

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמַם יֵשׁוּעַ  
הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִן־הַמָּוֶת



**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)

surely to be regarded as decisive<sup>81</sup>. That an unintelligible word should have got *omitted* from a few copies, requires no explanation. But it would have been inexplicable indeed, that such a singular expression should have *established itself* universally, if it were actually spurious.<sup>82</sup>

If we suppose that δευτεροπρώτον was added to the MSS by an unauthorized source, then we have to consider that it would not be an ordinary adulteration of the text. The usual addition to the text actually makes sense to the reader who proofs the text and thereby goes undetected. However, a spurious addition that has no explanation would be quickly labeled spurious and crossed out of the offending manuscripts as soon as it was proof-read. Further, no one adds what would be unintelligible to a text on purpose. For it serves no end but to discredit the text copier. It is indeed to be supposed that the word δευτεροπρώτον was questioned by the first readers to be ignorant of its meaning, and that the invariable answer that came back from any scribe was that it was what he found in the exemplar copy.

The word δευτεροπρώτον was deleted from certain texts for two reasons. The first is that its explanation was lost and some scribes thought the text was better without it. The second is that the true explanation of the phrase is pro-Torah, as can be seen from the consensus of the explanations, and for this reason alone scholars would discriminate against the word.

Alfred Edersheim<sup>83</sup> writes:

St. Luke describes the Sabbath of this occurrence as ‘the second-first’—an expression so peculiar that it cannot be

---

<sup>81</sup> UBS: omitting δευτεροπρώτον Ƴ<sup>4</sup> ⋈ B L W f<sup>1</sup> 33 1241 1365 f<sup>547</sup> it<sup>b,c,l,q,r1</sup> syr<sup>p,hmg,pal</sup> cop<sup>sa,bo</sup> eth Diatessaron<sup>a,i,n</sup>. UBS: supporting manuscripts: A C D K X Δ Θ Π Ψ (f<sup>13</sup> 28 1344\* δευτερω πρωτω) 565 700 892 1009 1010 1071 1079 1195 1216 1230 1242 (1253 δευτερω πρωτον) 1344<sup>c</sup> 1546 1646 2148 2174 Byz it<sup>a,aur,d,f,ff2</sup> vg syr<sup>h</sup> goth arm geo Caesarius-Nazianzus Gregory-Nanzianzus Ambrose Epiphanius Jerome Isidore Paschal Chronicle Theophylact.

<sup>82</sup> The Quarterly Review, Vol. 152, William Gifford, pg. 349, July & October 1881. London.

<sup>83</sup> Well known famous Jewish-Christian expert in Rabbinical literature.

regarded as an interpolation,<sup>84</sup> but as designedly chosen by the Evangelist to indicate something well understood in Palestine at the time... But we know that the fifty days between the Feast of Passover... and that of Pentecost were counted from the presentation of the wave-omer on the Second Paschal Day, at the first, second, third day, &c. after the ‘Omer.’ Thus the ‘second-first’ Sabbath might be either ‘the first Sabbath after the second day,’ which was that of the presentation of the Omer, or else the second Sabbath after this the first day of reckoning, or ‘Sephirah,’ as it was called (ספירת העמר). To us the first of these dates seems most in accord with the manner in which St. Luke would describe to Gentile readers the Sabbath which was ‘the first after the second,’ or Sephirath-day.<sup>85</sup>

Edersheim’s explanation of the word “second” is faulty here. It is granted that he identifies the “first Sabbath” as that first one after Passover. But he omits the explanation from Lev. 23:11-16, and explains “second” as second day of unleavened bread, which is to say the first Sabbath counted from the second day of unleavened bread. To explain the idiom this way is contrived and unnecessary. It would surely require a longer phrase for intelligibility! The real explanation here is being avoided by Edersheim, and that is that there are two “first Sabbaths,” namely 1. the first day of the feast, and 2. the weekly Sabbath following it. Therefore “second first-Sabbath” clarifies which “first Sabbath” is meant when saying “first Sabbath.” This was obviously a necessity which the passion narratives meet by first mentioning the annual Sabbath, and then following it with the “first of the Sabbaths,” i.e. John 19:31 and 20:1; Luke 23:56 and 24:1; Mark 16:1 and 16:2. Only Matthew uses a different method, “And the later of the Sabbaths, at the dawning on the first of the Sabbaths . . .” which is just as effective in clarifying which one is meant. So in the passion narratives it is not necessary to say “second first of the Sabbaths.”

---

<sup>84</sup> Edersheim’s note 2, “The great majority of critics are agreed as to its authenticity.”

<sup>85</sup> *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Vol. 2, pg. 54, Alfred Edersheim.

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

