

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)

Therefore, there is nothing unusual about the case and number combination in the resurrection passages disagreeing with the following attributive. And there is nothing unusual about the numeral enumerating or specifying a particular “one of” something. The only thing that might be slightly unusual is the need to supply the head noun needed to agree with the gender of the numeral. But we have seen in the exactly parallel example of “first *day* of unleavens” that the needed head noun can be supplied without changing the fact that the genitive phrase “of the unleavens” tells *what kind of day* (describes) in the adjectival sense. And in every variation of the phrase, “first of the unleavens,” “day of the unleavens,” or “first day of the unleavens”, the phrase “of the unleavens” describes the kind of day, and this day does not alter to another day upon addition of “first.”

So also, “of the Sabbaths” describes what kind of “first *day*” it is.

So also, “of the Sabbaths” describes what kind of “first *day*” it is.

In Luke 22:7, *ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων*, *day of the unleavens*, “of the unleavens” describes the kind of day. In Acts 16:13 *ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων*, *day of the Sabbaths*, “of the Sabbaths” describes what kind of day. In Mark 14:12 and Mat. 26:17 the phrase varies, dropping the word day, and adding a numeral. But still “of the unleavens” exactly describes the nature of the day whether it is counted or not, whether the word day is present or not. For this reason, there is absolutely no way a grammatical law can be invented or conjured up against the plain sense of the resurrection passages “one *day* of the Sabbaths” or “first of the Sabbaths.”

Now previously, I have removed the siren song of second century idioms in Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and LXX sources for “first day of the week.” These were the result of a conspiracy in Rabbinical Judaism against the Nazarenes, a conspiracy just as devilish as the Church’s replacement of Sabbath with Sunday. It had to have happened. For there is no other explanation as to why the chronology based on *Scripture alone* adds up against them. Nine passages have been corrupted to refer to Sunday rather than the Sabbath.

“And nine, nine rings were gifted to the race of men, who, above all else, desire power. But they were, all of them, deceived, for another Ring was made. In the land of Mordor, in

the fires of Mount Doom, the Dark Lord Sauron forged in secret a master Ring, to control all others. And into this Ring he poured his cruelty, his malice and his will to dominate all life. One Ring to rule them all.¹⁴⁸

Acts 20:

Sooner or later the skeptic tries to use Acts 20:6-7:

And we sailed from Philippi in the middle of the days of unleavened bread, and came to them at Troas within five days, where we *finally* consumed *the* seven days. And on the first of the sabbaths, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul began talking to them, intending to depart the next day, and he prolonged his message until midnight. (MISB).

I have supplied a corrected translation above. The skeptic says that they sailed “after the days of unleavened bread,” and that they spent seven days at their destination after their arrival, and then the “first of the Sabbaths.” They confidently proclaim that it is two weeks after Passover and that it is no longer the first sabbath after Passover.

To answer the skeptic I first point out that if you add up the rest of Paul’s travelogue to Jerusalem, then that would put him in Jerusalem after the day of Shavuot (Pentecost), and that such a two week delay is completely inconsistent with his stated desire to reach Jerusalem by the feast date (cf. Acts 20:16).

Now to rid ourselves of these two extra weeks I first render the Greek, “we sailed from Philippi in the middle of the days of unleavened bread” (Acts 20:6). The accusative *μετὰ* can indeed be rendered “in the middle of.”¹⁴⁹ The second step is to make sure the translation, “where we *finally*¹⁵⁰ consumed *the* seven days” is sufficiently literal.

¹⁴⁸ Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10. Fellowship of the Ring (2001).

¹⁴⁹ See Liddell, Scott, and Jones Greek Lexicon. Meta with the accusative and a verb of motion, i.e. “sailing” regularly has this sense. See “C. WITH ACCUS.” This Lexicon is also online.

¹⁵⁰ The literal text reads, “where we consumed seven days [*ὅπου διετρίψαμεν ἡμέρας ἑπτα*].” The italicized words are to prevent a misunderstanding of when Luke begins to count those seven days. Luke assumes the reader knows that those seven days began with the first day of unleavened bread. Friberg

To preview the next pages visit the main index at:

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

