

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)

And Wycliffe¹²⁵ (1380).

John 20:1, “And in oo dai of the woke . . .”

John 20:19, “in that dai oon of the sabotis”

Acts 20:7, “first dai of the woke”

1 Cor 16:2, “oo dai of the woke”

Anglo-Saxon 995 A.D.:

Luke 23:54, “and sæter-dæg onlyhte”

Luke 23:56, “and on sæter-dæg hig gestildon”

Luke 24:1, “On anum reste-dæge. . .”

Several conclusions can be drawn here. Among Sunday Christians in Europe, the Christian Sabbath replaced the Jewish Sabbath to the extent that when “Sabbath” is used in the translations, there is no consciousness of it being the Jewish Sabbath. So the translators of the Anglo-Saxon version render the Jewish Sabbath “sæter-dæg” (saturn-day) and the resurrection day “reste-dæge.” This allows literal conformity to the original language. However, it is clear that the literal language of the original has undergone Gnostic redefinition. Notice the inconsistency in John Wycliffe between John 20:1 and John 20:19. This is no accident. Wycliffe was doubtless aware of it, and what he is saying is that one is equal to the other. Wycliffe seems to be the first to originate “first day of the week” in English. But neither Tyndale nor Coverdale followed him on this.

But eventually Wycliffe’s innovation won the day in English.¹²⁶ This is because as the scholars read the bible more and more, and learned more of the opinions of the Jews and read the *Old Testament* more, they became aware of the faultiness of the Gnostic interpretation. The word Sabbath emerged as referring only to the

¹²⁵ The Wycliffe Bible was not so important or influential as Tyndale and Coverdale. It was hand copied before the invention of the printing press, and the circle of translators were all scholastic academics. The Wycliffe Bible New Testament was first printed in 1731, and the whole in 1850. There were two versions of the Wycliffe Bible.

¹²⁶ Continental Europe was another matter, and the tension between Wycliffe and Tyndale and Coverdale seems to be that the latter two spent much time in Continental Europe. There they adopted the notion that the Sunday was the seventh day, and even to this day the Continental Europeans ignorantly number the days of the week from Monday, making Sunday their seventh day.

seventh day. Tyndale tried to fix this with the interpretation, “one day *from* the Sabbath,” which allows for the word Sabbath to be expressed, but keeps the resurrection on Sunday. But this position proved to be untenable because it reminded people of the real Sabbath. Even if the resurrection was miss-dated in terms of the phrase “after the Saboth,” the people were now made aware of when the real Sabbath was. This was not acceptable to the Church. Sunday was the new Sabbath.

Therefore, when the King James version was produced, the scholarly standard has become “first day of the week.” The justification for this was sought in the Mishnaic and Syriac usages, “one day to the Sabbath.” Particularly relied on was the Mishnaic innovation from ca A.D. 200. While there is a similarity between $\mu\acute{\iota}\tilde{\alpha}\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$, and $\text{בַּתְּדָבְרָה בְּשַׁבָּת}$ (or Aramaic: $\text{בַּתְּדָבְרָה בְּשַׁבָּת}$), there is no evidence that the one phrase means the other, or that the one phrase should be used to interpret the other, yet the trap was laid in Hebrew at that time and the reformed Church fell right into it and thus a true Torah based reformation was aborted.

The first implicit claims of equivalence lie with the translation of the Greek into the Syriac, and exactly how this came about is rather obscure. One Catholic scholar, Robert North, S.J., speculates:

Through doubtless an ignorant overlooking of the final ‘*ayin* in *šeba*’ (seven), early Christian Fathers were led to equate seven (-day week) with Sabbath. [see E. Vogt, *Biblica* 40 (1959) 1008, who disproves that *šabbāt* ever meant week] Still, the best grammarians now admit cases in which ‘*ayin* is in fact transmuted or lost. In the existing Syriac form *šabbā*, the loss of the final *t* is no less anomalous than that of the final ‘*ayin* would be.”¹²⁷

North is probably correct that “Sabbath” was conflated with “seven.” This is what happens if one tries to use Deut. 16:9 [שִׁבְעַת]

¹²⁷ *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Sabbath,” © 2003, pg. 458; R. North. [] notation original. The 1996 article is substantially the same and carries the Vatican’s *imprimatur*. Also remarkable is that R. North’s paper is cited in the third edition of BDAG, “The Derivation of ‘Sabbath’”, *Biblica* 36, ’55, 182-201.”

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

