

# Born to Win

## The Passover #1

by Ronald L. Dart

Hello again. Welcome to the Weekend Bible Study and a special welcome to those of you who are joining us for the first time. We're glad you're here. We're about to start on a series of Bible studies—six weeks—on Passover: the Old Testament and New Testament.

Now, we have a lot to cover this time. There are only six sessions between now and Passover and I'm not going to attempt to answer all the questions I have today because some of them relate to later programs in this series and some of them will be answered in the ongoing discussion. I realize that I won't anticipate every question you will have, and I won't mind returning to clarify anything we didn't make clear the first time through. So be sure to send any questions or comments to me to [ron@borntowin.net](mailto:ron@borntowin.net). So warm up your coffee and we'll begin with our study of the Passover.

The tricky part of a study on the Passover is knowing exactly where to break into the story. I'm going to choose Exodus 5. There is so much of the back-story before this with Moses that's pretty familiar with everybody, but none of it bears that heavily on the Passover. Here we are at the point where Moses and Aaron go in and tell Pharaoh:

### Exodus 5

*KJV*

<sup>1</sup> [...] Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness.

Now here is what I think might be the first discussion question for you: Did Moses really mean this or was it this just something he made up? Was it an excuse, a provocation, an equivocation, or was there *really* a festival at this time? Now, I can easily understand saying, “What festival would that be?” The problem is, whenever you go back in Genesis to the very first chapter, you're told that the sun and the moon and all this stuff are for the *moeds*. *Moed* [מוֹעֵד, Strong's H4150] basically means “appointments”, which suggests that, from Genesis 1 forward, there were periods of time that were going to be *appointments* with God. And, you know, the funny thing about these things—the events, the huge events in Israel's history, all seem to occur on one or the other of these appointed times. So, it's not unreasonable to think that there really *was* a festival at this time. So you may want to pause at this point and discuss it among yourselves. Did Moses *really* mean this or did he just find an excuse, a provocation, an equivocation to challenge Pharaoh. Now, Pharaoh's reply is exactly what I would have expected.

### Exodus 5

*ASV*

<sup>2</sup> And Pharaoh said, Who is Jehovah, that I should hearken unto his voice to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah, and moreover I will not let Israel go.

Now, there's an absurdity in most of the versions at this point, in that they have Pharaoh referring to God as “the LORD”. You have it right there in front of you, probably, on *your* Bible.

**Exodus 5**

AKJV

<sup>2</sup> And Pharaoh said, Who is the LORD, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the LORD, neither will I let Israel go.

By now, I think most people realize that small-caps “LORD” in your version of the Bible stands for the divine name—*Yahweh* [Yhvh, יהוה, Strong’s H3068] or *Jehovah*. I think when Jehovah made it into the King James version, they probably thought that the “J” should be pronounced as “Y”—as in “Hallelujah”. There’s a “J” in there for those last three letters, but we still say “Hallelujah”. The pronunciation we use today derives from the old English. The letter “J” was originally used in Roman numerals for the final “I” in a Roman numeral, like the number eight which is “VIII”. (We all went to the pains of learning all the symbols of the Roman numerals in school.) But whenever you had a *final* “I” they made it with a little hook at the bottom, like “J”. Actually, the iota from the Greek is what we really have—that’s where this comes from. The lowercase letter ι, in the Greek, looks a little bit like “j” in that it’s got a hook at the bottom. I don’t think we come close to the Hebrew pronunciation, in any case. I hear people bandying around Hebrew names for God but, you know, people who speak Hebrew fluently would probably laugh at our pronunciations of them because we just don’t get it right. I remember once I was having dinner with a lady, Allie and I were, in Jerusalem. She was a friend of our mentor and we were having a wonderful conversation. I forget how I mentioned it, but I mentioned the Book of Nehemiah. And she looked at me blank as though she did not know what I was talking about. And I said, “NEE-uh-MY-uh”, and she thought a minute and said, “Oh, you mean Nuh-KHEE-me-uh”—the Hebrew pronunciation was different from what I learned growing up as to how to say the name of that man, Nehemiah.

So, we have our little problems here, and we have people who believe that it’s absolutely imperative that we use the Hebrew name for God that can’t be translated. As it happens. Paul didn’t understand it that way. Neither did Peter; neither did Matthew; neither did James, John, any of these guys. Every one of them—they sat down to write, wrote in Greek, and they used “the Lord” [ὁ κύριος, Strong’s G2962] where the Old Testament would have *Yahweh*. So, I’m sorry, I can’t buy the argument that you have to use the Hebrew names because they didn’t use them in the New Testament and they seem to have gotten away with it. So, back to Exodus 5, verse 3, following on to Pharaoh’s remark.

**Exodus 5**

ASV

<sup>3</sup> And they said, The God of the Hebrews hath met with us: let us go, we pray thee, three days journey into the wilderness, and sacrifice unto Jehovah our God, lest he fall upon us with pestilence, or with the sword.

Now, take special note of this. He’s saying there would be sanctions if they didn’t go and keep this feast, which I think suggests that this is not merely an excuse for leaving Egypt; there actually was a feast that they felt commanded to go out there and keep. Now, as I said, we know from Genesis that there were seasons, *moeds*, appointments with God. Now, if indeed this was one of the appointments, what was it commemorating *before this time*? This is another one of those places where, if you’d like, you can hit the pause button and take a little time to discuss this. What is there back in history that one would be commemorating on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month (first moon) of the year—which is where they were at? Well, it’s an interesting thought. Now, we won’t slog through all the plagues today, but we will skip forward to chapter 12 when the Passover really becomes germane.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>1</sup> And the LORD spoke to Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt saying,

<sup>2</sup> This month shall be to you the beginning of months: it shall be the first month of the year to you.

Now, how do we know what month that is? Here's another one of those places where you can easily hit the pause button and sit and talk this over. You know, he doesn't tell us which month it was. They knew because they were standing there alive, living and breathing, *in that month*. So he said, "this" one. (And, of course the word for "month" is the Hebrew word for the "new moon" [*chodesh*, חֹדֶשׁ, Strong's H2320]. New moons form the cycle of the month. So, "this month—this moon—will be the beginning of moons to you", he told them. The name of the month is revealed in the next chapter.

## Exodus 13

NAS

<sup>4</sup> On this day in the month of Abib, you are about to go forth.

The name is *Abib* [אַבִּיב, Strong's H24] which means "tender or green"—as in the green ears of barley that would have been out in the fields. Now, let me give you a clue as to where the problem arises here, as to how you know which month this is. Cairo is at a latitude of 31° 3' N. Jerusalem is 31° 47' N. Now, when you do the translation of how many miles per degree and how many miles per minute, this places Jerusalem at a latitude that is 120 miles north of Cairo. Do you think there would ever be a difference in the month at which the green years appear in one place or the other? Well, if you've ever been to Egypt you probably would say, "Oh, my word, yes." Obviously, the crops are going to become green much, much earlier in the year than you would think they would have been in Jerusalem, because Jerusalem not only is 120 miles north, it's a higher altitude than Cairo. So, it could *easily* be that the month of green ears was different in Jerusalem than it was in Cairo.

But here's the problem: Where do you go to a scripture to tell you that? We know "tender or green", but does that mean when the first little bit of green shows up on them? Does it mean as we are predicting the first ripe grain to come in the middle of the month? What does it mean? The Bible never explains—just as it never gets around to explaining what constitutes a new moon. It doesn't explain. What, then, are the consequences of this lack of explanation? It's easy: There is no calendar system that does not require some decision to be made on the part of man. It's as simple as that. You know, when you really look at it, you have to decide where you're going to be at the time. A question some people will raise is, "Well, it had to be in Jerusalem." Well, I don't think there was a Jerusalem *per se* when God told Moses "this month shall be the beginning of months to you." What *became* Jerusalem was a Jebusite town at the time. In all the early years that Israel was possessing the land at first, the tabernacle was not at Jerusalem, it was at Shiloh. What, 15 miles or so north of Jerusalem (I forget the exact distance.) but it wasn't there.

So where do you go with all this stuff and why am I making this an issue? The answer is because the Bible does not give you an authoritative answer. The question you get to think about and talk over: What are the consequences that flow from this? Somebody has to decide. In Israel, it would have been the priests who made this decision. And the tradition began to be developed and flowed down through all those years in between.

Okay, I said a new moon delineates the month. What actually constitutes a new moon? Well, among the people that think the new moon *even matters*, there are two different opinions: that the new moon is the conjunction, or the observed new crescent. Okay. Some people say the conjunction. The conjunction is the absolute dark of the moon when the moon is *precisely* positioned so there's not any reflection of light off of it. Question: Where is the scripture that tells us that? Other people say, logically: The first time you observe the new *crescent*, *that* is the new moon. Once again, I ask the question: Where is the scripture that says that? There isn't one. Nowhere is it defined. You want to argue your system is logical? I cannot dispute that. The problem is that both of these systems are completely logical. The question is: Who gets to decide? And if you don't have scripture on it, what good is logic?

Now, a lot of people raise the issue of the *postponements* in Jewish tradition. "Why are they doing postponements from the new moon?" You should know this: they are postponing, not from the *observed* new moon, they are postponing from the conjunction. The *whole objective* of the postponements is to, as often as it makes sense or is possible to do so, to make the new moon on the day *it would have been*

observed. Now, the Jews are smart people, and it doesn't take very long for you to figure out, you know, if we have to wait till somebody sees the new moon in Jerusalem, how in the world are we going to tell people in the northern part of the country? Well, we can light signal fires (which, apparently, they did at times in their history) but you can see the difficulty. Whereas if we *can* calculate this (and we've been doing this long enough now that we all know how many days there are in between) this is *totally predictable*. And so the whole system is designed, really, to put the new moon on the date of the observed new crescent. And there are a couple of other adjustments that are made for the convenience of the priesthood and the things that they had to do in the temple. Most of which, you know...they *had* to get it done and they made a logical, reasonable decision about how they would actually determine these things. We can argue with them if we want to, but don't make the mistake of thinking you can turn to scripture to support your argument. It isn't there.

There has to be, somewhere, a calendar authority. "Well", people say, "why do we look at a fourth-century Jew as the calendar authority?" (Hillel, I believe, was the guy who finally put all this out.) Most of my information on this particular side of things comes from a book called Spier's *Comprehensive Hebrew Calendar*, and, basically, as he develops the theme with Hillel, what Hillel did was to *reveal* for the first time what had previously been *secret*—and that is the tools for the calculating of the calendar. He didn't invent them. He was just the person who finally told a the world exactly what they were, so that Jews everywhere could be meeting on the same day. That's the idea of it. Which seems to me to be *entirely* rational.

So years have gone by and, eventually, some Christians start keeping the Holy Days. (Much like the first Christians did in the first century.) Now, the first Christians in the New Testament had no argument with the Jews about the calendar, even though they kept the Days of Unleavened Bread, the Passover, and so forth. There was no hint of a calendar problem at that time. Why? Well, after all, the Jews were the normative calendar authority; why mess around with it? And, of course, the Temple was still standing there and forms the center for all this worship. And when the priest said it was Passover, it was Passover.

So as time went by, in the modern church, we had a decision to make of what we were going to do about the calendar. And before I ever learned about Christians keeping the Holy Days, the decision was made to use the published Hebrew calendar. Pure and simple. So, for the church, the published Hebrew calendar became the calendar authority. Now, since that time there have been other people to come along and other little church groups who decided that they know better and that they can figure this stuff out—they have a more scriptural basis of it. One fellow published a book called *The Calendar God Gave to Moses*. If you've got a computer concordance, enter the word "calendar" and see what you find. And if you find the word "calendar", see if you can find the calendar God gave to Moses anywhere.

I'm being absurd because, in fact, everybody knows God did not give Moses a calendar. Or if he did, *nobody* ever made any note of it or made comment on it. In fact, I have a very strong suspicion that God placed his appointed times and his holy days into an existing calendar. "Let's see, what's your calendar, here? Okay, on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month—that's when I'm going to meet with you and you're going to sacrifice the Passover Lamb." It's an issue that we can all differ on. It's rattled around the rafters of the churches of God for who knows how long. But, you know, the odd thing about all this is that, in spite of the differences on it, we seem (most of us—98% or more) all observe the Lord's Supper, we've taken the bread and the wine, we wash one another's feet at the *same time of day* and on the *same day of the month*. So, we can have a lot of fun arguing about the issue, I guess, but we're not going to go any further with it and it doesn't affect any of our unity of practice. God went on to say in verse 3:

## Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>3</sup> Speak you to all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house:

Why the tenth day? Well, I don't know. I have speculated about various and sundry reasons why it might have been so. However, when you come down to the New Testament, it appears...if you work out the chronology of what's called "Holy Week"—if you begin to work your way back from the crucifixion—that most of Christianity places the tenth day of the month as Palm Sunday. And as a consequence, that's the day that Jesus entered the city, riding upon an ass, with people spreading palm branches and coats before his way and hailing him in his entry into Jerusalem and as the Passover Lamb. (Actually, it would be Palm *Wednesday* some years, but never mind.)

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>4</sup> And if the household be too little for the lamb [*You know, you've got a man, his wife, and not much else there.*], let him and his neighbor next to his house take it according to the number of the souls; every man according to his eating shall make your count for the lamb.

It's really quite true to call this original Passover a "home service", but actually in practice it was a bit of a neighborhood thing. Because you could *easily* have two, three, four families assembling with you in your home to eat this lamb.

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>5</sup> Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year: you shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats:

Why a male? Why without blemish? Would it really matter if the thing had a wart on it somewhere. Well, the symbolism which Christians see in this is that: Male—Jesus was a man. Without blemish—Jesus never committed a sin, never had a flaw or anything of the sort. And the symbolism carries forward and that does, frankly, seem to me to be the point of it.

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>6</sup> And you shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening.

It's a little bit of an unusual expression. Basically, the Hebrew says "between the evenings" rather than "in the evening". One of the Bible dictionaries mentions that:

The Jews divided the day into morning and evening: till the sun passed the meridian all was morning or fore-noon; after that, all was afternoon or evening. Their first evening began just after twelve o'clock, and continued till sunset; their second evening began at sunset and continued till night, i.e., during the whole time of twilight[.]

*Clarke's Commentary on the Bible - Exodus 12*

So, basically, it means "kill it that afternoon."

### Exodus 12

KJV

<sup>7</sup> And they shall take of the blood, and strike *it* on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it.

<sup>8</sup> And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; *and* with bitter *herbs* they shall eat it.

<sup>9</sup> Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast *with* fire; his head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof.

I guess you take the skin off of it; with the wool, that wouldn't smell very good being roasted. But otherwise, you just roast the *whole lamb*.

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>10</sup> And you shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that which remains of it until the morning you shall burn with fire.

Okay, what constitutes “morning”? Well, what do we today call “morning”. Virtually *any time* after midnight we call morning. Well, there's evidence, I think, that they looked at this much the same way and I'll point out as we go along. Here's how you're supposed to eat this:

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>11</sup> [...] with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and you shall eat it in haste: it is the LORD's passover.

Hmm. Why? Why would we have to eat this thing fully dressed, with our shoes on, *and our staff in our hands*? (Staves are for walking, you know.) And why should we have to eat it *fast*? Why can't we recline at meal? Why can't we have an easygoing time at this? Why can't we enjoy the meal and then go to bed and sleep? I think the answer is: You *aren't going to bed* this night. You're going to have to stay alert because of what's about to happen. So you're going to be ready for the road and you're going to eat it in haste. What is the antecedent of “it”? You should eat *it* in haste; it is the Lord's Passover. “It” is the lamb, in this case.

Now, our problem when we get to talking about this is the word “Passover” is used in a broad variety of meanings—certainly more than one single variety. We don't make our words always, in English, mean the same thing no matter where it's found. Why should we expect it of Hebrew? So the lamb is the Passover. Also, the *day* is the Passover. And we'll find, when we come to the New Testament, that the *Feast of Unleavened Bread* is called the Passover. So you've got to be a little bit careful about trying to be too technical in the use of the term. But here, the lamb is the Lord's Passover. Why were they to eat it ready for the road? Well, let's follow the story and see if we can pick up on it.

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>12</sup> For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment: I am the LORD.

<sup>13</sup> And the blood shall be to you for a token [...]

Before I go on: Is it really necessary that we kill all the firstborn in the land of Egypt? Well, I make this point in my book on the Holy Days called *The Thread*—that the Egyptians had killed, not merely the firstborn of the Israelites, they had killed *every man-child born*. Every one them. Not only had Pharaoh and his army done this, he engaged the whole people—the whole land of Egypt was involved in the throwing of little Israelite boys into the Nile for the crocodiles. Okay, so Moses came down there more of the first things he did was to give them blood to drink out of the Nile. The symbolism cannot be escaped. I mean, the blood of all these children is there—now *you will drink it*. So he's going to smite, not *every* child of the Egyptians, the firstborn. And for God to be a God of justice, this is necessary.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>13</sup> And the blood shall be to you for a token on the houses where you are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be on you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.

<sup>14</sup> And this day shall be to you for a memorial; and you shall keep it a feast to the LORD throughout your generations; you shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever.

Wow! “Forever” is still here, isn’t it? By the way, underline in your mind, or maybe on the page, that word “memorial”, because it will become important when we get down to 1 Corinthians 11 and talking about Paul’s description of what the church was going to do on that same night.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>15</sup> Seven days shall you eat unleavened bread; even the first day you shall put away leaven out of your houses: for whoever eats leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel.

What’s the significance of eating unleavened bread for seven days? Well, we’re going to see shortly that, for the Israelites, the significance had to do with the *speed* with which they had to leave Egypt—they could not *wait around* for bread to rise. The only bread they could bake was unleavened. They had to get whatever dough they had—they get it on the fire; they had to get it cooked; they had to get it eaten and they had to get back on the road again. This was not going to be a leisurely time for these.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>16</sup> And in the first day there shall be an holy convocation, and in the seventh day there shall be an holy convocation to you; no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you.

Now, for the record, the “first day” is the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the first month. And, of course, there are seven days of Unleavened Bread. The seventh day is also a holy convocation.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>17</sup> And you shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this selfsame day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall you observe this day in your generations by an ordinance for ever.

<sup>18</sup> In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, you shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even.

Now, *so many* arguments have been made about this. (Most of which are pointless, to tell you the truth.) But it’s fairly clear, when you read through this, that the First Day of Unleavened Bread, in the law, is the 15<sup>th</sup>. So when it says the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the month at even is when you start eating unleavened bread, that would be in the nighttime portion of the 15<sup>th</sup>. Do I need to remind everybody that, in this time, days began at sunset, every time, and ended at the following sunset. (Oh, yes, I keep forgetting. There is a theory out there of people who believe that a day is only the daylight portion of the day—that you observe the Sabbath from sunrise to sunset instead of from sunset the sunset. You know, I don’t know where to go with that. It’s not even worth the argument.) Okay, he says:

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>19</sup> Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses: for whoever eats that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether he be a stranger, or born in the land.

Okay. It doesn't make any difference whether they're here or not. You shall eat nothing leavened. We don't want to see it in your borders.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>20</sup> You shall eat nothing leavened; in all your habitations shall you eat unleavened bread.

Now, up through verse 20 of this chapter, everything is all instruction—this is what we're going to do. Now the *events* begin and it's at this point where the plot begins to thicken I think it confuses people—you read the instructions, then you read the events and it sounds redundant. But it's not.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>21</sup> Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said to them, Draw out and take you a lamb according to your families, and kill the passover.

<sup>22</sup> And you shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the basin, and strike the lintel and the two side posts with the blood that is in the basin; and none of you shall go out at the door of his house until the morning.

Why? Why can't we go out until morning? Well, because:

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>23</sup> For the LORD will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when he sees the blood on the lintel, and on the two side posts, the LORD will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in to your houses to smite you.

It's funny how the expression, "the death angel", has entered into colloquial thought about this. It never says it's a "death angel"; it just says "the destroyer".

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>24</sup> And you shall observe this thing for an ordinance to you and to your sons for ever.

<sup>25</sup> And it shall come to pass, when you be come to the land which the LORD will give you, according as he has promised, that you shall keep this service.

<sup>26</sup> And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say to you, What mean you by this service?

<sup>27</sup> That you shall say, It is the sacrifice of the LORD's passover, [...]

And, for some reason, there are people who don't believe the Passover Lamb was a sacrifice—but it was.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>27</sup> [...] who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses. And the people bowed the head and worshipped [*did*

*obeisance*].

<sup>28</sup> And the children of Israel went away, and did as the LORD had commanded Moses and Aaron, so did they.

<sup>29</sup> And it came to pass, that at midnight the LORD smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat on his throne to the firstborn of the captive that was in the dungeon; and all the firstborn of cattle.

After this, it was safe to go out, because once the destroyer has come, passed over your door, and gone through all of Egypt... (And I don't think he had to go from one end of Egypt to the other. I think all this happened at midnight, at the same time.) After this, it was morning and now it was safe for them to go out.

## Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>30</sup> And Pharaoh rose up in the night, [...]

Isn't this interesting—you know, that the time after midnight, while it is also *morning*, is now called "night"? Well, why should it be surprising; we do exactly the same thing. We call it night. Basically, it was still dark.

## Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>30</sup> [...] he, and all his servants, and all the Egyptians; and there was a great cry in Egypt; for there was not a house where there was not one dead.

And they knew what this meant. They knew *precisely* what this meant.

## Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>31</sup> And he called for Moses and Aaron by night, and said, Rise up, and get you forth from among my people, both you and the children of Israel; and go, serve the LORD, as you have said.

<sup>32</sup> Also take your flocks and your herds, as you have said, and be gone; and bless me also.

<sup>33</sup> And the Egyptians were urgent on the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men.

The first time that I really did a serious study of this, the church at that time held a doctrine that all this took place in the nighttime portion of the 14<sup>th</sup>. But I had a problem with that at the time. I wrote a paper for class and on it. And when I look at this—at midnight, every house in Egypt winds up finding a dead person in there and they *know* what it means; they know exactly. They've been through all the plagues. They've had this forecast. They knew that was what Moses said was going to happen. They just didn't believe it. Now it's happened.

Now, here's the question: Did everybody go back to bed and wait till daylight? And why were the Israelites eating this lamb, dressed, standing up, with shoes on their feet and their staff in their hand, if it wasn't because in a *matter of moments* they were going to have to leave because:

## Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>33</sup> [...] the Egyptians were urgent on the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men.

“Get these people out of here!”

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>34</sup> And the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading troughs being bound up in their clothes on their shoulders.

They did all this ready to walk. There was no time to let bread rise. They just stuck it in there and they left. And when they got a chance to cook it, they cooked it unleavened.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>35</sup> And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment:

<sup>36</sup> And the LORD gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent to them such things as they required. And they spoiled the Egyptians.

Well, why not? The Egyptians are here. They're right in front of you saying, "Get out of here!" "Well, I don't know whether I want to leave or not. And, uh, what's that you got around your neck?" "Here, take it, just go!" The thing that, to my mind, *dominates* is that these people were actually on their way—they were delivered from Egypt—at the moment of the death of the firstborn and Pharaoh's decree that said, "Get out." This is when Israel was delivered from Egypt—not when they actually crossed the boundary going out of the country, for they would not do that for a few days. They had to walk, remember? And a rather large group of them, as well.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>37</sup> And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, beside children.

600,000 *men* were in this group. This is going to make the whole group of them *well over* a million.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>38</sup> And a mixed multitude went up also with them; and flocks, and herds, even very much cattle.

Now, here's another one of these questions for discussion: How many miles a day do you think this gaggle of people and critters could travel? I read somewhere that, in Australia, there was a cattle drive—but this is a modern cattle drive, mind you, with all the resources that they had. They could move a herd of cattle about *six miles a day*. My guess is, considering that you have old people, young people, children...and those Australian cattle drives—they didn't have guys 80 and 90 years old and kids that are 2 and 3 *and* women. My guess is, the best they were able to do is about four miles a day.

So here they go, out across Egypt—still not beyond the boundaries of Egypt. Actually, until they crossed the Red Sea, they were not beyond the boundaries of Egypt.

**Exodus 12**

AKJV

<sup>39</sup> And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened; because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victual.

Now, does this explain why they had to be dressed and ready for the road? Oh, I think it does. The old theory that, you know, they didn't go out of their houses until daylight, and they spent the whole day of the 14<sup>th</sup> spoiling the Egyptians, and then began their march *that night* across the desert, makes very little sense, frankly. I have a feeling that they were in the process of getting organized, gathering things, putting people on the road, and actually beginning to move, *all day long* into the evening that first day—and finally camped and baked unleavened bread because everybody was hungry and nobody was going to wait for bread to rise. Okay. Now he says:

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>40</sup> [...] the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelled in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years.

<sup>41</sup> And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the LORD went out from the land of Egypt.

Now, this is an interesting question. It's at the end of 430 years, even the self-same day. The self-same day as what? Now, I'm going to leave you to do your own research on this, but if you go back and check Ussher's chronology (that we may have in the margin of your Bible or you can probably find something somewhere that talks about all these events) you're going to find that the time from when Israel went into Egypt until it came out was nowhere near 430 years. I forget the exact length of time that most chronologies have from the time that Jacob and his kids went down there, following Joseph, but it wasn't that long. What you *will* tend to find is that 430 years before that (if memory serves) puts you back in the day of Abraham. So then you can ask the question: Since this is the self-same day—it is a *moed*, an appointment of God—*something* happened on the self-same day 430 years before all this.

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>42</sup> It is a night to be much observed to the LORD for bringing them out from the land of Egypt: this is that night of the LORD [...]

That's the title of it, by the way. It's not the NTB...whatever it is we have. The title of this service is the Night of the LORD:

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>42</sup> [...] to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations.

What night is this? It's the night beginning the 15<sup>th</sup>. What's the name of the night? The Night of the LORD—the night that the Lord smote the firstborn in Egypt and Israel was freed by Pharaoh.

Now, I realize there are probably some of you that have got all kinds of “what if’s or “yes, but’s in your mind about this type of thing. Here's the thing you need to think about: If it weren't for the synoptic problem, as it's called...The synoptic problem is that the first three gospels—the synoptics—have Jesus observing the Passover with his disciples. John, who was not a synoptic, has the Passover the following night. The Jews are planning to observe the Passover the following night, because that's when it begins—the 15<sup>th</sup>. And everybody struggles with this. If it weren't for that struggle, I don't think anybody would ever look at the account here in Exodus and conclude anything else than that the lamb was killed the afternoon of the 14<sup>th</sup>; it was eaten during the night of the 15<sup>th</sup>—midnight on the 15<sup>th</sup>. That was when the destroyer went through Egypt, and by morning the Israelites were on the road. I think that's what you get from here. It's certainly what I got when I did my initial study on it years ago.

Well, why don't they go along with the church's teaching? Well, the truth is that, if you believe that the Passover was killed at twilight on the 14<sup>th</sup>, or if you believe it was killed in the afternoon the 15<sup>th</sup>, as a New Testament Christian you *still observe* the New Testament Passover—the Christian Passover—at the same time. We all agree to that and we'll come to the reasons for that in later studies.

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>43</sup> And the LORD said to Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover: There shall no stranger eat thereof:

<sup>44</sup> But every man's servant that is bought for money, when you have circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof.

<sup>45</sup> A foreigner and an hired servant shall not eat thereof.

Now, this was one service that the uncircumcised could not participate in. And this is the reason why we have always required baptism—that is, circumcision of the heart—for partaking in the Christian Passover. One of the questions that came in asked about this. Why do we say a person has to be baptized to keep the Passover? The reason really connects again to this—they should be circumcised in heart. However, the reasoning goes a little bit beyond that. When we come to the New Testament Passover, and the frame of mind that one must be in if he's going to partake of the shed blood of Jesus Christ, if he is going to partake of the body of Jesus Christ, you must be in a repentant frame of mind, must you not? Must you not have an attitude toward accepting the sacrifice of Christ for yourself? In other words, whatever it is that is required of a person to be able to take the Passover is also required for baptism. So why would they *not* be baptized before partaking of the Passover? Now, I don't think we should stand in people's way. I don't think at the doorway we should ask, "Have you been baptized? Have *you* been baptized? Oh, if you haven't been baptized, you can't partake of the Passover." I would never, never do that. But to explain to people that you should not, unless you have been baptized. Because if you are *ready* to take the Passover, you are *ready* for baptism. In years gone by, I think, there was a little bit too high a bar on baptism—made people jump through too many hoops—and some of the problem may have arisen from that. Continuing now in chapter 12 of Exodus, in verse 46.

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>46</sup> In one house shall it be eaten; you shall not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house; neither shall you break a bone thereof.

<sup>47</sup> All the congregation of Israel shall keep it.

So if you're sharing with your neighbors, you still must assemble in *one house*. A lamb could not be divided, and part of it sent home with a neighbor. Now, this suggests that the lamb is the central, unifying figure in the service—not the family, not the man, not his wife, not his kids—the *lamb* is the center. And it also may be suggestive of the reason why the sacrifice was centralized once they came into the land—because the lamb is the center of everything. I have to presume they were able to burn the flesh of the animal indoors. (Probably a fireplace with chimney; houses were very different from ours.)

### Exodus 12

AKJV

<sup>48</sup> And when a stranger shall sojourn with you, 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.

It is from this that we derive that rule that one should be baptized to eat of the Passover. So, if you're thinking about taking the Passover this year, and you have not been baptized, understand: Whatever it is

that you need to be in heart and in mind in order to take the Passover, you have to be in heart and in mind to be baptized. So, why not?

**Exodus 12**

*AKJV*

<sup>49</sup> One law shall be to him that is home born, and to the stranger that sojourns among you.

God doesn't have two laws: one for this people and one for another.

**Exodus 12**

*AKJV*

<sup>50</sup> Thus did all the children of Israel; as the LORD commanded Moses and Aaron, so did they.

<sup>51</sup> And it came to pass the very same day, that the LORD did bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt by their hosts.

So, what day were they delivered out of Egypt? The 15<sup>th</sup>. What day was the lamb eaten? The 15<sup>th</sup>. What midnight did the Lord take the firstborn? The 15<sup>th</sup>. What day was the Passover Lamb killed? The 14<sup>th</sup>, between the evenings. In other words, at the time of the evening sacrifice.

Well, I don't have any time for questions today. I have already answered a couple of them in the context of the lesson here. So we'll break off here and come back next week to go further in our study of the Passover service. Meanwhile, be sure and send in your questions and comments to [ron@borntowin.net](mailto:ron@borntowin.net), and we'll continue to try to develop our understanding. And I don't mind if you want to go back and clarify things that are in this lesson. So until next time, we'll be talking.

*Christian Educational Ministries*

P.O. Box 560 ❖ Whitehouse, Texas 75791

Phone: 1-888-BIBLE-44 ❖ Fax: (903) 839-9311

❖ [www.borntowin.net](http://www.borntowin.net) ❖