

הַיּוֹם בַּאֲשֶׁר קוֹמֵם יֵשׁוּעַ  
הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִן־הַמָּתִים



**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)

And the ambiguities in the text would allow the dispute to continue, only this time both sides would be counting Sabbaths, and the dispute would be purely over Lev. 23:11. The “tomorrow of” can mean “hereafter” or the next day. Both sides would admit it.<sup>121</sup>

So the LXX rendering “first day” (23:11), “weeks” (23:15), “week” (23:16), and “weeks” (25:8) is essentially to obscure the counting of Sabbaths and to introduce the meaning of “week” to the word Sabbath. Obviously the attempt to do so left some flaws behind it. But the flaws are not apparent until one looks closely and realizes the fallacy of using an interpretation to establish lexical meaning. But this does not stop the Church from using the excuse provided or the simple from believing it. The second century Rabbis fully knew what this would mean for the New Testament passages. For they knew that “first of the Sabbaths” is a key anchor point of the Nazarene chronology and all that goes with it.

Meanwhile, the Sadducees had lost all leverage by which they could at least keep the text ambiguous. By the time of Aquila, there would be no opposition from them. For all their political power was swept away in A.D. 70 when the Temple was lost.

The Church left their New Testament texts untouched as it was easier and more clever to appeal to the Septuagint and use it as an interpretive tool. The Greek texts continued to read “first of the Sabbaths” (μῆτ' τῶν σαββάτων) and the Latin texts read the same: *una sabbatorum*. Only with the Septuagint they had an excuse for interpreting the text to mean Sunday. That would be the scholarly excuse for deep questioners. The popular explanations remained the Gnostic one about a new series of spiritual Sabbaths or the eighth day,<sup>122</sup> and the slightly more sensible one “after the Sabbath.”

Meanwhile, sometime between the end of the Bar Kochba revolt (A.D. 140) and the final compilation of the Mishnah (A.D. 200), the

---

<sup>121</sup> Discussed and proved at length elsewhere in this book.

<sup>122</sup> The Greeks did not identify a regular week with *ebdomados*. Rather it was any period of seven. It was probably more common to say “eight days,” or on the eighth day counting inclusively from the current day. The “first day” equals the eighth day was the Gnostic code for referring to the first day of the week. . . . eight days from one period to the next inclusively. They liked it because it fit their symbolism of the heavenly spheres.

word “Sabbath” was introduced into Rabbinic literary usage as a manner of counting days of the week. The earliest usage of this is in *Seder Olam*. This use came into regular use in the Mishnah, and further use in the Talmud, which had the effect giving a back up to the obscure Septuagint translation, and also serving as a way to trap Christians into the first day of the week interpretations. So while Sunday observance arose due to Gnostic apostasy, complicity with Mithraism, and rebellion against the Torah, it was the Rabbis who certified the long term endurance of the myth by repaving the foundations with lies.<sup>123</sup> “But behold, the lying pen of the scribes has made it into a lie” (Jer. 8:8).

It is not lightly that I charge the Jewish side with conspiring to corrupt the Septuagint and to create a corrupt literary tradition in *Seder Olam*, Mishnah, and Talmud, as well as the Targums to misdirect the Church concerning the “first of the Sabbaths.” Nor is it lightly that I charge the Church with starting the Sunday myth and of excusing themselves on the authority of the Rabbis, and of perpetuating their own misunderstanding of Scripture in the writings of the Church Fathers. I must remind the world that the Church charges Synagogue with conspiracy to corrupt the truth, and the Synagogue charges the Church with the same crime. I have already outlined their respective biases, and say that both sides are in the wrong and guilty of conspiracy, and that both their houses are under the divine curse because of it.

But the Scriptural chronology leads to no other conclusion than that they did so conspire against both Messiah and Torah so as to corrupt it at those very points fulfilled by Yeshua. Naturally, there are limits to the ability of humans who are opposed to each other to mutually conspire, but the fact that one side conspired against Yeshua, and the other side against His Torah left both sides vulnerable to the

---

<sup>123</sup> Judaism and Christianity were as closely related as Catholics and Protestants in those days. So we can learn a lesson by understanding the activities of the Jesuits. The Jesuits infiltrated Protestant countries and Churches and even stooped to planting false doctrines to divide and conquer, i.e. doctrines that the Church of Rome might not agree with, but which served to divide its opposition. The Jesuits are the classic *agent provocateurs*. We should not assume that Judaism was incapable of such tactics.

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

