



NAILED TO HIS CROSS

ARE THE FEASTS STILL BINDING?

Nailed to His Cross

Are the Feasts Still Binding?

Bill Pinto



Restitution Ministries 2019

www.acts321.org

info@acts321.org

Nailed to His Cross

There are seven annual feasts in the Jewish economy. These were given by God through Moses, beginning with the feast of passover which was established on the night of Israel's exodus from Egypt. Each of these feasts (known as types) were symbolic of a greater event yet to take place (the antitype). Today, there is confusion as to whether these feasts should be kept. Some presume that the feasts were transferred from the old covenant to the new covenant and are still binding upon Christians today.

To begin, it's important to recognise a distinction between God's law (the ten commandments) and the law He gave to Moses. The following table highlights these differences as found in Scripture.

God's Moral Law (Ten Commandments)	The Ceremonial Law (Law of Moses)
Deuteronomy 4:13 And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.	Deuteronomy 31:9 And Moses wrote this law , and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel.
Exodus 31:18 And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.	Deuteronomy 31:24 And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book , until they were finished,

God's Moral Law (Ten Commandments)	The Ceremonial Law (Law of Moses)
Exodus 25:21 And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee.	Deuteronomy 31:25-26 That Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee.

From the verses above we may draw the following conclusions:

1. The ten commandments were written by “the finger of God” on “two tables of stone”. These were placed “in the ark”.
2. The ceremonial law was written by Moses “in a book” and was placed “in the side of the ark”.
3. The ten commandments were written in stone to signify their absolute permanency, whereas Moses’ law - containing aspects which were to pass away - was written in a book.

Indeed, these passages highlight a clear distinction between God’s moral law (which includes the 4th commandment; the Sabbath) and the ceremonial law. Although there are parts of Moses’ law which are still binding today, there are also parts comprised of shadows, types and figures, which as we’ll soon see, are no longer binding.

It’s also important to recognise that while the passover was introduced at the exodus, the ceremonial law (which includes the feasts) was instituted at Mount Sinai. It did not exist in Eden. Inspiration confirms this in *Patriarchs and Prophets*, in the chapter titled: ‘*The Law Given to Israel*’. This chapter is based on Exodus 19-24. In it, Sister White states:

“Again the people were reminded of the sacred obligation of the Sabbath. **Yearly feasts were appointed**, at which all the men of the nation were to assemble before the Lord, bringing to Him their offerings of gratitude and the first fruits of His bounties.”
PP 311.2

The feasts do not predate the book of Exodus. Nonetheless, a common objection is made that the feasts are called statutes and are therefore binding upon man in every age. Those seeking to support this claim refer to the following statement by Sister White:

“Christ gave to Moses religious precepts which were to govern the everyday life. These statutes were explicitly given to guard the ten commandments. They were not shadowy types to pass away with the death of Christ. They were to be binding upon man in every age as long as time should last.” *RH May 6, 1875, par. 10*

From this statement, many claim that the feasts are binding statutes and not shadows which were to pass away. It's worth noting that Sister White never kept the feasts, and neither did her husband. On the contrary, they both taught that the feasts were abolished, basing their position on Colossians 2 as we'll soon discover. So what did Sister White mean by the above statement? Let us glean some context in order to know exactly which statutes Sister White was speaking about as being “binding upon man in every age”. Four paragraphs earlier we read:

“The statutes concerning marriage, inheritance, and strict justice in deal with one another, were peculiar and contrary to the customs and manners of other nations, and were designed of God to keep his people separate from other nations. The necessity of this to preserve the people of God from becoming like the nations who had not the love and fear of God, is the same in this corrupt age, when the transgression of God's law prevails and idolatry exists to a fearful extent. **If ancient Israel needed such security, we need it more, to keep us from being utterly confounded with**

the transgressors of God's law. The hearts of men are so prone to depart from God that there is a necessity for restraint and discipline." *RH May 6, 1875, par. 6*

Certainly, the statutes given to Moses concerning marriage, inheritance and justice were to be binding upon man as long as time should last! These statutes enforce and guard the moral law. The ten commandments teach that we are to love our neighbours as ourselves. They also teach honesty and fidelity in marriage. It's interesting to note how Sister White ends this article.

"The death of Jesus Christ for the redemption of man, lifts the veil and reflects a flood of light back hundreds of years, upon the whole institution of the Jewish system of religion. Without the death of Christ all this system was meaningless. **The Jews reject Christ, and therefore their whole system of religion is to them indefinite, unexplainable, and uncertain. They attach as much importance to shadowy ceremonies of types which have met their antitype, as they do to the law of the ten commandments, which was not a shadow, but a reality as enduring as the throne of Jehovah.**" *RH May 6, 1875, par. 17*

What would be the most prominent shadow or type to meet its antitype? Surely, the greatest type ever given was the Passover Lamb. For fifteen hundred years it pointed to the Messiah to come as the Saviour of the world. John the Baptist recognised the fulfilment of this hope in the person of Jesus Christ, and thus he declared: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." John 1:29.

Furthermore, in the very same article we've been reading (from which feast-keepers argue that the feasts are not shadows but binding statutes) Sister White declares that in rejecting Christ (the antitype of passover), the Jews held to "shadowy ceremonies of types which have met their antitype"!

Yet aside from clear passages such as this which identify the statutes of marriage, inheritance and justice as being both necessary and imperative, how can one discern which statutes are binding and which are not?

Take for instance the statutes concerning the Levitical priesthood and the sanctuary. Of course these are no longer binding for the priesthood and the earthly sanctuary no longer exist. And yet it must be noted that the majority of the feasts were connected with the sanctuary, the Levitical priesthood, and the sacrificial offerings.

In Deuteronomy 12, Moses lists the “statutes and judgments, which ye shall observe to do” (vs 1). One such statute is described in verses 5-7:

Deuteronomy 12:5 But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come:

6 And thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and heave offerings of your hand, and your vows, and your freewill offerings, and the firstlings of your herds and of your flocks:

7 And there ye shall eat before the Lord your God, and ye shall rejoice in all that ye put your hand unto, ye and your households, wherein the Lord thy God hath blessed thee.

Further instruction is given in verse 14, in which Moses states:

Deuteronomy 12:14 But in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I command thee.”

So which place did the Lord choose? In 2 Chronicles 6:6 the Lord declares: “I have chosen Jerusalem, that my name might be there”. Are we to go to Jerusalem and keep these statutes today? Are we to bring burnt offerings, sacrifices and the firstlings of our herds and flocks?

This obviously cannot apply to us. Yet how do we prove which statutes are binding and which are not? In answer to this dilemma, the Spirit of Prophecy declares:

“Christ has taken his people into his church. **He has swept away every ceremony of the ancient type.** He has given no liberty to restore these rites, or to substitute anything that will recall the old literal sacrifices.” *RH February 25, 1896, par. 8*

This passage is not only in reference to animal sacrifices. Sister White states that Christ has “swept away **every ceremony of the ancient type**”. This is especially in reference to feasts such as passover, unleavened bread, and first fruits etc. Christ has “given no liberty to restore these rites” today.

When I first addressed this issue many years ago, I asked some feast-keeping brethren whether they were keeping the passover. At that time, the brethren said no. I found this response to be inconsistent with their views. In a sermon titled ‘*Are the Feasts Days Part of the New Covenant*’ (which you can find on the Audio Sermons page of our website), I show through a study of Hebrews that if one doesn’t keep the passover, they can’t keep any of the feasts which follow it.

Today, however, many feast-keeping brethren are indeed keeping the passover. And while this is more consistent with their views, it is intensely shameful and offensive to the One who took its place. Notice what Sister White has to say regarding the keeping of passover.

“The passover suppers had been scenes of special interest; but upon this occasion Jesus was troubled in spirit, and his disciples sympathized with his grief although they knew not its cause. **This was virtually the last passover that was ever to be celebrated;** for type was to meet antitype in the slaying of the Lamb of God for the sins of the world.” *3SP 83.3*

Inspiration declares that the passover supper which Jesus and His disciples observed on the night of His arrest was to be “virtually the last passover that was ever to be celebrated”. Why? “For type was to meet antitype”. What the passover had pointed to for fifteen hundred years was about to be fulfilled.

In the following quote, taken from an article titled *‘The Lord’s Supper and the Ordinance of Feet-Washing’*, Sister White stresses even more strongly the work Christ did in sweeping away the ceremony of pass-over.

“In this ordinance, Christ discharged his disciples from the cares and burdens of the ancient Jewish obligations in rites and ceremonies. These no longer possessed any virtue; for type was meeting antitype in himself...It was Christ’s desire to leave to his disciples an ordinance that would do for them the very thing they needed,—that would serve to disentangle them from the rites and ceremonies which they had hitherto engaged in as essential, and which the reception of the gospel made no longer of any force. To continue these rites would be an insult to Jehovah.” *RH June 14, 1898, par. 16*

What a powerful and conclusive statement! Why would anyone want to practise a rite when Inspiration declares it “would be an insult to Jehovah”? Christ discharged His disciples from the ancient Jewish rites and ceremonies for they no longer possessed any virtue. Statement after statement emphasises this point. And that’s exactly what we’ll see in Colossians 2 later on.

There is not a single verse in the New Testament which states that we are to keep the feasts. What we do have is clear instruction concerning the communion service and foot washing. These were the ordinances which Christ left for His disciples in place of passover; “an ordinance that would do for them the very thing they needed.” Mark once more the indisputable nature of the following statement:

“Christ was standing at the point of transition between two economies and their two great festivals. He, the spotless Lamb of God, was about to present Himself as a sin offering, that **He would thus bring to an end the system of types and ceremonies that for four thousand years had pointed to His death.** As He ate the Passover with His disciples, **He instituted in its place the service that was to be the memorial of His great sacrifice. 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.” *DA 652.2*

At the last supper, Christ stood at “the point of transition”. The old covenant was waxing old and vanishing away, and the new covenant was about to take its place. That’s why Jesus instituted the communion service in the place of passover. Yet there are brethren today who are keeping both and who teach others to do the same, notwithstanding the clear exhortation that to continue the ancient rites “would be an insult to Jehovah”!

This is not to say that there aren’t any future applications of the feasts yet to take place. I acknowledged this in my first study referenced earlier. The day of atonement, for example, met its antitype in October 22, 1844, and yet its ultimate fulfilment will occur just before Christ’s return. Pentecost had its fulfilment in the early rain, yet it will have a greater fulfilment in the last days. And the feast of tabernacles will have its final fulfilment in heaven, where not only will we have the joy of the harvest, but we will be tabernacling with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Indeed, the feasts teach many wonderful gospel lessons and they should be studied.

However, the keeping of a literal date belongs to the old covenant. The dates themselves are no longer binding and there isn’t a single verse in the New Testament that requires us to keep them. Rather, as we have seen, Christ discharged us from the burdens of these rites and ceremo-

nies, and provided us with a specific ordinance to keep in their place. As Sister White declared, Christ has “swept away every ceremony of the ancient type. He has given no liberty to restore these rites”.

Furthermore, one might ask how a Seventh-day Adventist today could keep the day of atonement (the 10th day of the 7th Jewish month) when their doctrine states that since 1844 we have been living in the antitypical day of atonement. Although the cleansing of sin from the heavenly sanctuary is yet to be complete, and we must cooperate with the work which the High Priest is doing to cleanse us from sin, to keep the literal day of atonement would be to deny what happened on October 22, 1844. In the very same way, to observe the date of passover today is to deny the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. The communion service was given in its place in order that we might “show the Lord’s death till he come”.

In his first letter to the Corinthian church, Paul records Christ’s institution of the communion service. Pay careful attention as to whether any dates are given for the performance of this new ordinance.

1 Corinthians 11:24 And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.

25 After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

26 For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come.

Are we instructed to keep the communion service on the 14th day of Nissan? Are any dates specified? No. Paul simply says: “as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup.”

The feasts were connected to the sacrifices, as well as to the meat and drink offerings which were types and shadows of Christ. Thus, the

dates and the literal keeping of the feasts were brought to an end with the old covenant, as were the sanctuary and the Levitical priesthood.

The Jews keep the feasts today for the simple reason that they reject the sacrifice of Christ. They reject Jesus as the antitype and believe that the feasts have not been fulfilled. Yet we're Gentiles. Why should we who believe in Jesus Christ keep the feasts, and especially the passover, when its entire purpose was to point the minds of the people to the first advent of their Redeemer and His sacrifice?

Moreover, if you reject the clear Inspiration given on this topic, and still maintain that the feasts are binding today, then there is another ordinance which you will also need to perform.

Exodus 12:43 And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover: There shall no stranger eat thereof:

44 But every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof.

45 A foreigner and an hired servant shall not eat thereof.

46 In one house shall it be eaten; thou shalt not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house; neither shall ye break a bone thereof.

47 All the congregation of Israel shall keep it.

48 And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, **let all his males be circumcised**, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land: **for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof.**

This is a statute given by God to Moses. If you want to claim that the feasts are binding today (particularly passover) then you need to be circumcised. However, what does the New Testament have to say about circumcision? Is it a requirement for the Gentile Christians which predominantly comprise the church today? As the following passage reveals, this was a question of great interest in the formation of the Christian church.

Acts 15:24 Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, **Ye must be circumcised**, and keep the law: **to whom we gave no such commandment**:

The New Testament clearly teaches that the Gentile Christian does not need to be circumcised, and yet it was a prerequisite for the keeping of passover. This is yet another contradiction that feast-keepers encounter. It's worth noting why the Jerusalem council was convened in the first place. Consider the following passage.

Acts 15:1 And certain men which came down from Judaea taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.

15:5 But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was **needful to circumcise them**, and to command them to **keep the law of Moses**.

Keeping the law of Moses involved participation in the Jewish national festivals. This is what the Pharisees were referring to in particular, for the keeping of passover by any Gentile required circumcision. Notice verse 2.

Acts 15:2 When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question.

Paul and Barnabus were raising Gentile churches in which people were not obligated to be circumcised and keep certain aspects of the law of Moses. This teaching and practice was now being questioned, and thus the Jerusalem council was convened to sort out the matter. Notice Sister White's commentary below:

“[The Jews] insisted that the Jewish laws and ceremonies should be incorporated into the rites of the Christian religion. They were slow to discern that all 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**....That which they shadowed forth had come to pass, and **those who were living under the gospel dispensation had been freed from their observance.**” *AA 189-190*

We who are living under the gospel dispensation are completely freed from the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic law. Even the Jerusalem council concludes without a single command to keep the feasts. Rather, the outcome of the council confirmed that circumcision, and the keeping of the Mosaic law were not a requirement. Acts 15:29 reveals that the only requirements to be laid upon Gentiles was “that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication”. This conclusion was based upon a new principle which Peter made known to the council:

Acts 15:8 And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us;
9 And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.

Drawing from his experience at Cornelius’ house, Peter testified that God had received the Gentiles into His church. Those uncircumcised Gentiles who were not keeping the feasts, whom the Jews and even Peter himself had looked upon as strangers and aliens from the covenant of promise, as dogs and without hope in this world, were being endowed with the gift of His Holy Spirit!

As mentioned earlier, there are no verses in the New Testament that support feast-keeping today, but there is a very clear passage which teaches that they have been abolished. Consider the following passage which Paul wrote to the Gentile church at Colosse:

Colossians 2:13 And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

14 Blotting 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.

Here, Paul makes a statement similar to Peter's in Acts 15. Paul declares that God had received the Gentiles while they were in the uncircumcision of their flesh. God did not place certain obligations upon them. Rather, Paul states that God brought them forgiveness by "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us".

As was shown at the start of this study, "the handwriting of ordinances" refers to the law which Moses wrote by hand in a book and placed in the side of the ark. God commanded Moses to place it there "that it may be there for a witness **against thee**". Deuteronomy 31:25-26. This is the same handwriting which Paul declared "was **against us**".

Some feast-keepers claim that the handwriting of ordinances is the debt we owe for our sins. As we are about to see, this assumption incurs a major contradiction with the Spirit of Prophecy. What's more is that it turns the crucifixion (the fulfillment of passover) into the day of atonement. This cannot be the case. In the typical system, the passover brought forgiveness and a second chance, but every sin remained on record. It wasn't until the day of atonement (which took place many months after passover) that the debt men owed for their sins was blotted out from the earthly sanctuary.

The same principle applies in the Christian dispensation. Christ's sacrifice brought us forgiveness and a second chance, but our sins remain on record until the close of probation, when the day of atonement meets its ultimate fulfillment and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is complete. Therefore, the debt we owe for our sins cannot be that

which was blotted out and nailed to the cross. For that debt remains on record even to this very day! The “handwriting of ordinances” is without any doubt the ceremonial law of Moses. Consider the following statement for further evidence.

“But there is a law which was abolished, which Christ “took out of the way, nailing it to his cross.” Paul calls it “the law of commandments contained in ordinances.” This ceremonial law, given by God through Moses, with its sacrifices and ordinances, was to be binding upon the Hebrews until type met anti-type in the death of Christ as the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world. Then all the sacrificial offerings and services were to be abolished. Paul and the other apostles labored to show this, and resolutely withstood those Judaizing teachers who declared that Christians should observe the ceremonial law.”
ST September 4, 1884, par. 3

Pay careful attention to this point. Sister White clearly states that the handwriting of ordinances which was blotted out, taken out of the way and nailed to His cross was **“the ceremonial law, given by God through Moses”**. That’s why it’s also called “the handwriting of ordinances”. Sister White stresses this point further when defending the permanency of the moral law (the ten commandments):

“Many in the Christian world also have a veil before their eyes and heart. They do not see to the end of that which was done away. They do not see that it was only **the ceremonial law which was abrogated at the death of Christ**. They claim that the moral law was nailed to the cross. Heavy is the veil that darkens their understanding.” *RH, April 22, 1902 par. 15*

J.N Andrews makes the same case:

“That the hand-writing of ordinances containing the feasts, new moons and the associated annual sabbaths of the Jews, has

been abolished and taken out of the way, we do not doubt. This was not the moral law of God; but was merely the shadow of good things to come.” *J.N Andrews, The Perpetuity of the Royal Law, par 2*

That the handwriting of ordinances is the ceremonial law of Moses is undeniable. Specifically speaking then, what comprised the “handwriting of ordinances” that was blotted out and nailed to the cross? The answer is given two verses later.

Colossians 2:16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday [feasts], or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

Writing in the New Testament after Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection, Paul declares that the feasts, new moons, and meal and drink offerings etc were blotted out and nailed to the cross! Therefore, no man (especially a Gentile) was to be wrongly judged for not partaking in these things.

Here, Seventh-day Adventist feast-keepers have a great dilemma. They cannot claim, as many do, that the “handwriting of ordinances” is not the ceremonial law of Moses, because the Spirit of Prophecy confirms that it is. Therefore, if they accept what Inspiration states, that the ceremonial law was blotted out and nailed to the cross, then they must also acknowledge that the feast days along with the new moons and meal and drink offerings were blotted out and nailed to the cross. However, if they insist the the feast days are still binding, then they have to reject the Spirit of Prophecy.

Furthermore, why does Paul say that the ceremonial law was “against us”? Paul makes a collective statement and includes himself. The handwriting of ordinances was against both the Jews and Gentiles. It was contrary to them both. In Ephesians 2:12, Paul outlines the condition in which the Gentiles were looked upon, by both themselves and the Jews:

Ephesians 2:12 That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world:

This was not the way God looked upon the Gentiles, for God had been saving Gentiles from the very beginning. Yet the Jews looked upon them that way, and had erected a wall of partition between them. This is why Peter did not want to go to Cornelius' house. It's also the reason why the woman of Canaan implored Jesus that even "the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table." Matthew 15:27. The Jews had looked upon the Gentiles as dogs, and Jesus sought to teach them an important lesson. Despite once being seen as "strangers from the covenants of promise", Paul went on to say:

Ephesians 2:13 But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

14 For he is our peace, **who hath made both [Jew and Gentile] one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;**

That which was "against us" and which Christ took out of the way was the middle wall of partition between the Jews and Gentiles. What was the middle wall of partition? Notice the following two verses.

Ephesians 2:15 **Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances;** for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace;

16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

The ceremonial law of Moses was what Christ had to abolish in order to break down the middle wall of partition and reconcile both Jews and Gentiles unto God. Indeed, by nailing these ordinances to His

cross, Christ was able slay the enmity that existed between the Jews and Gentiles. Notice the result in Colossians 2:16:

Colossians 2:16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday [feast], or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

The middle wall of partition - comprised of elements of the ceremonial law just described - was no longer to be a cause for judgement or enmity. No longer were the Gentiles to be looked upon as strangers from the commonwealth of Israel, for these rites that had heretofore separated them from the Jews had been taken out of the way and nailed to the cross!

Moreover, in the Strong's Concordance, the word "holyday" from Colossians 2:16 is the Greek word 'heortē' (G1859) which is defined as festival or feast. This word (G1859) occurs twenty-seven times in the New Testament. For twenty-six of these occasions, the word is translated into English as "feasts".¹ Therefore, that the word "holyday" in Colossians 2:16 refers to the feasts is so indisputable that even feast-keepers acknowledge this point.

Ultimately, Paul is instructing the Gentiles not to let anyone judge them for not keeping the feasts for the very reason that they were nailed to the cross! This text undeniably teaches that the feast days and the ordinances that went with them were abolished. All our pioneers, including Sister White, understood this passage in the same light.

Of course, the same principle applies to meats and drinks (sacrificial offerings), and the keeping of new moons or sabbath days beside the

1 The following list of verses all translate the greek word heortē (G1859) as "feast" or "feasts". Matthew 26:5; Matt 27:15; Mark 14:2; Mark 15:6; Luke 2:41,42; Luke 22:1; Luke 23:17; John 2:23; John 4:45; John 5:1; John 6:4; John 7:2,8,10,11,14,37; John 11:56; John 12:12,20; John 13:1,29; Acts 18:21.

Sabbath of the Lord (4th commandment). Colossians 2:17 reveals that each of these things were “a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.”

Some use this verse to teach that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was taken away and nailed to His cross. This would make the seventh-day Sabbath a shadow of things to come. Yet in utter contrast with this position, the Spirit of Prophecy proclaims:

“In Eden, God set up the memorial of His work of creation, in placing His blessing upon the seventh day. The Sabbath was committed to Adam, the father and representative of the whole human family. Its observance was to be an act of grateful acknowledgment, on the part of all who should dwell upon the earth, that God was their Creator and their rightful Sovereign; that they were the work of His hands and the subjects of His authority. **Thus the institution was wholly commemorative, and given to all mankind. There was nothing in it shadowy or of restricted application to any people.”** *PP 48.1*

All shadows and types were given for the redemption of man after sin. However, the Sabbath was instituted in Eden before Adam sinned. Thus we read that “the institution was wholly commemorative” of God’s work of creation and “there was nothing in it shadowy or of restricted application”. Furthermore, addressing this very objection, Sister White declares:

“I saw that the Sabbath commandment was not nailed to the cross. If it was, the other nine commandments were; and we are at liberty to break them all, as well as to break the fourth.” *EW 32.3*

Sister White clearly states that it was not the seventh-day Sabbath which was nailed to the cross in Colossians 2:14-16. This Sabbath remains binding throughout all time, even in heaven after sin has been destroyed. During a camp meeting in Melbourne, Australia, Sister

White stressed this fact once more.

“On every side we hear discussion of the subjects presented at the camp-meeting. One day as Elder Corliss stepped out of a train, the guard [conductor] stopped him with the request that he explain Colossians 2:16. They stopped, and as the crowd rushed by, the explanation was given, and from Leviticus 23:37, 38 **it was shown that there were sabbaths besides the Sabbath of the Lord.**”

RH January 7, 1896, par. 14

The ceremonial Sabbaths here described were indeed shadows of Christ's life, death, resurrection, and priesthood. These Sabbaths (presented in Leviticus 23:37-39) had met their antitype and were no longer required. They were taken out of the way and nailed to the cross. Uriah Smith declared the same when speaking of sabbaths besides the seventh-day Sabbath of the Lord:

“Now as their feast days commenced and ended with a Sabbath, so when **their feasts ceased to be binding on them these Sabbaths must also**, and all were “nailed to the cross.”

Uriah Smith, Sabbath Controversy #1, par 15

Interestingly, this view was also endorsed by Bible commentators such as Albert Barnes, Adam Clark and Jamieson, Fausset and Brown. As far as I know, these men were Sunday-keepers. And yet they acknowledge that it was not the seventh-day Sabbath which was nailed to the cross. Consider Barnes' commentary on this passage:

“**Or of the Sabbath days - Greek, “of the Sabbaths.**” The word Sabbath in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. **There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, since the word is used in the plural number, and the apostle does not refer particularly to the Sabbath properly so called.** There is no evidence from this passage that he would teach that there

was no obligation to observe any holy time, for **there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to teach that one of the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number - "the Sabbath," it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to teach that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not to the moral law, or the Ten Commandments. No part of the moral law - no one of the ten commandments could be spoken of as "a shadow of good things to come." These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation.**"

Adam Clark offers the same conclusion in his commentary of Colossians 2:16.

"Let no man - judge you in meat, or in drink - The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the hand-writing of ordinances, which had been taken away... **the necessity of observing certain holydays or festivals, such as the new moons and particular sabbaths**, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity; **all these had been taken out of the way and nailed to the cross**, and were no longer of moral obligation. **There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away**, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. **I have shown elsewhere that, Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy, is a command of perpetual obligation, and can never be superseded.**... Besides, it is not clear that the apostle refers at all to the Sabbath in this place, whether Jewish or Christian; his σαββατων, of sabbaths or weeks, most probably refers to their feasts of weeks, of which much has been said in the notes on the Pentateuch."

Finally, let us examine Jamieson-Fausset-Brown's commentary.

“the sabbath—Omit “THE,” which is not in the Greek (compare Note, see on [2419]Ga 4:10). **“Sabbaths”** (not “the sabbaths”) **of the day of atonement and feast of tabernacles have come to an end with the Jewish services to which they belonged (Le 23:32, 37-39)**. The weekly sabbath rests on a more permanent foundation, having been instituted in Paradise to commemorate the completion of creation in six days. Le 23:38 expressly distinguished “the sabbath of the Lord” from the other sabbaths.”

Through Sister White, the pioneers and even Sunday-keeping theologians, God has provided unmistakable evidence that the sabbaths which were nailed to the cross was not the seventh-day Sabbath. To claim that it is, is not only utterly discordant with the evidence we've seen, but directly contradicts the Bible itself. Notice once more the passage we've been studying.

Colossians 2:14 Blotting 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;
2:16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday [feasts], or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

The handwriting of ordinances which the Jews had used to separate themselves from the Gentiles was working against the gospel. It took the death of Christ to abolish that middle wall of partition, and yet there are people today who want to bring it back.

Indeed, Christ took this handwriting out of the way and nailed it to His cross. Thus, Gentiles were no longer to be judged for not partaking in meat or drink offerings, feasts, new moons or ceremonial sabbaths. What were some of the ceremonial sabbaths? Consider the feast of un-

leavened bread, as explained in Leviticus 23:

Leviticus 23:7 In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein

23:8 But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days: in the seventh day is an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein.

23:11 And he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it.

Here we see that the first and seventh day of unleavened bread was called a sabbath. The same occurred with the feast of tabernacles, where the first and last day were kept as a sabbath. No work was to be done on the day of atonement either, for it was to be kept as a sabbath. These are the sabbaths beside the seventh-day Sabbath of the Lord. By contrast, the other days during the feast of tabernacles and unleavened bread were not kept as a sabbath; they were holydays or feast days only. You could do servile work on those days.

What about the meat and drink? Notice what took place on the feast of first fruits:

Leviticus 23:13 And the **meat offering** thereof shall be two tenth deals of fine flour mingled with oil, an offering made by fire unto the Lord for a sweet savour: and the **drink offering** thereof shall be of wine, the fourth part of an hin.

Meat offerings and drink offerings were components of the feasts. Consider also the feast of pentecost:

Leviticus 23:16 Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new **meat offering** unto the Lord.

23:18 And ye shall offer with the bread seven lambs without blemish of the first year, and one young bullock, and two rams: they shall be for a burnt offering unto the Lord, **with their meat offer-**

ing, and their drink offerings, even an offering made by fire, of sweet savour unto the Lord.

Speaking of the feasts as a whole, Moses declared:

Leviticus 23:37 **These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings**, every thing upon his day:

It was not eating and drinking in general that was nailed to the cross, but rather the meat offerings and drink offerings which were abolished.

Let us conclude with a statement from J.N Andrews.

“The feasts, new moons, and annual sabbaths, were restored when the Hebrews returned from captivity, and with some interruptions, were kept up until the final destruction of their city and nation by the Romans. **But ere the providence of God thus struck out of existence these Jewish festivals, the whole typical system was abolished, having reached the commencement of its anti-type, when our Lord Jesus Christ expired upon the cross. The handwriting of ordinances being thus abolished, no one is to be judged respecting its meats, or drinks, or holy days, or new moons, or sabbaths**, “which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” **But the Sabbath of the Lord did not form a part of this handwriting of ordinances; for it was instituted before sin had entered the world, and consequently before there was any shadow of redemption**; it was written by the finger of God, not in the midst of types and shadows, but in the bosom of the moral law...” *J.N Andrews, History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week, 91.*

In this brief study, we have seen from Inspiration that to keep passover today is an insult to Jehovah. We have also seen from Colossians 2:14-

16 that the feast days, together with their meat and drink offerings were taken out of the way and nailed to the cross. To this day, I have never heard a feast-keeper intelligently answer this passage without contradicting the Spirit of Prophecy. Furthermore, there is not a single verse in the New Testament commanding us to keep the feasts. What we do have, however, is the teaching and example of Jesus in regards to the communion service that was instituted in the place of passover.

As we saw from the Spirit of Prophecy, the passover was to pass away “forever”. Inspiration uses the plainest language when speaking about the feast days in the Christian dispensation. Phrases such as “abolished”, “taken out of the way”, “nailed to His cross”, and “pass away forever” are inescapably clear, and yet some seek to resurrect the feasts as being binding under the new covenant regardless of the many contradictions that brings.

Friends, let us not do this, but rather obey the clear instruction from the Scripture and the Spirit of Prophecy. For as Paul wrote to Timothy, our work is to “study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”
2 Timothy 2:15

Amen

ARE THE OLD TESTAMENT FEASTS
WHICH GOD GAVE TO MOSES STILL
BINDING UPON MAN TODAY?

WHILE SOME PRESUME THAT THE
FEASTS WERE TRANSFERRED FROM
THE OLD COVENANT TO THE NEW
COVENANT, IS THERE ANY BIBLICAL
EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS CLAIM?

WHAT DID PAUL MEAN WHEN HE
SAID THAT THE HANDWRITING OF
ORDINANCES WAS NAILED TO THE
CROSS OF CHRIST?

NAILED TO HIS CROSS EXAMINES
THE BIBLE'S STANCE ON
FEAST-KEEPING IN THE
CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.