Only the Wednesday to Sabbath chronology synchronizes " $\epsilon\pi\iota$   $\tau\epsilon\iota\zeta$   $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\zeta$ " with the third day resurrection on the Sabbath. Only this view explains " $\epsilon\pi\iota$   $\tau\epsilon\iota\zeta$   $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\zeta$ " in the Gospel of Peter.

I have generously allowed a sunset reckoning of the day and non-inclusive counting. Actually Matthew's "εως της τριτης ημερας" is inclusive, which requires a sunrise calendar day to agree with "after three days". For only with a sunrise calendar can after one day be in the same calendar day. After one day will be the night after that day included in the same calendar day. Likewise, "after three days" is the third night after the third [dawn to dusk] day but still on the third calendar day. The three calendar days begin at sunrise Wednesday and end at sunrise on the Sabbath.

This does not work with the Friday to Sunday theory, because the resurrection was before sunrise, which would still be the second day under that scenario. The Gospel of Peter places the resurrection at night (11.45) "When those around the centurion that night saw these things ...."

Whoever edited or redacted the Gospel of Peter, if he should be a Catholic, failed to detect the older chronology reflected by "so that we may guard his tomb upon three days". For this reason there are really only two possible views for 9.35 and 12.50 which mention "dawn of the Lord's day" (η επεφωσκεν η κυριακη, Ορθρου δε της κυριακης). They are either synonymous with επιφωσκοντος του Σαββατου "dawn of the Sabbath" which stands in parallel to it, or they were redacted into the account. I favor the redaction theory because the Gospel of Peter introduces quite a few anti-Jewish sentiments to absolve the Romans of any complicity in Yeshua's death and to convict the Jews exclusively. Nevertheless, the anti-Semitic editor was not thorough enough. He changed only enough to deceive the careless reader and to make the text politically correct for the Roman censor.

At first the whole Church observed the Sabbath as a day of worship, and only the annual "first of the Sabbaths" was connected to the resurrection chronologically. In the types the third day could refer to the day of the crucifixion. After the Second Jewish Revolt, the Sabbath was suppressed, and the celebration was confined to the Passover Sabbath on the 15<sup>th</sup> of Nisan (sunset reckoned). The western Church<sup>336</sup> evolved a response to the Roman authorities faster and aban-

<sup>336</sup> Actually, the Sabbath suppression only stuck in Rome and Alexandria. The rest of Christendom returned to Sabbath observance until the fall of Rome. However, the Roman and Alexandrian Churches were able to survive with their hierarchy more intact because of the compromise under Hadrian, and slowly subverted and conquered all the other Churches, burning, banning, and anathematizing as they went

doned it for an annual Solar celebration of Easter by fasting on that Wednesday, adding a Friday fast, and observing Sunday as the resurrection. The Asian Quartodecimans who had no firm Sunday observance tradition, and who were equally infused with Gnosticism made the resurrection on the third day equal to Christ's death on the third day, and put it all on the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisan (sunrise to sunrise), or the spring equinox date, which included the night beginning the festival Sabbath on the 15<sup>th</sup>. This became their Great Sabbath.

Benjamin Bacon introduces our next tattered relic of the true chronology:

The real significance of Quartodecimanism is placed finally beyond doubt by the survivals of the practice in Gaul and Rome; for even in the West it survived so late as the sixth century! At Rome, where the death and resurrection of Attis had been officially celebrated on the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth of March, the latter being regarded as the spring equinox, ancient Martryologies give March 25 and March 27 as the dates of the Crucifixion and Resurrection.<sup>337</sup>

One needs to take a breath here, because as we have proved, the resurrection was on March 27<sup>th</sup>, A.D. 34! And March 25<sup>th</sup>, A.D. 34 was the Passover Sabbath. Yeshua died on the afternoon of the 24<sup>th</sup> of March. The 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisan, on a sunrise basis was sunrise March 24<sup>th</sup> to sunrise March 25<sup>th</sup>, A.D. 34. The 27<sup>th</sup> of March was the Sabbath. The actual time of the equinox was March 22, 10 hours, 13 minutes Julian (the 13<sup>th</sup> of Nisan), but the official days differed. The choice of March 25<sup>th</sup> over the 24<sup>th</sup> was no doubt motivated by the equinox in the Roman calendar on that date.

How did this correct timing survive? Neither the Orthodox Jews nor the Orthodox Nazarene believers in Yeshua would have preserved the Roman date. However, there can be no doubt that many Essenes became Christians, but failed to depart from the Egyptianized Essenes Calendar. The last supper on Tuesday night they regarded as the Pascal Meal, and the memory of the crucifixion in connection with this day on Wednesday would have survived, since only the Essenes had a fixed link between the Week cycle, the Passover, and the Equinox. It was these Christianized Essenes that are responsible for the memory of the date being retained in Rome.

Furthermore, in no other year does Nisan 14 fall even close to March 24-25<sup>th</sup>. Combining this with the *Didascalia* and the Christian Essene Wednesday Fast draws a beeline right to the resurrection of Yeshua on Sabbath, Nisan 17, March 27<sup>th</sup>, A.D. 34. A further element which would have preserved these dates was the corruption of the Second Century Church by the Gnostics and their adoption of idolatry.

Victorinus, the Bishop of Petau wrote in the third century (killed A.D. 304):

Now ... the reason ... why the fourth day ... why we fast even to the  $9^{th}$  hour ... Jesus was taken prisoner ... by four  $^{338}$  soldiers ... therefore ... we ... fast.  $^{339}$ 

With Catholic writers, one has to delete tons of superfluous flowery language that they use to make themselves look spiritual. It also makes their reasons hard to pin down precisely.<sup>340</sup> It might be argued that Victorinus was only

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>337</sup> See note 331 Bacon, pg. 385.

<sup>338</sup> Latin: quaternion.

The Writing of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus with the extant works of Victorinus and Commodianus, vol. 3, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1895, pp. 388, 389.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>340</sup> For example: Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.