morrow after the Passover...

They were not to eat of the new corn until the Wave Sheaf Offering was made. So, they ate the old corn, and yet, he says this proves that the Wave Sheaf Offering was waved because they ate the food because the manna stopped. They didn’t eat the new corn. Even if it does say in the Hebrew ‘new corn,’ it’s very possible that that day was the proper Wave Sheaf Offering Day, counting from the regular Sabbath, because of the way that it would fall in the week. This does not constitute dogmatic proof, but he contradicts himself.

...unleavened cakes and parched corn in the selfsame day. And the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten the old corn of the land. Neither ate the children manna anymore, but they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year.”

Which was whose crop? *The Canaanite’s crop, not their own!* You could just as forcibly argue that in Jos. 5, since it was the crop of the Canaanites, and it was not the crop of the Israelites, that at that point, since it was not their crop, they were not obligated to wave the Wave Sheaf Offering, but were only eating what the Canaanites had grown. Therefore, they

could consider that an unclean crop, because it wasn’t theirs.

It’d be the same way. A person, for example, if you have a bill that is due and lawful U.S. money and you pay it in lawful U.S. money, that’s fine, but what if it’s not your money? Even though you paid it in lawful U.S. money, you didn’t pay the bill because it wasn’t your money. Perhaps, it was stolen. Therefore, it was not a valid contract. You could have the same thing here. They ate of the crops that the Canaanites had grown. Is that their harvest? or Is it spoil? They didn’t plant it. So, again, this throws doubt on the dogmatism that he has here. He says:

But on the morrow after the Passover...”

Then he quotes additional ‘powerful’ proof—*The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*—and it quotes ‘weeks.’ It also says, the Sadducees interpreted it the way that we have explained it, here. That’s no new Truth for you.

Here the truth is distinctly expressed.

Whose authority? God? Christ? Peter? Paul? Jesus? *No, The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible!* Do we want to establish eternal doctrine on *The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*? *No!* Again, a ‘buzz word’—*this authority*. So, I’ve written in there, ‘Whose authority?’

...admits, first of all, that the oldest and best view is that of Pentecost to be counted from the day after the first annual Sabbath Days of Unleavened Bread....Notice secondly, that those who directed the services of the second temple of Zerubbabel...

Wait a minute! The temple during Jesus’ time was not Zerubbabel’s temple, but it was rebuilt by Herod. Notice incorrect facts! He’s trying to establish this way back to the time of Zerubbabel, which was nearly 500 years before.

We went through about the *Septuagint Version* of the Bible. Again, today you can’t use that to establish dogmatic doctrine. If you want to accept the *Septuagint Version* of the Bible as the inspired Word of God, you must accept all the Apocryphal books. Did you know that the book of Esther in the *Masoretic Text*—which is the same as the *King James*—is half as long as the one in the *Septuagint*? You can’t have it both ways. If you going to say it’s the inspired, authoritative Word of God, then you have to accept all of it.

Reliability and Authenticity of the Septuagint

Maybe then, but not now.’ Oh, I love this. I love it.

Why Counting Down?

- What day did Dankenbring condemn as the day of Baal and Mithra? *Sunday!*
- What is the birthday of Baal? *December 25th, Christmas!*

Notice what he says about how to count. Now, he's got to justify that you have to count. If you have a fixed day of the calendar, why do you count?

The world uses the same idea when it counts the days until its chief holiday, Christmas.

If you're going to condemn it, why use it as proof?

Songs have been written about how many days are left until Christmas. This builds and heightens the anticipation, suspense and adds to the thrill and excitement of the final day.

Oh, now endorsing Christmas. Oh, my!

I have always wondered why, of all of God's festivals, Pentecost seems to occur alone, all by itself. Now I see that it does not occur by itself, it's closely tied and related with the spring Passover Festival.

That's always been known. Where has he been all these years?

Thank God that He has had the mercy to reveal these amazing and marvelous Truths to us, His unworthy, humble, lowly servants.

Anyone who does not accept this:

- is not receiving God's mercy
- is not having these things revealed to him by God
- does not consider himself humble
- does not consider himself to be lowly
- does not consider himself to be unworthy

Listen, the Bible says that 'All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.' No one's worthy. That doesn't even need to be put in there.

However, some might object that if we do this...

Using the Pharisaical way of counting the Wave Sheaf Offering.

...then the Wave Sheaf Offering would not fall on Sunday, but the day after the weekly Sabbath and doesn't this, the Wave Sheaf Offering, typify Christ being accepted of the Father after His resurrection? We will refer to Jesus' words to Mary the Sunday morning after He rose from the grave, "Touch Me not for I have not yet ascended to My Father." Some assume that since Jesus had not ascended to the Father that

He means He was not yet accepted by the Father.

Very clever!

His ascending to the Father, they claim, is the fulfillment of the Wave Sheaf Offering...

I think literally, it actually is and has got to be!

...but is that assumption or idea really true? Was the sacrifice of Jesus Christ not accepted of the Father until after the resurrection and ascension? Does that really make sense?....

Now reasoning takes over. Never, *never*, *never* reason outside of properly putting Scriptures together.

I just heard a sermon by Chuck Barrett on the Passover and it is wild and weird, folks. I mean terrible. He uses logic, scenarios, symbology and reasoning. Whenever you hear anyone do that, you know that they are going to 'slide over' some Scriptures.

...Of course not! The sacrifice of Jesus for our sins was accepted by Almighty God our Father immediately. Therefore, since Jesus was crucified on Passover Day, the following day was the annual High Sabbath. The Wave Sheaf Offering was performed the very next work day...

If it was accepted immediately, why even wait a minute? It's a contradiction in terms. We'll see in a minute that it wasn't accepted immediately. Other things had to happen.

...not several days later on Sunday. Jesus was crucified on a Wednesday. Thursday of that week was the first day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread, or annual Sabbath. Therefore, the Wave Sheaf Offering, typifying the accepted Christ, occurred on Friday of that week, not two days later on Sunday.

Faulty reasoning! We just pointed it out!

The sacrifice of Christ could not be accepted until He ascended and was accepted by God the Father. Why? And where are the Scriptures?

It was not the sacrifice on earth alone that could be accomplished in one day, but Christ had to appear before God to put away sin an atonement made in heaven at God's throne (Heb. 9:11-28).

You study Heb. 9:11-28. He appeared once in heaven to put away sin for all.

It is a false assumption that the acceptance of the offering of Christ, the Firstfruits of

God's Plan, did not occur until four days until after the death of Christ. God accepted His death as payment for our sins as soon as He died. The Wave Sheaf Offering had to do with the acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, not the resurrection.

Oh, oh, oh. Why wave it, then? Why cut it from the ground and pick it up and carry it and wave it before God?

It had nothing whatsoever to do with the fact that Sunday morning when Jesus saw Mary, He told her, "Touch Me not for I have not ascended to My Father." Jesus was not saying that He was not yet accepted. He was simply saying that the time had not come for her to touch Him for He had not yet ascended.

Why say, 'Don't touch Me,' then?

There is a distinct difference between being accepted and ascended. They are not one in the same thing. The plain truth is that the Wave Sheaf Offering occurred right after the first annual Holy Day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. It represented Jesus Christ Who was the Sheaf of the Firstfruits. The priest waved it before the Lord to be accepted before you. This ritual had nothing to do with Christ being accepted or ascending to the throne of God after the resurrection, but rather with His sacrifice being accepted for us.

Then why wasn't it done as soon as the first Passover lamb was slain? if that was the case?

The wave sheaf was to be accepted for you, for the people. Christ's sacrifice was accepted immediately by God, not four days later.

No proof! No Scripture! No nothing to back it up! A statement! You see what happens when people get into an article and they get tired of reading, they get tired of proving. Don't do that! Go through the whole thing, because when does the con artist pull off his con? *At the end!*

We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, not by His ascension to heaven four days later.

"God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses to us, for He had made Him to be sin for us Who knew no sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."

That Scripture quote that he gave, by the way, did not prove his point at all. Let's look at some Scriptures that do.

Suffice to say, it just seems like that the Church is just being inundated and assaulted concerning the Passover and Pentecost. Of course, those are the two key things that keys us into Christ. It's really something!

I did not know that Chuck Barrett was doing something on Passover until I was almost done with the whole Passover thing. His is so weird that he says that there were two 15th of the first month in the year that Jesus was crucified. So, Christ kept the Passover on the 15th and that's 15 #1. Lo and behold, the Pharisees kept it on 15 #2. 'La-te-da!' That is the greatest stretch of imagination I've seen. I would not want to go back and undo that thinking, because it's worse than this. Suffice, my editorial's over.

Romans 4:24: "Rather, *it was* also *written* for our sakes, to whom it shall be imputed—to those who believe in Him Who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead; Who was delivered for our offenses and was raised for our justification" (vs 24-25).

What does justification mean? *It means being made right with God!* This one Scripture alone by itself proves that Jesus' sacrifice had to be accepted after His resurrection. Otherwise, there's no atonement. If you're going to try and establish Bible doctrine, *please use the whole Bible.*

Romans 5:8: "But God commends His own love to us because, when we were still sinners, Christ died for us. Much more, therefore, having been justified now by His blood..." (vs 8-9)—which had to be taken where? It had to go where? *To the altar in heaven, justified by His blood!*

"...we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His own Son, much more *then*, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life" (vs 9-10).

So, the death of Christ is part of the reconciliation, but it is not complete until it is accepted in heaven above. The whole point of it is, He was resurrected from the dead.

Romans 8:34: "Who *is* the one that condemns? *It is* Christ Who died, but rather, Who is raised again..."

- What did Paul preach about Jesus? *He went around and preached the resurrection of the dead, Christ crucified and resurrected!*
- What sense would it have made to preach about Christ crucified, if He hadn't been resurrected?
- Would He have been any different than any other person who had been crucified? *Of course not!*

Then you could say that the blood of anybody crucified would have forgiven sin. The fact that He rose from the dead is the key thing.

Three days and three nights is under tremendous assault again. The group I mentioned, now is beginning to believe that a day is part of a day, any part of a day. So, they're back to Protestant doctrine.

"...Who is even *now* at the right hand of God, and Who is also making intercession for us" (v 34). The whole book of Hebrews talks about the death and resurrection of Christ and the atonement He made for us.

His death paid the price for sin. His resurrection—"raised"—for our justification or reconciliation. We're not dealing with just the Passover sacrifice. Within the sacrifice of Christ, as Passover Lamb, what are we also dealing with? *We're dealing with the meaning of atonement, too!* It has to be combined together.

Hebrews 9:24: "For Christ has not entered into the Holy places made by *human* hands, which are mere copies of the true; rather, *He has entered* into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; Not that He should offer Himself many times, even as the high priest enters into the Holy of holies year by year with *the* blood of others; For then it would have been necessary for Him to suffer many times since *the* foundation of *the* world. But now, once and for all, in *the* consummation of the ages, He has been manifested... [Where? *In heaven above!*] ...for *the* purpose of removing sin through His sacrifice of *Himself*" (vs 24-26).

Nothing more clearly says that the sacrifice of Christ for the forgiveness of sins and our justification to God, is not complete until He ascended to God the Father. In this case, *ascended* and *acceptance* have to mean the same thing.

Hebrews 10:10: "By Whose will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. Now, every high priest stands ministering day by day, offering the same sacrifices repeatedly, which are never able to remove sins; But He, after offering one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at *the* right hand of God. Since that time, He is waiting until His enemies are placed *as* a footstool for His feet. For by one offering He has obtained eternal perfection *for* those who are sanctified" (vs 10-14).

The sacrifice of Christ is only effective because He ascended and was accepted as that sacrifice by God the Father. Let's finish this paper by William F. Dankenbring:

Importance of the Right Day

He goes through and makes a lot of appeals and says that if you don't chose the right day you're double minded and accuses you, then, that if you don't observe Pentecost on the 6th of Sivan that you have

leaven and sin in you. Then he quotes Herbert Armstrong again and that's it. That's the end of the paper.

I hope you know now how to take a doctrinal paper, go through and read it, go through and study it and think about and analyze the statements. That's why it is foolish for any Church to say, 'Don't read this thing written over here.' Haven't we heard that from the pulpit? 'Don't you dare read any of that.' If the Truth is truth, brethren, and we're following God and we're following Christ, if you don't have the ability to read something and know right from wrong, then telling you not to read it isn't going to do one bit of good.

I believe the opposite. If there's something out there that's written that is heresy, read it and find out where it's heresy. Someone may come up to you and say, 'Have you heard...?' *You can say, 'Yes, I heard and furthermore, I know.'* 'Oh really!' That's the way that it should be. I'm not afraid to read any of these things. You can read any of them you want to. Furthermore, if you want to follow error and heresy, God Himself isn't going to stop you. You have to choose to follow God in His way. That's just the way it is in the world.

It's like one man said to me, 'I can control what I do.' I thought, hopefully. 'But I can't control what the other person can do.' Christ in you can control. One thing about authority—let's get this settled right while we're here:

- Whose authority should control you?
- New Westminster Bible Dictionary?
- Jamison Fausset & Brown?
- *The Word of God and Jesus Christ!*
- Whose the Head of the Church? *Jesus Christ!*

That's Who should control you! You do that by willful choice toward God!

All Scripture from *The Holy Bible In Its Original Order, A Faithful Version* (except where noted)

Scriptural References:

- 1) Leviticus 23:11
- 2) Matthew 16:11-12
- 3) Matthew 23:1-3
- 4) Romans 4:24-25
- 5) Romans 5:8-10
- 6) Romans 8:34
- 7) Hebrews 9:24-26
- 8) Hebrews 10:10-14

Scripture referenced, not quoted:

- Leviticus 23:7-10
- Joshua 5

- Hebrews 9:11-28

Also referenced:

Books:

- *The Compendium of World History*,
Introduction of Preface by Dr. Herman Hoeh
(<http://lcmn.com/wp-content/uploads/Herman%20Hoeh%20-%20Compendium%20of%20World%20History%20Vol.%201.pdf>)
- *Josephus*

Article: What is the Correct Day to Observe Pentecost? By William F. Dankenbring

FRC:nfs
Transcribed:10-4-16
Proofed: 10/9/16