

BONUS INFORMATION: THE PASSOVER

The question considered: Did our Lord eat the Passover with his disciples before he suffered or maybe which one?

Every candid person must allow that there are great difficulties relative to the time in which our Lord ate the last Passover with his disciples. Four opinions are here examined:

- I. *Our Lord did not eat the Passover on the last year of his ministry.*
- II. *Our Lord did eat it that year; and at the same time with the Jews.*
- III. *He did eat it that year, but not at the same time with the Jews.*
- IV. *He did eat a Passover of his own instituting, but widely differing from that eaten by the Jews.*

The two first opinions do not appear to be solidly supported. The two last are of the most importance, are the most likely, and may be harmonized. I shall introduce a few observations on each in this place.

- I. *On the opinion that "our Lord did eat the Passover this year, but not at the same time with the Jews."*

Dr. Cudworth, who of all others has handled this subject best, has proved from the Talmud, Mishna, and some of the most reputable of the Jewish rabbins, that the ancient Jews, about our Saviour's time, often solemnized as well the Passovers as the other feasts, upon the ferias next before and after the Sabbaths. And, that as the Jews in ancient times reckoned the new moons, not according to astronomical exactness, but according to the fasiv, or moon's appearance: and, as this appearance might happen a day later than the real time, consequently there might be a whole day of difference in the time of celebrating one of these feasts, which depended on a particular day of the month; the days of the month being counted from the fasiv, or appearance of the new moon. As he describes the whole manner of doing this, both from the Babylonish Talmud, and from Maimonides, I shall give an extract from this part of his work, that the readers may have the whole argument before them.

"In the great or outer court there was a house called Beth Yazek, where the senate sat all the 30th day of every month, to receive the witnesses of the moon's appearance, and to examine them. If there came approved witnesses on the 30th day, who could state they had seen the new moon, the chief man of the senate stood up, and cried vdqm mekuddash, it is sanctified; and the people standing by caught the word from him, and cried, Mekuddash! mekuddash! But if, when the consistory had sat all the day, and there came no approved witnesses of the phasis, or appearance of the new moon, then they made an intercalation of one day in the former month, and decreed the following one and thirtieth day to be the calends. But if, after the fourth or fifth day, or even before the end of the month, respectable witnesses came from far, and testified they had seen the new moon in its due time, the senate were bound to alter the beginning of the month, and reckon it a day sooner, viz. from the thirtieth day. As the senate were very unwilling to be at the trouble of a second consecration, when they had even fixed on a wrong day, and therefore received very reluctantly the testimony of such witnesses as those last mentioned, they afterwards made a statute to this effect-That whatsoever time the senate should conclude on for the calends of the month, though it were certain they were in the wrong, yet all were bound to order their feasts according to it."

This, Dr. Cudworth supposes, actually took place in the time of our Lord; and *"as it is not likely that our Lord would submit to this perversion of the original custom, and that following the true fasiv, or appearance of the new moon, confirmed by sufficient witnesses, he and his disciples ate the Passover on that day; but the Jews, following the pertinacious decree of the Sanhedrin, did not eat it till the day following."* Dr. Cudworth farther shows from Epiphanius, that there was a contention, yorubov, a tumult, among the Jews about the Passover, that very year. Hence it is likely that what was the real paschal day to our Lord, his disciples, and many other pious Jews who adopted the true fasiv phasis, was only the preparation or antecedent evening to others, who acted on the decree of the senate. Besides, it is worthy of note, that not only the Karaites, who do not acknowledge the authority of the Sanhedrin, but also the rabbins themselves grant that, where the case is doubtful, the Passover should be celebrated with the same ceremonies, two days together; and it was always doubtful, when the appearance of the new moon could not be fully ascertained.

Bishop Pearce supposes that it was lawful for the Jews to eat the paschal lamb at any time between the evening of Thursday, and that of Friday; and that this permission was necessary, because of the immense number of lambs which were to be killed for that purpose: as, in one year there were not fewer than 256,500 lambs offered. *See Josephus, War, b. vii. c. 9. sect. 3.* In Mt 26:17, it is said, Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, (th de prwth twn azumwn,) the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover? As the feast of unleavened bread did not begin till the day after the Passover, the fifteenth day of the month, Le 23:5, 6; Nu 28:16, 17, this could not have been properly the first day of that feast; but, as the Jews began to eat unleavened bread on the fourteenth day, Ex 12:18, this day was often termed the first of unleavened bread. Now it appears that the evangelists use it in this sense, and call even the paschal day by this name, see Mr 14:12; Lu 22:7.

At first view, this third opinion, which states that ***Christ did eat the Passover with his disciples that year, but not in the same hour with the Jews;*** and that he expired on the cross the same hour in which the paschal lamb was killed, is the most probable. For it appears, from what has already been remarked, that our Lord and his disciples ate the Passover some hours before the Jews ate theirs; for they, according to custom, ate theirs at the end of the fourteenth day, but Christ appears to have eaten his the preceding evening, which was the beginning of the same sixth day of the week, or Friday, for the Jews began their day at sun-setting; unlike the gentiles who start at midnight.

"Thus Christ ate the Passover the same day with the Jews, but not on the same hour. Christ, therefore, kept this Passover the beginning of the fourteenth day, the precise day in which the Jews had eaten their first Passover in Egypt: see Ex 12:6-19. And in the same part of the same day in which they had sacrificed their first paschal lamb, viz. between the two evenings, i, e, between the sun's declining west and his setting, Jesus, our Passover was sacrificed for us. For it was the third hour, in the course of between 9 and 12, Mr 15:25, that Christ was nailed to the cross: and in the course of the ninth hour, between 12 and 3 in the afternoon, Mt 27:46; Mr 15:34, Jesus, knowing that the anti-type had accomplished every thing shadowed forth by the type, said, "It is FINISHED," tetelestai, completed, perfected, and, having thus said, he bowed his head, and dismissed his spirit. See on Joh 19:14, 30."

Probably there is but one objection of any force that lies against the opinion, that our Lord ate his Passover some hours before the Jews in general ate theirs; which is that;

“If our Lord did eat the Passover the evening before the Jews in general ate theirs, it could not have been sacrificed according to the law; nor is it at all likely that the blood was sprinkled at the foot of the altar. If, therefore, the blood was not thus sprinkled by one of the priests, that which constituted the very essence of the rite, as ordained by God, was lacking in that celebrated by our Lord.”

To this it is answered:-First, we have already seen that, in consequence of the immense number of sacrifices to be offered on the paschal solemnity, it is highly probable the Jews were obliged to employ two days for this work. It is not at all likely that the blood of 256,500 lambs could be shed and sprinkled at one altar, in the course of one day, by all the priests in Jerusalem, or indeed in the Holy Land; since they had but that one altar where they could legally sprinkle the blood of the victims.

Secondly, we have also seen that, in cases of doubt relative to the time of the appearance of the new moon, the Jews were permitted to hold the Passover both days; and that it is probable such a dubious case existed at the time in question. In any of these cases the lamb might have been killed and its blood sprinkled according to the rules and ceremonies of the Jewish Church.

Thirdly, as our Lord was the true paschal lamb, who was, in a few hours after this time, to bear away the sin of the world, he might dispense with this part of the ceremony, and act as Lord of his own institution in this, as he had done before in the case of the Sabbath. At any rate, as it seems probable that he ate the Passover at this time, and that he died about the time the Jews offered theirs, it may be fully presumed that he left nothing undone towards a due performance of the rite which the present necessity required, or the law of God could demand. Accepting that the earth, Calvary, was the courtyard and the blood had to be sprinkled on the altar in the holy place, yet the holy place in the transition was heaven, then the difficult is removed, observe Heb 9:11, 12, 24, 25:

*“But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the **holy place**, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For Christ is not **entered into the holy places made with hands**, which are the figures of the true; **but into heaven** itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others;”*

With this observation, it was not a must the blood should be sprinkled on the earthly altar after the expiration of our Lord but the next apartment which was heavenly temple after the earthly temple ceased its services after His death and the veil was rent into twine.

The objection that our Lord and his disciples appear to have sat or reclined at table all the time they ate what is supposed above to have been the Passover, contrary to the paschal institution, which required them to eat it standing, with their staves in their hands, their loins girded, and their shoes on, cannot be considered as having any great weight in it; for, though the terms anekeitō, Mt 26:20, and anepese, Lu 22:14, are used in reference to their eating that evening, and these words signify reclining

at table, or on a couch, as is the custom of the orientals, it does not follow that they must necessarily be restrained to that meaning; nor does it appear that this part of the ceremony was much attended to, perhaps not at all, in the latter days of the Jewish Church.

II. ***The second opinion which we have to examine is this: "Our Lord did eat a Passover of his own instituting, but widely different from that eaten by the Jews".***

Mr. Toinard, in his Greek Harmony of the Gospels, strongly contends that our Lord did not eat what is commonly called the Passover this year, but another, of a mystical kind. His chief arguments are the following:-

"It is indubitably evident, from the text of St. John, that the night on the beginning of which our Lord supped with his disciples, and instituted the holy sacrament, was not that on which the Jews celebrated the Passover; but the preceding evening, on which the Passover could not be legally offered. The conclusion is evident from the following passages: Joh 13:1. Now before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knowing, &c. Joh 13:2. And supper, (not the paschal, but an ordinary supper,) being ended, &c. Joh 13:27. That thou doest, do quickly. Joh 13:28. Now no one at the table knew for what intent he spake this. Joh 13:29. For some thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy what we have need of against the feast, &c. Joh 18:28. Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas to the hall of judgment, and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover. Joh 19:14. And it was the preparation of the Passover, and about the sixth hour. Now as it appears that at this time the disciples thought our Lord had ordered Judas to go and bring what was necessary for the Passover, and they were then supping together, it is evident that it was not the paschal lamb on which they were supping; and it is as evident, from the unwillingness of the Jews to go into the hall of judgment, that they had not as yet eaten the Passover. These words are plain, and can be taken in no other sense, without offering them the greatest violence."

Mr. Toinard, having found that our Lord was crucified the sixth day of the week, (Friday,) during the paschal solemnity, in the thirty-third year of the vulgar era, and that the paschal moon of that year was not in conjunction with the sun till the afternoon of Thursday the 19th of March, and that the new moon could not be seen in Judea until the following day, (Friday,) concluded that the intelligence of the fasiv, or appearance of the new moon, could not be made by the witnesses to the beth din, or senate, sooner than Saturday morning, the 21st of March. That the first day of the first Jewish month, Nisan, could not continence that thirty-third year sooner than the setting of the sun on Friday, March 20th; and, consequently, that Friday, April 3rd, on which Christ died, was the 14th of Nisan, (not the 15th,) the day appointed by the law for the celebration of the Passover. All these points he took care to have ascertained by the nicest astronomical calculations, in which he was assisted by a very eminent astronomer and mathematician, Bullialdus. (Mr. Bouilleau.).

These two last opinions, apparently contradictory, and which alone, of all those offered on the subject, deserve consideration, may be brought to harmonize. That Jesus ate the Passover with his disciples the evening before the Jews ate theirs, seems pretty clearly proved from the text of St. Luke, and the arguments founded on that text.

All that is assumed there, to make the whole consistent, is, that the Jews that year held the Passover both on the 13th and 14th of Nisan, because of the reasons already assigned: and that therefore Peter and John, who were employed on this business, might have got the blood legally sprinkled by the hands of a priest, which was all that was necessary to the legality of the rite.

But, secondly, should it appear improbable that such double celebration took place at this time, and that our Lord could not have eaten the Passover that year with his disciples, as he died on the very hour on which the paschal lamb was slain, and consequently before he could legally eat the Passover, how then can the text of St. Luke be reconciled with this fact? I answer, with the utmost ease; by substituting a Passover for the Passover, and simply assuming that our Lord at this time instituted the LORD'S SUPPER, in place of the PASCHAL LAMB: and thus it will appear he ate a Passover with his disciples the evening before his death, viz. THE MYSTICAL PASSOVER, symbolic of his body and blood; and that this was the Passover which he so ardently longed to eat with his disciples before he suffered. This is the opinion of Mr. Toinard, and, if granted, solves every difficulty. Thus the whole controversy is brought into a very narrow compass:

Our Lord did eat a Passover with his disciples some short time before he died:-the question is, What Passover did he eat-the regular legal Passover, or a mystical one?

That he ate a Passover is, I think, demonstrated: but whether the literal or mystical one, is a matter of doubt because, legally, He was the paschal lamb and mystically, He instituted something to replace it. On this point, good and learned men may innocently hesitate and differ: but on either hypothesis, the text of the evangelists is unimpeachable, and all shadow of contradiction done away: for the question then rests on the peculiar meaning of names and words. On this hypothesis, the preparation of the Passover must be considered as implying no more than:

- a. *Providing a convenient room.*
- b. *Bringing water for the baking on the following day, because on that day the bringing of the water would have been unlawful.*
- c. *Making inquisition for the leaven, that every thing of this kind might be removed from the house where the Passover was to be eaten, according to the very strict and awful command of God, Ex 12:15-20; 23:15; 34:25.*

These, it is probable, were the acts of preparation which the disciples were commanded to perform, *Mt 26:17; Mr 14:13,14; Lu 22:8-11*, and which, on their arrival at the city, they punctually executed. *See Mt 26:19; Mr 14:16; Lu 22:13*. Thus every thing was prepared, and the holy sacrament instituted, which should, in the Christian Church, take place of the Jewish Passover, and continue to be a memorial of the sacrifice which Christ was about to make by his death on the cross: for as the paschal lamb had showed forth his death till he came, this death fulfilled the design of the rite, and sealed up the vision and prophecy.

All preparations for the true paschal sacrifice being now made, Jesus was immediately betrayed, shortly after apprehended, and in a few hours expired upon the cross. It is therefore very likely that he did not literally and legally eat the Passover this year; and may I not add, that it is more than probable that the Passover was not eaten in the whole land of Judea on this occasion. The rending of the veil of the temple, *Mt 27:51; Mr 15:38; Lu 23:45*, the terrible earthquake, *Mt 27:51-54*; the dismal and unnatural darkness, which was over the whole land of Judea, from the sixth hour, (twelve o'clock,) to

the ninth hour (i.e. three o'clock in the afternoon,) with all the other prodigies which took place on this awful occasion, we may naturally conclude, were more than sufficient to terrify and appall this guilty nation, and totally to prevent the celebration of the paschal ceremonies. Indeed, the time in which killing the sacrifices, and sprinkling the blood of the lambs, should have been performed, was wholly occupied with these most dreadful portents; and it would be absurd to suppose that, under such terrible evidences of the Divine indignation, any religious ordinances or festive preparations could possibly have not taken place but you just never know to what length the apostate Sanhedrin could go with their peculiar services ignorant that the true lamb was Christ and the type was meeting the antitype exactly **IN EVENT AND TIME** and the Jewish economy was now but coming to an end:

Everything happened according to the Sanctuary Plan

Ex 12:5, 6:

*"Your lamb shall be **without blemish**, a male of the first year: ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats: And ye 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**"*

In the evening] "between the two evenings" 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; between twelve o'clock, therefore, and the termination of twilight, the Passover was to be offered.

The day among the Jews had twelve hours, Joh 11:9. Their first hour was about six o'clock in the morning with us. Their sixth hour was our noon. Their ninth hour answered to our three o'clock in the afternoon. By this we may understand that the time in which Christ was crucified began at the third hour, that is, at nine o'clock in the morning, the ordinary time for the daily morning sacrifice, and ended at the ninth hour, that is, three o'clock in the afternoon, the time of the evening sacrifice, Mr 15:25,33,34,37. Wherefore their ninth hour was their hour of prayer, when they used to go into the temple at the daily evening sacrifice, Ac 3:1; and this was the ordinary time for the Passover. It is worthy of remark that God sets no particular hour for the killing of the Passover: any time between the two evenings, i.e., between twelve o'clock in the day and the termination of twilight, was lawful. The daily sacrifice (see Ex 29:38,39) was killed at half past the eighth hour, that is, half an hour BEFORE three in the afternoon; and it was offered up at half past the ninth hour, that is, half an hour AFTER three. In the evening of the Passover it was killed at half past the seventh hour, and offered at half past the eighth, that is, half an hour BEFORE three: and if the evening of the Passover fell on the evening of the Sabbath, it was killed at half past the SIXTH hour, and offered at half past the SEVENTH, that is, half an hour BEFORE two in the afternoon. The reason of this was, they were first obliged to kill the daily sacrifice, and then to kill and roast the paschal lamb, and also to rest the evening before the Passover. Agreeably to this Maimonides says 'the killing of the Passover is after mid-day, and if they kill it before it is not lawful; and they do not kill it till after the daily evening sacrifice, and burning of incense: and after they have trimmed the lamps they begin to kill the paschal lambs until the end of the day.' By this time of the day God foreshowed the sufferings of Christ in the evening of times or in the last days, Heb 1:2; 1Pe 1:19,20: and about the same time of the day, when the paschal lamb ordinarily died, HE died also, viz., at the ninth hour; Mt 27:46-50." See Ainsworth.

Now just creation took 6 days and on the 7th God rested, so Jesus on His work of redemption finished His on Friday the 6th day of the week, He rested on the 7th in the tomb to coincide with the creation week and obedience to the Sabbath.

"On the fourteenth day of the month, at even, the Passover was celebrated, its solemn, impressive ceremonies commemorating the deliverance from bondage in Egypt, and pointing forward to the sacrifice that should deliver from the bondage of sin. When the Saviour yielded up His life on Calvary, the significance of the Passover ceased, and the ordinance of the Lord's Supper was instituted as a memorial of the same event of which the Passover had been a type." — Patriarchs & Prophets, p. 539.3 – EGW

Many will probably be surprised to see the preceding opinions so dissent among themselves, and the plausible reasons by which they are respectively supported, where each seems by turns to prevail. Nevertheless, I think the plan of reconciling the texts of the evangelists, particularly St. Luke and St. John adopted above, is natural. The morning of the resurrection is probably the period in which the most accurate information on this point can be expected. It would not be presumptuous to say, **Christ did eat the Passover this last year of his ministry, a mystical one in replacement of the legal one: it would be as hazardous to say he did not eat it.** One thing is sufficiently evident, that Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed for us; and that he has instituted the **"Last Supper"**, to be a perpetual memorial of that his precious death until his coming again: and they who, with a sincere heart, and true faith in his passion and death, partake of it, shall be made partakers of his most blessed body and blood. Reader, praise God for the atonement, and rest not without an application of it to thy own soul:

"In this ordinance [foot-washing and Lord's supper], 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, the authority and foundation of all Jewish ordinances that pointed to Him as the great and only efficacious offering for the sins of the world. He gave this simple ordinance that it might be a special season when He Himself would always be present, to lead all participating in it to feel the pulse of their own conscience, to awaken them to an understanding of the lessons symbolized, to revive their memory, to convict of sin, and to receive their penitential repentance. He would teach them that brother is not to exalt himself above brother, that the dangers of disunion and strife shall be seen and appreciated; for the health and holy activity of the soul are involved. ¶ This ordinance does not speak so largely to man's intellectual capacity as to his heart. His moral and spiritual nature needs it. If His disciples had not needed this, it would not have been left for them as Christ's last established ordinance in connection with, and including, the last supper. 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. Eating of the body, and drinking of the blood, of Christ, not merely at the sacramental service, but daily partaking of the bread of life to satisfy the soul's hunger, would be in receiving His Word and doing His will." — Review & Herald, June 14, 1898, par. 15-16 — EGW

Why still appeal to the shadows and types when the reality is with us?

"The Jewish ceremonial law has passed away. The temple is in ruins. Jerusalem was given up to be destroyed. But the law of the Ten Commandments lives, and will live through the eternal ages. The need for the service of sacrifices and offerings ceased when type met anti-type in the death of Christ. In him the shadow reached the substance. The Lamb of God was a complete and perfect offering. Types and shadows, offerings and sacrifices, had no virtue after Christ's death on the cross; but God's law was not crucified with the Saviour. Had it been, Satan would have gained all that he attempted to gain in heaven. For this attempt he was expelled from the heavenly courts, and today he is deceiving human beings in regard to the law of God. But this law will maintain its exalted character as long as the throne of Jehovah endures. Christ came to live this law, and he declared, "I have kept my Father's commandments." — RH, October 10, 1899 par. 9 – EGW

"Paul did not bind himself nor his converts to the ceremonies and customs of the Jews, with their varied forms, types, and sacrifices; for he recognized that the perfect and final offering had been made in the death of the Son of God. The age of clearer light and knowledge had now come. And although the early education of Paul had blinded his eyes to this light, and led him to bitterly oppose the work of God, yet the revelation of Christ to him while on his way to Damascus had changed the whole current of his life. His character and works had now become a remarkable illustration of those of his divine Lord. His teaching led the mind to a more active spiritual life, that carried the believer above mere ceremonies. "For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it. Thou delightest not in burnt-offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit. A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." — 3SP 411.1 — EGW

"The Jews had always prided themselves upon their divinely appointed services, and many of those who had been converted to the faith of Christ still felt that since God had once clearly outlined the Hebrew manner of worship, it was improbable that He would ever authorize a change in any of its specifications. They insisted that the Jewish laws and ceremonies should be incorporated into the rites of the Christian religion. They were slow to discern that all 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." — AA 189.3 — EGW

"The Jews were not generally prepared to move as fast as the providence of God opened the way. It was evident to them from the result of the apostles' labors among the Gentiles, that the converts among the latter people would far exceed the Jewish converts; and that if the restrictions and ceremonies of the Jewish law were not made obligatory upon their accepting the faith of Christ, the national peculiarities of the Jews, which kept them distinct from all other people, would finally disappear from among those who embraced the gospel truths. ¶ The Jews had prided themselves upon their divinely appointed services; and they concluded that as God once specified the Hebrew manner of worship, it was impossible that he should ever authorize a change in any of its specifications. They decided that Christianity must connect itself with the Jewish laws and ceremonies. They were slow to discern to the end of that which had been abolished by the death of Christ, and to perceive that all their sacrificial offerings had but prefigured the death of the Son of God, in which type had met its antitype rendering valueless the divinely appointed ceremonies and sacrifices of the Jewish religion. ¶ Paul had prided himself upon his Pharisaical strictness; but after

the revelation of Christ to him on the road to Damascus, the mission of the Saviour, and his own work in the conversion of the Gentiles, were plain to his mind; and he fully comprehended the difference between a living faith and a dead formalism. Paul still claimed to be one of the children of Abraham, and kept the ten commandments in letter and in spirit as faithfully as he had ever done before his conversion to Christianity. But he knew that the typical ceremonies must soon altogether cease, since that which they had shadowed forth had come to pass, and the light of the gospel was shedding its glory upon the Jewish religion, giving a new significance to its ancient rites." — Sketches from the Life of Paul, p. 64, 65 — EGW

The types and shadows of the sacrificial service, with the prophecies, gave the Israelites a veiled, indistinct view of the mercy and grace to be brought to the world by the revelation of Christ. To Moses was unfolded the significance of the types and shadows pointing to Christ. He saw to the end of that which was to be done away when, at the death of Christ, type met antitype. He saw that only through Christ can man keep the moral law. By transgression of this law man brought sin into the world, and with sin came death. Christ became the propitiation for man's sin. He proffered His perfection of character in the place of man's sinfulness. He took upon Himself the curse of disobedience. The sacrifices and offerings pointed forward to the sacrifice He was to make. The slain lamb typified the Lamb that was to take away the sin of the world. {1SM 237.3}

After Christ died on the cross as a sin offering, the ceremonial law could have no force. Yet it was connected with the moral law, and was glorious. The whole bore the stamp of divinity, and expressed the holiness, justice, and righteousness of God. And if the ministration of the dispensation to be done away was glorious, how much more must the reality be glorious, when Christ was revealed, giving His life-giving, sanctifying Spirit to all who believe? {1SM 238.1}

The Jews refused to accept Christ as the Messiah, and they cannot see that their ceremonies are meaningless, that the sacrifices and offerings have lost their significance. The veil drawn by themselves in stubborn unbelief is still before their minds. It would be removed if they would accept Christ, the righteousness of the law. {1SM 239.1}

As touching to Colossians 2:

"The moral law was never a type or a shadow. It existed before man's creation, and will endure as long as God's throne remains. God could not change nor alter one precept of His law in order to save man; for the law is the foundation of His government. It is unchangeable, unalterable, infinite, and eternal. In order for man to be saved, and for the honor of the law to be maintained, it was necessary for the Son of God to offer Himself as a sacrifice for sin. He who knew no sin became sin for us. He died for us on Calvary. His death shows the wonderful love of God for man, and the immutability of His law. {1SM 239.4}"

Further, Galatians 3 and 4 we read:

These false teachers were mingling Jewish traditions with the truths of the gospel. Ignoring the decision of the general council at Jerusalem, they urged upon the Gentile converts the observance of the ceremonial law." — Acts of the Apostles, p. 383.1 — EGW

While tarrying at Corinth, Paul had cause for serious apprehension concerning some of the churches already established. Through the influence of false teachers who had arisen among the believers in Jerusalem, division, heresy, and sensualism were rapidly gaining ground among the believers in Galatia. These false teachers were mingling Jewish traditions with the truths of the gospel. Ignoring the decision of the general council at Jerusalem, they urged upon the Gentile converts the observance of the ceremonial Law. {AA 383.1}

Why was then Paul attending these feasts?!

Paul had prided himself upon his Pharisaical strictness; but after the revelation of Christ to him on the road to Damascus, the mission of the Saviour, and his own work in the conversion of the Gentiles, were plain to his mind; and he fully comprehended the difference between a living faith and a dead formalism. Paul still claimed to be one of the children of Abraham, and kept the ten commandments in letter and in spirit as faithfully as he had ever done before his conversion to Christianity. But he knew that the typical ceremonies must soon altogether cease, since that which they had shadowed forth had come to pass, and the light of the gospel was shedding its glory upon the Jewish religion, giving a new significance to its ancient rites." {Sketches from the Life of Paul, p. 64, 65} "

"Soon altogether cease"---reveals that it was already an ongoing process, which explains why Paul was still attending several of them.

God is in the business of saving His people; His ways are not our ways and we can't define for Him which method to use. If Christians creep among the wicked to win them so be it. Just denying Paul could not use a certain method to win soul is being ignorant of the plain Word of God, notice:

"For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you." (1 Corinthians 9:19-23).

SHALOM