

Mat 16:21	after three days	Codex Bezae, Itala
Mat 17:23	after three days	Codex Bezae, Itala, Syriac
Mark 14:58	through three days	literal Greek
Mark 15:29	three days	a false witness
Mat 20:19	after three days	parallel passage in Mark
Mat 26:61	through three days	literal Greek
Mat 27:40	in three days	a false witness
Mat 27:63	after three days	KJV
Luke 9:22	after three days	Bezae, Itala, Marcion
Luke 18:33	after three days	parallel passage in Mark
Luke 24:7	the third day	
Luke 24:46	the third day	
John 2:19	three days	Vaticanus
John 20:20	in three days	misquoted Yeshua
Acts 10:40	after three days	Codex Bezae
1Cor 15:4	the third day	

The rule of textual correction is to use the harder reading. Which reading is harder? "After three days". Moreover, "the third day" shows up in Luke the most. Why? Because Luke was the most worked over gospel by both heretical and careless scribes.

However, we should not toss out "the third day". The deeper story is told by the Hebrew language. What Yeshua said in Hebrew was mostly, "לְיָמֵם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי" (Exodus 19:11) and "לְשִׁלֶּשֶׁת יָמִים" (Exodus 19:15), and a few times "בְּיָוֶם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי" (Hosea 6:2). I have shown before how both "the third day" and "after three days" agrees with the chronology.

The Hebrew lamed preposition (ל) prefixed to *yom* or *shlishi* may mean (1) *pertaining to the third day* (2) *after the third day* or (3) *the third day*. It was often translated by the Greek dative or genitive case without a separate Greek preposition. It is used in 2nd Sam. 13:23, "After two full years" with the meaning "after". It is used in Exodus 19:11, "against the third day" and 19:15 "against the third day," where the chronology means after sunset at the end of the day, but in the same calendar day. Also "And it came to pass after seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth" (Gen. 7:10, KJV).²³⁹

We see then that Yeshua was variously understood. In Mark 8:31; 9:31; and 10:34, and all the parallel passages, Yeshua meant "after three days" and so the Gospel writers made this explicit with "μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας". Yeshua's enemies understood him variously as "through three days" or "on the third day," or "after three days". In a number of cases, such as Luke 24:46 and 1Cor 15:4 the text almost certainly means "pertaining to the third day". In very few cases did the Greek Scribes dare to insert "ἐν" (in), and this too may be an exchange with "εἰς" = "ל". We can deduce that at least 12 passages read "after three days" and only 6 passages "the third day", and 3 of these are not quoted from Yeshua himself, but

²³⁷ ανασθησεται B C² D W Θ 085 J^{1,3} 33 M. This remnant indicates that μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας was excised first (for which we only have Mark) and αν. was changed to εγερθησεται later when the MSS were more numerous, and therefore the evidence of the change survived.

²³⁸ Luke has τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τῆ τρίτῃ; The Lukan MSS underwent earlier and more extensive redaction by the gnostics. Only Mark preserves the original.

²³⁹ Compare Gen. 7:4, "For yet seven days". The Hebrew literally means "After 7 more days" and agrees exactly with Gen. 7:10. cf. Koehler's Lexicon under (ל).

from persons who may have misconstrued his meaning. Two of the six are in Luke and may either be explained by another sense of the same Hebrew or Gnostic Scribes. This leaves only John 2:19 where Yeshua said "לְיָוֶם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי" in Hebrew, which John chose to render "τρισὼν ἡμέρας".²⁴⁰ "Destroy this temple and three days I raise it". The omission of "in" in Vaticanus is almost certainly correct. For only with the said Hebrew above and "three days I raise it" can we explain the variant interpretations of Yeshua's enemies, who weren't sure whether he meant "after", "through," or "in" "three days".

The Sunday apologists invariably try to use the "on the third day" MSS to correct Mark. It should be pointed out to them at the outset that none of the parallel passages contain the word "on". Further, not wanting to expose their own MSS tradition they argue that after *n* calendar days = on the *n*th calendar day. The foolishness of this can be seen immediately by taking *n*=1 instead of *n*=3. If someone says today "after one day" he means at least after sunset ending that day.

Moreover they try to appeal to the "peculiarity" of the Hebrew idiom or the Semitic/Aramaic languages to substantiate their reinterpretation of "after". I can say as an expert biblical chronologist that I have had to pay utmost attention to the exact sense of many temporal words in the original languages, and can say with full confidence that they are 100% bluff on this point. Also, the Muslims reject the Sunday apologists arguments for Matthew 12:40 to which these Semitic appeals are attached, and being speakers of Arabic, they form the largest remaining base of Semitic language in the world.²⁴¹

Dawn on the third Day (Hosea 5:14-6:3)

Our final passage from the prophets is the least understood, but it is also one of the most powerful arguments

²⁴⁰ This Greek construction comes after A.D. 70 and is unlike all the others. It appears that John was attempting to preserve the ambiguity of the Hebrew phrase in a later Greek dialect. The farther back we go into the Greek era the easier it is to construe (ל) for the dative. After A.D. 70 the Semitic base is being broken up, or its influence on Palestinian Greek attenuated.

²⁴¹ A favorite trick is to call Matt. 12:40 an idiom or figure of speech, even to the point of labeling it an *hendiadys*. This appeal to esoteric knowledge is combined with their bold assertion that they "know" how the Jews reckoned days and nights. The truth is that trying to override Mat. 12:40 has always been controverted by many Hebrew speaking Jewish Christians who take it literally! The Jews that they are appealing to are either Phantom Jews or Jews with some vested interest in the Catholic Chronology of the Passion. They avoid trying to settle the question using the beliefs of Jewish Christians because "too many of them" believe Yeshua rose on the Sabbath. Rather they turn us to the Talmudic reasoning to attempt to achieve their end, "A day and a night are and onah, and a part of it is as the whole of it", and fail to point out that the Talmud contains numerous statements by bickering Rabbis who do not agree with one another, or even what is meant by more ancient Rabbis. All of these tricks by the Catholics are appeals to authorities and traditions which cannot be cross examined by the simple. Real truth is not defended in this manner. The authority of real truth is based on observable facts and sound mathematics. The meanings of words in Hebrew and Greek are to be determined by sound linguistic analysis and common sense usage. Tradition is the haunt of prevaricators and entering there should arouse our skepticism the most. The Church's tradition is where we should apply higher criticism, and not to the common sense meaning of the Scripture.