

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמַם יֵשׁוּעַ  
הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִן־הַמָּוֹת



**The Resurrection Day  
Of Messiah Yeshua**

*When It Happened*

According To The Original  
Texts

Order From:

<http://www.torahtimes.org/>

Preview is on next two Pages  
(laid out in book order)

Jewish, biblical, and Semitic sources do indeed count inclusively. For example, a part day, a day, and a part day, are termed “three days.” Using inclusive counting “three days and three nights” can be a part day, a whole night, a whole day, a whole night, a whole day, and a part night. Even so, there is nothing to say in Messiah’s case that it is not three whole days and three whole nights. We shall see later in this book that the 72 hour interpretation and inclusive counting are both possible. But it is not Matthew 12:40 that secures 72 hours. Matthew 12:40 only proves three days or parts thereof, and three nights or parts thereof, and allows up to 72 hours. Other evidence will be used to show that it was 72 hours from the beginning of his suffering to his resurrection, and it will also be shown that Matthew 12:40 includes the suffering.

Therefore, if the skeptic responds with the examples aiming to show that three days and three nights is to be shortened to less than three parts night, then you should confidently dismiss the examples as deceptions, or insufficient, or you should think about the examples until you understand their faults. There are some examples that require knowledge of the exact Hebrew or Greek wording to refute. The sad thing is, that we have to undo the damage of mistranslating that those who were entrusted the rule over the Church have committed, in order to be free from their error.

If you are given an argument that seems in English to prove the point, then you should not swallow it. I will give an example of such an argument. The KJV says, “Come again unto me after three days” (2 Chron. 10:5), and then “So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam on the third day as the king had directed, saying, ‘Return to me on the third day’” (2 Chron. 10:12). It seems that 2 Chron. 10:5 says to come “after three days” are passed, i.e. on the fourth day, or in the night after the day part of the third day.<sup>12</sup> But then 2 Chron. 10:12

---

<sup>12</sup> Using a twenty-four hour calendar day from daybreak to daybreak, “after three days,” can mean the night of the third calendar day, and “after” is with respect to the daytime part of the third day, whereas “on the third day” may be with respect to the whole twenty-four hour calendar day from daybreak to daybreak. This explanation works for Yeshua’s statements, because the resurrection was in the night after the third day, but still on the third calendar

says it was really “on the third day.” Is somehow stating “after three days” a Hebrew direct idiom for “on the third day”?<sup>13</sup> Are these simply two ways of expressing the exact same thing? Not at all! The Hebrew text of 2 Chron. 10:5 says: עוֹד שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים = *while still three days*. Several other translations agree with this. The NAS has “in three days,” and the NIV has “in three days.” Don’t be misled by “after.” It is a mistranslation. The Hebrew says “while still” (עוֹד). And the Septuagint says, “ἕως τριῶν ἡμερῶν,” “as far as three days.”<sup>14</sup>

In some cases, only by knowing more than the skeptic about the original source can you expose his faulty assumption. The key word is the Hebrew word עוֹד. This word never means “after.” It means “still.”<sup>15</sup> Therefore the example does not prove that “after three days” equals “on the third day.”<sup>16</sup>

Here is another inclusive counting argument:

Go, assemble all the Jews who are found in Susa, and fast for me; do not eat or drink for three days, night or day [עוֹד שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים לַיְלָה וְיוֹם]. I and my maidens also will fast in

---

day. But it does not work here, because the people were not expected to hold audience with the King at night.

<sup>13</sup> Obviously, the question is assuming the same definition of “day” on both sides of the equivocation, such that the solution is not in two different definitions of “day” but in assuming the equivalency of “after” and “on” as some supposed Semitic manner of speaking.

<sup>14</sup> Like the King James Version, Josephus has “ὁ δὲ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας (*Ant* 8:214),” “after three days,” but this has the MT and LXX against it, as well as most of Josephus’ other usages of “μετὰ,” which are strictly “after.” There are two more exceptions. One concerns Hezekiah (μετὰ τρίτην ἡμέραν, *Ant* 10:27), but also disagrees with the MT and LXX (τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ τρίτη, 2 Kings 20:5, 8). The final example concerns Amasa (μεθ’ ἡμέρας τρεῖς, *Ant* 7:280), but this disagrees with the MT and LXX (τρεῖς ἡμέρας, 2Sa 20:4). The follow up in *Ant* 7:281 (τῆ τρίτη τῶν ἡμερῶν) is without parallel in the Hebrew or Septuagint. All three of these cases take unjustified liberties with the Scriptural texts. Against these errors are, e.g. *Ant* 3:143 (μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας ἑπτα), and *War* 3:145 (μετὰ μίαν ἡμέραν), and all other passages in Josephus with “after,” that clearly mean “after *n* days” in which *n* is counted exclusive of the starting point.

<sup>15</sup> pg. 267 Holladay. pg 648, vol. II, TWOT. pg 728, “still, yet, again, besides” (BDB).

<sup>16</sup> Both phrases can be used to describe the same event, but only if “day” is understood differently.

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

<http://www.torahtimes.org/pbook>

