

# *Summation to Volume I*

**O**ur first volume has accomplished several important tasks. To begin with, it has established the fact that the festivals and sacred days of Yahweh are required under grace. They are a statutory condition of the Abrahamic Covenants of Promise (the Torah of Trust), under which those saved by grace are subject. At the same time, since the death of the messiah, we find that Christians are no longer under the Torah of Moses (Old Covenant). Accordingly, though there are four *dogmasin* that favor us that are still in force, Christians are not obligated to follow those *dogmasin* that are against us, as found in the Torah of Moses. Therefore, even though the Torah of Moses is good, just, and of the *ruach*, its augmentations to the festivals and sacred days, which do not favor us, are no longer required. Yet, the handwritten Torah itself will remain with mankind until heaven and earth pass away, for within its pages lay the knowledge of what constitutes sin for the Torah of Trust—i.e., the breaking of the commandments, laws, and statutes kept by Abraham.

Next, the various views regarding the Festival of Phasekh and Unleavened Bread and the Festival of Shabuath (Pentecost) have been exposed. We find seven basic Jewish and Christian constructs for Phasekh (Systems A through G) and four for Pentecost. The very fact that there have been so many different ways of understanding what Scriptures have commanded with regard to these festivals and sacred days demonstrates the complexity of the issues.

We have also learned that, based upon the qualification found in Joshua, 5:10–12, only two of the four Shabuath, or Pentecost, systems are viable: the Aristocratic and Hasidic. At present, the Orthodox Jews continue the Hasidic method and the mainstream Christians continue the Aristocratic form.

The issues surrounding Phasekh and the seven days of unleavened bread are more difficult. Today, the two most practiced of the Phasekh theories are System B, the Jewish reckoning, and System E, the Roman Catholic assembly reckoning, which is followed by almost all mainstream Christian groups. There are very few advocates left for hybrid System C, chiefly because the neo-Samaritans and Karaites are in a state of near extinction. At the same time, System C is in reality only a slight variation of System B and is an obvious attempt to combine the Aristocratic and Hasidic views.

Similarly, the old Syrian hybrid, System F, has few if any Christian advocates remaining. It is by-and-large only a variant of System E and, like its Jewish counterpart System C, it is an obvious attempt to mend the breach between System A (advocated by the Quartodecimans) and the Hasidic-based Roman assembly System E. The only hybrid system having any real following in our present time is System G, which combines the Aristocratic view that the

14th is the date of the true Phasekh supper and the Hasidic view for the seven days of unleavened bread, i.e., from the 15th until the end of the 21st of Abib.

Our first volume has likewise brought to light the most ancient and important of all the Phasekh systems, System A, the Aristocratic view. System A looms on the horizon, concealed in the pages of history, yet profound in its far-reaching implications. The evidence proves that it is the oldest system known and was used by the earliest elements of both Judaism and Christianity. It was advocated by the royal Zadokite high priests of Yahweh. They governed the Temple of Yahweh at Jerusalem ever since the first was built under King Solomon and, again, after it was rebuilt in the late sixth century B.C.E. System A was subsequently continued by the conservative branch of the Zadokites, who formed the Sadducean and Samaritan religious parties.

In the second century B.C.E. the family of Zadok lost the high priesthood at Jerusalem to the Hasmonaeans, but, due to the Sadducees, who were close allies of the Hasmonaeans, the System A practice continued. It was finally suppressed in Jerusalem by the Pharisees during the early part of the first century C.E. System A was also practiced by the earliest of the Christian assemblies, the Quartodecimans. That the first Christian assemblies would continue the Aristocratic systems for both Phasekh and Shabuath is not only revealing but points to a heretofore unexplored consideration. Is it possible that System A is the original scriptural practice?

Most modern scholars have only noticed System A as a footnote in history. For the most part, they have failed to investigate its true structure and doctrine. Accepting the long-standing victories of the Hasidic Systems B and E as a fait accompli, they have passed over any in-depth study of System A. At the time it seemed unnecessary. This neglect is largely based upon the pre-inclination of interested Jewish and Christian scholars to accept the long-standing practices of their own respective groups as original, despite the evidence to the contrary. Yet, it cannot be ignored that System A has all along been the real focal point of opposition for the ancient populist Hasidic systems, such as Systems B and E. This historical detail alone should have raised a red flag.

Nevertheless, System A answers questions that are otherwise an enigma for the present Christian Phasekh (System E). For example, Yahushua was under the Torah of Moses at the time that he kept the Phasekh supper on the 14th of Abib. He also commanded his disciples to keep the Phasekh with him on that date. Yet under System E the 14th is supposedly the wrong date for the legal Phasekh. The problem created by Yahushua's actions is that if the 14th had been incorrect, then Yahushua, the author of the Torah, would have broken (i.e., sinned against), and caused others to sin against, the very Torah by which he was to receive the Abrahamic inheritance as the seed of Abraham. He would have lost his right to the eternal inheritance.

For System E, Yahushua's actions form an unsolvable paradox. No excuse that the Last Supper was a pre-enacted parable can explain his willful act of breaking the Torah by keeping Phasekh on the wrong date. No matter how one tries to explain it, Yahushua is specifically said to have been under the

---

<sup>1</sup> Gal., 4:4.

Torah.<sup>1</sup> Further, he had no power as a man under the Torah to change its conditions. Indeed, once the contract had been made with Abraham, no one, not even Yahweh himself, could change it.<sup>2</sup> When one breaks but one point in the Torah of Moses he has broken the entire agreement.<sup>3</sup> The result of such a rebellious act would have rendered Yahushua unable to pass on to others the eternal inheritance via grace. Yet if System A is correct, Yahushua was keeping the true Phasekh, as the Quartodecimans—and even the quasi-Quartodecimans, like System D—had argued from the beginning days of Christianity. This circumstance demands that, along with the other systems, the validity of System A must be thoroughly tested.

Our first volume has left us with several important outstanding questions about the Phasekh and Shabuath:

- By what authority did the various Christian assemblies derive their interpretations for the Phasekh?
- What was the underlying motive for Christians to abandon their original Quartodeciman system?
- What is the correct definition of *arab* and *byn ha-aramim*, being the time of the Phasekh sacrifice? The answer to this question will determine when the legal Phasekh supper should be celebrated—either on the night of the 14th or the night of the 15th of Abib.
- When does one begin to correctly count the 50 days of Pentecost?
- What is the scriptural evidence for the correct ancient Israelite practice of Phasekh and the seven days of unleavened bread?

In volumes two and three of this series our attention will shift to answering these and other such questions. As we proceed in this effort, we shall begin to solve many of the long-standing, perplexing and intricate problems associated with the festivals and sacred days of Yahweh.

---

<sup>2</sup> Gal., 3:15–17.

<sup>3</sup> James, 2:10.